Calendar No. 79

107TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 107–39

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 2002

JULY 13, 2001.—Ordered to be printed

Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2001

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1171]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1171) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002

Budget estimates considered by Senate	$23,008,002,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	25,450,485,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Above the budget estimate, 2002	2,442,483,000
Over enacted bill, 2001	1,404,173,000

CONTENTS

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Page
General investigations ... 8
Construction, general ... 29
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries ... 49
Operation and maintenance, general ... 54
Regulatory program ... 76
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program ... 76
General expenses ... 77

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
Central Utah project completion account ... 79
Bureau of Reclamation: Water and related resources ... 79
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account ... 91
Central Valley project restoration fund ... 91
California bay-delta ecosystem restoration ... 92
Policy and administrative expenses ... 93

TITLE III

Department of Energy:
Energy Supply ... 95
Renewable energy resources ... 95
Nuclear energy programs ... 99
Environment, safety, and health ... 102
Energy support activities ... 102
Environmental management (nondefense) ... 102
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation ... 103
Nuclear waste fund ... 104
Science ... 107
High energy physics ... 107
Nuclear physics ... 108
Biological and environmental research ... 108
Basic energy sciences ... 108
Other energy research programs ... 109
Fusion energy sciences ... 110
Departmental administration ... 110
Miscellaneous revenues ... 110
Inspector General ... 110
Atomic energy defense activities:
National Nuclear Security Administration:
Weapon activities ... 111
Defense nuclear nonproliferation ... 119
Naval reactors ... 122
Office of the Administrator ... 122
Other defense related activities:
Defense environmental restoration and waste management ... 122
Defense facilities closure projects ... 127
Defense environmental management privatization ... 128
Other defense activities ... 128
Defense nuclear waste disposal ... 133

Page

Department of Energy—Continued
Power marketing administrations:
Operations and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration 135
Operations and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration 135
Construction, rehabilitation, operations and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration 135
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 136
General provisions 157

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:
Appalachian Regional Commission 159
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 159
Delta Regional Authority 160
Denali Commission 160
Nuclear Regulatory Commission 160
Office of Inspector General 162
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board 162

TITLE V

General provisions 163
Compliance with paragraph 7, rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 164
Compliance with paragraph 7(c), rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 164
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 165
Budgetary impact statement 167
Additional views of Senator Larry E. Craig 168

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2002 beginning October 1, 2001, and ending September 30, 2002, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Delta Regional Authority, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2002 budget estimates for the bill total $23,008,002,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $25,450,485,000. This is $2,442,483,000 above the budget estimates and $1,404,173,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The bill, as recommended, is in compliance with the subcommittee allocation under section 302(b)(1) of the Budget Act.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $15,088,547,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Weapon activities	$6,062,891,000
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	880,500,000
Naval reactors	688,045,000
Other defense activities	564,168,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	5,389,868,000
Defense facilities closure projects	1,080,538,000
Defense environmental privatization	157,537,000

ENERGY SUPPLY

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $741,139,000 for energy research programs including:

Renewable energy resources	$435,600,000
Nuclear energy	264,069,000

NONDEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of $228,553,000 is recommended for nondefense environmental management activities of the Department of Energy.

SCIENCE

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $3,268,816,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$725,100,000
Nuclear physics	373,000,000
Basic energy sciences	1,040,705,000
Biological and environmental R&D	490,000,000
Fusion energy sciences	248,495,000
Other energy research	391,516,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $192,010,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$66,290,000
Delta Regional Authority	20,000,000
Denali Commission	40,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	181,155,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	506,900,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Corps of Engineers:	
General Investigations	$152,402,000
Construction, General	1,570,798,000
Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries	328,011,000
Operation and Maintenance, General	1,833,263,000
Regulatory Program	128,000,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	140,000,000
General Expenses	153,000,000
Central Utah Project Completion Account	36,228,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Water and Related resources	732,496,000
Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account	7,495,000
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	55,039,000
Policy and Administration	52,968,000

The Committee has recommended appropriations totaling approximately $5,050,000,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability and control of water affect and benefit all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resource development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with a central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide hydroelectric power production and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for thousands of urban residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development. Flood control projects prevent an average $22,000,000,000 per year in damages, and U.S. ports and harbors annually handle about $600,000,000,000 in international cargo generating over $14,500,000,000 in tax revenues, nearly $515,000,000,000 in personal income, contributing $783,000,000,000 to the Nation's gross domestic product, and $1,600,000,000,000 in business sales.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held four sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2002 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

In addition, the subcommittee received numerous statements and letters from Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life throughout the United States. Information, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 2002 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 29 to 0 the Committee on July 12, 2001, 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

In the past year, the Corps has received a considerable amount of criticism over the conduct of its studies. Whistleblower allegations and the findings of the Army's Inspector General, regarding the Corps' conduct of an ongoing study of the need to expand the navigation capacity of the upper Mississippi River and the Illinois Waterway, have been widely cited in the press. The Committee notes that the Inspector General found no criminal violations by any member of the Corps.

The Committee is satisfied that the Corps has responded professionally to the issues raised and is taking the concerns with all due seriousness. The Committee believes that the Corps is a unique national resource for managing the competing concerns involved in the development and protection of national water resources and infrastructure and has faith in the ultimate Corps findings and recommendations arising from the various studies that the Corps is authorized and directed to undertake. The Committee commends the Corps for its responsiveness to the American people in developing needed flood control and navigation infrastructure while keeping a delicate balance with the concerns of the environment.

The Committee remains concerned about the huge and increasing backlog of infrastructure development, maintenance, and repair over which the Corps has jurisdiction. The proposed budget causes the backlog of unconstructed projects to increase from $38,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 and ignores an accelerating critical maintenance backlog which nearly doubles from $450,000,000 to $864,000,000. This maintenance backlog will soon become entirely unmanageable under the weight of an aging and crumbling inventory.

Even though the Administration has mounted an initiative to reduce the recreation infrastructure backlog for the Department of the Interior, the Corps' water recreation program, the Nation's largest, is left to deteriorate. Proposing no new study or construction starts, underfunding on-going projects, and providing minimal O&M funding for completed projects leads the Committee to believe that the budget preparation may have been influenced by those seeking to capitalize on the recent controversy surrounding the Corps. The situation that the proposed budget poses to the Nation's economy and quality of life leave the Committee no option but to step forward in support of these vital projects.

The Committee recommendation for the Corps of Engineers totals $4,305,474,000. This is $405,474,000 above the budget request

for fiscal year 2002, but is $235,591,000 below the appropriation for the current year.

BUDGET CONSTRAINTS

The budget allocation for non-Defense discretionary programs contained in the Energy and Water Development bill for fiscal year 2002 are constrained below what is necessary for a robust, balanced national water resources program. Faced with these budget realities, the Committee has had to make tough decisions and choices in the development of the Corps of Engineers' budget request for fiscal year 2002. However, while the budget resources for non-Defense discretionary programs have remained flat or have declined, the number of requests of the Committee continue to increase. This year the Committee received nearly 1,000 requests for funding for water projects within the Corps' Civil Works program. Many supported the funding level in the budget request, but a majority of the requests made of the Committee sought increases over the budgeted amounts or new items not contained in the President's budget for fiscal year 2002.

To compound pressures on the budget this year, the Committee was faced with the recently enacted Water Resources Development Act of 1999 and 2000. Both acts authorized the construction of many new projects, extended credit and reimbursement authorities, and significantly expanded new missions and responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers into areas which historically have been a State and local responsibility. The best example of this is the environmental and other infrastructure authorities which the Committee estimates will cost over $1,200,000,000. It should also be pointed out that the backlog of authorized but unfunded projects is in excess of $40,000,000,000.

BASIS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Specifically, in development of the fiscal year 2002 funding recommendation for the Corps of Engineers, the Committee is not able to include any new construction starts, and has recommended only a limited number of new study starts in an effort to restore balance to the water resource program of the Corps, and to address high priority requests made to the Committee. The limited resources available have been focused on on-going projects where the Corps has contractual commitments. While the Committee has not been able to fund all projects at the optimum level, it has endeavored to provide sufficient funding on each project to mitigate delays and increased costs, to the greatest extent possible, across the entire Corps' Civil Works program.

Finally, the Committee received numerous requests to include project authorizations in the energy and water development appropriations bill. In an effort to support and honor congressional authorizing committees jurisdiction, the Committee has not included new project authorizations.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2001	$160,584,000
Budget estimate, 2002	130,000,000
Committee recommendation	152,402,000

This appropriation includes funds for surveys, preconstruction engineering and design, data collection, inter-agency coordination and research activities to determine the need, engineering feasibility, economic justification, and the environmental and social suitability of solutions to water and related land resource problems.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	ALABAMA						
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	2,617	890	300		300	
(SP)	BALDWIN COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, AL	1,100	100	100		100	
(FDP)	BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL	750	234	50		50	
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	600	100	50		50	
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	15,030	642	300			
(FDP)	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	750	100	50		50	
(SPE)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	1,373	310	160		160	
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	1,651	1,106	250		250	
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	1,463	680	250		250	
	ALASKA						
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	9,600			100		100
	ANIAK HARBOR, AK					100	
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	870	270	50		50	
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	1,188	290	100		500	
(FDP)	BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	1,140	212	100		250	
(E)	CHANDALAR RIVER WATERSHED, VENETIE INDIAN, AK	550	137	50		50	
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	786	486	100		100	100
(N)	CRAIG HARBOR, AK	600	75	50		50	
(N)	DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	3,000	2,115	200		500	
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	4,000	37		100		100
(N)	FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	4,800	187		100		313
	FIRE ISLAND CAUSEWAY, AK					100	
(N)	HAINES HARBOR, AK	315	150	150		165	
(E)	HARDING LAKE WATERSHED, AK	350	50	50		100	
	KENAI RIVER BLUFF EROSION, AK					500	
(N)	KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK	560	150	50		100	
(N)	KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	512	112	50		100	
(N)	LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK	900	56	50		150	
(N)	MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK	600	75	50		100	
	MATANUSKA EROSION CONTROL, AK					100	

(N)	PERRYVILLE HARBOR, AK	800	60	40		150	
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	435	215	96		150	
(N)	QUINHAGAK HARBOR, AK	290	17	50		50	
(N)	SAINT GEORGE NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, AK	650	150	50		150	
(E)	SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	504	190	50		50	100
(N)	SITKA HARBOR, AK	900	75	50		200	
(N)	SKAGWAY HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	500	161	138		138	
	SKAGWAY RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, AK					100	
(N)	UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	400	55	50		50	
(N)	UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	9,000			226		226
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	17,550			150		150
(N)	WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	527	127	150		150	
	AMERICAN SAMOA						
(N)	TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	430	206	124		124	
	ARIZONA						
	COLONIAS ALONG THE US-MEXICO BORDER, AZ						
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTHEAST PHOENIX DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,985	1,842	143		143	
(SPE)	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ	1,724	249	100		100	
(E)	PIMA COUNTY, AZ	1,125	246	400		400	
(E)	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	950	150	200		200	
(FC)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	18,200	281		230		230
(E)	RIO SALADO ESTE, AZ	800	110	100		100	
(E)	RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ	800	375	300		300	
(FDP)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER, GRANT RD TO FT LOWELL RD, AZ	1,350	390	100		100	
(E)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER, PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS, AZ	1,115	516	300		300	
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	62,800	543		270		270
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	19,400	1,199		208		208
(E)	VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ	2,100	75	100		100	
	ARKANSAS						
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR	10,000	1,135		187		187
(N)	ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR AND OK	5,830	1,841	1,200		1,200	
(FC)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	19,500			200		200
(FC)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	19,500	625		400		500
	PINE MOUNTAIN DAM, AR						200
	RED RIVER WATERWAY, AR, LA, OK, TX					100	
(N)	RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR	3,355	2,457	450		500	
(COM)	WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR AND MO	2,000	375	581		581	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(E)	WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR	850	637	213		363	
	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION, AR					169	
	CALIFORNIA						
(E)	ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	1,100	200	50		200	
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	329,300	21,650		2,000		2,600
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	159,600			20		20
(FDP)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	5,565	5,247	318		480	
	ARROYO SECO WATERSHED, CA						
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	11,250	50		300		750
	COYOTE DAM, CA					100	
	CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA					100	
	CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA						
(FDP)	CITY OF WESTMINSTER FLOOD CONTROL DRAINAGE STUDY, CA	1,100	75	100			
	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA					400	
	GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S CREEK, WALNUT CREEK, CA					100	
	HUNTINGTON BEACH COASTAL BLUFF EROSION, CA						400
(E)	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	1,975	350	200		200	
(FC)	LLAGAS CREEK, CA	19,000	990		250		250
(SPE)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	1,100	200	200		350	
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA	60,000	750		600		2,600
(SPE)	LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT, CA	950	850	100		100	
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	10,000	68		150		150
(E)	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	1,150	304	200		200	
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	1,350	1,275	50		250	
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	3,075	2,045	169		400	
(SPE)	MATILIJA DAM, CA	2,000	200	400		523	
(E)	MIDDLE CREEK, CA	16,250			300		300
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER FORKS DAM, CA	1,135	285	200		200	
(E)	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	900	300	150		300	
(E)	MUGU LAGOON, CA	700	450	250		250	
(FC)	MURRIETA CREEK, CA	25,600	748		250		500
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	410	157	150		150	

(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND AND V	1,961	1,393	568	.....	568	100
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	1,970	1,022	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	1,777	1,202	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	2,850	200	250	.....	250	.....
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	21,109	257	.....	280	.....	500
	NEWPORT BAY (LA—3 SITE DESIGNATION STUDY), CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
(E)	NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	1,220	618	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,200	184	200	.....	200	.....
	ORANGE COUNTY COAST BEACH EROSION, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	400	.....
	ORANGE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	139	.....
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	9,300	3,469	.....	750	.....	750
(E)	PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA	1,100	100	50	.....	50	.....
	PENINSULA BEACH CITY OF LONG BEACH), CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(E)	PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION,	22,000	.....	.....	400	.....	400
	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	POSO CREEK, CA	1,450	250	200	.....	200	.....
(FC)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	17,836	.....	.....	100	.....	100
	REGIONAL CONSERVATION/CONJUNCTIVE USE PROJECT, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	RIVERSIDE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
	ROCK CREEK-KEEFER SLOUGH, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	3,677	662	300	.....	300	.....
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	5,940	5,354	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	19,500	13,396	4,479	.....	5,000	.....
(FDP)	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	1,125	175	200	.....	200	.....
(SP)	SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA	950	250	100	.....	100	.....
	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	1,990	821	300	.....	300	.....
	SAN GABRIEL RIVER TO NEWPORT BAY, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA	1,000	110	300	.....	300	.....
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	9,750	.....	.....	200	.....	200
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES AND MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	1,175	150	350	.....	350	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA	1,600	100	25	.....	100	.....
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	.....	.....	.....	100	.....	100
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	1,611	1,561	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	1,600	125	200	.....	350	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	847	687	160	.....	300	.....
(FDP)	SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	1,100	50	100	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA	875	150	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	2,800	938	300	.....	300	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	SANTA BARBARA AND VENTURA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(E)	SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	1,216	656	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	SANTA YNEZ RIVER, CA	600	75	100	.....	100	.....
	SOLONO BEACH-ENCINITAS, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
(E)	SONOMA CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	2,350	300	300	.....	.....	.....
(FC)	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	46,100	2,813	.....	100	.....	100
(FDP)	STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	467	392	75	.....	75	.....
(FDP)	SUTTER COUNTY, CA	1,308	307	300	.....	300	.....
(SPE)	TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	1,250	250	200	.....	200	.....
(FC)	TULE RIVER, CA	14,000	355	.....	400	.....	400
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	55,000	1,666	.....	300	.....	300
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	1,845	986	300	.....	400	.....
(E)	UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	3,400	160	200	.....	200	.....
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	1,300	497	250	.....	400	.....
	WESTMINSTER, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
(FC)	WESTSIDE TRIBUTARIES TO YOLO BYPASS, CA	.....	.....	.....	50	.....	50
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA	650	50	25	.....	25	.....
	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	500
(FC)	YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	19,500	570	.....	780	.....	780
	COLORADO						
(RCP)	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	1,350	773	250	.....	250	.....
	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO	2,100	100	.....	.....	175	.....
(E)	ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO	719	162	200	.....	400	.....
	COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.						
(N)	ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	800	.....	25	.....	25	.....
(N)	TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	800	.....	25	.....	25	.....
	DELAWARE						
	CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHEAD, DE	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....

	DELAWARE						
	COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200
	FLORIDA						
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	3,420	1,360	240	.....	240	.....
	EGMONT KEY SHORELINE, FL	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	ST. LUCIE COUNTY, FL	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL	1,443	185	300	.....	375	.....
(N)	LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	600	146	100	.....	100	.....
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	6,500	.....	.....	300	.....	300
(FDP)	WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL	1,565	185	300	.....	300	.....
	GEORGIA						
(E)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	926	358	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA	1,100	75	60	.....	60	.....
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, GA	1,700	793	252	.....	252	.....
(E)	INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS,	1,130	130	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	1,100	100	100	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	LUBBUB CREEK, GA	600	100	50	.....	50	.....
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	2,230	2,005	175	.....	175	.....
	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200
(E)	SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	1,690	855	350	.....	350	.....
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	144,302	415	.....	400	.....	540
(COM)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA AND SC	2,548	925	230	.....	230	.....
(E)	UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	1,100	100	150	.....	150	.....
	HAWAII						
(E)	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	925	230	350	.....	350	.....
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	23,200	130	.....	100	.....	100
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	750	568	101	.....	101	.....
(E)	KAHUKU, HI	500	100	50	.....	50	.....
(N)	KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	900	130	225	.....	225	.....
(SP)	KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI	600	100	50	.....	160	.....
	NAWILIWILI HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(SP)	WAIKIKI EROSION CONTROL, HI	.....	.....	.....	50	.....	350
	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, OAHU, HI	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100
	IDAHO						
(FDP)	BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	800	100	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	GOOSE CREEK, OAKLEY, ID	800	75	150	.....	150	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(FDP)	KOOTENAI RIVER AT BONNERS FERRY, ID	759	259	50		50	
(FDP)	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID	473	217	256		256	
(FDP)	PAYETTE AND SNAKE RIVER, ID	800	75	150		150	
	ILLINOIS						
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	1,712	1,534	130		130	
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	3,000	562	400		400	
	ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK (INTERIM 1), IL						
	ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL						
(E)	ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	2,725	652	825		825	
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL AND IN	1,770	1,593	177		177	
(SPE)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	1,090	779	311		311	
(E)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL				415		415
(E)	ROCK RIVER, IL AND WI	1,555	683	300		300	
(RCP)	UPPER MISS AND ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO AND WI	62,767	59,043	3,724		3,724	
	UPPER MISS RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, IL					500	
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	8,191	6,419	1,200		1,200	
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	12,302	215		160		160
(FC)	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	18,750	405		341		341
	INDIANA						
(SPE)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	3,100	475	250		500	
(N)	JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN AND KY	225,000	2,312		2,100		2,100
	LONG LAKE, IN					100	
(E)	WOLF LAKE, IN AND IL	550	100	100			
	IOWA						
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	1,620	889	450		450	
	FORT DODGE, IA						
	LOWER DES MOINES RIVER, IA AND MO					100	
	KANSAS						
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	1,287	1,020	133		133	

(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	25,600	1,163	.....	122	.....	400
(FDP)	UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS	650	75	150	.....	250	.....
(E)	WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	545	186	200	.....	200	.....
	KENTUCKY						
(N)	GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND OH	241,300	1,322	.....	2,372	.....	2,372
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	850	598	252	.....	252	.....
(E)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	850	175	325	.....	325	.....
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	850	326	264	.....	264	.....
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	1,784	1,474	200	.....	200	.....
	NORTH FORK LICKING RIVER, KY	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	45,300	43,356	1,500	.....	1,500	.....
	LOUISIANA						
(E)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	2,100	300	300	.....	300	.....
(FDP)	ASCENSION PARISH, LA	2,275	200	100	.....	300	.....
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	1,750	250	100	.....	300	.....
(N)	BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA	82,400	.....	.....	300	.....	300
(N)	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	3,190	532	400	.....	500	.....
(FDP)	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	2,100	400	200	.....	300	.....
	GULF INTERCOASTAL WATERWAY, BANK STABILIZATION AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA	4,500	100	100	.....	300	.....
(FC)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	39,000	68	.....	50	.....	50
(FC)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	52,000	.....	.....	400	.....	400
(E)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	17,500	3,174	1,072	.....	1,072	.....
(FC)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	61,800	.....	.....	50	.....	50
	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, LA AND AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	2,100	100	100	.....	300	.....
	PORT OF IBERIA, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	1,710	475	300	.....	400	.....
(FDP)	ST CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	2,200	100	100	.....	300	.....
	ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FDP)	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	1,850	1,653	197	.....	197	.....
	MARYLAND						
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	3,000	2,542	458	.....	458	.....
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD AND DC	1,453	1,134	240	.....	240	.....
(E)	BALTIMORE METRO, GWYNNS FALLS, MD	4,953	.....	.....	50	.....	50
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD	9,750	525	.....	175	.....	175

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(E)	EASTERN SHORE, MD	1,250	296	250		250	
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD	460	323	87		87	
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD	680	267	190		190	
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	5,655	75		300		300
	MASSACHUSETTS						
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	1,797	1,050	100		100	
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA (45-FOOT CHANNEL)	1,786	236	300		300	
(E)	COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	600	100	100		100	
(FC)	MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA	32,500	375		330		600
(E)	SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, MA AND VT	369	166	100		100	
	MICHIGAN						
	BELLE ISLAND SHORELINE, DETROIT, MI					150	
	CASS RIVER, VASSAR, MI						
	DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI					200	
	DETROIT RIVER MASTER PLAN, MI	200	100			100	
(N)	GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	1,000	499	501		501	
	ROUGE RIVER WATERSHED, MI						
(N)	SAULT STE MARIE (REPLACEMENT LOCK), MI	130,600	2,602		1,530		1,530
	ST CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	400	200			200	
	MINNESOTA						
(E)	LOWER ST ANTHONY FALLS RAPIDS RESTORATION, MN		900		100		100
(E)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD AND MANITOBA, C	8,210	200	500		500	
(E)	UPPER MISS RIVER WATERSHED MGMT, LAKE ITASCA TO L/D 2,	3,105	337	200		200	
	MISSISSIPPI						
	HANCOCK COUNTY, MS					100	
	MISSOURI						
(FC)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	37,759	134		605		605
(N)	HANNIBAL HARBOR, MO	400	75	175		175	

(FDP)	KANSAS CITYS, MO AND KS	3,750	1,272	580	.....	900	.....
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460–471, MO	1,570	1,214	180	.....	180	.....
	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO	17,400	1,255	.....	242	.....	242
(FC)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	6,000	589	.....	98	.....	98
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO AND IL	15,524	3,410	.....	284	.....	284
	ST LOUIS RIVERFRONT, MO AND IL	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FC)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	6,500	38	.....	150	.....	150
	WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	MONTANA						
(FC)	LOWER YELLOWSTONE RIVER DIVERSION DAM, MT	6,500	75	.....	25	.....	25
(COM)	YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	2,175	200	325	.....	325	.....
	NEBRASKA						
(FC)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	1,014	614	.....	400	.....	400
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	2,481	2,045	350	.....	350	.....
	LOWER PLATTE RIVER WATERSHED, NE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE	17,586	469	.....	656	.....	656
(FC)	WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NE	591	100	.....	90	.....	590
	NEVADA						
	LAS VEGAS WASH, NORTH LAS VEGAS, NV	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	1,800	1,475	50	.....	725	.....
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	39,200	7,124	.....	500	.....	500
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	1,325	350	200	.....	200	.....
	NEW HAMPSHIRE						
	CONNECTICUT RIVER ECO SYSTEM RESTORATION, NH AND VT	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(COM)	MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN, NH	3,850	374	300	.....	500	.....
	NEW JERSEY						
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	6,000	50	.....	300	.....	300
(SP)	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR, NJ	353,000	573	.....	263	.....	263
	GOFFLE BROOK, BOROUGH OF HAWTHORNE, NJ	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(SP)	GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	13,600	112	.....	69	.....	150
(E)	HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	2,500	81	200	.....	200	.....
(E)	LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	2,600	100	75	.....	200	.....
(SP)	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	10,350	112	.....	68	.....	200
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	6,000	.....	.....	150	.....	150

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HERFORD/CAPE MAY INLET	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
	NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	.....	525	.....	100	.....	200
(FDP)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ	4,260	198	100	.....	230	.....
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ	1,750	86	50	.....	300	.....
	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ	.....	.....	.....	.....	350	.....
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	1,375	632	250	.....	450	.....
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NJ	18,900	272	.....	100	.....	300
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ	1,919	1,875	44	.....	44	150
(FDP)	SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	1,500	190	50	.....	250	.....
(FC)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	.....	.....	.....	100	.....	200
(E)	STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ	1,500	190	100	.....	250	.....
(FDP)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	750	581	169	.....	169	.....
(FDP)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ	1,400	581	200	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	WOODBRIDGE RIVER BASIN, NJ	1,330	198	100	.....	250	.....
	NEW MEXICO						
	NAVAJO NATION, NM, AZ AND VT	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(COM)	RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO AND TX	2,000	450	300	.....	300	.....
	SANTA FE, NM	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, NM	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
	NEW YORK						
(FDP)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY	800	144	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY	800	142	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY	900	487	50	.....	100	.....
	DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, NY,NJ,DE,PA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(E)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	1,614	1,098	409	.....	409	.....
(N)	FREEPORT CREEK, VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NY	1,600	100	75	.....	75	.....
(E)	HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY AND NJ	2,500	81	400	.....	400	.....
(E)	HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY AND NJ	6,200	638	1,369	.....	1,369	.....
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY	1,000	37	50	.....	50	.....
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	2,510	1,910	400	.....	400	.....

(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR,NY	1,400	575	100	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	LINDENHURST, NY	800	149	50	.....	50	.....
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	1,100,000	3,951	.....	2,500	.....	2,750
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	1,300	810	200	.....	200	.....
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY	998	318	50	.....	250	.....
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	1,850	700	100	.....	300	.....
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	2,102	1,384	350	.....	350	.....
(E)	SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	1,600	225	50	.....	50	.....
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	2,150	267	50	.....	50	.....
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	2,000	1,451	209	.....	209	.....
(E)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	1,300	150	160	.....	160	.....
	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
	NORTH CAROLINA						
(SP)	BOGUE BANKS, NC	1,735	350	400	.....	400	.....
(E)	CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	1,100	75	200	.....	200	.....
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	5,397	2,837	100	.....	600	.....
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC (BODIE ISLAND PORTION)	199,467	250	.....	500	.....	750
(E)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	1,470	142	83	.....	83	.....
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	1,100	159	100	.....	100	.....
(SP)	SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	1,100	.....	100	.....	300	.....
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, FRANKLIN, MACON COUNTY, NC	393	238	155	.....	155	.....
	NORTH DAKOTA						
(FC)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	.....	6,000	.....	1,700	.....	1,700
(FC)	GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND	19,500	940	.....	60	.....	60
	OHIO						
(E)	ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	21,130	249	.....	583	.....	583
	BELPRE RIVERFRONT PARK, OH	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	BUTLER COUNTY, OH	850	100	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH	556	378	178	.....	178	.....
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH	700	200	200	.....	200	.....
(E)	LOWER BIG DARBY CREEK BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION,	1,425	100	370	.....	370	.....
	MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, HOH	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	.....
(E)	MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	2,061	175	400	.....	400	.....
	OHIO RIVERFRONT STUDY, CINCINNATI, OH	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	OHIO RIVER FLOW COMMODITY STUDY, OH	800	200	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FDP)	RICHLAND COUNTY, OH	600	175	200	.....	200	.....
	SANDUSKY RIVER, TIFFIN, OH	100	100	.....	.....	.....	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	STEUBENVILLE, OH	175	25				
(E)	UPPER BIG DARBY CREEK BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION,	375	310	65		65	
	WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH						
	OKLAHOMA						
(E)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OK, KS, NM AND CO	2,620	220	226		226	
	MIAMI AND VICINITY, OK					300	
(E)	SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	2,900	336	200			
(FDP)	WARR ACRES, OK	360	186	174		174	
	WISTER LAKE WATERSHED, OK					375	
	OREGON						
	AMAZON CREEK, OR					100	
(E)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	3,200	75	135		135	
(E)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	1,860	1,174	500		500	
	WALLA WALLA WATERSHED, OR AND WA					600	
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	2,284	1,908	130		130	
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	3,200	171	369		369	
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	1,590	225	170		170	
	PENNSYLVANIA						
(FDP)	BLOOMSBURG, PA	1,152	791	250		250	
	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, WISSAHICKON, PA					100	
	RHODE ISLAND						
(N)	QUONSET DAVISVILLE PORT, RI	1,600	100	150		150	
(E)	RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	1,200	290	50		50	
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST AND STRM DMG REDU	6,825			160		160
	SOUTH CAROLINA						
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	4,722	1,835	655		655	
(COM)	BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC	975	100	125		125	
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	1,677	157	50		50	

	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(SP)	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	478	378	100	.....	100	.....
(SP)	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	4,300	.....	.....	25	.....	25
	REEDY RIVER, SC	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	SANTEE DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, SC	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	600	55	195	.....	195	.....
(E)	YADKIN—PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC AND NC	9,750	.....	.....	50	.....	50
	SOUTH DAKOTA						
(FDP)	NIOBRARA RIVER AND MISSOURI RIVER, SD	350	75	25	.....	225	.....
	TENNESSEE						
	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FDP)	DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	910	185	105	.....	105	.....
	FORT DEFIANCE, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, CLARKSVILLE, TN	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(E)	FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN	706	355	280	.....	280	.....
	TEXAS						
(FDP)	BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	770	130	200	.....	200	.....
	BRAZORIA COUNTY, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	1,670	472	150	.....	500	.....
	CEDAR BAYOU, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	400
(E)	COLONIAS-LWR RIO GRANDE BASIN ALONG TX AND MEXICO BORDER	.....	45	.....	100	.....	400
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, LAQUINTA CHANNEL, TX	1,120	742	378	.....	378	.....
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,851	2,093	572	.....	572	.....
	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	FREEPORT HURRICANE PROTECTION LEVEE, TX	4,380	75	100	.....	100	.....
(N)	GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX	8,810	219	400	.....	150	.....
(RCP)	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	4,710	2,843	810	.....	810	.....
(N)	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	50,000	.....	.....	540	.....	540
(N)	GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX	10,000	150	.....	200	.....	400
(RCP)	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	4,660	2,003	600	.....	600	.....
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	171,294	6,568	.....	190	.....	377
(E)	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	2,600	500	200	.....	200	.....
(E)	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	10,395	1,639	950	.....	950	.....
(E)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	1,540	826	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	NORTH BOSQUE RIVER, TX	6,600	.....	.....	100	.....	100
(E)	NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TX	19,500	1,319	.....	130	.....	130
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	975	590	250	.....	250	.....
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	80,850	311	.....	50	.....	250

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(E)	RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX	2,650	75	100		325	
(N)	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	3,715	1,064	650		650	
(E)	SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	4,850	146	450		450	
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	153,700	7,495		380		600
	SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX					100	
	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL, TX					250	
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	9,310	7,739	650		1,200	
	UTAH						
	PARK CITY, UT					100	
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	1,495	620	100		100	
	VIRGINIA						
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	22,168	150		475		475
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, HAMPTON, VA	1,004	872	100		100	
(N)	ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	37,200			284		284
	FOURMILE RUN, VA						
	GOSHEN DAM, VA						
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	9,795	376		295		295
(FDP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (SECTION 216)	1,650	286	400		400	
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	3,050	2,104	946		946	
(E)	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	1,477	1,065	100		100	
	WASHINGTON						
(E)	BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	601	125	200		300	
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	56,000	5,076		500		1,000
(E)	CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	700	100	250		250	
	COMMENCEMENT BAY, WA					100	
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	92,740	166		250		375
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	61,192	5,618		500		1,250
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	2,791	1,741	254		1,050	
(SP)	OCEAN SHORES, WA	896	100	50		50	
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	2,124	1,537	225		225	

(E)	PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	700	100	200		200	
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	2,547	1,497	200		200	
(E)	SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	1,386	175	50		50	
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	20,825	50		50		50
	WALLA WALLA WATERSHED, WA					1,000	
	WHITE RIVER BASIN, WA					100	
	WEST VIRGINIA						
	ERICKSON/WOOD COUNTY PUBLIC PORT, WV						600
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	12,718	2,067		483		983
	LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV					100	
(FC)	MERCER COUNTY, WV				100		100
(E)	NEW RIVER BASIN, WV, NC AND VA	2,400	200	200		200	
	PARKERSBURG/VIENNA, WV						300
	WEIRTON PORT, WV						400
	WISCONSIN						
(E)	BARABOO RIVER, WI	2,650	100	240		240	
	WYOMING						
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	8,000	225		175		175
	MISCELLANEOUS						
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION			2,200		3,200	
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES			100		100	
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA			400		400	
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES			8,200		9,500	
	GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION					200	
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)					2,000	
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES			500		500	
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES			500		500	
	JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM					500	
	NATIONAL SHORELINE			300			
	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS			7,200		7,200	
	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES			6,500		6,500	
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)			400		400	
	PROJECT MONITORING			100			
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT			300		300	
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			24,000		29,000	
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS			100		100	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	.....	.....	700	.....	700	.....
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	.....	.....	700	.....	700	.....
	TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	.....	.....	650	.....	650	.....
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−24,050	.....	−50,059	.....
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	96,274	33,726	105,310	47,092

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(RCP) REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
(RDP) REVIEW OF DEFERRED PROJECT
(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
(SPEC) SPECIAL

Aniak Harbor, AK.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for Aniak Harbor, AK.

False Pass, AK.—The Committee has provided $313,000 to expedite completion of the plans and specifications for the harbor project at False Pass, AK.

Kenai River Bluff Erosion, AK.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for a special technical evaluation study of bank stabilization needs along the Lower Kenai River.

Seward Harbor, AK.—Based on the findings of the Corps of Engineers feasibility for navigation improvements to Seward Harbor, Alaska, the Committee urges the Corps to proceed with implementing this critical project within available funds.

Ship Creek Watershed, AK.—The Committee recommendation includes $150,000 to complete feasibility studies and to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for Ship Creek Watershed, AK.

Red River Navigation Study, Southwest Arkansas, AR.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for continuation of the cost-shared navigation feasibility study. The Committee understands that navigation in the Shreveport, Louisiana to Index, Arkansas reach is an extension of the existing J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, and as such, urges the Corps to perform an additional analysis using the same discount rate and local cost-sharing requirements as required for the existing waterway. This analysis should be displayed as a part of the feasibility report.

Red River Waterway, AR, LA, OK, & TX.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the Index, AR to Denison Dam reach of the Red River. The study is to examine environmental restoration and other water resource needs of the river corridor.

American River Watershed, CA.—The Committee recognizes the serious flood threat that faces the Sacramento area and has provided $2,600,000 to expedite completion of the preconstruction engineering and design of this vital flood control project.

Los Angeles Harbor Main Channel Deepening, Los Angeles, CA.—The Committee has provided $2,600,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Los Angeles Harbor Main Channel Deepening, Los Angeles, CA.

Westminster, CA.—An amount of $300,000 is recommended by the Committee to complete the reconnaissance study and initiate the feasibility study for the East Garden Grove/Winterburg Channel in Westminster, CA.

Wailupe Stream Flood Control Study, Oahu, HI.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design activities for the Wailupe Stream flood control study, in Oahu, HI.

Illinois Rivers, IL.—The Committee is aware of an innovative restoration initiative in the Illinois River Basin designed to enhance the waterway as a vital transportation corridor, improve water quality, protect farmland and open space, and promote important conservation and environmental practices—Illinois Rivers 2020. The project was authorized in Public Law 106–541. The Committee expects the Corps to continue to work with the State of Illinois on this project and to identify appropriate funding sources.

Upper Mississippi & Illinois Navigation Study, IL, IA, MN, MO, & WI.—The Committee has provided $3,724,000 to continue this study. The Committee recognizes that the controversy over the past year has considerably slowed progress on completing this important study. However, with the completion of the various investigations and independent reviews, the Committee believes that it is time for the Corps to finish this nearly decade long study. The Corps should make every effort to bring this study to a logical conclusion within 18 months of enactment of this act. No funding shall be expended on preconstruction engineering and design activities until the feasibility study is completed.

Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Study, IL, IA, MO, MN, and WI.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Study. The funding will allow the Corps to initiate studies for the following: development of an integrated strategy and implementation plan for flood control and flood damage reduction, continued maintenance and improvement of the navigation project, improved management of nutrients and sediment, environmental stewardship, and increased recreational opportunities for the Upper Mississippi River above Cairo, IL and the entire Illinois River.

Ouachita and Black Rivers, LA & AR.—The Committee understands that there are critical erosion problems along the Ouachita River in Arkansas and Louisiana. These erosion problems are threatening Federal flood control levees and hindering navigation, as well as causing damage to utilities, roads, historic sites and private property. The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps to assess bank caving locations along the Ouachita River in Louisiana and Arkansas and to prepare an evaluation report identifying and prioritizing the most critical caving locations.

Belle Island Shoreline, Detroit, MI.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to initiate the feasibility studies for stabilization of the crumbling Bell Island Shoreline. The Committee urges the Corps to examine the use of innovative techniques for stabilization alternatives.

Sault Ste. Marie Lock, Sault Ste. Marie, MI.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,530,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design of the replacement lock at Sault Ste. Marie in Michigan.

Kansas Citys, MO & KS.—The Committee has provided $900,000 to continue flood damage reduction studies for the Kansas Citys area of Missouri and Kansas.

Little Tallahatchie River, MS.—The Committee urges the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to examine a proposal by the Friends of the Upper Sardis Wildlife Management Area to repair and restore the Little Tallahatchie River located in Holly Springs National Forest, Mississippi.

Lower Las Vegas Wash Wetlands, NV.—The Committee has provided $725,000 for feasibility studies of the environmental restoration of the Lower Las Vegas Wash Wetlands, Las Vegas, NV.

Grafton, Park River, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes $60,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design of the Grafton, Park River, ND flood damage reduction project.

Amazon Creek, OR.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of Amazon Creek in the Eugene/Springfield Metropolitan area.

Niobrara River and Missouri River, SD.—The Committee has provided $225,000 to complete the reconnaissance study and to initiate the feasibility study.

Upper Trinity River Basin, TX.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 to continue feasibility studies. The additional amount provided will allow for completion of the Dallas Floodway and Stemmons North Industrial Corridor Studies, for continuation of studies on the Clear and West Forks of the Trinity River and the Big Fossil Creek Watershed, and for initiation of a new study.

North Padre Island, TX.—The Committee has included $130,000 for the preconstruction engineering and design portion, as well as continuing the environmental studies, for the North Padre Island, Texas, flood control project.

Coastal Field Data Collection.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 over the budget request for the Southern California Beach Processes Study to help preserve the California coastline from beach erosion.

Great Lakes Remedial Action Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Great Lakes Remedial Action Program. The funds will allow for the continuation of development of remedial action plans identified in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement of 1978.

Planning Assistance to States.—Within the funds provided for Planning Assistance to States, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to initiate an investigation of the streambank erosion problems in the East Baton Rouge Parish Canal in Baker, Louisiana, and desalinization efforts at Tularosa Basin in Alamogordo, New Mexico.

Other Coordination Programs.—The Committee encourages the Corps to use funds provided herein to support the Estuaries Council in the development of a national strategy for estuary habitat restoration programs.

Research and Development.—The Committee has provided $29,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers R&D Program. Within the amount provided, $800,000 is for the National Shoreline Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program at Allergan County, Michigan.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2001	$1,716,165,000
Budget estimate, 2002	1,324,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,570,798,000

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

The appropriation provides funds for the Continuing Authorities Program (projects which do not require specific legislation), which includes projects for flood control (Section 205), emergency streambank and shoreline protection (Section 14), beach erosion control (Section 103), mitigation of shore damages (Section 111), navigation projects (Section 107), snagging and clearing (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 budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	ALABAMA				
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	326,605	30,017	2,300	2,300
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL AND GA (MAJOR REH	43,700	1,357	12,325	11,325
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB)	36,000	7,423	3,000	3,000
	ALASKA				
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	6,500	1,751	3,300	3,300
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	20,192	1,294	2,200	2,200
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	23,125	12,500	700	700
	ARIZONA				
(E)	RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	62,730	5,953	13,200	18,000
	ARKANSAS				
	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, AR				180
(N)	MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	651,000	616,536	3,000	3,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	242,000	158,064	18,000	24,000
	RED RIVER WATERWAY, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX	76,700	76,700		3,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR				4,500
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, AR, LA, OK AND TX				3,500
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	87,000	38,268	13,000	13,000
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS	97,500	5,752	4,500	4,500
	CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA				
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	21,900	12,625	250	250
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	43,300	33,331	600	600
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	128,700	79,188	4,000	6,000
(E)	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	47,400	1,589	1,000	4,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING, CA	.....	.....	.....	4,500
(SP)	IMPERIAL BEACH, SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CA	15,300	3,654	500	500
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	19,700	6,660	3,000	4,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,100	3,669	1,431	1,431
	LOWER WALNUT CREEK, CA	.....	.....	.....	250
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	34,700	30,625	4,075	4,075
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	91,800	19,816	500	500
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	14,700	12,437	2,263	2,263
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	91,000	21,091	5,500	6,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA (50 FOOT PROJECT)	144,000	7,142	2,000	12,000
	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	.....	.....	.....	4,500
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	179,900	114,601	2,326	2,326
	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	.....	.....	.....	300
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	20,000	15,008	2,284	4,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	173,000	66,850	250	250
	SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION, CA	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	19,440	12,832	3,490	3,490
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	924,000	685,775	26,800	30,800
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	5,450	410	100	100
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	36,000	19,805	1,700	1,700
(FC)	STOCKTON METROPOLITIAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	35,700	3,352	1,000	.....
(FC)	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	30,900	2,054	1,000	1,000
(SP)	SURFSIDE—SUNSET—NEWPORT BEACH, CA	8,300	700	300	300
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,810	4,347	1,463	1,463
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	17,700	16,332	1,368	1,368
	DELAWARE				
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	12,600	5,597	270	353
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE	64,900	3,237	100	100

	FLORIDA				
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL	136,600	8,939	200	200
(SP)	BROWARD COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSABLE)	90,200	21,422	200	200
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	133,740	35,878	5,701	5,701
(E)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	2,219,000	560,018	95,278	95,278
(SP)	DADE COUNTY, FL	182,400	70,613	8,000	8,000
	DUVAL COUNTY, FL				
(E)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	75,000	19,455	19,876	19,876
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL				500
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	11,000	5,384	1,457	5,300
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL AND GA (MAJOR R	29,800	22,037	4,300	4,300
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	265,600	92,532	25,846	25,846
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	26,485	7,149	1,000	1,000
	MARTIN COUNTY, FL				
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	50,255	23,443	5,274	5,274
(SP)	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	85,000	12,840	200	200
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	19,000	11,701	7,299	7,299
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	25,747	2,832	1,215	1,215
	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL				
	PORT EVERGLADES, FL				
(SP)	ST JOHN'S COUNTY, FL	184,700	5,458	300	1,000
	ST LUCIE INLET, FL				
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	751	251	500	500
	GEORGIA				
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	41,461	2,044	4,084	6,400
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,200	7,319	3,000	3,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	31,000	25,600	4,500	4,500
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA AND SC	3,167	1,124	1,300	1,300
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	11,208	9,739	632	632
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	619,570	603,835	3,000	3,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700	29,265	6,500	6,500
	HAWAII				
	HAWAII WATER MANAGEMENT, HI				200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	15,004	1,224	400	400
	KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, HI	11,700	3,000	.....	1,300
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	5,620	4,194	1,275	1,275
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	11,883	3,983	325	325
	ILLINOIS				
(N)	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	24,756	3,895	3,617	3,617
(SP)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	174,188	67,459	24,000	25,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	37,861	30,642	1,000	1,000
	EAST ST LOUIS INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL, IL	.....	.....	.....	.....
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	68,592	24,704	8,038	8,038
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	21,000	13,862	1,600	1,600
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	501,100	35,678	10,000	17,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL AND MO	740,636	731,324	500	500
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL AND KY	1,052,000	511,482	34,000	41,000
(E)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	766,195	217,229	21,000	19,000
	INDIANA				
	CALUMET REGION, IN	.....	.....	.....	1,500
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY)	61,100	4,918	5,000	5,000
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	.....	.....	.....	1,000
	INDIANA POLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	.....	.....	.....	5,000
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	12,806	1,576	3,600	3,600
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	139,000	77,977	4,000	4,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	46,619	2,080	8,500	9,500
(FC)	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	17,500	3,209	2,400	2,400
	IOWA				
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	15,000	5,464	4,906	4,906

(E)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	85,400	63,611	11,000	12,609
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS AND MO	152,394	105,689	8,500	9,200
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	46,540	37,905	4,000	4,000
	KANSAS				
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	20,850	13,384	3,050	5,100
	KENTUCKY				
	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY				
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	17,000	10,808	2,900	2,900
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	533,000	70,058	14,400	23,000
	LOUISVILLE WATERFRONT, KY				
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND IN	278,000	60,316	13,632	19,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	7,951	1,270	2,575	2,575
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	13,524	8,665	1,400	1,400
	POND CREEK, KY				425
	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY				2,500
	LOUISIANA				
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	106,000	11,361	500	4,000
	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA				200
(N)	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	652,000	71,181	10,000	15,000
(N)	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	1,895,807	1,732,172	16,555	20,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	527,000	425,826	7,500	15,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	81,000	75,857	1,500	1,500
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	179,800	27,419	575	575
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	92,189	81,184	500	500
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	173,000	146,736	2,000	2,000
	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, AR AND LA	30,417	24,516		1,500
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	450,000	233,067	51,908	62,000
(FC)	WEST BANK AND VICINITY, NEW ORLEANS, LA	200,000	61,843	12,000	13,000
	MARYLAND				
	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD				
(SP)	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	25,800	2,095	10,000	10,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	189,000	34,951	2,300	5,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD AND VA	21,000	3,189	8,000	8,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD AND VA	27,000	6,454	1,500	3,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000	77,700	18,200	18,200
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	31,800	8,375	12,500	12,500
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	13,200	1,000	9,000	9,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN	7,020	1,708	2,000	1,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	18,800	3,114	800	800
	NORTHEASTERN, MN				
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	10,200	9,570	630	630
	STILLWATER, MN				
	MISSISSIPPI				
	DESOTO COUNTY, MS				5,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	32,948	26,083	100	100
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	47,789	28,232	1,930	1,930
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	13,500	1,662	675	675
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	220,000	175,497	8,400	10,400
	BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MO				100
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	37,128	32,521	1,717	1,717
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	29,056	18,579	1,200	1,200
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	269,273	198,687	4,000	4,000
	ST LOUIS, MO				2,000
(FC)	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	34,710	29,598	850	850

(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200	20,510	5,900	5,900
	MONTANA				
	FORT PECK DAM, MT	7,443	5,233	.....	700
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	21,000	5,073	1,800	1,800
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	10,698	3,884	4,000	4,000
	NEVADA				
	RURAL NEVADA, NV	25,000	3,332	.....	9,000
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	214,800	109,010	22,000	30,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE				
	ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LEBANON, NH	.....	.....	.....	2,000
	NEW JERSEY				
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET, NJ (ABSECON ISLAN	290,000	5,284	100	100
(SP)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	53,400	16,250	780	780
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA AND DE	231,000	30,555	10,000	8,000
(SP)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	241,500	36,630	130	130
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	84,300	11,184	22,000	21,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	19,700	4,605	5,400	5,400
	PASSAIC RIVDR STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ	.....	.....	.....	2,000
(FC)	RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY	8,400	1,559	100	100
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	11,800	6,851	4,949	4,949
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	343,000	1,126	100	400
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	314,400	33,827	10,000	8,000
(SP)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	698,200	120,495	5,000	5,000
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	163,000	4,702	2,000	2,000
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	66,000	13,224	2,000	2,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	41,400	8,039	3,500	3,500
	CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM	25,000	2,514	.....	6,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	46,800	9,889	600	600

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	62,300	5,138	300	300
	NEW YORK				
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	230,400	8,452	15,000	18,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	76,500	15,761	300	900
(SP)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	55,000	43,982	1,230	1,230
(SP)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	119,300	36,374	4,700	4,700
(SP)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	403,400	59,858	2,275	2,275
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY AND NJ	580,200	282,643	44,000	42,000
	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY				2,000
	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY				4,000
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(SP)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, OCEAN ISLE BEACH PORTION, NC	96,600	9,277	300	800
	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC				300
(SP)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC	112,300	699	300	700
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	248,100	58,068	43,159	46,000
(SP)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	26,500	4,609	550	550
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BUFORD—TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION,	34,000	17,279	3,000	5,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	44,318	19,813	7,000	7,000
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND—EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	178,800	26,741	25,954	31,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	12,400	8,712	2,400	2,400
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	55,807	28,998	2,000	2,000
	OHIO				
	LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, OH				1,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	32,123	5,347	2,700	2,700

(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000	102,661	2,000	3,000
	OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, OH	.....	.....	.....	1,000
	OTTAWA RIVER, OH	.....	.....	.....	300
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	97,000	77,754	7,200	10,000
	OKLAHOMA				
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	10,000	1,228	1,800	1,800
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	39,300	16,315	3,700	3,700
	OREGON				
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	110,800	60,036	10,000	10,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	79,760	39,970	5,000	5,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	179,400	110,273	2,000	2,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR AND WA	28,000	21,693	100	100
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	72,000	16,719	8,000	9,000
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,500	29,418	3,082	3,082
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	705,000	185,322	34,470	40,470
	NANTY GLO, PA	.....	.....	.....	100
	NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA, PA	.....	.....	.....	3,000
(SP)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	64,785	17,716	392	392
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	13,374	6,437	4,138	4,138
	SCHUYLKILL RIVER PARK, PA	.....	.....	.....	500
	SOUTH CENTRAL PENN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	5,000
	SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, PA	5,000	276	.....	.....
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	131,000	63,293	19,000	19,000
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	14,400	3,199	500	500
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	430,300	395,516	5,409	5,409
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	66,700	7,340	500	500
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	155,300	3,342	500	500
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE MANATI, PR	1,500	.....	1,500	1,500
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	331,000	75,163	9,000	9,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING AND WIDENING)	98,444	66,766	6,365	10,865
	FOLLY BEACH, SC				
(MP)	HARTWELL LK,CLEMSON UPPER AND LOWER DIVERSION, SC (DAM S	8,741	400	2,500	2,500
	LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	15,000	3,352		11,648
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	30,450	7,103	6,000	6,000
(E)	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	107,000	6,252	3,000	7,000
(MP)	PIERRE, SD	35,000	12,868	6,000	6,000
	TENNESSEE				
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN				2,000
	TEXAS				
	BOSQUE AND LEON RIVERS, TX				
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	312,485	23,751	4,066	4,066
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	28,391	22,826	5,565	5,565
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	94,115	24,154	1,200	1,200
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX	95,826	10,698	2,000	10,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	116,300	111,907	3,400	3,400
(N)	HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	475,468	159,576	28,785	24,785
(FC)	JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	13,630	5,724	2,900	5,000
	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX				
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	45,375	15,364	8,068	10,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX AND OK				2,100
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, TX,AR,LA				2,500
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	155,300	153,632	866	866
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	225,752	90,058	9,000	9,000

	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	.....	.....	.....	2,617
	UTAH				
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	9,660	2,429	500	500
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	24,054	14,755	7,000	7,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (MAJOR REHAB)	61,800	4,553	4,800	4,800
	LYNCHBURG COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,400	23,916	486	486
	RICHMOND COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	31,000	7,304	3,000	3,000
(SP)	SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA	193,050	3,734	3,380	3,380
(SP)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	273,624	72,084	9,000	9,000
	VIRGINA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	.....	.....	.....	.....
	WASHINGTON				
(E)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR AND ID	1,506,330	706,416	81,000	83,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, WA	28,170	18,170	325	325
(E)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	261,000	230,612	2,555	2,555
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	199,500	116,476	545	545
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	93,720	81,944	3,300	3,300
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1–14), WA AND OR (MAJOR REH	102,900	25,728	7,000	7,000
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	112,300	11,463	8,000	12,000
	CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV	.....	.....	.....	3,000
	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	.....	.....	.....	1,200
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,931,287	760,170	16,700	41,100
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB)	22,200	3,596	4,300	8,700
	LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	.....	.....	.....	750
(N)	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	313,000	46,358	6,200	28,100
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV AND OH	369,474	362,290	1,300	3,500
	SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV	.....	.....	.....	3,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	9,500	8,039	1,461	1,461
	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV AND PA	.....	.....	.....	2,300

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	235,500	227,344	600	2,700
	WISCONSIN				
(FC)	LAFARGE LAKE, WI	17,000	7,472	5,150	5,150
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)			15,000	20,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM			3,000	5,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)			1,500	4,000
	DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM			5,000	9,000
	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM			9,000	9,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)			7,000	9,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION			20,000	20,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)			30,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE			45	45
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE			185	185
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)			500	1,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)			7,000	10,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME			21,000	25,000
	SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103)			5,000	5,000
	SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208)			1,000	1,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE			−156,580	−262,793
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL			1,324,000	1,570,798

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, AR.—An appropriation of $24,000,000 is provided. While this is a significant increase over the budget request of $18,000,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, AR, LA, OK, TX.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,500,000 to continue bank stabilization along the Red River in Arkansas.

Red River Below Denison Dam, AR, LA, OK, TX.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,500,000 to continue the project along the Red River in Arkansas.

Guadalupe River, CA.—An amount of $6,000,000 is recommended for the Guadalupe River, CA flood damage reduction project.

Sacramento area flood control.—Sacramento California remains perhaps the most flood threatened major urban area in the country with upwards of 400,000 people and up to $30,000,000,000 in property at risk, $16,000,000,000 of that in the 100-year flood plain. Flood control improvements authorized in 1996 and 1999 will provide a doubling of flood protection but still leave the city exposed to an unreasonable risk of flooding. The Corps should make every effort to move forward with the authorized improvements as quickly as possible and the Committee has included funding for initiation of the South Sacramento Streams Group project, the American River Common Elements project and the Folsom Modifications project.

The Committee directs that, in carrying out the work on the Common Elements project, as modified by section 366 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, the Corps should consider necessary adjustments to the project to pass the existing design emergency release from Folsom Dam for communities along both banks of the levees along the American River and to provide a uniform level of protection consistent with the other authorized work along the Sacramento River.

Delaware Coast, Rehoboth Beach to Dewey Beach, DE.—An appropriation of $100,000, the Corps' full capability, is provided to continue construction of the shoreline protection project.

Kaumalapau Harbor, HI.—The Bill includes $1,300,000 to continue construction of the Kaumalapau Harbor, Hawaii project.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, IL.—An appropriation of $17,000,000 is provided. While this is a significant increase over the budget request of $10,000,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Olmsted Locks and Dam, IL & KY.—An appropriation of $41,000,000 is provided. While this is a significant increase over the budget request of $34,000,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level. No funds are included for reimbursement of the Claims and Judgement Fund.

Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation, IA, NE, KS, & MO.—The full capability of $12,609,000 is provided for project mitigation. Funds provided above the budget request are to complete the Lower Hamburg Site in Missouri and the Kansas Bend Site in Nebraska.

Missouri River Levee System, IA, NE, KS, MO.—The Committee recommendation is $9,200,000. Funds provided above the budget

request are to accelerate the first contract for the Unit L15 levee project.

Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA.—An appropriation of $15,000,000 is provided. While this is a significant increase over the budget request of $10,000,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level. The Committee expects the Corps to continue to work closely with community leaders to implement the mitigation plan.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.—An appropriation of $20,000,000 has been provided to continue necessary navigation channel refinements, mitigation of project impacts, and construction of project recreation elements.

Southeast Louisiana, LA.—An appropriation of $62,000,000 is provided. While this is a significant increase over the budget request of $51,908,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

DeSoto County, MS.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 to continue DeSoto County, Mississippi wastewater treatment project, as authorized under Section 502 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Blue River Channel, Kansas City, MO.—The Committee has provided $10,400,000 for the Corps to expedite work on the Blue River Channel, Kansas City, Missouri flood control project.

Grand Forks, ND-East Grand Forks, MN.—An appropriation of $31,000,000 is provided. While this is an increase over the budget request of $25,954,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Fort Peck Dam, MT.—The Committee has provided $700,000 to continue construction of facilities at Fort Peck Dam.

Central New Mexico, NM.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 for the Central New Mexico project. Within funds provided, the Corps' attention is directed to projects located in Belen, Los Lunas, Bosque Farms, Bernalillo, Corrales, Bernalillo County, and the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Rural Nevada, NV.—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 to continue the Rural Nevada project. Within funds provided, the Corps is directed to give consideration to projects at Mesquite, Silver Springs, Lawton-Verdi, Moapa, and Elko County, Nevada.

Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, NV.—The Committee has provided $30,000,000 for the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes project in Nevada to advance completion of this important flood control project. The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for reimbursement of work performed by the project non-Federal sponsor in accordance with Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Wilmington Harbor, NC.—An appropriation of $46,000,000 is provided. While this is an increase over the budget request of $43,159,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Mill Creek, OH.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the General Reevaluation Report and to complete the plans and specifications of the Mill Creek, Ohio project.

Willamette River Temperature Control, OR.—The Committee recommendation includes $9,000,000. The increase over the budget re-

quest of $8,000,000, is to expedite the project modifications necessary to improve downstream water temperatures for fish and wildlife habitat.

Locks and Dams 2, 3, & 4, Monongahela River, PA.—An appropriation of $40,470,000 is provided. While this is a significant increase over the budget request of $34,470,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

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

Colonias-Lower Rio Grande Basin along Texas & Mexico border.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue their work in the Texas colonias, and directs that of this amount $100,000 be used to conduct a reconnaissance study in the Sparks Colonia in El Paso County, Texas.

Virginia Beach, Hurricane Protection, VA.—The Committee recommendation includes $9,000,000. The Committee understands that these funds complete the project providing needed flood damage protection to the Virginia Beach area.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, WA, OR, & ID.—An appropriation of $83,000,000 is provided to continue the Columbia River Fish Mitigation project. This increased level of funding is intended to assist in implementing the recommendations of the recently issued biological opinion.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, and Kentucky.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $41,100,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. The amount provided includes: $4,500,000 for the Clover Fork, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,000,000 for the City of Cumberland, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,650,000 for the town of Martin, Kentucky, element of the project; $2,100,000 for the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the project, including $1,100,000 for additional studies along the tributaries of the Tug Fork and continuation of a Detailed Project Report for the Levisa Fork; $3,850,000 for the Martin County, Kentucky, element of the project; $950,000 for the Floyd County, Kentucky, element of the project; $600,000 for the Harlan County element of the project; and $800,000 for additional studies along tributaries of the Cumberland River in Bell County, Kentucky.

The Committee has also provided $18,600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Grundy, Virginia, element of the project; $450,000 to complete the Buchanan County, Virginia, Detailed Project Report; and $700,000 to continue the Dickenson County, Detailed Project Report. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to continue the Dickenson County Detailed Project Re-

port as generally defined in Plan 4 of the Huntington District Engineer's Draft Supplement to the Section 202 General Plan for Flood Damage Reduction dated April 1997, including all Russell Fork tributary streams within the County and special considerations, as may be appropriate, to address the unique relocations and resettlement needs for the flood-prone communities within the County.

In addition, the Committee has also provided $1,500,000 for the Lower Mingo County, West Virginia, element of the project; $600,000 for the Upper Mingo County, West Virginia, element of the project; $600,000 for the Wayne County, West Virginia, element of the project; and $3,200,000 for the McDowell County element of the project.

Marmet Lock, Kanawha River, WV.—The Committee has provided $28,100,000 for continued construction of the replacement lock and dam.

Robert C. Byrd Locks and Dam, Ohio River, WV & OH.—An appropriation of $3,500,000 is provided. No funds are included for reimbursement of the Claims and Judgement Fund.

Aquatic Plant Control.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Aquatic Plant Control Program. While this is an increase over the budget amount of $3,000,000, it is far less funding than is needed for this national program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $500,000 to eradicate Eurasian Watermilfoil on Houghton Lake, Michigan; $80,000 to study the problem of Eurasian Watermilfoil at Clearwater Lake, Michigan; $250,000 for South Carolina, to be matched by an equal amount by the State for aquatic plant control activities in that State; $400,000 for aquatic weed control at Lake Champlain, Vermont; and $300,000 for the removal of aquatic weeds in the Lavaca and Navidad Rivers, Texas.

Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $9,000,000 for the Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program. Within this amount, $4,000,000 is provided for the Corps of Engineers to continue critical dam safety repairs to Waterbury Dam in Vermont.

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

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

The Committee is aware that there are funding requirements for ongoing, continuing authorities projects that may not be accommodated within the funds provided for each program. It is not the Committee's intent that ongoing projects be terminated. If addi-

tional funds are needed to keep ongoing work in any program on schedule, the Committee urges the Corps to reprogram the necessary funds.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the Section 206 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $105,000 to complete the ecosystem restoration report for the Agua Caliente Wash, Pima County, AZ, project; $500,000 for completion of engineering and design and initiation of construction for the Arkansas River Fisheries Habitat Restoration, Pueblo, CO, project; $175,000 for feasibility studies for the Mill River, Stamford, CT, project; $150,000 to initiate feasibility studies on the Wabash River, West Lafayette, IN, project; $329,000 for the Iowa River and Clear Creek, Johnson, IA, project; $700,000 for plans and specifications and to initiate construction for the Whitebreast Creek, IA, project; $208,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Hay Creek, MN, project; $400,000 for the Lawrence Gateway, MA, restoration project; $100,000 to continue the Carson River, NV project; $150,000 to continue the Steamboat Creek, Washoe County, NV, project; $125,000 to continue the Bottomless Lakes State Park, NM, project; $100,000 to continue the Jemez River, NM, project; $1,000,000 for plans and specifications and to initiate construction for the Springfield Millrace, OR, project; $332,000 is provided to continue the City Creek, UT, project; $350,000 for completion of plans and specifications for the Jordan River Meander environmental restoration in Utah; $430,000 for the completion of plans and specifications for the Upper Jordan River ecosystem restoration in Utah; $700,000 for the Salmon Creek, WA, project; and $117,000 to complete design and initiate construction of the Brodhead Dam Fish Passage, WI, project.

Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for the Section 107 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $250,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Russellville Slackwater Harbor, AR; $500,000 to complete the feasibility studies and initiate the plans and specifications for the Blytheville Harbor, AR; $100,000 is provided for feasibility studies of repairing or replacing the existing wave attenuator for Lubec Harbor, Lubec, ME; $827,000 for construction of the Pemiscot County Harbor, MO; $45,000 to initiate the feasibility studies for Fairport Harbor, OH; and $100,000 to initiate feasibility studies at Saxon Harbor, WI.

Navigation Mitigation Projects (Section 111).—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Section 111 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $100,000 to initiate studies of shoreline damages attributable to the Federal jetties at Moss Landing Harbor, CA; $150,000 to initiate studies for the Wells Harbor, Wells, Maine, project; $350,000 for completion of plans and specifications, environmental documentation, and design for the estimated $3,500,000 project at Saco River and Camp Ellis Beach, Maine to mitigate shoreline damages caused by the Federal navigation project; and 100,000 to initiate studies for the Puget Island Shoreline, WA & OR, project.

Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $25,000,000 for the Sec-

tion 1135 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $150,000 to initiate feasibility studies for Horseshoe Lake, AR; $2,000,000 to continue construction of the Colfax Reach, South Platte River, Denver, CO, project; $190,000 to initiate plans and specifications for Spunky Bottoms, Brown County, IL; $100,000 to initiate studies on Nahunt Marsh, Davenport, IA; $500,000 to initiate and complete design and to initiate construction of the Brush Creek-Lake of the Enshriners, MO, project; $150,000 for the feasibility study for Duck Creek, Stoodard County, MO; $500,000 to complete the plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Kansas City Riverfront, MO, habitat restoration project; $200,000 for the Albuquerque Biopark, NM, wetlands restoration project; $2,000,000 for the Pueblo Santa Ana, NM, riparian and wetland restoration project; $530,000 for the Eagleland environmental restoration project located along the San Antonio River in Texas; $281,000 is provided to conduct the feasibility study and to initiate the plans and specifications for the Chamna Area Shoreline, WA, project; and $500,000 to complete the feasibility study and to initiate and complete the design of the Pasco County Shoreline, WA, project.

Emergency Streambank & Shoreline Protection Projects (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for the Section 14 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $800,000 could be used to initiate and complete the Little Rock Slack Water Harbor, AR, bank stabilization project; $75,000 to initiate and complete the planning and design analysis and initiate plans and specifications for the Powers Boulevard at East Fork of Sand Creek, Colorado Springs, CO, project; $260,000 for construction of the Iowa River, Sac & Fox Settlement, Tama County, IA, project; $40,000 for the planning and design analysis for the Penobscot River, Brewer, ME, project; $100,000 to continue the planning and design analysis for the Belle Isle South Shore, Detroit, MI, project; $100,000 to continue the planning and design analysis of the Detroit River Shoreline, Detroit, MI; $700,000 is provided to continue the I–40, Rio Pierco, Gallup, NM, project; $150,000 is provided to continue the Paseo Del Norte, NM, project; $415,000 is provided to continue the Unnamed Arroyo, Hwy 371 near Crown Point, NM, project; $130,000 for construction of the Heathcott Road, Lauderdale County, TN, project; $146,000 for construction of the Dresden, TN, project; $100,000 to complete the planning and design analysis and initiate construction of the Bogachiel River near La Push, Clallam County, WA, project; and $40,000 for the planning and design analysis of the Kenosha Harbor, Retaining Wall, Kenosha, WI.

Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided $40,000,000 for the Section 205 Program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $100,000 to initiate the plans and specifications for the Sugar Creek, Piggott, AR, project; $100,000 to initiate the detailed project report for Galindo Creek, CA; $100,000 for the feasibility study for the Ocmulgee River Levee, Macon, GA; $150,000 is for the Corps of Engineers to address flooding problems of the Snake River at Jensen Grove Lake in Blackfoot, ID; $50,000 to complete feasibility studies for the Mosquito Creek, Council Bluffs, IA, project; $200,000 for the

Banklick Creek, Kenton County, Kentucky flood control project; $275,000 to initiate the plans and specifications for the Granite Fall, MN, project; $350,000 to initiate the plans and specifications for the Montevideo, MN project; $86,000 to complete the feasibility study and to initiate plans and specification for the Little River Diversion, Dutchtown, MO, project; $100,000 for flood control studies for Grant Creek, Missouli, Montana; $100,000 to continue the Arroyo de La Manteca, Las Vegas, NM, project; $750,000 to continue the Little Puerco Wash, Gallup, NM, project; $100,000 to initiate the Taos, NM, project; $1,500,000 for construction of the Wahpeton, ND, project; $100,000 to initiate feasibility studies of the Lafayette Township, OH, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study and to initiate the plans and specifications for the Erwin, TN, project; $75,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Oliver Creek, TN, project; $75,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Covington, TN, project; and $200,000 to initiate studies of the Jamestown Island Seawall, VA.

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

Appropriations, 2001	$350,458,000
Budget estimate, 2002	280,000,000
Committee recommendation	328,011,000

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

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS					
	SURVEYS:					
	GENERAL STUDIES:					
(FDP)	ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	3,150	810	710	500	500
(FC)	BAYOU METO BASIN	14,417	11,844	6,158	.....	1,500
(FDP)	DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	4,000	1,543	1,043	700	700
(SPE)	SPRING BAYOU, LA	2,850	350	150	500	500
(FDP)	COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	1,350	95	95	200	200
	HORN LAKE CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FDP)	OLIVE BRANCH, MS	1,500	200	200	300	100
(COM)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN AND MS	2,075	253	253	394	394
(FC)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	442,000	2,309	1,895	4,000	4,000
(FC)	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	4,962	38,741	803	.....	600
(FC)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	6,350	205	205	205	205
	TENSAS RIVER BASIN, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	100
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	.....	.....	.....	615	615
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	.....	7,414	9,414
	CONSTRUCTION					
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	3,863,000	2,602,600	36,866	43,405	45,405
(FC)	FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	9,270	5,981	2,000	915	915
(FC)	GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	208,000	38,741	19,234	.....	16,300
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	8,590	6,910	2,321	1,675	1,675
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	2,106,000	936,548	40,911	43,457	49,457
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	401,600	373,335	4,374	3,230	4,230
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	176,000	91,288	11,475	7,160	8,060
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,790,000	890,470	21,635	23,400	27,400
(FC)	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	19,500	14,690	3,712	3,022	3,022
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA AND MS	71,300	8,035	95	25	100
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	99,800	92,720	6,738	1,600	2,900
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	169,195	132,342	5,804	2,628	3,653
	YAZOO BASIN	(1,135,920)	(445,080)	(17,163)	(8,550)	(28,499)

(FC)	BACKWATER PUMP, MS	195,400	11,912	733	500	4,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	110,000	97,236	3,264	1,000	1,500
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	288,427	273,427	142,127	.....	9,500
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	205,112	34,629	24	25	25
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,408	29,434	469	25	25
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	250,000	107,713	356	200	200
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	343,000	164,156	12,317	6,800	10,749
(FC)	ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	61,400	9,794	987	150	150
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN AND MS	17,900	14,736	1,895	1,300	1,300
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	153,300	54,186	224	25	25
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	.....	.....	.....	140,542	190,591
	MAINTENANCE					
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	.....	.....	.....	61,462	61,462
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	.....	.....	.....	434	434
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	.....	.....	.....	480	480
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	.....	.....	.....	419	419
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	.....	.....	.....	10	10
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	.....	.....	.....	7,650	9,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	.....	.....	.....	6,678	8,423
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA	.....	.....	.....	2,000	4,500
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	.....	.....	.....	1,102	1,102
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	.....	.....	.....	43	43
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	.....	.....	.....	29	29
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	.....	.....	.....	2,065	2,065
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	.....	.....	.....	10,661	12,471
(N)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	.....	.....	.....	216	216
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	.....	.....	.....	56	56
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	.....	.....	.....	1,854	1,854
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	.....	.....	.....	422	422
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	.....	.....	.....	6,239	6,239
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	.....	.....	.....	916	916
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	.....	.....	.....	6,116	6,116
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	.....	.....	.....	2,500	2,500
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	.....	.....	.....	645	645
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	.....	.....	.....	249	249
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	.....	.....	.....	494	494
	YAZOO BASIN	.....	.....	.....	(21,260)	(23,260)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	.....	.....	.....	4,500	4,500

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS				1,000	3,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS				3,500	3,500
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS				250	250
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS				4,500	4,500
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS				275	275
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS				6,500	6,500
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS				350	350
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS				55	55
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS				180	180
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS				150	150
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO				143	143
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO				8,000	8,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN				86	86
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN				1,118	1,118
(FC)	MAPPING				1,097	1,097
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE				144,444	153,849
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE				−12,400	−25,843
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES				280,000	328,011

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL

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

Construction

Grand Prairie Region, AR.—The Committee recommendation includes $16,300,000 to continue construction of the project, including construction of features designed to withdraw water from the White River.

Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, & TN.—An appropriation of $49,457,000 is provided for continued construction of this vital levee project. While this is an increase over the budget request of $43,457,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, MO.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway project.

Yazoo Basin, Mississippi Demonstration Erosion Control.—The Committee has provided $9,500,000 for the Demonstration Erosion Control Project, a continuation of a joint effort by the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service in the Yazoo Basin of Mississippi. The work to date has demonstrated positive results in the reduction of flood damages, decreased erosion and sediments. Funds provided for fiscal year 2002 will continue to design for future work, monitor results for all watersheds as required for completion of the total program and award continuing contracts.

Tensas Basin, Red River Backwater Area, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,653,000 to complete construction of the Sicily Island Area Levee project.

Upper Yazoo Projects, MS.—The Committee has provided $10,749,000 for the Upper Yazoo Projects, $3,949,000 more than the Administration's request for fiscal year 2002.

Maintenance

Atchafalaya Basin, LA.—An appropriation of $12,471,000 is provided. Additional funds provided over the budget request are for major lock repairs at Berwick Lock.

Yazoo Basin, Big Sunflower River, MS.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 to continue the maintenance project for the Big Sunflower River to restore the project's flood control channel capacities.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2001	$1,897,775,000
Budget estimate, 2002	1,745,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,833,263,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA-COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	219	219
ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER, AL	1,555	4,710
BAYOU CODEN, AL	.....	500
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	50	200
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	21,100	21,100
BON SECOUR RIVER, AL	20	20
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	250	600
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	450	450
FLY CREEK, AL	200	200
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,000	5,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	100	1,133
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM ''BILL'' DANNELLY LA	4,900	7,200
MOBILE AREA DIGITAL MAPPING, AL	.....	.....
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	18,900	20,900
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	1,000	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	350	350
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	5,000	5,600
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	80	80
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS	23,800	23,800
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	.....	.....
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	6,565	6,565
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,788	2,788
BETHEL HARBOR, AK	416	416
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,659	1,659
COOK INLET SHOALS, AK	2,200	2,200
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	384	384
HOMER HARBOR, AK	181	181
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	35	35
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, BAR POINT, AK	160	160
KODIAK HARBOR, AK	.....	750
NAKNEK RIVER, AK	.....	1,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	173	173
NOME HARBOR, AK	1,458	1,458
PELICAN HARBOR, AK	.....	600
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	527	527
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,306	1,306
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	86	86
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,310	1,310
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	32	32
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	184	184

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,343	4,343
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,734	4,734
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,148	1,148
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,402	4,402
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,337	5,337
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,235	4,235
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	947	947
DIERKS LAKE, AR	946	946
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	841	841
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,873	4,873
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	.....	340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	308	308
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	22,338	21,338
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,559	1,559
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,308	3,308
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,319	1,319
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,255	3,255
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	.....	610
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	7,127	7,127
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,912	3,912
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	10	10
WHITE RIVER, AR	195	195
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	.....	150
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,952	1,952
BODEGA BAY, CA	.....	1,800
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,725	1,725
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	40	40
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,537	3,537
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,604	4,604
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	299	299
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,687	1,687
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,516	3,516
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,171	1,171
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	836	1,476
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	170	170
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	200	2,200
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,691	4,691
MARINA DEL REY, CA	40	40
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	314	314
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	273	273
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	3,860	3,860
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	.....	2,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,922	1,922
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,573	1,573
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40	40
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	10,127	10,127
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,270	1,270
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	.....	2,500
PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	.....	.....
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,443	2,443
PORT HUENEME, CA	40	40

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,224	1,224
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	.....	2,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	4,389	4,389
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,964	1,964
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,766	1,766
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	132	132
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	140	140
SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	40	40
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,700	1,700
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	.....	200
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,366	2,366
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,501	2,700
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	998	3,000
SAN RAFAEL CREEK, CA	.....	1,800
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,537	3,537
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,020	2,020
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,504	1,504
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,969	1,969
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	1,635	1,635
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,747	1,747
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,980	2,980
YUBA RIVER, CA	102	102
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	420	420
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	797	1,197
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	525	925
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	70	70
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	3,454	3,454
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	249	249
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	733	1,133
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	490	490
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	454	454
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	221	221
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	979	979
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	424	424
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	294	294
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	485	485
THOMASTON DAM, CT	516	516
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	711	711
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	12,223	13,500
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	888	888
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	140	140
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	140	140
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,985	2,985
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	928	928
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	48	48

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FLORIDA		
APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	300	300
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,966	3,966
CARRABELLA BAY HARBOR, FL	.....	.....
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	11,591	11,591
CLEARWATER PASS, FL	.....	500
EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	700	700
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	3,037	3,037
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	49	1,000
HORSESHOE COVE, FL	520	520
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	100	100
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	2,173	2,173
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,040	4,040
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL AND GA	5,719	5,719
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	20	20
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	3,700	3,700
MIAMI RIVER, FL	.....	2,000
NEW PASS CHANNEL, FL	.....	.....
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,520	2,520
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	3,253	3,253
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	1,000	1,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	500	500
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	2,032	2,032
PORT ST JOE HARBOR, FL	500	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	600	600
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,634	3,634
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	50	50
SUWANEE RIVER, FL	.....	.....
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	4,163	4,163
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34	34
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	5,427	5,427
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	1,237	8,173
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,172	2,172
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,902	3,902
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,525	7,525
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,600	7,600
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC	11,876	11,876
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	10,325	10,325
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	6,564	6,564
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	12,911	12,911
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	215	215
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	4,865	4,865
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	344	344
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	122	122
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	508	508
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,475	1,475
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	4,002	4,002

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	75	75
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,526	1,526
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	342	342
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN	3,709	3,709
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,962	4,962
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,662	2,662
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	170	170
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL AND IN	21,881	20,881
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL AND IN	1,610	1,610
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	758	758
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,159	1,650
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	1,037	1,037
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	6,071	6,071
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	42,431	42,431
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	13,897	13,897
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	43	43
REND LAKE, IL	4,760	4,760
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	97	97
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	770	770
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	792	792
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	3,977	3,977
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	674	674
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	829	829
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	64	64
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	102	102
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	690	690
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	1,495	1,495
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	803	803
MONROE LAKE, IN	819	819
PATOKA LAKE, IN	757	757
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	42	42
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	710	710
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	90	90
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,735	2,735
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	812	812
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	148	148
MISSOURI RIVER—RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS AND MO	3,270	6,880
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA AND NE	2,263	2,263
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,195	2,195
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,356	5,182
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,887	3,887
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,201	2,201
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,116	1,116
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	478	478
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	526	526
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	973	973

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	1,014	1,014
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	45	45
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,100	1,100
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,507	1,507
MARION LAKE, KS	1,422	1,422
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,006	2,006
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,997	1,997
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	898	898
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,055	2,055
POMONA LAKE, KS	2,130	2,130
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	185	185
TORONTO LAKE, KS	456	456
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,004	2,004
WILSON LAKE, KS	2,069	2,069
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	6,896	6,896
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,900	1,900
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,099	1,099
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,440	1,440
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,656	1,656
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	834	834
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,371	1,371
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR	.....	460
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	2,095	2,095
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,332	1,332
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,079	1,079
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,107	2,107
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	87	87
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	913	913
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,311	1,311
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	617	617
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	106	106
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,808	1,808
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN AND OH	28,572	27,572
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN AND OH	5,180	5,180
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,178	1,178
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,069	2,069
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	993	993
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,407	5,407
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,136	1,136
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	13,181	13,181
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	.....	1,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	652	652
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	730	730
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	28	28
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	.....	740
BAYOU TECHE, LA	.....	1,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	92	92
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	12,773	12,773
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,595	3,595
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	18,195	19,500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,343	3,343
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	549	549
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,477	11,477
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	.....	592
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	.....	120
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	933	1,258
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,937	1,937
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	55,831	53,331
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	13,111	15,111
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	154	154
WATERWAY FROM IWW TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	.....	500
MAINE		
PENOBSCOT HARBOR, ME	.....	275
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,130	1,130
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
UNION RIVER, ME	230	230
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	464	464
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	650	650
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	22,568	21,568
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	157	157
HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD	.....	500
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY—BACK CREEK, MD	.....	300
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	330	330
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	2,074	2,174
NANTICOKE HARBOR, MD	.....	700
NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	865	865
NEALE SOUND, CHARLES COUNTY, MD	.....	677
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	2,798	2,798
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	459	459
RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	736	736
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	142	142
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	1,901	1,901
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	742	742
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	450	450
MASSACHUSETTS		
ANDREWS RIVER, MA	.....	130
AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, MA	.....	300
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	489	489
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	511	511
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	427	427
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	10,150	10,150
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	294	294
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	234	234
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	325	325
GREEN HARBOR, MA	378	378
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	416	416
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	125	125
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	648	648

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	476	476
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	358	358
PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA	3,356	3,356
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	3,536	3,536
SCITUATE HARBOR, MA	.....	1,500
TULLY LAKE, MA	665	665
WEST HILL DAM, MA	607	607
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	397	397
MICHIGAN		
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	118	118
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	122	122
DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,692	3,692
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	47	47
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	2,239	2,239
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	.....	200
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	10	10
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	554	554
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205	205
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	804	804
LELAND HARBOR, MI	191	191
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	103	103
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	42	42
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	239	239
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI	104	104
MONROE HARBOR, MI	52	52
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	451	451
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	1,544	1,544
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	185	185
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	2,518	2,518
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	275	275
ROUGE RIVER, MI	87	87
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,587	1,587
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	1,231	1,231
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10	10
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,563	1,563
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	759	759
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	638	638
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	17,418	17,418
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	3,295	3,295
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD	217	217
DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI	2,692	2,692
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	101	101
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	573	573
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	130	130
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	45,329	43,329
ORWELL LAKE, MN	337	337
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	7	7
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	146	146
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,552	3,552
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	94	94

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	30	30
CLAIRBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	.....	122
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	170	170
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,100	2,100
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	126	126
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,584	1,584
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	4,200	4,200
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	250	250
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	.....	661
YAZOO RIVER, MS	.....	115
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	.....	240
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	6,196	6,196
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,184	3,819
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,215	8,215
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	142	142
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	800	800
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	876	876
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,068	13,068
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	.....	290
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,204	2,204
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	10	10
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,128	1,128
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER	.....	400
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,065	4,065
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,826	8,826
UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,342	4,342
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,791	1,791
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD	6,495	6,745
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,019	2,019
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE	.....	275
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	500	500
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWK	80	80
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWO	125	125
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	611	611
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	847	847
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	329	329
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	43	43
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA	576	576
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	210	210
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	607	607
COCHECO RIVER	.....	300
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	460	460

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	1,104	1,104
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,412	1,412
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	781	781
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH	287	287
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	749	749
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,400	3,200
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	410	410
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	19	19
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA AND DE	17,105	19,105
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,465	3,465
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,800	2,800
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	2,900	2,900
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	425	425
SHARK RIVER, NJ	100	100
SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	.....	.....
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,556	3,056
COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,209	2,209
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,932	1,932
GALISTEO DAM, NM	368	468
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	80	80
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	541	541
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,049	1,229
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	130	130
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	328	328
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL	.....	1,500
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	463	463
ARKPORT DAM, NY	252	252
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	2,795	2,795
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	515	515
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	280	280
EAST RIVER, NY	600	600
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	250	250
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	513	513
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	2,300	2,300
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	3,000	3,000
GREAT KILLS HARBOR, NY	.....	.....
GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	50	50
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	100	100
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	2,525	2,525
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	509	509
JAMAICA BAY, NY	250	250
JONES INLET, NY	100	100
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	80	80
LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	50	50
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	70	70
MORICHES INLET, NY	80	80
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	2,616	2,616

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	4,250	4,250
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY AND NJ	5,030	5,030
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	750	750
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	5,570	5,570
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	20	20
PLATTSBURGH HARBOR, NY	.....	.....
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	2,563	2,563
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	35	35
RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	475	475
SAG HARBOR, NY	925	925
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	100	100
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	750	750
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	479	479
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	564	564
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	2,391	4,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	3,065	3,065
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	35	35
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	1,267	1,267
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	486	486
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,060	1,060
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,516	1,516
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22	22
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	895	1,895
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,863	4,863
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	2,245	2,245
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	4,450	4,450
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,235	1,235
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	940	940
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	64	64
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,253	2,253
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	5,105	5,105
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN-HALEY LAKE, ND	210	210
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,111	9,911
HOMME LAKE, ND	164	164
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	52	52
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,264	1,264
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	402	402
SOURIS RIVER, ND	385	385
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	799	799
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	2,051	2,051
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,872	1,872
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,142	1,142
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	723	723
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,700	3,700
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	30	30
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	903	903

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	642	642
DILLON LAKE, OH	527	527
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,235	1,235
HURON HARBOR, OH	1,040	1,040
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	166	166
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,100	1,100
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	809	809
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,054	1,054
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,284	6,284
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	358	358
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	680	680
PORT CLINTON HARBOR, OH	1,080	1,080
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	85	85
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	950	950
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	190	190
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,211	3,211
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	229	229
TOUSSAINT RIVER, OH	10	10
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	476	476
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	816	816
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	429	429
BIRCH LAKE, OK	572	572
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,549	1,549
CANDY LAKE, OK	18	18
CANTON LAKE, OK	3,012	3,012
COPAN LAKE, OK	824	824
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	6,277	6,277
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,144	4,144
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	879	879
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	234	234
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	572	572
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,670	1,800
HULAH LAKE, OK	406	406
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	91	91
KAW LAKE, OK	1,840	1,840
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	5,553	5,553
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	3,025	3,025
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,843	1,843
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	56	56
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	32	32
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,170	1,170
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	5,130	5,130
SARDIS LAKE, OK	913	913
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	370	370
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	893	893
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,228	3,228
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,426	1,426
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,557	3,557
WISTER LAKE, OK	602	672

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	720	720
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	260	260
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	5,430	5,880
CHETCO RIVER, OR	402	402
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA	13,042	15,042
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	7,818	8,018
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	352	352
COOS BAY, OR	4,692	4,692
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	193	193
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	981	981
COUGAR LAKE, OR	752	752
DEPOE BAY, OR	3	3
DETROIT LAKE, OR	584	584
DORENA LAKE, OR	649	649
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	722	722
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	952	952
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,196	1,196
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	377	377
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	176	176
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	4,056	4,356
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,818	1,818
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,049	3,049
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	3,650	3,650
PORT ORFORD, OR	631	631
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	674	674
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	69	69
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	781	781
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	161	161
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	14	214
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	834	834
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	291	291
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	68	68
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	830	830
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	2,354	2,454
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,015	6,015
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	622	622
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	229	229
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,355	1,355
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,285	2,285
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	945	945
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,887	1,887
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	2,001	2,001
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	676	676
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,322	1,322
ERIE HARBOR, PA	70	70
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	729	729
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	797	1,097
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	365	365
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	95	95

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,115	1,115
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,189	1,189
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	977	977
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,093	1,093
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,203	14,203
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH AND WV	19,321	19,321
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH AND WV	58	58
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	88	88
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	482	482
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	15	15
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,902	3,902
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,315	1,315
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,252	2,252
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	350	350
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	65	65
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,501	2,501
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,262	2,262
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	221	221
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	761	761
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	547	547
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	1,871	1,871
RHODE ISLAND		
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	2,110	2,110
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	1,575	2,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,171	5,171
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,201	3,201
FOLLY RIVER, SC	748	748
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	5,738	5,738
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
MURRELLS INLET, SC	.....	200
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	169	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	45	45
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	486	486
TOWN CREEK, SC	305	305
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,136	6,386
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	433	433
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	197	197
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,044	8,294
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN	531	531
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	625	625
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	9,480	9,730
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	306	306
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	4,757	4,757
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	4,217	4,217
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	2,315	2,315
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,910	3,910
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,217	4,217
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	97	97

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,222	3,222
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,981	5,981
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	19	19
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	16,422	16,422
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	.....	450
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	708	708
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,267	1,267
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	577	577
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,499	1,499
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,275	2,275
BELTON LAKE, TX	2,578	2,578
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,290	2,290
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,222	1,222
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,977	2,977
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,743	2,743
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,399	5,399
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,532	5,532
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	5	5
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,554	2,554
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	6,950	6,950
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	130	130
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	585	585
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,535	1,535
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,478	2,478
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	19,994	19,994
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,190	1,190
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	7,555	7,555
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	452	452
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,189	1,189
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	784	784
LAKE KEMP, TX	143	143
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,485	2,485
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,253	3,253
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,665	1,665
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,480	2,480
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,596	1,596
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,748	1,748
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	893	893
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	976	976
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,659	1,659
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	15	15
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	821	821
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	14,272	14,272
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,417	4,417
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	243	243
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,555	2,555
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,719	1,719
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	1,500	1,500
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,748	1,748
TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,000	1,000
WACO LAKE, TX	2,412	2,412
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,320	1,320

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	4,227	4,800
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,611	2,611
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	75	75
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	390	390
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	743	743
BURLINGTON HARBOR BREAKWATER, VT	250	2,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND NY	95	95
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	635	635
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	700	700
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	764	764
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	506	651
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	749	749
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	1,795	1,795
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	835	835
CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	430	430
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	898	898
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,535	1,535
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	1,095	1,095
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	59	59
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,680	3,680
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	10,013	10,013
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,387	1,387
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	916	916
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	215	215
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	6,439	6,439
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	328	328
PAGAN RIVER, VA	145	145
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	3,865	3,865
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	630	630
RUDEE INLET, VA	1,053	1,053
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,190	1,190
WINTER HARBOR, VA	.....	1,000
YORK RIVER, VA	155	155
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	848	848
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA AND OR	28	28
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	36	36
EDIZ HOOK, WA	718	718
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,345	1,345
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	11,275	15,075
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,739	1,739
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,249	3,249
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	243	243
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	7,200	7,200
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,290	1,590
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,114	6,114
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,230	2,230
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	3,016	3,016

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	319	319
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,319	2,819
NEAH BAY, WA	30	30
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	253	253
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	938	938
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,760	1,760
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	427	427
SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEPENING, WA	300	300
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	620	620
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	240	240
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	58	58
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	515	515
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	123	123
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR	2,961	3,261
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	435	885
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,074	1,074
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,231	6,661
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,783	1,783
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,687	1,687
ELKINS, WV	18	18
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	211	211
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	6,799	6,799
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY AND OH	16,738	20,053
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY AND OH	2,407	2,407
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,582	1,582
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	888	888
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,458	1,458
SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,016	2,016
TYGART LAKE, WV	3,223	3,223
WHEELING CREEK, VA	.....	2,000
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	736	736
FOX RIVER, WI	4,004	9,004
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,641	1,641
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	17	17
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	1,122	1,122
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	210	210
LAFARGE LAKE, WI	56	56
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	249	249
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	603	603
PENSAUKEE HARBOR, WI	488	488
PORT WING HARBOR, WI	260	260
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	8	8
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	46	46
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	2,625	2,625
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	42	42
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	1,102	1,102
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,198	1,198

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	700	700
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,750	2,750
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	1,500	1,500
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	8,000	8,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,000	1,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	7,000	7,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	1,500	1,500
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	500	500
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	500	1,000
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	575	575
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	.....	.....
MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M	500	500
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,700	1,700
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40	40
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	25	25
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	4,000	4,000
NATIONAL LEWIS AND CLARK COMMEMORATION COORDINATOR	300	300
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	415	415
PROTECTING, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS(SEC 3)	50	50
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,500	1,500
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT SEDIMENT DEMO PROGRAM	1,500	1,500
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	675
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	700	700
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,000	4,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−16,457	−33,634
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,745,000	1,833,263

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

Maintenance backlogs continue to grow, with much of the backlog being essential maintenance dredging needed to keep the Nation's ports, harbors, and waterways open and able to efficiently handle important national and international trade activities. Yet, the Committee is aware that out-year budget planning guidance for the Corps of Engineers projects that the current appropriations for their critical operation and maintenance activities will continue to decline for the foreseeable future. If additional resources are not made available, the Committee will be forced to cut back on services, and begin to terminate and close many projects and activities.

The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to stretch the limited resources to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of means. With an increasing number of projects entering the inventory, and budgetary constraints increasing, it is

clear that the Corps will have to find innovative ways of accomplishing required maintenance work, while reducing operational and other costs. Adjustments in lower-priority programs and noncritical work should optimize limited resources while maximizing the public benefit.

The Committee agrees that centralized management of project funds is efficient and is allowed under current guidelines for multi-project-related activities. These activities include, but are not limited to, the program development system known as the Automated Budget System (WinABS) and certain activities such as the National Recreation Reservation Service; the provision of uniforms for those required to wear them; Volunteer Clearinghouse; the Water Safety Program; and the Sign Standards Program. However, the Committee expects the Chief of Engineers to properly account and disclose the costs of these activities.

The Committee is concerned about efforts to place the dredge *McFARLAND* directly into active ready reserve status. In addition, the Committee is concerned about efforts preventing the *McFARLAND* from being scheduled to work outside the Delaware River in other navigation channels (especially the Mississippi River) as it has successfully done. Though the private dredging industry has constructed one new hopper dredge and has another in construction, it is not known if these two vessels can provide sufficient additional private industry equipment capacity to execute an average year of dredging. Hopper dredging requirements over the last 2 years have been below average. The Committee believes that, given the policy implications, the future status of the dredge *McFARLAND* or the recommendation of placing another dredge in ready reserve should be carefully reviewed and authorized by the appropriate authorizing committees of the Congress.

The inland waterways infrastructure is an investment that tangibly benefits the nation's economy and all consumers. Based on analyses by the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), the use of inland waterway transportation nationally saves an estimated average of $10.69 per ton over alternative modes (based on 1997 waterborne commerce data). This represents a savings to American shippers, consumers and exporters of $7,000,000,000 annually, or a 14 to 1 return on the $500,000,000 investment of Federal dollars in operating, maintaining and improving the inland waterways.

Inland and intracoastal navigation operates as a system, much like highways. The Mississippi, Ohio, Illinois, Tennessee and Gulf Intracoastal Waterway are like interstates—the main arteries that carry most of the system traffic. Smaller tributary waterways act as secondary roads, or neighborhood streets, allowing commerce to feed on and off the main routes, and providing access to more remote communities and regions. These tributary waterways naturally carry far less traffic than the mainstem waterways, but, like neighborhood streets, they play a vital role in linking communities to the system as a whole. This allows shippers and consumers in communities on tributary waterways to take advantage of the huge economies of scale offered by large barge tows on the mainstem, resulting in lower transportation costs. It also allows millions of tons of cargo to remain on barges much closer to its final destination,

rather than moving longer distances by highway or rail and adding to existing congestion.

The tributary waterways naturally do not enjoy the same level of relative efficiencies as the mainstem waterways. The Mississippi and Ohio handle tremendous volumes of traffic over long distances and so generate impressive ton-mile statistics. Tributaries by nature provide generally short, smaller channels with lower traffic densities. Consequently, "ton-mile" statistics for tributary waterways are dwarfed by statistics for the mainstem waterways. But it is important to recognize that the commerce on the tributaries is usually only a small part of a total journey between producer and consumer. Tributary traffic joins the mainstem traffic and becomes a part of the impressive ton-mile statistics realized by the "interstates" of waterways.

Because of their very nature and function as tributaries, these waterways have much higher operation and maintenance costs per ton-mile than the mainstem waterways. However, as a return on investment, most tributary waterways in fact appear to "pay their way". Therefore, the Committee has restored funding to most of the low use waterways and port projects not included in the budget request. The Committee believes that cutting low-use waterway funding does a serious disservice to the public.

Alabama-Coosa River, AL.—The Committee has included $4,710,000 for the Alabama-Coosa River navigation channel. Funds provided over the budget request are for annual maintenance dredging of the waterway.

Naknek River, AK.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to prepare plans and specifications and to initiate a contract to remove obstructive boulders causing hazardous navigation conditions.

Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, CA.—$2,200,000 has been provided to perform maintenance activities at the harbor project.

Cherry Creek, Chatfield, and Trinidad Lakes, CO.—An appropriation of $1,200,000 has been provided above the budget request of $2,055,000 for these three lakes. Frequent inundation of recreation areas are causing health and safety concerns requiring repair or replacement of the facilities. It is the Committee's understanding that the State of Colorado has agreed to cost share in this project on a 50–50 basis. It is also the understanding of the Committee that the Secretary is not to assume, nor share in the future cost of the operation and maintenance of these recreation facilities. This action in no way is intended to alter the Corps of Engineers' lease and property accountability policies.

Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland.—The Committee recommendation is $13,500,000. A portion of the additional funds provided over the budget request of $12,223,000, are to be utilized to immediately reimburse the State of Delaware for normal operation and maintenance costs incurred by the State for the SR1 Bridge, from station 58 + 00 to station 293 + 00, between May 12, 1997, and September 30, 2001. The reimbursable costs include electric lighting and associated late fees, power sweeping, drainage cleaning, snow removal, surface deicing, and periodic bridge inspections. Further, funds are provided to reimburse the State for costs associated with normal operation and maintenance of the SR1 Bridge for the period Octo-

ber 1, 2001, through September 30, 2002. Reimbursable costs include electric lighting, power sweeping, drainage cleaning, snow removal, surface deicing, and periodic bridge inspections. The Corps shall initiate necessary repairs to the SR1 Bridge once repair recommendations from the bridge inspection are received.

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, GA, FL, & AL.—An appropriation of $8,173,000 is provided. Funds are to be used as follows: $1,237,000 for operation of the George W. Andrews Lock; $3,000,000 for system-wide annual maintenance dredging; $1,000,000 for maintenance of the disposal site; $600,000 to develop and implement a dredge material management plan; $1,200,000 to dredge spot shoals; $365,000 to perform annual lock maintenance; $231,000 to reestablish survey control points; and $540,000 to restore hydrologic connections and habitat values in three slough/tributary sites within the Apalachicola River System.

Calumet Harbor and River, IL & IN.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,709,000 for the Calumet Harbor and River, IL & IN.

Missouri River-Rulo to the Mouth, IA, NE, KS, & MO.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,880,000. In addition to maintenance activities included in the budget request, additional funding is provided for restoration of shallow water habitat and maintenance and repair of dike and revetment structures.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, LA.—An appropriation of $19,500,000 is provided. Funds over the budget amount are for major repairs at Harvey Lock, painting emergency stoplogs at the INHC, and painting stiffleg derricks at Algiers Lock.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.—The Committee recommendation includes $11,477,000 to continue operation of the locks and dams and dredging within the waterway. Further, funds provided above the budget request are to be used to perform revetment repairs, lock and dam repairs, and to maintain the hydraulic connections to the oxbow lakes.

Wolf and Jordan River, MS.—The Committee is aware that the authorized 7 foot deep and 100 foot wide Jordan River Channel is currently subject to draft restrictions due to shoaling, and has, therefore, directed the Corps of Enginers, within available funds, to perform maintenance dredging, or such activity as the Corps determines most effective, to ensure that project depth is maintained.

Honga and Tar Bay-Back Creek, MD.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for dredging the navigation channel.

Missouri River Master Water Control Manual, NE, IA, KS, MO, MT, & ND.—The Committee recognizes that this continues to be a very contentious issue among all parties involved. Further, the Committee understands that the Corps is complying with provisions contained in the National Environmental Policy Act concerning development of reasonable and prudent alternatives to the biological opinion of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 to accomplish additional measures to complete the final EIS.

Cocheco River, NH.—An appropriation of $300,000 is provided to continue coordination with the State and Federal agencies for an upland disposal site.

Abiquiu Dam, NM.—The Committee has provided $3,056,000 for stabilization of the fractured rock walls on the north abutment of the dam which are threatening facilities and cause a hazard to project personnel.

Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model, NM.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 continued development of the Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, ND.—The Committee has provided $9,911,000, an increase of $800,000 over the budget. The additional funds are provided for repair of damaged facilities and mosquito control activities.

Wister Lake, OK.—The Committee has provided $70,000 above the budget request for land transfers on the Wister Lake, Oklahoma, project.

Colombia River at the Mouth, OR & WA.—The Committee has provided $200,000 over the budget request for the Corps to study the impacts of alternate dredged material disposal methods. Specifically, the Corps is urged to examine the impacts of disposing of dredged material at Benson Beach. The Corps should report back to the Committee by September 30, 2002, with its recommendations as to whether this alternative is technically sound, environmentally acceptable and cost effective.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, OR.—The Committee recommendation contains $200,000 above the budget request for initiation of a major maintenance report for repairing the north and south jetties.

Providence River and Harbor, RI.—The Committee has provided $2,110,000, the same as the budget request. These funds will be used for normal maintenance activities as well as necessary activities to develop both the interim and long-term dredge material disposal areas.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, SC.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 to continue maintenance activities along the waterway from Little River, South Carolina, to Port Royal Sound.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.—The Committee notes that Title VI of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, as amended, requires that funding to inventory and stabilize cultural and historic sites along the Missouri River in South Dakota, and to carry out the terrestrial wildlife habitat programs, shall be provided from the Operations and Maintenance account. The Committee has provided $1,000,000 under the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (Oahe, Big Bend, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dams) for this purpose, and in compliance with the requirements of Title VI, directs the Corps to contract with or reimburse the State of South Dakota and affected tribes to carry out these duties.

Texas Water Allocation, TX.—The Committee has included $1,500,000, as proposed in the budget request, for the ongoing Corps' effort to determine the optimum allocation of existing water resources in Federal reservoirs in Texas.

Burlington Harbor Breakwater, VT.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for normal O&M activities and to repair the south breakwater.

North Springfield Lake and Union Village Dam, VT.—$145,000 has been provided above the budget request for these two projects to update the project master plans.

Little Goose Lock and Dam, WA, and The Dalles Lock and Dam, OR & WA.—$600,000 is provided above the budget request for these two projects to fund new requirements implementing the Federal Columbia River Power System biological opinion.

Willapa River and Harbor, WA.—An additional $450,000 is provided to resume the navigation study.

Bluestone Lake, WV.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,661,000. This is $5,430,000 above the budget request. The additional funds are for continued construction of the multi-level release tower, the public awareness program, and to initiate the downstream clean-up.

Wheeling Creek, WV.—The Bill includes $2,000,000 to continue the project.

Fox River, WI.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 above the budget request to transfer the navigation portion of the Federal project to the State of Wisconsin.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2001	$124,725,000
Budget estimate, 2002	128,000,000
Committee recommendation	128,000,000

An appropriation of $128,000,000 is recommended for the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers.

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

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

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2001	$139,692,000
Budget estimate, 2002	140,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $140,000,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) in fiscal year 2002.

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.INSERT 78A

The Committee notes that significant radiological contamination has been discovered in the past year that the former nuclear weapons facility at the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant in Middletown, Iowa, and understands that the Corps is currently conducting a Preliminary Assessment of the site for inclusion under FUSRAP. The Committee is disappointed that the Preliminary Assessment is not yet done. The Committee directs the Corps, in consultation with the State of Iowa, to report back to the Committee, by December 1, 2001, on their recommendations regarding a radiological survey of the entire plant site and to take all appropriate actions in accordance with rules and procedures governing the program.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2001	$151,666,000
Budget estimate, 2002	153,000,000
Committee recommendation	153,000,000

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.

Executive direction and management.—The Office of the Chief of Engineers and 8 division offices supervise work in 37 district offices.

Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity.—This support center provides administrative services for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and other separate field operating activities, to include personnel, logistics, and finance and accounting.

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

United States Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center.—This center was established in 1996 in Memphis, Tennessee, to centralize Corps finance and accounting sites.

The Committee is concerned that the Army's Centralized personnel management system for worldwide military service and combat operations may not be meeting the Corps of Engineers hiring needs. The Committee urges the Army to evaluate the merits of extending this centralized system to an organization of distinctly regional civilian field operating agencies.

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $153,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

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

The bill includes language in Section 102 which directs that none of the funds made available in fiscal year 2002 may be used to carry out any activity relating to closure or removal of the St. Georges Bridge across the Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland.

Language is included in Section 103 that directs that the Secretary of the Army may not accelerate the schedule to finalize the Record of Decision for the revision of the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual and any related changes to the Missouri River Annual Operating Plan. The Corps of Engineers is undergoing an extensive process to revise the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual and the annual operating plan with regard to the Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion and other views. The Corps' schedule calls for more than a 15 month period between the Secretary's release of the Implementation Plan, which has not yet occurred, and the finalization of the Record of Decision. So, under this provision and in accordance with this schedule, the Record of Decision will not occur in fiscal year 2002.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2001	$39,862,000
Budget estimate, 2002	36,228,000
Committee recommendation	36,228,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2002 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals $36,228,000. An appropriation of $24,169,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; $10,749,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides $1,310,000 for program administration and oversight.

The Central Utah Project Completion Act (titles II–VI of Public Law 102–575) provides for the completion of the central Utah project by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. The Act also authorizes the appropriation of funds for fish, wildlife, recreation, mitigation, and conservation; establishes an account in the Treasury for the deposit of these funds and of other contributions for mitigation and conservation activities; and establishes a Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to administer funds in that account. The Act further assigns responsibilities for carrying out the Act to the Secretary of the Interior and prohibits delegation of those responsibilities to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Committee notes that the requirement under the Completion Act to make an annual Federal contribution of $5,000,000 to the principal of the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account ended in 2001.

It is the intent of the Committee that funds previously appropriated for the Uinta Basin Replacement Project, which was authorized by Section 203 of the Central Utah Project Completion Act (Public Law 102–575), shall be immediately available to proceed with construction of the Project as described in the 2001 Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2001	$678,953,000
Budget estimate, 2002	647,997,000
Committee recommendation	732,496,000

An appropriation of $732,496,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation. The water and related resources account supports the development, management, and restoration of water and related natural resources in the 17 Western States. The account includes funds for

operating and maintaining existing facilities to obtain the greatest overall level of benefits, to protect public safety, and to conduct studies on ways to improve the use of water and related natural resources. Work will be done in partnership and cooperation with non-Federal entities and other Federal agencies.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
ARIZONA						
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	6,282	.....	6,282
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN	4,359,206	3,437,832	31,392	50	31,392	50
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	449,596	411,038	725	9,355	725	9,355
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	147,873	102,490	3,103	.....	3,103	.....
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	575	.....	575	.....
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT	20,000	475	250	.....	250	.....
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	64,983	24,424	4,055	.....	4,055	.....
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	685	.....	685	.....
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	6,040	4,788	200	.....	200	.....
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	1,000	759	100	.....	100	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	1,658	18,037	1,658	18,037
CALIFORNIA						
CACHUMA PROJECT	36,605	36,605	640	426	640	426
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT	20,000	2,272	1,800	.....	1,800	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:						
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	202,014	165,661	2,387	10,996	2,387	10,996
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,723,655	376,856	1,947	.....	1,947	.....
DELTA DIVISION	425,681	227,531	12,182	5,053	27,432	5,053
EAST SIDE DIVISION	.....	.....	604	3,630	604	3,630
FRIANT DIVISION	519	400	2,103	2,923	4,603	2,923
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	745,537	402,932	12,637	879	28,387	879
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT	.....	.....	.....	11,000	.....	11,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	520,329	405,241	4,071	1,682	5,071	1,682
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	362,463	311,500	447	.....	697	.....
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	530,566	98,531	1,280	.....	1,280	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	301,019	292,284	2,456	7,025	7,706	7,025

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	355,515	332,404	7,751	5,380	7,751	5,380
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	.....	.....	900	7,322	900	7,322
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	1,599,810	585,638	4,735	6,417	4,735	6,417
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	.....	.....	1,500	.....	1,500	.....
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	.....	.....	200	.....	2,000	.....
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	15,411	3,396	1,800	.....	1,800	.....
LONG BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	20,000	6,140	1,800	.....	1,800	.....
NORTH SONOMA COUNTY WATER REUSE STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
GROUNDWATER REPLENISHMENT SYSTEM	20,000	3,396	1,800	.....	1,800	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	410	.....	410
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	13,675	8,665	800	.....	800	.....
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVERSION STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECYCLING PROGRAM	172,590	57,534	6,000	.....	6,000	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	38,090	26,714	1,800	.....	1,800	.....
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	109,959	19,117	2,500	.....	2,500	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	.....	.....	1,210	1,149	1,210	1,149
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	875	.....	875	.....
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
COLORADO						
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTION 5 AND 8	.....	79,178	12,000	.....	16,000	.....
COLLBRAN PROJECT	.....	.....	127	1,202	127	1,202
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
COLORADO—BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	.....	.....	49	7,913	49	7,913
COLORADO—BIG THOMPSON PROJECT—HORSETOOTH DAM	90,606	10,000	.....	26,000	.....	26,000
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	.....	.....	74	17	74	17
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	.....	.....	9	4,472	9	4,472

GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	.....	.....	427	573	427	573
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	.....	.....	421	1,787	421	1,787
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	.....	.....	.....	332	.....	332
MANCOS PROJECT	.....	.....	49	23	49	23
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	.....	.....	.....	2,119	.....	2,119
PINE RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	88	62	88	62
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	.....	.....	326	4,021	326	4,021
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	.....	.....	368	27	368	27
HAWAII						
HAWAII WATER RESOURCES STUDY, HI	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
IDAHO						
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	1,526	6,071	1,526	6,071
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	.....	53,040	11,000	.....	11,000	.....
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	1,073	723	165	.....	165	.....
FORT HALL EROSION CONTROL STUDY	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	509	.....	509	.....
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	1,968	3,272	1,968	3,272
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,830	768	262	.....	262	.....
KANSAS						
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	594	.....	594	.....
WICHITA PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	269	.....	269
MONTANA						
FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	294	.....	294
MILK RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	440	541	440	541
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	321	.....	321	.....
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	.....	.....	8,000	.....	8,000	.....
NEBRASKA						
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	.....	.....	23	32	23	32
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NEVADA						
HALFWAY WASH, NV	.....	.....	.....	.....	120	.....
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	.....	.....	6,347	2,089	6,347	2,089

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	.....	.....	1,000	.....	1,400	.....
NEWLANDS PROJECT WATER RIGHTS FUND	7,000	3,200	.....	.....	2,000	.....
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,500	.....
STEAMBOAT CREEK RENO, NV	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
WALKER RIVER BASIN PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
NEW MEXICO						
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,500	.....
CARLSBAD PROJECT	.....	.....	1,689	742	1,689	742
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY	.....	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	.....	.....	2,684	8,967	14,884	8,967
NAVAJO GALLUP WATER SUPPLY	2,000	909	300	.....	500	.....
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	50	.....	50
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	.....	.....	1,001	2,591	1,001	2,591
RIO JEMEZ (ABOUSELMAN) INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	1,200	.....	.....	.....	1,200	.....
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	214	.....	214	.....
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	200	.....	200	.....
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	.....	.....	26	.....	26	.....
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	217	.....	217	.....
NORTH DAKOTA						
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	354	.....	354	.....
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	.....	.....	250	.....	250	.....
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	1,484,000	675,205	21,011	4,228	24,000	4,228
OKLAHOMA						
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	186	.....	186
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	569	.....	569
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	276	.....	276
NORMAN PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	183	.....	183

OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			263		263	
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT				731		731
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT				280		280
OREGON						
BEND FEED CANAL PIPELINE PROJECT					300	
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT			278	418	278	418
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	15,000	2,285	500		500	
DESCHUTES PROJECT			360	138	360	138
DESCHUTES PROJECT—WICKUP DAM	38,279	11,500		12,000		12,000
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS			340	267	340	267
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	1,871	1,271	150		150	
KLAMATH PROJECT			12,277	483	17,777	483
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			457		457	
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION			317	162	317	162
TUALATIN PROJECT			149	107	149	107
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	275	100	100		100	
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	804	704	50		50	
UMATILLA PROJECT			409	2,227	409	2,227
SOUTH DAKOTA						
CROW CREEK TRIBE RESERVATION WIDE M AND I WATER SUPPLY					100	
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	213,888	1,534			2,000	
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	136,325	70,424	10,000	40	15,500	40
MNI WICONI PROJECT	372,640	178,923	20,511	7,489	26,000	7,489
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM				30		30
TEXAS						
BALMORHEA PROJECT			30		30	
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT				104		104
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE						
HASKELL STREET RECLAIMED WATER PROJECT, TX	8,328	6,232				
NAVAJO GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT			300		300	
NUECES RIVER				421		421
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT				688		688
SAN ANGELO PROJECT				335		335
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			197		197	
UTAH						
HYRUM PROJECT			310	8	310	8

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
MOON LAKE PROJECT			39	6	39	6
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	875	524	250		250	
NEWTON PROJECT			46	7	46	7
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			305		305	
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT			111	51	111	51
PROVO RIVER PROJECT			465	363	465	363
SCOFIELD PROJECT			56	25	56	25
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			300		300	
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT			82	7	82	7
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	19,639	16,593	1,704	290	1,704	290
WEBER RIVER PROJECT			356	32	356	32
WASHINGTON						
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT			4,044	9,119	4,044	9,119
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			425		425	
YAKIMA PROJECT			516	6,753	516	6,753
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	194,034	25,234	10,600		10,600	
WYOMING						
KENDRICK PROJECT			8	4,654	8	4,654
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT			40	1,412	40	1,412
SHOSHONE PROJECT			54	925	54	925
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM			55		55	
VARIOUS						
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II: PROGRAM AND COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	175,000	46,793	10,929		10,929	
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5			5,349	1,821	5,349	1,821
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8, R&F&WL	103,876	55,633	4,677	61	4,677	61
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	60,000	40,905	150		150	

DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:						
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM				1,700		1,700
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION				16,400		16,400
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS				17,900		17,900
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES				624		624
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM			2,620		2,620	
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE			582		582	
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM			3,738		3,738	
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM				330		330
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION			13,522		13,522	
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION			1,882		1,882	
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES			1,661		1,661	
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES			32	5,110	32	5,110
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM				950		950
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES			1,861		1,861	
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM			7,690		7,690	
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM			2,000			
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM			13,103		13,103	
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS				509		509
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION			1,000		1,000	
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM			8,400		8,400	
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING			1,709		1,709	
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT			180	950	180	950
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—OTHER PROJECTS			3,183	29,747	3,183	29,747
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES			590	345	590	345
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM			463		463	
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION			5,130		5,130	
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT—TITLE XXVIII			1,922		1,922	
RECREATION & FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION			2,694		2,694	
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:						
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT DESALINATION PROGRAM			1,150		1,150	
APPLIED SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT			3,290		3,290	
DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM			300		5,000	
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION/ENHANCEMEN			660		660	
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT			300		300	
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM			940		940	
SITE SECURITY				1,755		1,755
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION			314		314	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES			1,894		1,894	
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM			1,650		1,650	

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	.....	.....	70	.....	70	.....
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM	.....	.....	7,507	.....	7,507	.....
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	.....	.....	3,836	.....	3,836	.....
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	.....	.....	−33,840	.....	−45,989	.....
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	.....	.....	343,599	304,698	427,798	304,698

Central Valley Project, CA.—Additional funding for this project is included over the budget request for activities in support of the Bay Delta Restoration. These activities are described more fully under the heading for the California Bay Delta Restoration.

Lake Tahoe Regional Wetlands Development, California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to continue the environmental restoration project for the Upper Truckee River in the vicinity of the airport at South Lake Tahoe, California.

Animas LaPlata Project, Colorado.—The bill contains $16,000,000 for the Animas LaPlata, Colorado Project. While this is $4,000,000 over the budget request, the Committee recognizes that with constrained resources it will be difficult to maintain the schedule established by the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000.

Halfway Wash, NV.—The Committee recommendation has provided $120,000 for prefeasibility studies of Halfway Wash in Mesquite, County, NV.

Steamboat Creek, Reno, NV.—An appropriation of $100,000 has been provided for the Bureau to initiate feasibility studies for flood control and environmental restoration improvements for Steamboat Creek.

Middle Rio Grande Project, NM.—The Committee recommends $12,200,000 in additional funding for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the efforts of the Middle Rio Grande Collaborative Program Workgroup and its support activities to water users and species along the Middle Rio Grande. These efforts are intended to promote long and short term activities to benefit species and water users along the Middle Rio Grande, pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding signed among the relevant agencies and interested parties. Funded activities will include: $4,700,000 for modifications to river habitat; $2,180,000 for silvery minnow population management; $1,100,000 for monitoring of stream effects on the silvery minnow; $120,000 to combat non-native species; $640,000 for Bureau of Reclamation's repayment obligations; $950,000 for water quality studies and improvements; and $2,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation's purchase of water. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the silvery minnow monitoring and habitat efforts. In addition, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to collaborate with Universities in geographical proximity to the silvery minnow and possessing established experience and expertise in working with the silvery minnow. Finally, the Committee has included statutory language which requires the Bureau to submit a report on the status and results of fiscal year 2001 funding and, to submit to the Committee for approval, a detailed spending plan for fiscal year 2002 within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

Garrison Diversion Unit, ND.—The Committee recommendation includes $24,000,000. While this is an increase over the budget request of $21,011,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

Klamath Project, OR.—The Committee recommendation includes $17,777,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request. The additional funds are for continued construction of the A-Canal.

Mni Wiconi Project, SD.—The Committee has provided $26,000,000 for the Mni Wiconi Project. While this is an increase over the budget request of $20,511,000, it is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimal level.

Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.—The Committee supports the WateReuse Research Foundation program to provide important research into the science and technological aspects of water reclamation. The Committee further notes that the Foundation has secured its cost shared portion for this program as directed in last year's spending bill. Accordingly, the Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation, within available funds, to continue support of the Foundation's research program.

Science and Technology, Desalination Research and Development Program.—Within the funds provided $500,000 is for research of brine disposal alternatives in "land locked" areas such as Phoenix, Arizona, and Las Vegas, Nevada and $1,000,000 to the Bureau of Reclamation to complete a study to determine the most effective and efficient manner of, and to develop a technology progress plan to be used in, the development of a desalination research and development facility in the Tularosa Basin in New Mexico. The Committee recognizes that effective desalination cost reduction is the key to wider use of desalination for improving the quality of life in water-scarce regions. The Secretary of the Interior shall consult with the Secretary of Energy and the Director of the Sandia National Laboratories in the development of the technology and implementation plan and will submit a report by the end of fiscal year 2002 to the Senate Committee on Appropriations outlining the development of desalination technology for the basin.

Within available funds, the Committee directs the Bureau to work with other Federal and State agencies, including the National Academy of Sciences, universities, and non-government entities to act as a national clearinghouse for desalination technologies. The Bureau shall establish a peer review process to validate the efficacy of the multitude of desalination techniques available.

BUDGET LIMITATIONS AND REDUCTIONS

Constrained spending limits imposed by the Congressional Budget Resolution have made it difficult for the Committee to formulate a balanced Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. In order to adhere to the subcommittee's allocations, address the critical ongoing activities, correct program imbalances contained in the President's fiscal year 2002 budget, and respond to the numerous requests of the Members, the Committee finds it necessary to recommend numerous adjustments to funding levels proposed in the budget. Finally, the Committee regrets that many worthwhile projects could not be recommended for funding because of the lack of authorization and the shortfall in resources.

The Committee received numerous requests to include project authorizations in the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. However, in an effort to support and honor the congressional authorizing committees' jurisdiction, the Committee has not included new project authorizations.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2001	$9,348,000
Budget estimate, 2002	7,495,000
Committee recommendation	7,495,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,495,000, the same as the budget request, for the small reclamation program of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (43 U.S.C. 422a–422l), loans and/or grants can be made to non-Federal organizations for construction or rehabilitation and betterment of small water resource projects.

As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this loan program account records the subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated in 1992 and beyond, as well as administrative expenses of this program. The subsidy amounts are estimated on a present value basis; the administrative expenses are estimated on a cash basis.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—LOAN PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
LOAN PROGRAM				
CALIFORNIA				
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	14,403	13,164	1,239	1,239
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION	9,401	9,000	401	401
SAN SAVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT	28,100	22,525	5,575	5,575
VARIOUS				
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	.....	.....	280	280
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM	.....	.....	7,495	7,495

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2001	$38,360,000
Budget estimate, 2002	55,039,000
Committee recommendation	55,039,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $55,039,000, the same as the budget request for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund was authorized in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, title 34 of Public Law 102–575. This fund was established to provide funding from project beneficiaries for habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition, and other fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Central Valley project area of California. Revenues are derived from payments by project beneficiaries and from donations. Payments from project beneficiaries include several required by the Act (Friant Division

surcharges, higher charges on water transferred to non-CVP users, and tiered water prices) and, to the extent required in appropriations acts, additional annual mitigation and restoration payments.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriations, 2001	.....
Budget estimate, 2002	$20,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

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

The Committee has consistently expressed concern regarding the duplication and overlap of CALFED activities with Central Valley Project Improvement Act programs and other activities funded under various other programs within the Bureau of Reclamation. In addition the Committee believes that the appropriate authorizing committees of Congress should thoroughly review and specifically reauthorize the CALFED program. The committees of jurisdiction in these complicated matters should have the opportunity to develop legislation to address these issues.

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

The Committee has provided an additional $40,000,000 over the budget request for the Central Valley Project. Additional funds to support the goals of CALFED are provided as follows:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL WATER ACCOUNT

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—$14,250,000 to acquire water and ground water storage and conduct NEPA analysis.

PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Delta Division Oversight.—$7,500,000 to continue coordination, administration, planning, performance tracking and science activities in coordination with CALFED Program Implementation Plan.

STORAGE

Shasta Division.—$5,250,000 to continue evaluating the potential impacts of the proposed Shasta raise.

Delta Division.—$250,000 to continue evaluations of the Delta Wetlands project and other in-delta storage proposals. $1,000,000 for Reclamation to continue participating in planning activities associated with enlarging Los Vaqueros reservoir.

Friant Division.—$2,500,000 to continue developing a plan of study for a feasibility level investigation for storage in the Upper San Joaquin Watershed.

Sacramento River Division.—$500,000 to continue planning activities as agreed to in the Sites MOU.

CONVEYANCE

Delta Division.—$250,000 for the DMC Intertie with the California Aqueduct to continue evaluation studies on systems and environmental impacts. $250,000 to evaluate operations alternatives for the Delta Cross Channel Reoperation.

WATER USE EFFICIENCY

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—$1,000,000 for pilot studies.

WATER TRANSFER PROGRAM

Miscellaneous Project Programs.—$500,000 to conduct NEPA analysis and operate clearinghouse.

CONVEYANCE

Delta Division.—$6,000,000 to construct the Tracy Test Fish Facility.

Sacramento River Division.—$500,000 to continue engineering and design work for the Red Bluff Diversion Dam Fish Passage Improvement Project.

San Felipe Division.—$250,000 to provide technical assistance to Santa Clara Valley Water District in conducting operational appraisal studies.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2001	$50,114,000
Budget estimate, 2002	52,968,000
Committee recommendation	52,968,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $52,968,000. This is the same as the budget request.

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Section 201 of the Bill includes language that States requirements for purchase or lease of water from the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad Projects, New Mexico.

Section 202 of the Bill includes language concerning Drought Emergency Assistance.

Section 203 of the Bill includes language concerning refunds of fees assessed for failure to file certain certification or reporting forms under the Reclamation Act.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Title III provides for the Department of Energy's defense and nondefense functions, the power marketing administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

The Committee believes that earlier statutory restrictions on contractor travel established new appreciation by contractors for propriety and cost effectiveness in their travel expenditures. For fiscal year 2002, no statutory travel restrictions are included. Nevertheless, the Committee directs the Department to maintain contractor travel summaries adequate for periodic reviews of programmatic relevance and costs of contractor travel.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee believes that Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) is essential to maintaining scientific and engineering excellence in the technical areas of effort undertaken by the laboratories in support of the Department's missions. The Committee therefore directs that no more than 6 percent of funding to the laboratories be made available for LDRD.

In fiscal year 2001, the Committee established at the nuclear weapons production plants a program analogous to the LDRD program at the laboratories. This provision for the production plants is provided to attract and retain the highest quality work force through investments in new production and design concepts and the establishment of intern and cooperative student programs. The Committee recognizes the value derived from this activity and directs the Department to permit similar investment for the future by the Nevada Test Site. All of these efforts will be critical to maintaining the Department's most valuable assets—its people.

ENERGY SUPPLY

Appropriations, 2001	$659,918,000
Budget estimate, 2002	544,245,000
Committee recommendation	741,139,000

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2001	$375,785,000
Budget estimate, 2002	276,653,000
Committee recommendation	435,600,000

The Committee recommendation provides $435,600,000, for renewable energy resources, an increase of $59,815,000 over the current year appropriation, and $158,947,000 over the administration's request.

The recommendation for Renewable Energy Resources reflects the Committee's strong belief that only a balanced portfolio of production and distribution technologies and strategies will fulfill our Nation's long-term needs and goals for both energy and the environment. For that reason, the Committee recommendation includes substantial investments in renewable energy resources above the Administration's request. While the Administration's Report of the National Energy Policy Development Group recognized the importance of a clean and diverse portfolio of renewable domestic energy supplies, the Administration's budget, even as amended, provides inadequate resources to accomplish these goals.

The Committee agrees that the Secretaries of Energy and Interior need to re-evaluate access limitations to Federal lands in order to increase renewable energy production, such as geothermal, solar, wind, and biomass. The Committee is encouraged by the interdepartmental cooperation demonstrated by these Departments in facilitating the privately-funded large wind turbine project at the Nevada Test Site. Our Nation's vast holdings of public land are, in many cases, ideally suited to the deployment of renewable technologies. The Administration is encouraged to enhance these opportunities.

The Committee has modified the request for low emission energy technologies; including hydro, renewable, and nuclear, with the view toward post 2010 application of new technologies. As a result, with few exceptions, the Committee recommends basic research that will provide significant improvements over existing technologies. The Committee is well aware of the proposition that appropriated funds can demonstrate the reliable operation of low emission technologies before they become commercially attractive. In a few cases, the Committee has provided funds for just such demonstrations. However, in general, the Committee expects non-Federal financing to support the final stages of product development and all stages of market development.

Solar building technology research.—The Committee recommends $7,000,000 to fund solar building technology development.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The Committee recommends $70,000,000 for photovoltaic energy systems. The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for continuation of the Million Solar Roofs program at current year levels and $2,500,000 for the Southeast and Southwest photovoltaic experiments stations. Additionally, the Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the Navajo electrification project.

Concentrating solar power.—The Committee recommends $15,300,000 for concentrating solar power. Within these amounts the Department is directed to continue with deployment of the 1.0 MW dish engine and to continue activities associated with the 25 kW dish system. Additionally, the Committee directs the Department to develop and scope out an initiative to fulfill the goal of having 1,000 MW of new solar capacity supplying the Southwestern United States by the year 2006. A report is due to the House and Senate Committees by March 1, 2002.

Biomass/biofuels—power systems.—The Committee recommends $53,000,000 for biomass/bio-fuels—power systems.

The Iowa switch grass project is funded at $4,000,000 in fiscal year 2002.

The recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the McNeil biomass plant in Burlington, Vermont, and $1,000,000 for the for methane energy and agriculture development project in Tillamook Bay, Oregon.

Biomass/biofuels—transportation.—The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000 for biomass/biofuels transportation. Within available funds, $300,000 is provided for the continuation and expansion of the on-going demonstration of the oxygenated diesel fuel particulate matter emission reduction project in Clark County, Nevada; $3,000,000 for the Michigan Biotechnogy Initiative; $3,000,000 for the Prime LLC, of South Dakota integrated ethanol complex, including an ethanol unit, waste treatment system, and enclosed cattle feed lot; $300,000 for the Biomass Energy Resource Center project in Vermont; $2,000,000 to continue the Sealaska ethanol project (subject to a non-federal match) at the fiscal year 2001 level; $3,000,000 for the Biomass Gasification Research Center in Birmingham, Alabama; and $3,000,000 for the Winona, Mississippi, biomass project. Additionally, the Committee directs the Department to continue funding for the Energy and Environment Research Center at last year's level.

Biomass demonstration projects may be funded from within the totals available under biomass/biofuels energy systems account. The Committee recommendation includes $18,000,000 to continue the Integrated Biomass Research and Development Program.

Wind.—The Committee recommendation includes $45,000,000 for wind. Within this amount, $500,000 is provided for the Turtle Mountain Community College project in North Dakota; $1,000,000 is provided for the Kotzebue project in Alaska; $250,000 is provided to the Wind Technology Center for a feasibility study for a wind power generation facility to serve St. Paul and Unalaska, Alaska. The Wind Powering America initiative is to be continued at last year's funding level. The Committee continues to recognize the need for a set-aside for small wind programs, such as the one being developed by the Vermont Department of Public Service and the Department, in the Federal wind energy research and development budget. The Committee recommends $500,000 for this project.

Renewable energy production incentive.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive.

Renewable program support.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for technical analysis and assistance within renewable program support.

Departmental Energy Management.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for departmental energy management. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report by January 1, 2002, detailing the potential energy savings to be derived from this program, if fully implemented.

International renewable programs.—The Committee strongly supports the U.S. international joint implementation program funded in this account and recommends $3,000,000 for that purpose. The Committee supports efforts to increase international market opportunities for the export and deployment of advanced clean energy

technologies—end-use efficiency, fossil, renewable, and nuclear energy technologies.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000, for capital equipment and general plant projects at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Of this amount, $1,000,000 is provided to reduce the maintenance backlog. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for technical analysis, technical assistance, and the harmonization of multi-program activities that address the resource opportunities and electric power needs in the Southwest United States. The expertise of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) is to be made available through a site office in Nevada. NREL will provide expertise through a virtual laboratory concept, serving as a portal for electronic communications, information sharing, data warehousing, and partnerships among universities, researchers, technology developers, and those interested in deployment.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommends $32,000,000 for geothermal technology development, including $2,500,000 for GeoPowering the West. The Committee is concerned that the Department appears to be cutting funds for these important research efforts prematurely. The Committee has provided a substantial increase and expects the Department to use the additional funds, in part, to foster university research and public private partnerships. Within available funds, the Committee provides $1,000,000 for the UNR Geothermal Energy Center's demonstration project.

Hydrogen research.—The Committee strongly supports research and development of hydrogen technology and recognizes it to be a highly promising and cost effective energy carrier. The Committee recommends $35,000,000. The recommendation includes $350,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings, MT to continue the ongoing resource inventory, feasibility study, and development of a Solid Waste Hydrogen Fuel Cell manufacturing capability, $1,000,000 for the gasification of Iowa switch grass and its use in fuel cells, $1,500,000 for the ITM Syngas project, $1,500,000 for the fuel cell installation project at Gallatin County, Montana, and $2,000,000 for continued demonstration of the hydrogen locomotive and front-end loader projects.

The Committee continues to encourage demonstration of a dedicated fleet of vehicles, including buses, powered by hydrogen.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommends $9,300,000 for hydropower. The Committee commends the Department of Energy for recognizing the benefits of and developing advanced "fish-friendly" turbines for hydro-electric generation. The Committee recommendation includes $7,000,000 for that effort. Within available funds, the Committee recommends $400,000 to plan a hydroelectric power generation facility at Gustavus, Alaska, subject to a local match for construction. Additionally, the Committee recommends $1,900,000 for the completion of the Power Creek hydroelectric project in Alaska. No additional funds will be made available for this project.

Renewable Indian energy resources.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for Indian renewable energy resource development. The Committee expects these funds to be ad-

ministered as competitively awarded grants to federally-recognized tribes throughout the United States.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation includes $71,000,000 for electric energy systems and storage.

This program provides funding for transmission reliability, energy storage systems and high temperature superconductivity research and development.

Within available funds under electric energy systems and storage, the Committee recommends $1,000,000 to initiate development of a bipolar wafer-cell nickel metal hydride battery storage system; $2,000,000 for Glenallen power generation upgrades, including extension of electricity to residents of Lake Louise; and $2,000,000 for the Kachemak Bay Power System to extend and upgrade marine power cabling to provide power to the villages of Seldovia, Nanwalek, and Port Graham, Alaska. The Committee also recommends $3,000,000 for the Swan Lake-Lake Tyee electrical intertie pursuant to the Southeast Alaska intertie authorization enacted into law last year. Additionally, the Committee recommends $3,000,000 to complete the Prince of Wales Island electrical intertie. The Committee notes that $20,000,000 has been provided in State and local funds and this Federal amount represents the final installment needed to complete the project. The Committee recommendation also includes $3,000,000, within available funds, for NREL for research, development, and demonstration of advanced thermal energy storage technology integrated with renewable thermal energy technology.

In view of the Department's goal of obtaining a minimum of 20 percent of new generation through distributed generation technologies by 2010, the Committee supports the joint effort between New Mexico Tech and the Natural Energy Laboratory of Hawaii to integrate, demonstrate, and ultimately deploy distributed energy systems that make full use of conventional and renewable technologies and recommends $1,000,000 for this purpose.

The Committee urges the Department of expand its partnership with and funding support to the University of California-Irvine's Advanced Power and Energy Program (APEP), the only nationally university-based public-private collaborative involving major gas turbine, micro turbine, fuel cell and renewable manufacturers, California utilities and Federal, regional and State government agencies. APEP's energy and information related technology demonstrations are accelerating the deployment of affordable and reliable energy products and systems, essential to helping the nation and Western States respond to current and future energy requirements.

Renewable program direction.—The Committee recommendation includes $21,000,000 for program direction within this account.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2001	$259,925,000
Budget estimate, 2002	223,122,000
Committee recommendation	264,069,000

The Committee recommendation provides $264,069,000 for nuclear energy, an increase of $4,144,000 from the current year appropriation.

Nuclear energy presently contributes about 21 percent of our nation's electrical power and emits no atmospheric pollutants. The United States has not yet determined how to handle spent nuclear fuel, and the Committee does not underestimate the technical and social challenges entailed in this challenge. Although geologic repository characterization activities continue at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, this "bury and forget" concept for dealing with spent nuclear fuel continues to encounter obstacles to its implementation, both domestically and internationally. While the Committee supports continued nuclear power research and development activities as part of a balanced approach to meeting our Nation's energy needs, industry and the Department are strongly encouraged to focus their research efforts on a broader array of disposal options, including reprocessing, transmutation, and dry cask storage, all of which reduce or eliminate the need for a geologic repository.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The Committee recommends $29,094,000 for advanced radioisotope power systems.

Isotopes.—The Committee recommends $24,683,000 for isotope support and production. Within this amount, the Committee recommends an additional $1,000,000 for medical applications. Additionally, the Committee recommends $2,494,000 for the Isotope Production Facility at LANSCE. The amount recommended is reduced by offsetting collections of $9,000,000 to be received in fiscal year 2002, resulting in a net recommended appropriation of $18,177,000.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The Committee recommends a total of $19,000,000, an increase of $7,206,000 over the budget request, for university reactor fuel assistance and support. University nuclear engineering programs and university research reactors represent a fundamental and key capability in supporting our national policy goals in health care, materials science and energy technology.

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

The Committee is very concerned about the long-term viability of nuclear engineering programs in the United States and the continued loss of university research reactors. In 1988, the United States had 40 university reactors. Today, only 27 exist, and of those, several are under consideration for closing. To address this growing problem, the additional resources shall be used to initiate the establishment of (1) geographically distributed regional university research reactor user facilities, and (2) geographically distributed training and education reactor facilities in a manner consistent with the Final Report of the Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee University Research Reactor Task Force. The program

should also include substantial financial support from the nuclear industry.

Nuclear energy plant optimization.—The Committee recommends a total of $9,000,000, an increase of $4,500,000 over the budget request. The Department is encouraged to expand this cost-shared research and development program to improve the reliability, availability, and productivity of existing nuclear power plants.

Nuclear Energy Research Initiative.—The Committee recommends a total of $38,000,000, an increase of $19,921,000 over the budget request and $3,000,000 over the current year enacted level. The Department's budget request would only marginally support existing NERI projects and would not allow for any new projects in the coming year. The proposed increase is necessary to grow the scope of the technology and the people for a growing nuclear industry. The recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the Department to pursue reactor-based transmutation in coordination with studies of accelerator-based transmutation.

Nuclear Energy Technologies.—The Committee recommends a total of $14,000,000, an increase of $9,500,000 over the budget request and $6,500,000 over the current year level. The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for completion of the Generation IV Technology Roadmap; $7,000,000 for advanced reactor development consistent with the longer term recommendations of the Generation IV Technology Roadmap and to continue research begun in the current fiscal year on small, modular nuclear reactors; and $3,000,000 to support, on a cost-shared basis, the generic/industry-wide proposals from the report of the Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee's Near-Term Deployment Group.

Infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation includes $81,279,000 for infrastructure, the amount of the request.

ANL–West Operations.—The Committee recommendation includes $34,107,000, the amount of the request and $5,043,000 less than the current year, for ANL–West operations.

Fast flux test facility.—The Committee has provided the budget request of $38,439,000 for the FFTF. Since the FFTF was shut down in 1992, the Department has spent a total of $473,700,000 to begin deactivation and then to maintain it in a safe standby condition while seeking other missions. Had this amount of funding been spent to decontaminate and decommission (D&D) the reactor, the job would have been finished.

In April, the Secretary of Energy granted a 90-day delay in shutdown for yet another review of possible missions. The Committee is not optimistic that the results of this review will be any different than previous reviews. If the review determines that the reactor should be shut down, the Department is directed to immediately submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a plan detailing how the Department intends to shut down and begin the decommissioning and decontamination of the FFTF. If the review determines that the reactor should be restarted, the Department must submit a detailed project plan with a validated baseline cost, scope and schedule for restart to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. No funds may be obligated for restart activities until 60 days after submission of this report and approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

Nuclear facilities management.—The Committee recommendation includes $30,457,000 for nuclear facilities management, the amount of the request. Within this amount, the Committee directs that $4,200,000 be used to complete deactivation of EBR–II.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation includes $25,062,000 for program direction, the amount of the request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 2001	$35,998,000
Budget estimate, 2002	35,500,000
Committee recommendation	33,500,000

The Committee recommendation includes $33,500,000 for non-defense environment, safety, and health which includes $19,527,000 for program direction.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2001	$8,600,000
Budget estimate, 2002	8,970,000
Committee recommendation	7,970,000

Technical information management.—The Committee recommendation for the technical information management program is $1,600,000.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $6,370,000.

General reduction.—The Committee recommendation includes a general reduction of $5,000,000, to be applied uniformly across Nuclear Energy.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

(NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 2001	$277,200,000
Budget estimate, 2002	228,553,000
Committee recommendation	228,553,000

The Committee recommendation provides $228,553,000 for non-defense environmental management.

The non-defense environmental management program is responsible for managing and addressing the environmental legacy resulting from nuclear energy and civilian energy research programs, primarily the Office of Science within the Department of Energy. Research and development activities of DOE and predecessor agencies generated waste and other contaminants which pose unique problems, including unprecedented volumes of contaminated soils, water and facilities. The funding requested and provided here supports the Department's goal of cleaning up as many of its contaminated sites as possible by 2006 in a safe and cost-effective manner. The Committee is concerned that a growing number of projects within the closure account will not, in fact, be closed out by 2006. The closure accounts were created to focus attention and resources on clean-up projects that were considered the most likely candidates for timely closure. To the extent that several projects now appear likely to miss the 2006 deadline, the Department should consider moving them back to the post-2006 list. The Committee directs the Department to provide to the Committee by March 1,

2002, a report that aligns projects appropriately among site closure, site completion, and post-2006 completion.

Site Closure.—The Committee recommendation provides $43,000,000 for site closure.

Site completion.—The Committee recommendation provides $64,119,000 for site completion. Within available funds, the Committee recommends $1,800,000 to support accelerating clean-up along the Columbia River in Hanford's 300 Area.

Post 2006 completion.—The Committee recommendation provides $120,053,000, the amount of the request.

Excess Facilities.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,381,000 for the transfer of excess facilities at the Brookhaven National Laboratory and Oak Ridge from other DOE organizations.

URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

Appropriations, 2001	$392,502,000
Budget estimate, 2002	363,425,000
Committee recommendation	408,725,000

Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning.—The Committee recommendation provides $286,941,000 for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund, an increase of $45,300,000 above the requested level. Of this amount, $14,300,000 is provided for continued critical soil remediations at East Tennessee Technology Park and $30,000,000 is provided for continued clean-up at Paducah, Kentucky. Within the amount provided to Paducah, the Committee directs that $3,000,000 be set aside for the purpose of depleted uranium cylinder yard contruction. Total funding for Paducah under the Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation account for fiscal year 2002 is $102,982,000.

The Committee directs the Secretary to provide a detailed accounting of the $373,000,000 fund created under Public Law 105–204 and reserved exclusively for DUF6 activities. The report is due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on or before January 31, 2002, and should cover all activities since the fund's inception in 1998. The uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund was established in accordance with title XI of Public Law 102–486, the National Energy Policy Act of 1992. The funds provided for the environmental cleanup of the Department's uranium enrichment plants, two of which are currently leased to the USEC, and the cleanup of uranium mill tailings and thorium piles resulting from production and sales to the Federal Government for the Manhattan Project and other national security purposes.

The Committee remains concerned by the growing backlog and gap between the amount of claims approved for payment and the funding requested by the Department to pay those claims. Since these payments go to reimburse operating uranium and thorium licensees for their costs of cleanup related to Federal activities, the Committee continues to believe the Department should be doing more to ensure additional funds are available to make timely payments for approved claims.

Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends $800,000 for the Secretary to contract with the nation's sole remaining ura-

nium converter for the purpose of performing research and development to improve the environmental and economic performance of U.S. uranium conversion operations. The Committee is aware of a December 2000 report to Congress—"Report to Congress on Maintenance of Viable Domestic Uranium, Conversion and Enrichment Industries"—that documents the negative impact of the privatization of the U.S. Enrichment Corporation on the U.S. conversion industry. Although the Department recommended a more ambitious proposal to assist the industry involving price supports, the Committee finds a modest research and development program to be more appropriate at this time.

Other Uranium Activities.—The Committee recommends $120,784,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. The additional funds reflect the transfer of DUF_6 activities from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund subaccount to the Other Uranium Activities subaccount.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 2001	$190,654,000
Budget estimate, 2002	134,979,000
Committee recommendation	25,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes $275,000,000 for nuclear waste disposal. Of that amount, $25,000,000 is derived from the nuclear waste fund, and $250,000,000 shall be available from the "Defense nuclear waste disposal" account.

The Committee is concerned about the failure of the Nation's nuclear waste policy to define an acceptable solution to the problem of disposing of the growing inventories of spent nuclear fuel and other high level radioactive waste. More than two decades ago, the Nation determined that permanent disposal in a geologic repository was the only acceptable path. That decision was based, in part, on another policy that prohibited the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel into its constituent materials, each of which represents different hazardous properties and raises nuclear non-proliferation issues. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, further restricted disposal options by prohibiting the characterization of any potential repository site other than Yucca Mountain, Nevada, because the technical investigation was more costly than anticipated.

These efforts to accelerate the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste appear to have accomplished just the opposite. The decision to prohibit the consideration of any sites other than Yucca Mountain, Nevada, engendered strong and unified opposition by the State of Nevada and its citizens, with obvious consequence. The decision to pursue only a "bury it all and forget it" policy at a single site closed off many avenues of investigation and research into alternative disposal concepts that might better serve our Nation's needs.

Since the enactment of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the Department has spent $8,000,000,000 on investigating a geologic repository for the nation's nuclear waste. However, the Department still has not demonstrated that the proposed site at Yucca Mountain will be suitable. There are still many significant unresolved technical and socioeconomic issues that may prevent the site from

being developed as a repository. The Committee expects the Department to focus all its resources on resolving the remaining technical issues prior to site recommendation and initiating any actions on performance confirmation or license application.

The Committee is also concerned with what is apparently unwarranted confidence on the part of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management that its current concept for the repository will stand the tests of time and inquiry. For example, surface water was assumed to take thousands of years to penetrate to the repository level, assuring a "dry and non-corrosive" environment for repository canisters containing millions of tons of spent nuclear fuel. The earliest studies making use of the excavated test facility disproved this assumption. Subsequently, it was assumed that radioactivity that escaped the canisters because of the corrosive effects of water would be "immobilized" within the rock, would not penetrate to the ground water, and even if it did, would move with excruciating slowness through the ground water matrix. Observations of migration of radioactive contaminants from underground nuclear test cavities disproved these assumptions.

Until quite recently, the repository operational concept entailed backfilling and sealing chambers within the repository that had been filled with waste canisters. The concept relied on the assumption that the heat generated by radioactive decay would prevent surface water from entering the repository level. Subsequent studies suggested that the repository levels could become wet as the radioactivity (heat) decreased over time. So the latest current concept is to ventilate the repository to prevent the accumulation of liquid water as the waste decays. Presently, the repository concept appears to be a "monitored, retrievable" storage site with the possibility of transition to a sealed permanent repository some time in the future. Such significant variance with founding assumptions of geologic disposal is damaging to public confidence in site characterization findings, especially when these changes are made so close to the expected decision on site suitability.

The Department has an ambitious schedule to complete action this year on the site suitability determination. The Committee is concerned that work which should be completed as part of the site characterization of Yucca Mountain is being postponed for the performance confirmation period between site recommendation and closure. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act requires the Department to apply for a license within 90 days of the finalization of site recommendation. The expectation is that the Department will have all necessary science and technical information for the license application. To guide the program, the Department has agreed on nine Key Technical Issues that must be addressed or planned to be addressed to ensure the completeness of the Department's license application. To restore confidence in the site characterization process, the Committee recommends that the Department fulfill commitments pursuant to all Key Technical Issue agreements prior to a decision about site suitability.

Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that the performance assessment, the Total System Performance Assessment, used by the Department suffers from poor quality assurance. An independent review of the program by the Nuclear Regulatory Commis-

sion found technical errors and/or inconsistencies. Since the performance assessment will provide important information for a decision about site suitability, the Committee recommends the Department place a greater emphasis on identifying and fixing these problems. The Committee recommends the Department review the Quality Assurance Requirements Description document and its implementing procedures. The Committee recommends including the results of this review with the material the Secretary prepares for a decision about site suitability.

The Committee is concerned the Department intends to finalize proposed changes to the regulations that prescribe the criteria for a decision about site suitability. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act directs the Department to establish these criteria in the Site Characterization Plan developed pursuant to section 112(a) of the Act. The proposed rule changes would eliminate the specific factors to qualify or disqualify the site contrary to the requirements of the Nuclear Waste Policy and replace them with a single performance evaluation. The Committee is concerned that the Department has no statutory authority for modifying these regulations. In addition, these changes would place a greater emphasis on the expected performance of engineered barriers over the natural barriers. The Committee notes that the existing regulations allow for a performance assessment in addition to the other qualifying and disqualifying factors. With significant site characterization activities remaining to be completed and budget resources limited, the Committee recommends the Department use existing regulations to determine site suitability.

The Committee is concerned that the program suffers from poor management and as a result has had significant cost overruns and has postponed necessary site characterization work. The Committee understands the General Accounting Office is investigating allegations of waste, fraud and abuse in the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management made in an anonymous letter to the Inspector General. The Committee expects to receive the results of the GAO investigation later this year and intends to reexamination the allocation for the Office in light of the findings of that investigation.

The draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Department indicates thousands of shipments of commercial spent nuclear fuel and Department of Defense waste would be made to the proposed repository at Yucca Mountain. The Committee is concerned that communities in at least 43 States would be near the transportation routes. The Committee recommends the Department determine the specific shipment methods and routes, make that information available to the communities along those routes, and holds hearings in the affected communities. These hearings should allow a reasonable period for public comment for the affected communities. The comments should be included in the information the Secretary provides to the President for a decision about site suitability.

The Committee also believes the massive interstate transportation of spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste constitutes a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment for purposes of the National Environ-

mental Policy Act. According to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the final environmental impact statement and any associated comments must be included with the Secretary's determination of site recommendation. The Committee is concerned that the Department has not dedicated sufficient resources to address this issue. Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that a failure to incorporate this information into a possible decision about site suitability will lead to additional delays and cost overruns in the Yucca Mountain site characterization program. The Committee recommends the Department allocate appropriate funds to complete the environment impact statement on transportation of nuclear waste.

Finally, the Committee is concerned that the costs of the repository, which have clearly escalated, are still not well understood by the Department. To say the least, it is disturbing that overall costs have nearly doubled (from $30,000,000,000 to $58,000,000,000) since the early 1990's. More troubling is the $12,000,000,000 increase in costs during just the last 3 years. It is difficult, for example, to understand the implications to design, licensing, construction, and operational costs of such dramatic differences in concepts as represented by the change from a sealed repository to a monitored, retrievable storage facility. The Department is encouraged to maintain current construction and operational cost assessments for the proposed repository that provide comparable costs of the design and operational concepts that remain viable options as the site characterization and performance assessments proceed.

The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the State of Nevada and $6,000,000 for affected units of local government in accordance with the statutory restrictions contained in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2001	$3,180,341,000
Budget estimate, 2002	3,159,890,000
Committee recommendation	3,268,116,000

The Committee recognizes that the relatively small funding increases provided to the Office of Science are inadequate. While most programs are funded above the Administration's request, the severe non-defense spending constraints that the Committee operates under have made it impossible to to do justice to many of these outstanding programs and initiatives. Unlike the Administration's request, the Committee recommendation is sufficient to avoid any staff reductions at labs or universities.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2001	$726,130,000
Budget estimate, 2002	716,100,000
Committee recommendation	725,100,000

The Committee recommendation includes $725,100,000 for high energy physics, an increase of $9,000,000 over the request. Within the amounts provided, the Committee recommends $2,000,000 for materials development of low temperature superconductors to support future high energy physics requirements; and an additional $7,000,000 for university support. Within available funds, the Com-

mittee recommends $1,000,000 for research, development, and initial demonstration in support of an experiment, to be conducted underground at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, to evaluate the mass of the neutrino through study of double beta decay of xenon-136. These funds may be used for extraction of the xenon-136 in a Russian nuclear city in coordination with the NNSA/Non-Proliferation programs.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2001	$369,890,000
Budget estimate, 2002	360,510,000
Committee recommendation	373,000,000

The Committee recommends $373,000,000 for nuclear physics, an increase of $12,490,000 above the request and an increase of $3,110,000 above current year levels. The Committee recommends that the additional funds be used to enhance operation of the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory and the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility at the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility in Virginia.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2001	$501,260,000
Budget estimate, 2002	442,970,000
Committee recommendation	490,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes $490,000,000 for biological and environmental research, including $10,000,000 for construction of the laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The recommendation includes an additional $16,000,000 above the requested level for the Genomes to Life program and $10,000,000 in additional funding above the requested level for the low dose effects program. Within the recommended amount, the Committee also recommends $7,000,000 in additional funding for computer upgrades and capital equipment costs at the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory (EMSL); $11,500,000 to complete the positron emission tomography facility at West Virginia University; and funding to continue the following on-going projects: the Natural Energy Laboratory in Hawaii, and the biological effects of exposure to low-level radioactivity. The recommendation also continues the free air carbon dioxide experiments at the current year level.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2001	$1,013,370,000
Budget estimate, 2002	1,004,705,000
Committee recommendation	1,040,705,000

The Committee recommendation includes $1,040,705,000, an increase of $36,000,000 above the request and an increase of $27,335,000 over current year levels. For purposes of reprogramming in fiscal year 2002, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within basic energy sciences upon written notice to the appropriate Congressional Committees.

The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 for the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Re-

search and $4,000,000 for programmatic activities at the National Center of Excellence in Photonics and Microsystems. The Committee's recommendation also includes $8,300,000 for the SPEAR 3 upgrade at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory.

Additionally, the Committee recommends that the additional funds be used to support the following important activities: facility operations user support; completion of the Nanoscience Research Center project engineering and design; and additional work in computational sciences in materials and chemistry.

Nanoscale Science Research Centers.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for project engineering design work for three of five planned user centers for nanoscale science, engineering, and technology research. The Committee strongly supports this new initiative.

Construction.—The Committee recommendation includes $291,000,000 to continue the Spallation Neutron Source, including $276,300,000 for construction (under Project 99–E–334) and $15,100,000 for other activities related to the project. The amount represents a $23,000,000 increase over current year funding. The Committee recommends $4,000,000 in project engineering and design funding at various locations (under Project 02–SC–002). The Committee also authorizes construction of the Nanoscience Research Center upon completion of the project engineering and design.

The Committee recognizes the importance the SNS offers in advancing the frontiers of science and technology and the opportunities it will provide for future scientific and industrial research and development for the United States. The design and construction of this next-generation, accelerator-based, neutron scattering facility, located at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, is a collaborative effort involving six DOE national laboratories (Argonne, Brookhaven, Jefferson, Lawrence Berkeley, Los Alamos, and Oak Ridge).

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation provides $49,818,000 for safeguards and security. This is the amount of the current year level and $5,594,000 less than the Administration's request. The Committee remains unconvinced that such a large 1-year increase is warranted.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation provides $142,385,000 for science program direction, the amount of the request and $3,140,000 above the current year.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2001	$171,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002	164,050,000
Committee recommendation	163,050,000

The Committee recommendation provides $163,050,000 for other energy research programs, an increase of $18,050,000 over the current year appropriation.

Advanced Scientific Computing Research.—The Committee recommendation provides $163,050,000 for advanced scientific computing research. This amount is the amount of the request. The Committee directs that $15,000,000 of available funds be used to support the Scientific Discovery Through Advanced Computing (SciDAC) program and that $10,000,000 of available funds be used for terascale operating systems development.

MULTI-PROGRAM ENERGY LABORATORIES FACILITIES SUPPORT

The Committee recommends $30,175,000, the amount of the request, for multi-program energy laboratories facilities support. The amount recommended is $3,755,000 less than the current year. The program supports infrastructure activities at the five national labs under the direction of the Office of Science.

The recommendation includes construction funding for two projects, 02–SC–001 and MEL–001, at the level of the request.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2001	$255,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002	248,495,000
Committee recommendation	248,495,000

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $248,495,000, the amount of the request.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2001	$225,942,000
Budget estimate, 2002	221,618,000
Committee recommendation	208,948,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2001	−$151,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002	−137,810,000
Committee recommendation	−137,810,000

The Department recommends $208,948,000 for departmental administration, a decrease of $12,670,000 from the Administration's request.

INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2001	$31,430,000
Budget estimate, 2002	31,430,000
Committee recommendation	30,000,000

The Committee has provided $30,000,000 for the Office of the Inspector General.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy are provided for in two categories—the National Nuclear Security Ad-

ministration and Other Defense Related Activities. Appropriation accounts under the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) are weapons activities, defense nuclear non-proliferation, naval reactors, and the Office of the Administrator. Other defense related activities include appropriation accounts for defense environmental restoration and waste management, defense facilities closure projects, defense environmental management privatization, other defense activities and defense nuclear waste disposal.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2001	$5,006,153,000
Budget estimate, 2002	5,300,025,000
Committee recommendation	6,062,891,000

Weapons activities provide for the continuing assurance of safety, reliability, and security of the nuclear weapons in our enduring nuclear weapons stockpile while adhering to the terms of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Necessary ingredients for success in this important mission include a highly skilled and motivated workforce, advanced experimental and computational facilities and equipment, adequately invested and maintained physical plants and supporting infrastructure, and exceptionally focused and dedicated management.

The Committee is concerned about several of these necessary ingredients for success. Whereas significant progress can be cited with respect to the development of advanced experimental and computational capabilities, the Committee notes that the capability to certify the safety and reliability of new components for our aging nuclear weapons stockpile is still many years in the future. Moreover, the initial emphasis on developing these new computational and experimental capabilities has contributed to an unacceptable decline in the physical plants and supporting infrastructure of the nuclear weapons enterprise. Finally, the Committee is deeply concerned with the lack of progress toward the definition and establishment of an enduring production complex capable of providing cost-effective, scalable production of all necessary nuclear weapon components. In response to the Committee's concerns, recommended appropriations in many categories exceed the amounts requested by the President.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

An appropriation of $1,081,337,000 is recommended for directed stockpile work of the NNSA, an increase of $37,546,000 over the budget request.

Directed stockpile work encompasses all activities that directly support specific weapons in the nuclear stockpile as directed by the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Plan. These activities include current maintenance and day-to-day care of the stockpile as well as planned refurbishments as outlined by the stockpile life extension program (SLEP). This category also includes research, development and certification activities in direct support of each weapon system, and long-term future-oriented research and development to solve either current or projected stockpile problems.

Stockpile research and development.—The Committee recommends $365,145,000, an increase of $59,685,000 over the request, providing for assessment, certification, surveillance and maintenance research and development for systems comprising our enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. The increased appropriation above the requested amount is meant to support acceleration in stockpile life extension research and development activities for the W80 and W76 weapons systems, and necessary additional sub-critical experiments at the Nevada Test Site.

Stockpile maintenance.—The Committee recommends $367,223,000, an increase of $4,730,000 over the request, to provide for stockpile maintenance and production and exchange of limited life components in the enduring stockpile, as well as major refurbishment activities to extend the stockpile life of the W87, W76, W80, and B61 weapons systems.

Stockpile evaluation.—The Committee recommends $178,589,000, a reduction of $2,245,000 over the request, to support the implementation of changes recommended by the 150-day study, reduction of the surveillance backlogs at the Savannah River Site and the Y–12 Plant, and reinstatement of the shelf life program at the Pantex and Y–12 Plants.

Dismantlement/disposal.—The Committee recommends $29,066,000, a decrease of $6,348,000 below the request. From the funds provided, a single combined line at the Pantex Plant servicing dismantlement of the W56 and W79 weapons systems will be expanded to one full line for the W56 and two full lines for the W79.

Production Support.—The Committee recommends $134,896,000, a decrease of $17,994,000 from the request, for production support.

CAMPAIGNS

An appropriation of $2,259,505,000 is recommended for the campaigns of the NNSA, an increase of $263,092,000 over the budget request.

The stockpile stewardship campaigns program establishes and applies a number of highly focused and integrated scientific and technical capabilities to maintain indefinitely the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile without nuclear testing. The present structure of the campaigns program reflects the current investment in developing advanced facilities and capabilities while simultaneously applying existing and developing capabilities to important stewardship tasks.

Primary certification.—The Committee recommends $52,661,000, a decrease of $2,869,000 from the request, to support sub-critical experiments and other activities necessary to support the required delivery date for a certified pit.

Dynamic materials properties.—The Committee recommends $93,644,000, a decrease of $4,166,000 above the request. Within the available funds, the Administration is directed to make full use of existing and developing capabilities for materials properties studies, including the Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research facility at the Nevada Test Site, and the High Pressure Collaborative Access Team facility at the synchrotron light source at Argonne National Laboratory.

Advanced radiography.—The Committee recommends $85,803,000, an increase of $25,293,000 over the request. The recommendation includes $25,000,000 to continue research, development, and conceptual design for an advanced hydrodynamic test facility, including further development and evaluation of proton radiography techniques. It is the intent of the Committee to continue this important effort even though any decision on whether to proceed to construction is still several years away. Additional funds are provided to fund other experiments that might be conducted in the Contained Firing Facility, the U1–A tunnel complex, or other appropriate experimental facilities.

Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins.—The Committee recommends $44,524,000, a decrease of $2,746,000 over the budget request for radiation source development, radiation case dynamics studies, radiation transport and the effects of aging and refurbishment on secondary performance. From the funds available, the Administration is encouraged to continue, and expand as appropriate, its investments in high energy density physics research through university grants and partnerships.

Enhanced surety.—The Committee recommends $39,298,000, an increase of $4,501,000 over the request, to develop and demonstrate advanced initiation concepts and enhanced use denial concepts, and to enhance efforts to establish high precision, micro system technologies for enhanced surety of future weapon systems.

Weapons systems engineering certification.—The Committee recommends $26,665,000, an increase of $2,622,000 over the request, to accelerate the acquisition of experimental data necessary to validate new models and simulation tools being developed in the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign.

Nuclear survivability.—The Committee recommends $23,694,000, an increase of $4,644,000 over the request, to develop and validate tools to simulate nuclear environments for survivability assessments and certification; restore the capability to provide nuclear-hardened microelectronics and microsystem components for the enduring stockpile; and accelerate the qualification and certification of the neutron generator and the arming, fusing and firing system for the refurbished W76.

ICF ignition and high yield, Project 96–D–111 National Ignition Facility.—The Committee recommends $492,443,000, an increase of $24,500,000 over the budget request.

Within the available funds, the Committee provides $59,259,000 for ICF/NIF Experimental Support Activities, an increase of $24,500,000 over the budget request. Of this increase, $10,000,000 is provided to enhance NIF diagnostics and cryogenic target activities; and $7,000,000 is provided to supplement the base program.

The Committee understands that a "National Petawatt Laser Strategic Plan" has been commissioned by the Administration. The Administrator is encouraged to pursue this initiative, including, within the strategic planning, the research and development of supporting technologies necessary to ensure that the Nation retains and maintains its leadership in ultra-short pulse laser technology. Guided by the strategic plan, and from available funds within the ICF/NIF Experimental Support Activities, $3,000,000 is provided for conceptual and preliminary engineering design studies for the

realization of a petawatt-class laser at the Sandia National Laboratory's Z-Machine, and $2,000,000 is provided to initiate development of critical short-pulse laser technologies, like damage resistant gratings.

The Committee recommendation provides $7,886,000 for University Grants/Other ICF Support, an increase of $2,500,000 above the budget request, to complete the transfer and initiate operations of a petawatt laser or high-power, short-pulse laser at the University of Nevada-Reno. The Committee believes that early access to an operating petawatt-class laser will provide valuable opportunities for exploring technology options for incorporation in the next generation of petawatt lasers. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to complete this primary activity before undertaking next-generation petawatt laser development at other universities.

The Committee is aware of interest in next-generation short-pulse laser technology expresssed by the University of Rochester and the University of Texas. Within available funds, the Committee recommends the support of conceptual and engineering design studies of the capabilities proposed by the University of Rochester and the University of Texas. Finally, the Administrator is encouraged to promote and facilitate access by university scientists and others to short-pulse laser facilities for research and exploration of high density physics phenomena.

The Committee recommendation includes $33,450,000, the amount of the budget request, for the Omega laser at the University of Rochester and $10,000,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory.

The Committee recommendation provides $245,000,000 for NIF construction, Project 96–D–111, the same as the budget request. While the Administrator has certified continued fidelity with the re-structured cost and deliverable schedule, the Committee notes that a high level of vigilance and extraordinary management attention is warranted to maintain confidence in satisfactory progress of this important project. The Committee agrees with a recent General Accounting Office review that highlighted, among other things, persistent DOE oversight problems. The Committee continues to be concerned that the same individuals who have performed oversight of NIF since 1999, when costs and schedules grew unnoticed, continue to have that role.

Advanced simulation and computing.—The Committee recommends $711,185,000, the amount of the budget request. The Committee recommends the following amounts for ASCI construction projects:

Project 01–D–101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA.—The Committee recommends $12,400,000, an increase of $7,000,000 over the request.

Project 00–D–103 Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA.—The Committee recommends $22,000,000, an increase of $17,000,000 over the request.

Project 00–D–107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM.—The Committee recommends $15,377,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the request.

Pit manufacturing and certification.—The Committee recommends $237,713,000, an increase of $109,168,000 over the budg-

et request, to fully fund all activities necessary for engineering certification and subcritical experiments that maintain the revised certification schedule.

The Committee notes that the Administration's schedule of accomplishments proposed under the recommended increase would delay the availability of a certified pit until fiscal year 2009. Circumstances make such a delay unacceptable. The Administrator shall carefully reconsider his pit-manufacturing plan to reestablish the full capability to manufacture all pit types before successful certification of a manufactured pit validates the manufacturing process.

The Committee notes that in spite of repeated encouragement to accelerate the acquisition of essential certification data by making use of subcritical experiments at the Nevada Test Site, the originally promised average of 4 subcritical experiments per year has never been achieved. The Administrator shall direct his new pit manufacturing and certification oversight office to ensure that the most productive and cost effective means are emphasized as the program attempts to reduce the intervening period between pit manufacturing capability and pit certification.

High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness.—The Committee recommends $6,846,000, an increase of $2,886,000 above the request, to establish production-scale high explosives manufacturing and qualification; to deploy and validate technologies and facilities for production re-qualification; and, to demonstrate and validate Enterprise Integration and Collaborative Manufacturing.

Non-nuclear readiness.—The Committee recommends $18,187,000, an increase of $5,983,000 above the request, to deploy commercial products and processes for components supporting the B61, W80, and W76 stockpile life extension programs; to modify existing tritium loading and cleaning facilities to support stockpile life extension programs; and, to support neutron target loading and detonator production.

Materials readiness.—The Committee recommends $1,209,000, the same as the budget request.

Secondary Readiness.—The Committee recommends $68,445,000, an increase of $45,276,000 over the request, to support modernization of secondary manufacturing facilities and infrastructure at Y–12 and to ensure readiness to meet near-term stockpile life extension requirements.

Tritium readiness.—The Committee recommends $138,475,000, an increase of $14,000,000 above the request, to provide funding required for establishing commercial light water reactor production of tritium, construction of the Tritium Extraction Facility at Savannah River Site, and to complete the APT demonstration and design preparatory to its close out. The Committee recommends $42,350,000 for tritium readiness and $81,125,000 for construction of the tritium extraction facility at Savannah River.

Cooperative agreements.—The Committee recognizes that cooperative agreements with universities are important resources for developing essential technical data for stockpile stewardship. Additionally, such long-term relationships with universities allow considerable opportunity for promoting advanced studies and recruit-

ing the future workforce in technical areas that are critical to the continuing stewardship enterprise. The Committee understands that the NNSA is establishing a new office to be responsible for administering university partnerships, cooperative agreements and/or other long-term university relationships. The Committee applauds this initiative and encourages the Administrator to review the benefits to the program and the Department of delegating much of the day-to-day management and administration to offices in the regions containing the participating universities.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

An appropriation of $1,607,716,000 is recommended for readiness in technical base and facilities, an increase of $160,728,000 over the original budget request. Readiness in technical base and facilities encompasses efforts to provide for the physical infrastructure and operational readiness required to conduct the directed stockpile work and campaign activities at the laboratories, the test site and the production plants.

Operations of facilities.—The Committee recommends $939,479,000, an increase of $109,052,000 over the budget request, to maintain warm standby readiness for all RTBF facilities with some allowance for inflation. The recommendation includes an additional $10,000,000 for the operation of pulsed-power facilities at Sandia National Laboratory and an additional $10,000,000 for the Z machine refurbishment.

Technology transfer and industrial partnerships.—The Committee recognizes that partnerships with industry may enable the weapons complex to accomplish its mission more efficiently. Such partnership can provide access to new technologies, processes and expertise that improve NNSA's mission capabilities. One of the most successful technology transfer and commercialization efforts in the Department of Energy has occurred around Sandia National Laboratories, resulting in over 30 start-up ventures and thousands of jobs created. The Committee has included an additional $3,000,000 and directs the NNSA to follow this successful public/private partnership model at the other NNSA laboratories and the Nevada Test Site.

Uranium 233.—The Committee commends the Department for issuing a draft Request for Proposal to process Uranium 233 stored in building 3019 in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to obtain Thorium-229 needed for cancer treatment and recommends a total program funding of $21,000,000 in fiscal year 2002. This should fully support the scope necessary to meet the quality, cost, and schedule requirements associated with providing for the medical use of the extremely short half-life Actinium-225 and includes $6,000,000 to address necessary security at building 3019. The Department should limit the scope of the Request for Proposal to the processing of U–233 already in Oak Ridge, or provide additional resources for expanded scope. The Committee recommends that the Department assign responsibility as soon as possible for Actinium-25 production to a contractor clearly capable of achieving the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) required Good Manufacturers Practice (GMP). The Committee further recommends that the expanded scope of the

Request for Proposal include the shutdown of building 3019 making it read for decontamination by the Department.

Program readiness.—The Committee recommends $197,220,000, an increase of $9,094,000 above the budget request, to enhance Nevada Test Site readiness and maintain materials processing and component manufacturing readiness.

Special projects.—The Committee recommends $60,385,000, a decrease of $4,108,000 over the request.

Within funds available from the appropriation: $2,000,000 is provided to the Remote Sensing Laboratory to enhance pilot proficiency, aircraft safety, and to enhance aviation support elements that have experienced greater operational demands than earlier expected; $1,000,000 is provided for improvements to the Tumor Registry in the State of Nevada to improve the accuracy and completeness of health records of a population with significant potential radiation exposure; $2,500,000 to implement Departmental strategy to preserve the history of the Manhattan Project at sites to be determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Federal Preservation Office within the Department; and, $2,000,000 for the installation of exhibits at the Atomic Testing History Institute.

Material recycle and recovery.—The Committee recommends $90,310,000, a decrease of $11,001,000 below the budget request.

Nuclear weapons incident response.—The Committee recommends $88,923,000, a decrease of $202,000 below the request, to enhance the state of response readiness at various locations. Within the available funds, the Administrator is directed to conduct a study and report to the Committee by March 1, 2002, on the status of planning for remediation and disposition of a weapon in various states of disrepair that could result from credible accidents or incidents.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $212,557,000, an increase of $57,893,000, for construction projects under Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

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

Project 02–D–101 Microsystems and engineering science applications, SNL.—The Committee recommends $67,000,000, an increase of $65,000,000 above the budget request.

Project 02–D–103 Project engineering and design, various locations.—The Committee recommends $31,130,000, an increase of $21,950,000 above the budget request. Of this amount, $4,000,000 is provided for architecture and engineering services (Title I and Title II) for modernization of the surface support facilities for the U1A complex.

Project 02–D–105 Engineering technology complex upgrade, LLNL.—The Committee recommends $4,750,000, an increase of $4,750,000 above the budget request.

Project 02–D–107 Electrical power systems safety, communications, and bus upgrades, NV.—The Committee recommends $6,200,000, and increase of $2,693,000 above the budget request.

Project 01–D–103 Preliminary project engineering and design, various locations.—The Committee recommends $16,379,000, a decrease of $29,000,000 below the budget request.

Project 99–D–108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000, an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget request.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends $300,000,000, an increase of $300,000,000 above the request, to establish a new program line dedicated to re-capitalization of existing operational facilities to halt their deterioration and restore the robust and enduring mission readiness that relies on them.

The Committee is aware of the need for funding a facilities and infrastructure program, but is concerned the Administration has not established a facilities management structure adequate to ensure the funds are used to address those items that will be most effective in reducing long-term costs and risk. The Committee directs the Administrator to provide a semi-annual report to the Committee on the status of the facilities and infrastructure program. The report should include the current priority list of proposed facilities and infrastructure projects, including cost and schedule requirements. For each site, the report should include: a current 10-year site plan that demonstrates the reconfiguration of its facilities and infrastructure to meet its missions and to address its long-term operational costs and return on investment; the current budget for all facilities and infrastructure funding in this program as well as all funding for maintenance and infrastructure upgrades funded through other parts of the budget; and the current status of each facilities and infrastructure project compared to the original baseline cost, schedule, and scope.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Committee recommends $123,300,000, an increase of $1,500,000 over the budget request. Of the amount appropriated, $79,071,000 is provided for operations and equipment, and $44,229,000 is provided for program direction.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $448,881,000, an increase of $71,285,000 over the current year enacted level.

The security budget request has increased dramatically over the last several years and again this year. The Committee recommendation includes $364,323,000 for physical security, an increase of $33,783,000 over the current year enacted level; $58,000,000 for cyber security, an increase of $29,156,000 over the current year enacted level; and $16,958,000 for personnel security, an increase of $2,338,00 over the current year enacted level.

The Committee has provided the full budget request but remains very concerned about the safeguards and security operations at the NNSA and the relevant imbalance of physical verses cyber security. The Committee strongly urges the Administrator to find more efficient and effective ways to conduct physical security operations in order to free-up resources to address the evolving cyber security threats.

The Congress provided $20,000,000 in supplemental appropriations in fiscal year 2000 for the NNSA to perform planning, analysis, testing and evaluation necessary to develop the highest value alternatives for improving cyber security throughout the nuclear weapons complex. Congress further directed that NNSA should submit to Congress by January 15, 2001, a detailed plan with an estimated cost and schedules for a reasonable program that defends the highest value targets. On February 22, the Integrated Cyber Security Initiative plan was submitted to Congress. The plan did not have an estimated cost but indicated that the cost estimates for each of the 4 years in the implementation phase would be developed and validated by a panel of cyber security and network experts. The Committee looks forward to receiving this information and considering a request in the future for resources to support the initiative.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $271,137,000 for program direction, the amount of the budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2001	$872,273,000
Budget estimate, 2002	773,700,000
Committee recommendation	880,500,000

The Committee recommendation provides $880,500,000, an increase of $106,800,000 over the original budget request.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation activities of the NNSA are directed to reducing the serious global danger of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The NNSA utilizes the highly specialized scientific, technical, analytical, and operational capabilities of the NNSA and its national laboratories as well as other Department of Energy laboratories. Its mission is to prevent the spread of WMD materials, technology and expertise; detect the proliferation of WMD worldwide; reverse the proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities; dispose of surplus materials in accordance with terms set forth in agreements between the United States and Russia; and store surplus fissile materials in a safe manner pending disposition. The Committee continues to strongly support these important national security programs.

The Committee is concerned that the proposed budget would seriously erode progress made at great expense to assure the Nation's capability to detect and mitigate global proliferation activities. Accordingly, the Committee recommends restoration of much of the funds, especially in the accounts supporting research and development, arms control activities, and materials protection and accountability. The Committee supports the proposed increases in surplus nuclear materials disposition and safe storage.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development.—The Committee recommends $222,355,000, an increase of $52,059,000 over the original budget request.

The recommended increase is provided to continue the important remote sensing and verification technology research, development and deployment, and to continue to invest in the development of

essential technologies for responding to the growing threat of chemical or biological terrorism.

The Nonproliferation and Verification, Research and Development program is essential for stable long-term research and the development of unique science and technology competencies needed for the increasing demands of arms control, nonproliferation, domestic nuclear safeguards and security, energy security, and emergency management. Within available funds, $5,000,000 is provided to establish the Remote Systems Test and Engineering Center at the Remote Sensing Laboratory (RSL) to provide Department-wide support for prototype engineering design, development, test, and evaluation of remote sensing and data acquisition missions of the Department. The Committee recommends $2,500,000 in support for the 3-year research effort by the Caucasus Seismic Information Network. The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the Incorporate Research Institutions for Seismology PASSCAL Instrument Center.

Project 00–D–192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), Los Alamos National laboratory.—The Committee recommends $35,806,000, the same as the budget request.

Arms Control.—The Committee recommends $138,000,000 for arms control and nonproliferation, an increase of $36,500,000 over the original budget request.

The Arms Control and Nonproliferation program is the focal point within the Department of Energy which supports the U.S. arms control and nonproliferation policies, and provides leadership and representation within the Department in the international arms control and nonproliferation community. The goal is to reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation by integrating the Department's assets and efforts, including those of the national laboratories and contractors, to provide technical support to the U.S. Government's foreign policy and national security objectives.

The increase recommended by the Committee is meant to continue important activities that would be curtailed or significantly reduced under the budget request. From within the additional funds recommended, the Committee restores $14,500,000 for the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI), $15,000,000 for Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (IPP), $7,000,000 for continuing the efforts for disposition of spent nuclear fuel in Kazakhstan, and $1,000,000 to continue activities in support of spent nuclear fuel storage and a geologic repository in Russia. The Committee directs that a portion of the additional resources recommended for IPP be expended in projects within the Russian nuclear cities in coordination with the Nuclear Cities Initiative.

International materials protection, control, and accounting.—The recommendation provides $143,800,000 for international material protection, control, and accounting [MPC&A] activities, an increase of $5,000,000 over the original budget request. The Committee continues to consider these activities extremely important to reducing the threat created by the breakup of the former Soviet Union. The increased funding will allow for additional material consolidation and control work, an expanded program of MPC&A at several Russian Navy sites, and expanded MPC&A efforts within defense-related and important civilian and regulatory sites in Russia. The

Committee continues to believe that these activities are critical elements of the United States non-proliferation efforts.

HEU (Highly Enriched Uranium) Transparency Implementation.—The Committee recommendation includes $13,950,000, the amount of the budget request for the HEU Transparency Implementation program of the Department of Energy. This program is responsible for ensuring that the non-proliferation aspects of the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation are met. This Agreement covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium [LEU] derived from at least 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the Agreement, conversion of the HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The purpose of this program is to put into place those measures agreed to by both sides, that permit the United States to have confidence that the Russian side is abiding by the Agreement.

International nuclear safety.—The Committee recommends $19,500,000, and increase of $5,700,000 above the budget request, to implement permanent improvements in Russian nuclear safety culture as well as improvements in the regulatory framework for Soviet-design reactor operations in nine former Soviet Union countries.

Fissile materials disposition.—The Committee recommends $299,089,000, an increase of $9,000,000 above the budget request, to maintain operations in the United States and in Russia according to the plan under the budget request. Planned construction projects are slowed to accommodate the shortfall in the disposition account.

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

The Committee recommendation includes $130,089,000 for U.S. surplus materials disposition, the same as the original budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to support the joint United States-Russian program to develop an advanced reactor to consume large quantities of excess weapons plutonium. The primary purpose of the joint United States-Russian program for the development of an advanced reactor is the design and eventual construction of a demonstration reactor in Russia for the purpose of surplus weapons plutonium disposition. However, the United States must take full advantage of the development of this attractive technology for a possible next generation nuclear power reactor for United States and foreign markets. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to explore opportunities to develop and exploit this technology for commercial purposes.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000 for program direction within Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, a decrease of $1,459,000 below the budget request

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2001	$688,645,000
Budget estimate, 2002	$688,045,000
Committee recommendation	$688,045,000

[1] Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106–251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Naval Reactors Program within the NNSA provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combat vessels varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships. The Committee recommendation is $688,045,000, the amount of the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2001	$9,978,000
Budget estimate, 2002	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	15,000,000

The Committee has included $15,000,000 to cover the expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2001	$4,963,533,000
Budget estimate, 2002	4,548,708,000
Committee recommendation	5,389,868,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,389,868,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management programs for fiscal year 2002. This is $841,160,000 over the budget request.

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

fense environmental restoration and waste management" appropriation is organized into two program accounts, site/project completion and post-2006 completion to reflect the emphasis on project completion and site closures.

Fiscal year 1999 budget request was the first fiscal year that the environmental management program structure was aligned with DOE's 2006 plan. All activities have been organized into projects, which have more defined scopes, schedules, and costs that support a defined end state at each specific site. In addition, the environmental management budget is organized into program decision units that focus on the end-date of the project. Those decision units are site closure, site/project completion, post-2006 completion; science and technology; and program direction.

The Committee believes that the environmental management program of the Department of Energy is beginning to turn the corner in the cleanup effort. Leadership within the Department has put in place initiatives which have produced greater efficiencies, reduced cost growth on many projects, and resulted in moving the program from the study phase to the cleanup of facilities. The Committee believes that the program recommended for fiscal year 2002 is within the acceptable range and will meet all legal requirements and other agreements.

Budget constraints will check future large increases and additional efficiencies will be required. However, even with these constraints, tremendous progress continues to be made both in tangible, on-the-ground results and in the business practices within the program. The Committee expects the Department to continue to seek every opportunity to bring about more efficiencies and tough businesslike approaches to program execution. The Department should continue the critical review of the need and requirement for each individual support service contract, and duplicative and overlapping organizational arrangements and functions.

While it is imperative that the Department's cleanup costs be brought down, there are instances where relatively small amounts of additional funding invested in the near-term offer the potential for significant reductions in long-term budgetary requirements. The Committee continues to be concerned with growing landlord costs required to maintain buildings and facilities that are ready for demolition, and the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. In order to reduce these costs in the future, it is important that the Department expedite demolition work, waste shipments, and permanent storage whenever possible.

Finally, the Committee notes that the Department's budget request is not sufficient to satisfy both the existing State-imposed legal requirements in place at several sites and maintain prompt and efficient cleanup at other sites not subject to such requirements. The effect of these budget shortcomings will be to force States to seek legally binding agreements with the Department. The Department should recognize that these legal agreements, while negotiated with the best information available to all parties at the time of their finalization, may lock the Department into cleanup paths that are not optimized as further information and technologies become available. For this reason, it is strongly in the

Government's interest to avoid imposition of additional legal requirements by States. The Committee strongly urges the Department to request budget levels that maintain significant annual progress at each site and thus avoid the need for States to seek new legal requirements to ensure that sites within their borders are adequately considered in budget requests.

SITE AND PROJECT COMPLETION

An appropriation of $1,003,646,000 is recommended for site and project completion activities, including $979,480,000 for operation and maintenance, and $24,166,000 for construction.

This account will provide funding for projects that will be completed by fiscal year 2006 at sites or facilities where a DOE mission (for example, environmental management, nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship, or scientific research) will continue beyond 2006. These activities are focused on completing projects by 2006 and distinguishes these projects from the long-term projects or activities at the sites, such as high level waste vitrification or the Department's other enduring missions. The largest amount of funding requested is for activities at the Hanford, WA, Savannah River, SC, and Idaho sites. A significant amount of work is expected to be completed at these sites by 2006, although environmental management and other stewardship activities will continue beyond 2006.

For construction, the Committee recommendation includes all requested projects except for Project 92–D–140, the F and H canyon exhaust upgrades at Savannah River. The Committee reduces the recommendation for this project by $15,790,000 due to the Department's decision to eliminate some activities and defer others.

The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the following activities above the level of the Administration's request: $34,300,000 for clean-up activities at Hanford; $20,000,000 in additional funding at Idaho to ensure Settlement Agreement and legal requirements for the shipping of waste out-of-state are met; $28,500,000 in additional funding for clean-up activities at Savannah River; $10,000,000 in enhanced funding for remediation at South Valley, Kansas City, Pantex, and Sandia; and $5,100,000 in enhanced funding for remediation at ETEC and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The Committee is aware that the Department provides approximately $500,000 per year to the State of Oregon each year to cover costs of its clean-up effort, including emergency drills, planning activities, technical review of DOE's waste management and clean-up plans, participation in the Hanford Advisory Board meetings and other meetings at Hanford. The Committee recommends that this DOE contribution be increased to $1,000,000 to pay for increased costs.

The Committee is aware of a pending MOU between the University of Georgia and the University of South Carolina with respect to the Savannah River Ecology Lab and expects the Department of Energy to provide adequate funding to support this long-term partnership. Within available funds, the Committee also recommends that the Department's on-going relationship with the University of South Carolina's Center for Water Resources be continued at $800,000, an increase of $50,000 over last year's level.

The Committee understands the Department is prepared to transfer up to 2,000 acres for the use of Pueble of San Ildefonso and approximately 100 acres to the County of Los Alamos. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $9,000,000 to expedite the remediation and conveyance of the land consistent with the direction of section 632 of Public Law 105–119.

POST-2006 COMPLETION

The Committee recommendation for post-2006 completion activities is $3,574,001,000, which includes $2,133,779,000 in operating expenses for post-2006 completion, $1,033,468,000 in operating expenses for the Office of River Protection, a $420,000,000 contribution to the UED&D fund, and $705,317,000 for construction.

The Post-2006 completion request supports projects that are projected to continue well beyond 2006. As cleanup is completed, it will be necessary for environmental management to maintain a presence at most sites to monitor, maintain, and provide information on the continued residual contamination. These activities are required to ensure the reduction in risk to human health is maintained.

Post-2006 construction.—The Committee recommends the amount of the Administration's request.

Post-2006 operation and maintenance.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the following activities above the level of the Administration's request: $125,200,000 for clean-up activities at Hanford; $146,500,000 for clean-up activities at Savannah River; $100,000,000 for clean-up activities at Idaho; $4,400,000 in restored funding for the Nevada Test Site; $4,000,000 to continue the Underground Test Area groundwater flow characterization drilling program at an accelerated pace; $14,300,000 to continue remediation, waste management, and nuclear materials stewardship activities at Los Alamos National Lab in New Mexico; $14,000,000 to continue remediation, waste management, and nuclear materials stewardship at Lawrence Livermore National Lab in California. Within available funds, the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program and the HAMMER program are to be funded at current year levels.

The Committee expects that portions of the additional $105,200,000 for Hanford will support the River Corridor Initiative, including the continued cocooning of the four former plutonium production reactors and the removal and disposal of hazardous and radiologically contaminated soil along the shoreline of the Hanford Reach portion of the Columbia River.

Additionally, the Committee expects that, within the additional $100,000,000 provided for Idaho, $15,000,000 will be used to initiate activities associated with the demonstration of waste retrieval at the subsurface disposal area at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory.

The Committee recommends that the current cooperative agreement with the Waste-management Education and Research Consortium be extended for a 5 year period at a level of $2,500,000 annually to continue its support for environmental education and technology development.

Carlsbad Field Office.—The Committee recommendation includes $201,170,000, an increase of $36,600,000 above the budget request and $10,284,000 above the current year level. The recommendation includes and additional $21,600,000 for operations of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). The additional resources are required in order increase the transportation capabilities required to meet the Department's commitments at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site and to correct for unjustified regulatory assumptions used in the development of the Department's budget request. The recommendation includes an additional $5,000,000 to continue the U.S. Mexico Border Health Commission/Materials Corridor Partnership Initiative. The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to begin implementing program-wide best practices to optimize waste processing, developing new technology solutions, and developing a mobile/modular approach for small quantity sites.

Regulatory requirements dictate that characterization data for each drum of waste shipped to WIPP must be reviewed multiple times to insure compliance. The Committee recognizes that the process could be streamlined and improved with more comprehensive and timely data review and reporting. The Committee encourages the Department to work through the Carlsbad Field Office to implement a standardized, automated program for TRU waste characterization throughout the DOE complex using a secure web-based system that allows user access and regulatory transparency without regard to the location of the user, and includes interfaces between all existing site operation databases.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the following activities above the level of the President's request: $165,000,000 for the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant and $56,000,000 for tank farm operations. Total recommended fiscal year 2002 funding for the waste treatment plant construction is $665,000,000. The Department is expected to continue making PILT payments to counties that have the Hanford reservation within their boundaries at last year's level.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

An appropriation of $271,700,000 is recommended for science and technology activities related to the environmental waste cleanup program, an increase of $75,700,000 over the original budget request.

The Science and Technology Program provides new or improved technologies and research results that reduce risks to workers, the public and the environment; reduce cleanup costs; and/or provide solutions to environmental problems that currently have no solutions. New and improved technologies have the potential to reduce environmental restoration and cleanup costs by an estimated several billion dollars. The Committee continues to be impressed with the ability of the Department's Deactivation and Decommisioning Focus Area Program to deploy cost effective new technologies that both help to reduce the overall D&D mortgage and protect workers, communities, and the environment. The Committee provides $27,100,000 in total funding to the D&D focus area program, the same as the current year. The Committee also provides total fund-

ing of $33,800,000 for the Industry and University programs managed by the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

The Committee recommendation includes additional funding for the following activities above the level of the Administration's request: $20,000,000 for Idaho Environmental Systems research and analysis; $5,000,000 for work within the University Involvement in Science and Technology program; $7,000,000 for the Western Environmental Technology Office; $4,000,000 for new basic science awards; and $6,000,000 for new research and development projects; $6,000,000 to continue evaluation, development, and demonstration of the Advanced Vitrification System; $3,000,000 to continue the engineering, development, and deployment of prototypical monitoring systems and microsensor systems for the remote monitoring of the Underground Test Area; $5,000,000 for the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory (DIAL); and $4,350,000 for the university robotics research program.

Within available funds, $4,000,000 is provided for the Subsurface Science Research Institute, operated by the Inland Northwest Research Alliance and the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. Within available funds, $350,000 above the level of the Administration's request is provided to complete the conceptual design of the Subsurface Geosciences Laboratory in Idaho.

EXCESS FACILITIES

The Committee recommendation for excess facilities is $1,300,000, which is the same as the budget request. These funds are provided to manage the transfer for the final disposition of excess contaminated physical facilities leading to significant risk and cost reductions. In fiscal year 2002 these funds are to be used for the transfer of excess facilities at the Pantex Plant, Savannah River Site, and the Y–12 Plant from other DOE organizations.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommendation for safeguards and security is $205,621,000, which is the same as the budget request.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction totals $355,761,000, which is the same as the budget request.

Program direction provides the overall direction and administrative support for the environmental management programs of the Department of Energy.

DEFENSE FACILITY CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriations, 2001	$1,080,331,000
Budget estimate, 2002	1,050,538,000
Committee recommendation	1,080,538,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,080,538,000 for the site closure program, an increase of $30,000,000 over the request.

The "Site closure" account includes funding for sites where the environmental management program has established a goal of com-

pleting the cleanup mission by the end of fiscal year 2006. After the cleanup mission is complete at a site, no further DOE mission is envisioned, except for limited long-term surveillance and maintenance. This account provides funding to cleanup the Rocky Flats, Fernald, Mound, Ashtabula, and Battelle Columbus sites. The additional $30,000,000 is provided for clean-up activities at the Fernald, Ashtabula, and Columbus sites.

The Committee continues to believe that a closure fund, which targets funding at specific facilities whose accelerated closure in the near-term results in significantly reduced out-year costs, is important in freeing up budgetary resources in the longer term. However, the Committee remains concerned that several projects in both the defense and non-defense closure accounts are in danger of not meeting 2006 closure goals. Once it becomes clear that a closure deadline cannot be met prior to 2006, the Department should propose moving the project into a post-2006 account. Such a move would ensure adequate attention and resources for the projects that remain in the closure account.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriations, 2001	$65,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002	141,537,000
Committee recommendation	157,537,000

An appropriation of $157,537,000 is recommended for the environmental management privatization initiative. The Committee recommendation includes $10,826,000 for a construction contingency fund for the Transuranic Waste Treatment Facility at Oak Ridge in Tennessee; $49,332,000 for Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage in Idaho; $26,050,000 for environmental/waste management at Oak Ridge in Tennessee; $13,329,000 for the privatization of the Paducah Disposal Facility in Kentucky; and $2,000,000 for the onsite disposal cell at Portsmouth, Ohio.

The Committee recommendation also includes $56,000,000 for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project, an increase of $16,000,000 over the budget request. This recommended amount, together with the expected fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriation of $29,600,000, is sufficient to cover the Department's obligations on this project in fiscal year 2002. The Committee notes the existence of an ongoing Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) audit to review the project contractor's cost management to date and whether the Department is meeting its obligation requirements. If the DCAA audit indicates the Department is not meeting its obligation responsibilities, the Committee will expect an appropriate supplemental appropriation request in fiscal year 2002.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2001	$582,466,000
Budget estimate, 2002	527,614,000
Committee recommendation	564,168,000

INTELLIGENCE

The Committee recommendation totals $40,844,000, an increase of $4,785,000 over the current year appropriation.

The Office of Intelligence provides information and technical analysis on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy-related matters to policymakers in the NNSA, the Department and other U.S. Government agencies. The focus of the Department's intelligence analysis and reporting is on emerging proliferant nations, nuclear technology transfers, foreign nuclear materials production, and proliferation implications of the breakup of the former Soviet Union.

SECURITY AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

The Committee recommendation for security and emergency operations is $247,565,000, a decrease of $21,685,000 from the current year appropriation.

Nuclear Safeguards.—The Committee recommendation provides $121,188,000 for nuclear safeguards, an increase of $4,779,000 from the current year appropriation.

Security Investigations.—The Committee recommendation provides $44,927,000, the amount of the budget request.

Corporate Management Information Program.—The Committee recommendation includes no funding for the corporate management information program. If the Department wishes to undertake the activities envisioned for this program in fiscal year 2002, the Committee directs that they be paid for using available funds within the Departmental Administration account or from program direction accounts of beneficiary programs. The Committee sees no apparent connection to the specific mission of the Security and Emergency Operations program or even the broader mission of Other Defense Activities. The Committee is concerned that the Department is attempting to disguise large increases in departmental administration costs by dispersing department-wide activities to individual program offices.

Self-Protecting Data.—The Committee is aware of self-protecting data software that allows for the encryption, control and management of any electronic document, web page or e-mail message even after distribution. The Committee strongly urges the Department to use available funds in fiscal year 2002 to review such capabilities and incorporate them into the Department's cyber security activities.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation provides $81,450,000 for program direction, a decrease of $1,685,000 from the budget request.

INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Committee recommendation provides $14,904,000 for independent oversight and performance assurance, the amount of the budget request.

The independent oversight and performance assurance program provides independent evaluation and oversight of safeguards, security, emergency management and cyber security for the Department at the Secretary's direction.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

An appropriation of $46,389,000, the amount of the request, is provided for the counterintelligence activities of the Department of Energy. This is an increase of $1,189,000 over the current years appropriation.

The Counterintelligence program has the mission of enhancing the protection of sensitive technologies, information, and expertise against foreign intelligence, industrial intelligence, and terrorist attempts to acquire nuclear weapons information or advanced technologies from the National Laboratories.

ADVANCED ACCELERATOR APPLICATIONS

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $70,000,000 for Advanced Accelerator Applications, including $15,000,000 provided in Project 98–D–126 Accelerator Production of Tritium. The recommended amount includes $6,000,000 for research and development of technologies for economic and environmentally-sound refinement of spent nuclear fuel at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas; and $2,000,000 for the Idaho Accelerator Center.

The Department provided the Report to Congress: The Advanced Accelerator Applications Program Plan as required by House Report 106–988 accompanying the Fiscal Year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. This Report outlined a program plan to build an Accelerator-Driven Test Facility (ADTF) as part of achieving four central objectives: (1) providing proof-of-principle demonstration of an accelerator-driven sub-critical multiplier; (2) conducting research on the viability of transmutation for waste and spent fuel management; (3) enhancing the Nation's nuclear science and technology education infrastructure; and (4) providing a more robust back-up tritium production capability for national security. The cost estimate for the ADTF, plus additional information now available to the Committee, leads to the Committee's recommendation that the Advanced Accelerator Applications program should not move towards construction of the ADTF in the near future.

The Committee directs the Department to instead broaden the program's research efforts into optimized waste management strategies leading towards combination of reprocessing with transmutation and energy extraction involving both a new generation of reactors (either liquid-metal or helium cooled) with safety features comparable to Generation IV reactors and an accelerator-based system. The Department is directed to explore research and development for comprehensive spent fuel management strategies, which emphasize avoidance of proliferation issues and have minimal environmental impact, along with reasonable economic projections that include efficient utilization of the energy resource of the spent fuel. The Department should develop goals for the overall program that combine these attributes with final waste forms that significantly decrease the long-term toxicity to levels far below that of spent fuel. As part of the program, the Department should evaluate the benefits and costs realized from only reprocessing as well as each additional treatment step. Finally, the Department is directed to close-out the Accelerator Production of Tritium project in fiscal

year 2002 and document all information pertinent to its utility as a back-up source of tritium for the stockpile.

The Department is directed to utilize existing facilities to accomplish short-term research and demonstrations. The Committee anticipates that test facilities added to the LANSCE facility and/or the Fast Flux Test Facility may provide opportunities for the most rapid progress, and is encouraged to consider such facilities. In addition, the Department is directed to seek out and utilize cooperation with international partners who share common goals. Utilization of international research facilities is encouraged where it advances program goals.

The Department is directed to prepare a report for Congress by March 1, 2003, outlining a long-term program plan which may include construction of new facilities required by the program.

The Committee is encouraged by the possibilities for leveraging the work accomplished thus far in the accelerator production of tritium (APT) program to accomplish a wide range of science and technology missions. Importantly, advanced, high-energy accelerators could be central to a future strategy to transmute spent nuclear fuel into less toxic, shorter-lived materials, thereby ensuring greater public confidence in a national strategy to manage spent nuclear fuel of a nuclear waste repository.

In order to pursue these important technology opportunities while still completing necessary design work for a facility capable of producing tritium to meet possible future defense requirements, the Committee directs the Department to establish an Office of Advanced Accelerator Applications (AAA) within the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology. The mission of the AAA program shall include conducting scientific, engineering research, development and demonstrations on: (1) accelerator production of tritium as a back-up technology; (2) transmutation of spent nuclear fuel and waste; (3) material science; and (4) other advanced accelerator applications. The Committee further directs that the Department transfer the APT program from the Office of Defense Programs within the NNSA to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology for integration into the AAA office. The AAA program shall assure the accelerator-based back-up capability of producing tritium for the Nation's nuclear stockpile, based on requirements defined by the Office of Defense Programs. The Committee encourages the participation of international collaborators, industrial partners, and support for new graduate engineering and science students and professors at U.S. universities.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation provided $122,285,000 for Environmental, Safety and Health activities including $23,293,000 for program direction. The mission of the Office of Environmental, Safety and Health is to protect the health and safety of Department of Energy workers, the public, and the environment and is to be the Department's independent advocate for safety, health and the environment.

The Committee notes that the effective management, storage, retrieval, and integration of environmental, scientific and medical records is important to ensuring public health and safety through-

out the Department of Energy complex. Current Department record keeping is managed at local offices using a variety of methods and formats. Furthermore, current approaches to digitization contain overlapping functions, are not standardized, and may result in records with a very short useful life. Integrated management of these records would ensure data preservation and access, and may result in substantial savings through reduced information technology operations and maintenance costs. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 to establish a program at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas for Department-wide management of electronic records.

The Committee is concerned that the Department's current program of medical screening and education at the gaseous diffusion plants will not be sufficient to complete all necessary screening and evaluation under the current contract period. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to ensure that all necessary screening and evaluation of workers, both current and former, is adequate and that those workers with an elevated risk of lung cancer will receive a lung scan. The Committee recommendation also provides $2,500,000 for the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky to undertake epidemiological studies of workers to identify exposure pathways; and $1,000,000 to provide medical screening for workers employed at the Amchitka Nuclear Weapons Test Site; and not less than $1,000,000 for health studies of workers at the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant.

Energy Employees Compensation Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000, the amount of the request, for the Energy Employees Compensation Initiative. Title 36 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (Public Law 106–398) established the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program to provide benefits to DOE contractor workers made ill as a result of exposures from nuclear weapons production. The Department is responsible for establishing procedures to assist workers in filing compensation claims.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee has provided an appropriation of $20,000,000 for these activities for fiscal year 2002. This is the same as the budget request.

The Worker and Community Transition budget provides funding for activities associated with enhanced benefits beyond those required by contract, existing company policy or collective bargaining agreements at defense nuclear facilities. The goals of the program are to mitigate the impacts on workers and communities from contractor work force restructuring, and to assist community planning for all site conversions, while managing the transition to the reduced work force that will better meet ongoing mission requirements through the application of best business practices.

The Committee urges the Department to improve the manner in which it deals with the communities the Worker and Community Transition program serves. The Committee reminds the Department that the communities and community re-use organizations that rely on these funds are generally small. Slow release of funds

or, worse, reneging on previously promised funding, can be devastating to these communities and organizations.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 for national security programs administrative support. This is the amount of the request and the same as the current year. This fund pays for departmental services that are provided in support of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

An appropriation of $2,893,000 is recommended for the Office of Hearings and Appeals. The Office of Hearings and Appeals conduct all of the Department's adjudicative process and provides various administrative remedies as may be required. The goal is to promote successful and uninterrupted DOE operations through the deliberate, expeditious and equitable resolution of all claims of adverse impact emanating from the operations of the Department.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2001	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2002	310,000,000
Committee recommendation	250,000,000

The Committee recommends $250,000,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

All power marketing administrations except Bonneville are funded annually with appropriations, and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury. Bonneville operations are self-financed under authority of Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, which authorizes Bonneville to use its revenues to finance operating costs, maintenance and capital construction, and sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

The fiscal year 2002 budget request provides authority for the use of offsetting collections from the sale of electricity to finance purchase of power and wheeling expenses previously funded by direct appropriations.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets hydroelectric power from 31 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Bonneville constructs, operates, and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of over 15,000 circuit-miles of transmission line and 324 substations with an installed capacity of 21,500 megawatts. BPA is the largest power wholesaler in the northwest and provides about 46 percent of the region's electric energy supply and about three-fourths of the region's electric power transmission capacity.

Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed Bonneville on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, Bonneville's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, investing in cost-effective, regionwide energy conservation, and acquiring generating resources to meet these requirements.

The Committee is aware that BPA and many of its transmission customers have agreed to form a technical review committee to assure that BPA's transmission investments are prioritized to ensure cost-effective and reliable service for the consumers of the Northwest. The Committee fully supports the formation of this committee.

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to Bonneville as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts Bonneville plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 2002, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $374,500,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs.

The Committee recommendation includes language that provides Bonneville with a $2,000,000,000 increase in borrowing authority to address critical infrastructure needs arising from anticipated increases in generation within Bonneville's service area. Bonneville is not permitted to obligate any funds from this additional obligation authority in fiscal year 2002 and, as previously noted, may not obligate more than $374,500,000 of its permanent borrowing authority in fiscal year 2002.

Limitation on direct loans.—The Committee recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 2002.

Budget revisions and notification.—The Committee expects Bonneville to adhere to the borrowing authority estimates recommended by the Congress and promptly inform the Committee of any exceptional circumstances which would necessitate the need for Bonneville to obligate borrowing authority in excess of such amounts.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2001	$3,891,000
Budget estimate, 2002	4,891,000
Committee recommendation	4,891,000

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 11 Southeastern States. There are 23 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092 megawatts. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through transmission arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The Committee concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2001	$28,038,000
Budget estimate, 2002	28,038,000
Committee recommendation	28,038,000

The Southwestern Power Administration is the marketing agent for the power generated at Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana with a total installed capacity of 2,158 megawatts. It operates and maintains some 1,380 miles of transmission lines, 24 generating projects, and 24 substations, and sells its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

The Committee concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2001	$165,465,000
Budget estimate, 2002	169,465,000
Committee recommendation	169,465,000

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water

Commission which operate hydropower generating plants in 15 Central and Western States encompassing a 1.3-million-square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of almost 17,000 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with 258 substations. Western distributes power generated by 55 plants with a maximum operating capacity of 10,576 megawatts.

Western, through its power marketing program, must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, purchased power, wheeling, and other expenses, in order to repay all of the power investment with interest, and to repay that portion of the Government's irrigation and other nonpower investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basin power marketing fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River storage facilities, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

Of the total resources available to the Western Power Administration, $6,092,000 shall be transferred to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

The Committee concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994–95. This legislation also directed that the fund be administered by the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas.

The Committee recommendation is $2,663,000, the same as the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2001	$175,200,000
Budget estimate, 2002	181,155,000
Committee recommendation	181,155,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2001	−$175,200,000
Budget estimate, 2002	−181,155,000
Committee recommendation	−181,155,000

The Committee recommendation provides $181,155,000, the amount of the budget request, for the Federal Energy Regulatory

Commission (FERC). Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regulates key interstate aspects of the electric power, natural gas, oil pipeline, and hydroelectric industries.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's detailed funding recommendation for programs in Title III, Department of Energy, are contained in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
ENERGY SUPPLY					
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES					
Renewable energy technologies:					
Biomass/biofuels energy systems:					
Power systems	40,800	37,754	53,000	+12,200	+15,246
Transportation	46,160	44,201	50,000	+3,840	+5,799
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	86,960	81,955	103,000	+16,040	+21,045
Geothermal technology development	27,000	13,900	32,000	+5,000	+18,100
Hydrogen research	27,000	26,881	35,000	+8,000	+8,119
Hydropower	5,000	4,989	9,300	+4,300	+4,311
Solar energy:					
Concentrating solar power	13,800	1,932	15,300	+1,500	+13,368
Photovoltaic energy systems	75,775	39,000	70,000	−5,775	+31,000
Solar building technology research	3,950	2,000	7,000	+3,050	+5,000
Subtotal, Solar energy	93,525	42,932	92,300	−1,225	+49,368
Wind energy systems	40,000	20,500	45,000	+5,000	+24,500
Total, Renewable energy technologies	279,485	191,157	316,600	+37,115	+125,443
Electric energy systems and storage:					
High temperature superconducting R&D	37,000	36,819	43,000	+6,000	+6,181
Energy storage systems	6,000	5,987	12,000	+6,000	+6,013
Transmission reliability	9,000	8,940	16,000	+7,000	+7,060
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	52,000	51,746	71,000	+19,000	+19,254

Renewable support and implementation:					
Departmental energy management	2,000	1,000	1,000	−1,000	.....
International renewable energy program	5,000	2,500	3,000	−2,000	+500
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,000	3,991	4,000	.....	+9
Renewable Indian energy resources	6,600	.....	4,000	−2,600	+4,000
Renewable program support	4,000	2,059	3,000	−1,000	+941
Total, Renewable support and implementation	21,600	9,550	15,000	−6,600	+5,450
National renewable energy laboratory	4,000	5,000	12,000	+8,000	+7,000
Program direction	18,700	19,200	21,000	+2,300	+1,800
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	375,785	276,653	435,600	+59,815	+158,947
NUCLEAR ENERGY					
Advanced radioisotope power system	32,200	29,094	29,094	−3,106	.....
Isotopes: Isotope support and production	24,715	24,683	24,683	−32	.....
Construction: 99–E–201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	2,500	2,494	2,494	−6	.....
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	27,215	27,177	27,177	−38	.....
Offsetting collections	−8,000	−9,000	−9,000	−1,000	.....
Total, Isotopes	19,215	18,177	18,177	−1,038	.....
University reactor fuel assistance and support	12,000	11,974	19,000	+7,000	+7,026
Research and development:					
Nuclear energy plant optimization	5,000	4,500	9,000	+4,000	+4,500
Nuclear energy research initiative	35,000	18,079	38,000	+3,000	+19,921
Nuclear energy technologies	7,500	4,500	14,000	+6,500	+9,500
Total, Research and development	47,500	27,079	61,000	+13,500	+33,921
Infrastructure:					
ANL-West operations	39,150	34,107	34,107	−5,043	.....
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	44,010	38,439	38,439	−5,571	.....
Test reactor area landlord	7,575	7,283	7,283	−292	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Construction:					
99–E–200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	925	950	950	+25	
95–E–201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	500	500	500		
Subtotal, Construction	1,425	1,450	1,450	+25	
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	9,000	8,733	8,733	−267	
Total, Infrastructure	92,160	81,279	81,279	−10,881	
Nuclear facilities management:					
EBR-II shutdown	8,800	4,200	4,200	−4,600	
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials	16,200	16,267	16,267	+67	
Disposition technology activities	9,850	9,990	9,990	+140	
Total, Nuclear facilities management	34,850	30,457	30,457	−4,393	
Program direction	22,000	25,062	25,062	+3,062	
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	259,925	223,122	264,069	+4,144	+40,947
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH					
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	16,000	14,973	13,973	−2,027	−1,000
Program direction	19,998	20,527	19,527	−471	−1,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	35,998	35,500	33,500	−2,498	−2,000
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES					
Technical information management program	1,600	1,600	1,600		

Program direction	7,000	7,370	6,370	−630	−1,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	8,600	8,970	7,970	−630	−1,000
Subtotal, Energy supply	680,308	544,245	741,139	+60,831	+196,894
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−1,456	.....	.....	+1,456	.....
General reduction	.....	.....	−5,000	−5,000	−5,000
Offset from nuclear energy royalties	−2,352	.....	.....	+2,352	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security	−16,582	.....	.....	+16,582	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	659,918	544,245	736,139	+76,221	+191,894
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT					
Site closure	81,636	43,000	43,000	−38,636	.....
Site/project completion	61,621	64,119	64,119	+2,498	.....
Post 2006 completion	137,744	120,053	120,053	−17,691	.....
Excess facilities	.....	1,381	1,381	+1,381	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−612	.....	.....	+612	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security	−3,189	.....	.....	+3,189	.....
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	277,200	228,553	228,553	−48,647	.....
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION					
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund:					
Decontamination and decommissioning	273,038	241,641	286,941	+13,903	+45,300
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	72,000	1,000	1,000	−71,000	.....
Depleted UF6 conversion project	.....	10,000	.....	.....	−10,000
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund	345,038	252,641	287,941	−57,097	+35,300
Other Uranium Activities:					
Maintenance of facilities and inventories	29,193	99,000	99,000	+69,807	.....
Pre-existing liabilities	11,330	11,784	11,784	+454	.....
Depleted UF6 conversion project	21,877	.....	10,000	−11,877	+10,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Total, Other uranium activities	62,400	110,784	120,784	+58,384	+10,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	−14,071			+14,071	
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−865			+865	
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	392,502	363,425	408,725	+16,223	+45,300
SCIENCE					
High energy physics:					
Research and technology	234,720	247,870	256,870	+22,150	+9,000
Facility operations	459,010	456,830	456,830	−2,180	
Construction:					
00–G–307 SLAC office building	5,200			−5,200	
99–G–306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	4,200			−4,200	
98–G–304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	23,000	11,400	11,400	−11,600	
Subtotal, Construction	32,400	11,400	11,400	−21,000	
Subtotal, Facility operations	491,410	468,230	468,230	−23,180	
Total, High energy physics	726,130	716,100	725,100	−1,030	+9,000
Nuclear physics	369,890	360,510	373,000	+3,110	+12,490
Biological and environmental research	498,760	432,970	480,000	−18,760	+47,030
Construction: 01–E–300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL	2,500	10,000	10,000	+7,500	
Total, Biological and environmental research	501,260	442,970	490,000	−11,260	+47,030

Basic energy sciences program:					
Materials sciences	456,111	434,353	454,353	−1,758	+20,000
Chemical sciences	223,229	218,714	228,714	+5,485	+10,000
Engineering and geosciences	40,816	38,938	42,938	+2,122	+4,000
Energy biosciences	33,714	32,400	34,400	+686	+2,000
Construction:					
02–SC–002 Project engineering and design (VL)	.....	4,000	4,000	+4,000	.....
99–E–334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	259,500	276,300	276,300	+16,800	.....
Subtotal, Construction	259,500	280,300	280,300	+20,800	.....
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,013,370	1,004,705	1,040,705	+27,335	+36,000
Advanced scientific computing research	170,000	163,050	163,050	−6,950	.....
Energy research analyses	1,000	1,000	1,000	.....	.....
Multiprogram energy labs—facility support:					
Infrastructure support	1,160	1,020	1,020	−140	.....
Oak Ridge landlord	10,711	7,359	7,359	−3,352	.....
Construction:					
MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	22,059	18,613	18,613	−3,446	.....
02–SC–001 Multiprogram energy laboratories, project engineering design, various locations	.....	3,183	3,183	+3,183	.....
Subtotal, Construction	22,059	21,796	21,796	−263	.....
Total, Multiprogram energy labs—fac. support	33,930	30,175	30,175	−3,755	.....
Fusion energy sciences program	255,000	248,495	248,495	−6,505	.....
Facilities and infrastructure	.....	.....	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Safeguards and security	49,818	55,412	49,818	.....	−5,594
Program direction:					
Field offices	83,307	64,400	63,000	−20,307	−1,400
Headquarters	51,438	73,525	74,385	+22,947	+860
Science education	4,500	4,460	5,000	+500	+540
Total, Program direction	139,245	142,385	142,385	+3,140	.....
Subtotal, Science	3,259,643	3,164,802	3,273,728	+14,085	+108,926

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to— Current year enacted	Committee recommendation compared to— Budget estimate
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−7,011			+7,011	
General reduction	−34,047			+34,047	
Reduction for safeguards and security	−38,244			+38,244	
Less security charge for reimbursable work		−4,912	−4,912	−4,912	
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,180,341	3,159,890	3,268,816	+88,475	+108,926
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL					
Repository program	135,200	70,577	15,000	−120,200	−55,577
Program direction	62,800	64,402	10,000	−52,800	−54,402
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−420			+420	
Reduction for safeguards and security	−6,926			+6,926	
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	190,654	134,979	25,000	−165,654	−109,979
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION					
Administrative operations:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Office of the Secretary	5,000	4,700	4,700	−300	
Board of Contract Appeals	878	911	911	+33	
Chief financial officer	32,148	36,464	34,000	+1,852	−2,464
Contract reform and privatization	2,500			−2,500	
Engineering and project management					
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	5,000	5,478	4,500	−500	−978
Economic impact and diversity	5,126	5,230	5,000	−126	−230
General counsel	22,724	23,058	22,000	−724	−1,058
International affairs	8,500	8,481	8,500		+19
Management and administration	77,800	76,392	69,000	−8,800	−7,392
Policy office	6,600	6,649	6,600		−49

Public affairs	3,900	4,581	4,000	+100	−581
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	170,176	171,944	159,211	−10,965	−12,733
Program support:					
Minority economic impact	1,500	1,498	1,500	.....	+2
Policy analysis and system studies	422	420	400	−22	−20
Environmental policy studies	1,000	919	1,000	.....	+81
Corporate management information program	12,000	.....	.....	−12,000	.....
Subtotal, Program support	14,922	2,837	2,900	−12,022	+63
Total, Administrative operations	185,098	174,781	162,111	−22,987	−12,670
Cost of work for others	74,027	71,837	71,837	−2,190	.....
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	259,125	246,618	233,948	−25,177	−12,670
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−165	.....	.....	+165	.....
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	−8,000	.....	.....	+8,000	.....
Funding from other defense activities	−25,000	−25,000	−25,000	.....	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security	−18	.....	.....	+18	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	225,942	221,618	208,948	−16,994	−12,670
Miscellaneous revenues	−151,000	−137,810	−137,810	+13,190	.....
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	74,942	83,808	71,138	−3,804	−12,670
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL					
Office of Inspector General	31,500	31,430	30,000	−1,500	−1,430
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−70	.....	.....	+70	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	31,430	31,430	30,000	−1,430	−1,430
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES					
Directed stockpile work:					
Stockpile research and development	272,300	305,460	365,145	+92,845	+59,685

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Stockpile maintenance	279,994	362,493	367,223	+87,229	+4,730
Stockpile evaluation	174,710	180,834	178,589	+3,879	−2,245
Dismantlement/disposal	29,260	35,414	29,066	−194	−6,348
Production support	149,939	152,890	134,896	−15,043	−17,994
Field engineering, training and manuals	4,400	6,700	6,418	+2,018	−282
Total, Directed stockpile work	910,603	1,043,791	1,081,337	+170,734	+37,546
Campaigns:					
Primary certification	41,400	55,530	52,661	+11,261	−2,869
Dynamic materials properties	74,408	97,810	93,644	+19,236	−4,166
Advanced radiography	58,000	60,510	85,803	+27,803	+25,293
Construction: 97–D–102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	35,232	.....	.....	−35,232	.....
Subtotal, Advanced radiography	93,232	60,510	85,803	−7,429	+25,293
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	52,964	47,270	44,524	−8,440	−2,746
Enhanced surety	40,600	34,797	39,298	−1,302	+4,501
Weapons system engineering certification	16,300	24,043	26,665	+10,365	+2,622
Nuclear survivability	15,400	19,050	23,694	+8,294	+4,644
Enhanced surveillance	106,651	82,333	82,333	−24,318	.....
Advanced design and production technologies	75,735	75,533	75,533	−202	.....
Inertial confinement fusion and high yield	250,500	222,943	247,443	−3,057	+24,500
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, LLNL	199,100	245,000	245,000	+45,900	.....
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	449,600	467,943	492,443	+42,843	+24,500
Advanced simulation and computing	716,175	711,185	711,185	−4,990	.....
Construction:					
01–D–101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	2,300	5,400	12,400	+10,100	+7,000
00–D–103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	5,000	22,000	+17,000	+17,000
00–D–105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	56,000	11,070	11,070	−44,930	.....

00–D–107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,700	5,377	15,377	+8,677	+10,000
Subtotal, Construction	70,000	26,847	60,847	−9,153	+34,000
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing	786,175	738,032	772,032	−14,143	+34,000
Pit manufacturing and certification	125,038	128,545	237,713	+112,675	+109,168
Secondary readiness	20,000	23,169	68,445	+48,445	+45,276
High explosives manufacturing and weapons assembly/disassembly readiness	.....	3,960	6,846	+6,846	+2,886
Non-nuclear readiness	.....	12,204	18,187	+18,187	+5,983
Materials readiness	40,511	1,209	1,209	−39,302	.....
Tritium readiness	77,000	43,350	42,350	−34,650	−1,000
Construction:					
98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	75,000	81,125	81,125	+6,125	.....
98–D–126 Accelerator production of Tritium, various locations	15,000	.....	15,000	.....	+15,000
Subtotal, Construction	90,000	81,125	96,125	+6,125	+15,000
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	167,000	124,475	138,475	−28,525	+14,000
Total, Campaigns	2,105,014	1,996,413	2,259,505	+154,491	+263,092
Readiness in technical base and facilities:					
Operations of facilities	1,252,232	830,427	939,479	−312,753	+109,052
Program readiness	74,500	188,126	197,220	+122,720	+9,094
Special projects	48,297	64,493	60,385	+12,088	−4,108
Material recycle and recovery	30,018	101,311	90,310	+60,292	−11,001
Containers	11,876	8,199	8,199	−3,677	.....
Storage	9,075	10,643	10,643	+1,568	.....
Nuclear weapons incident response	56,289	89,125	88,923	+32,634	−202
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,482,287	1,292,324	1,395,159	−87,128	+102,835
Construction:					
02–D–101 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL	.....	2,000	67,000	+67,000	+65,000
02–D–103 Project engineering and design, various locations	.....	9,180	31,130	+31,130	+21,950
02–D–105 ETCU upgrade, LLNL	.....	.....	4,750	+4,750	+4,750
02–D–107 Electrical power systems safety communications and bus upgrades, NV	.....	3,507	6,200	+6,200	+2,693
01–D–103 Preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	35,500	45,379	16,379	−19,121	−29,000
01–D–124 HEU storage facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	17,800	9,500	.....	−17,800	−9,500
01–D–126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,000	7,700	7,700	+4,700	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
01–D–800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL	2,000	12,993	12,993	+10,993	.....
99–D–103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	4,400	4,400	−600	.....
99–D–104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,800	2,800	2,800	.....	.....
99–D–106 Model validation and system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	5,200	4,955	4,955	−245	.....
99–D–108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	.....	2,000	.....	+2,000
99–D–125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,000	300	300	−12,700	.....
99–D–127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	23,765	22,200	22,200	−1,565	.....
99–D–128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	4,998	3,300	3,300	−1,698	.....
98–D–123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	30,767	13,700	13,700	−17,067	.....
98–D–124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y–12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	.....	6,850	6,850	+6,850	.....
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	2,918	3,000	3,000	+82	.....
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	.....	2,900	2,900	+2,900	.....
95–D–102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL)	13,337	.....	.....	−13,337	.....
93–d–122 Life saftey upgrades, Y–12	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
88–D–125 HE Machining facility, Panter	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
88–D–122 FCAP	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	162,085	154,664	212,557	+50,472	+57,893
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,644,372	1,446,988	1,607,716	−36,656	+160,728
Facilities and infrastructure	.....	.....	300,000	+300,000	+300,000
Secure transportation asset:					
Operations and equipment	79,357	77,571	79,071	−286	+1,500
Program direction	36,316	44,229	44,229	+7,913	.....
Total, Secure transportation asset	115,673	121,800	123,300	+7,627	+1,500
Safeguards and security	356,840	439,281	439,281	+82,441	.....

Construction:					
99–D–132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	18,043	9,600	9,600	−8,443	.....
88–D–123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,713	.....	.....	−2,713	.....
Subtotal, Construction	20,756	9,600	9,600	−11,156	.....
Total, Safeguards and security	377,596	448,881	448,881	+71,285	.....
Program direction	224,071	271,137	271,137	+47,066	.....
Subtotal, Weapons activities	5,377,329	5,329,010	6,091,876	+714,547	+762,866
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) Public Law 106–554)	−11,033	.....	.....	+11,033	.....
Use of prior year balances	−13,647	.....	.....	+13,647	.....
General reduction	−35,700	.....	.....	+35,700	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security	−310,796	.....	.....	+310,796	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	.....	−28,985	−28,985	−28,985	.....
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	5,006,153	5,300,025	6,062,891	+1,056,738	+762,866
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION					
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	235,990	170,296	222,355	−13,635	+52,059
Construction: 00–D–192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	17,000	35,806	35,806	+18,806	.....
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	252,990	206,102	258,161	+5,171	+52,059
Arms control	152,014	101,500	138,000	−14,014	+36,500
Nonproliferation programs with Russia:					
International materials protection, control, and accounting	173,856	138,800	143,800	−30,056	+5,000
Russian transition assistance	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
HEU transparency implementation	15,190	13,950	13,950	−1,240	.....
International nuclear safety	20,000	13,800	19,500	−500	+5,700
Fissile materials disposition:					
U.S. surplus materials disposition	139,517	130,089	130,089	−9,428	.....
Russian surplus materials disposition	40,000	57,000	66,000	+26,000	+9,000
Construction:					
01–D–407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend dow Savannah River, SC	20,932	24,000	24,000	+3,068	.....
01–D–142 Immobilization and associated processin facility, various locations	3,000	.....	.....	−3,000	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility various locations	20,000	16,000	16,000	−4,000	
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility various locations	26,000	63,000	63,000	+37,000	
Subtotal, Construction	69,932	103,000	103,000	+33,068	
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	249,449	290,089	299,089	+49,640	+9,000
Total, Nonproliferation programs with Russia	458,495	456,639	476,339	+17,844	+19,700
Program direction	51,468	51,459	50,000	−1,468	−1,459
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation	914,967	815,700	922,500	+7,533	+106,800
Use of prior year balances	−526	−42,000	−42,000	−41,474	
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) Public Law 106–554)	−1,923			+1,923	
Reduction for safeguards and security	−40,245			+40,245	
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	872,273	773,700	880,500	+8,227	+106,800
NAVAL REACTORS					
Naval reactors development	644,500	652,245	652,245	+7,745	
Construction:					
GPN–101 General plant projects, various locations	11,400			−11,400	
01–D–200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	1,300	9,000	9,000	+7,700	
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	16,000	4,200	4,200	−11,800	
Subtotal, Construction	28,700	13,200	13,200	−15,500	
Total, Naval reactors development	673,200	665,445	665,445	−7,755	

Program direction	21,400	22,600	22,600	+1,200	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security	−4,437	.....	.....	+4,437	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−1,518	.....	.....	+1,518	.....
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	688,645	688,045	688,045	−600	.....
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR					
Office of the Administrator	10,000	15,000	15,000	+5,000	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−22	.....	.....	+22	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	9,978	15,000	15,000	+5,022	.....
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	6,577,049	6,776,770	7,646,436	+1,069,387	+869,666
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.					
Site/project completion:					
Operation and maintenance	919,167	872,030	979,480	+60,313	+107,450
Construction:					
02–D–402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, INEEL, Idaho Falls, ID	.....	3,256	3,256	+3,256	.....
01–D–414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	17,300	6,254	6,254	−11,046	.....
01–D–415 235–F packaging and stabilization project, Savannah River, SC	4,000	.....	.....	−4,000	.....
99–D–402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	7,714	5,040	5,040	−2,674	.....
99–D–404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	4,300	2,700	2,700	−1,600	.....
98–D–453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,690	1,910	1,910	+220	.....
97–D–470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	3,949	.....	.....	−3,949	.....
96–D–471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	12,512	4,244	4,244	−8,268	.....
92–D–140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC	8,879	15,790	.....	−8,879	−15,790
86–D–103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA	2,000	762	762	−1,238	.....
Subtotal, Construction	62,344	39,956	24,166	−38,178	−15,790
Total, Site/project completion	981,511	911,986	1,003,646	+22,135	+91,660
Post 2006 completion:					
Operation and maintenance	2,251,514	1,680,979	2,133,779	−117,735	+452,800
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	420,000	420,000	.....	.....
Construction: 93–D–187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	27,212	6,754	6,754	−20,458	.....
Office of River Protection:					
Operation and maintenance	309,619	272,151	328,151	+18,532	+56,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Construction:					
01–D–416 Hanford waste treatment plant, Richland, WA	377,000	500,000	665,000	+288,000	+165,000
99–D–403 Infrastructure support, Richland, WA	7,812			−7,812	
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA and 94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems	46,023	33,473	33,473	−12,550	
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,385	6,844	6,844	−10,541	
Subtotal, Construction	448,220	540,317	705,317	+257,097	+165,000
Subtotal, Office of River Protection	757,839	812,468	1,033,468	+275,629	+221,000
Total, Post 2006 completion	3,456,565	2,920,201	3,594,001	+137,436	+673,800
Science and technology	256,898	196,000	271,700	+14,802	+75,700
Excess facilities		1,300	1,300	+1,300	
Safeguards and security	203,748	205,621	205,621	+1,873	
Program direction	363,988	355,761	355,761	−8,227	
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,262,710	4,590,869	5,432,029	+169,319	+841,160
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−10,943			+10,943	
Use of prior year balances	−34,317	−36,770	−36,770	−2,453	
Pension refund	−50,000			+50,000	
General reduction	−10,700			+10,700	
Reduction for safeguards and security	−193,217			+193,217	
Less security charge for reimbursable work		−5,391	−5,391	−5,391	
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,963,533	4,548,708	5,389,868	+426,335	+841,160

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS					
Site closure	1,027,942	1,004,636	1,034,636	+6,694	+30,000
Safeguards and security	54,772	45,902	45,902	−8,870	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−2,383	.....	.....	+2,383	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS	1,080,331	1,050,538	1,080,538	+207	+30,000
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION					
Privatization initiatives, various locations	90,092	141,537	157,537	+67,445	+16,000
Use of prior year balances	−25,092	.....	.....	+25,092	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	65,000	141,537	157,537	+92,537	+16,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	6,108,864	5,740,783	6,627,943	+519,079	+887,160
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
Other national security programs:					
Security and emergency operations:					
Nuclear safeguards and security	116,409	121,188	121,188	+4,779	.....
Security investigations	33,000	44,927	44,927	+11,927	.....
Corporate management information program	.....	20,000	.....	.....	−20,000
Emergency management	33,711	.....	.....	−33,711	.....
Program direction	92,967	83,135	81,450	−11,517	−1,685
Subtotal, Security and emergency operations	276,087	269,250	247,565	−28,522	−21,685
Intelligence	36,059	40,844	40,844	+4,785	.....
Counterintelligence	45,200	46,389	46,389	+1,189	.....
Advanced accelerator applications	34,000	.....	55,000	+21,000	+55,000
Independent oversight and performance assurance Program direction	14,937	14,904	14,904	−33	.....
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	102,963	91,307	98,992	−3,971	+7,685
Program direction—EH	22,604	23,293	23,293	+689	.....
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health (Defense)	125,567	114,600	122,285	−3,282	+7,685
Worker and community transition	21,500	21,246	18,000	−3,500	−3,246
Program direction—WT	3,000	3,200	2,000	−1,000	−1,200
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	24,500	24,446	20,000	−4,500	−4,446

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
National Security programs administrative support	25,000	25,000	25,000	.....	.....
Office of Hearings and Appeals	3,000	2,893	2,893	−107	.....
Subtotal, Other defense activities	584,350	538,326	574,880	−9,470	+36,554
Use of prior year balances	.....	−10,000	−10,000	−10,000	.....
Reduction for safeguards and security	−595	.....	.....	+595	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−1,289	.....	.....	+1,289	.....
Less security charge for reimbursable work	.....	−712	−712	−712	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	582,466	527,614	564,168	−18,298	+36,554
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL					
Defense nuclear waste disposal	200,000	310,000	250,000	+50,000	−60,000
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−275	.....	.....	+275	.....
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	13,468,104	13,355,167	15,088,547	+1,620,443	+1,733,380
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS					
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Purchase power and wheeling	34,463	34,463	34,463	.....	.....
Program direction	5,000	4,891	4,891	−109	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,463	39,354	39,354	−109	.....
Offsetting collections	−34,463	−34,463	−34,463	.....	.....
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−9	.....	.....	+9	.....

Use of prior year balances	−1,100			+1,100	
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,891	4,891	4,891	+1,000	
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Operating expenses	3,795	3,339	3,339	−456	
Purchase power and wheeling	288	1,800	1,800	+1,512	
Program direction	18,388	18,668	18,668	+280	
Construction	6,817	6,031	6,031	−786	
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,288	29,838	29,838	+550	
Offsetting collections	−288	−1,800	−1,800	−1,512	
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)					
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−62			+62	
Use of prior year balances	−900			+900	
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	28,038	28,038	28,038		
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Construction and rehabilitation	23,115	16,064	16,064	−7,051	
System operation and maintenance	36,104	37,796	37,796	+1,692	
Purchase power and wheeling	65,224	186,124	186,124	+120,900	
Program direction	106,644	114,378	114,378	+7,734	
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,950	1,227	6,092	+142	+4,865
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	237,037	355,589	360,454	+123,417	+4,865
Offsetting collections	−65,224	−186,124	−190,989	−125,765	−4,865
Offsetting collections (Public Law 106–377)					
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) Public Law 106–554)	−365			+365	
Use of prior year balances	−5,983			+5,983	
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	165,465	169,465	169,465	+4,000	
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND					
Operation and maintenance	2,670	2,663	2,663	−7	

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to—	
				Current year enacted	Budget estimate
Across-the-board cut (.22 percent) (Public Law 106–554)	−7			+7	
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING FUND	2,663	2,663	2,663		
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	200,057	205,057	205,057	+5,000	
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION					
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	175,200	181,155	181,155	+5,955	
FERC revenues	−175,200	−181,155	−181,155	−5,955	
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION					
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission)	−75,000			+75,000	
Defense environmental privatization (rescission)	−97,000			+97,000	
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	18,303,148	18,106,554	20,061,975	+1,758,827	+1,955,421

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

Language under section 301 prohibits the use of funds to award, amend or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulations unless on a case-by-case basis, a waiver is granted by the Secretary of Energy or the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration. Similar language was contained in last year's Energy and Water Development Act, Public Law 106–377. The recommendation contained herein, provides waiver authority for Atomic Energy Defense Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration to the Administrator. Waiver authority for all other programs shall be provided by the Secretary of Energy.

Language is included under section 302 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to develop or implement a workforce restructuring plan or enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 484. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–377.

Language is included under section 303 which prohibits the use of funds for severance payments under the worker and community transition program.

Language is included under section 304 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to initiate requests for proposals or expression of interest for new programs which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission, and which have not yet been approved and funded by Congress. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–377.

Language is included under section 305 which permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–377.

Language is included under section 306 which provides that up to 6 percent of funds appropriated in this Act, including Environmental Management programs, may be used for Laboratory Directed Research and Development. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–377.

Language is included under section 307 which provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant which contains concentrations of plutonium in excess of 20 percent by weight for the aggregate of any material category on the date of enactment of this Act, or generated after such date. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2001, Public Law 106–377.

Language is included under section 308 which provides that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize 2 percent of the amount allocated to a nuclear weapons production plant for the production plant to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the Engineering and manufacturing capabilities of the plant in order to maintain and enhance such capabilities at the plant. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2001, Public Law 106–377.

Language is included under section 309 which allows the Power Marketing Administrations to engage in activities and solicit, undertake and review studies and proposals relating to the formation and operation of a regional transmission organization.

Language is included under section 310 which provides that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize 2 percent of the amount allocated for national security operations at the Nevada Test Site for investment in innovative research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the development, test, and evaluation capabilities necessary for operations and readiness of the Nevada Test Site.

Language is included under section 311 to extend the authorization for withdrawals from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund from fiscal year 2002 to fiscal year 2005.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2001	$66,254,000
Budget estimate, 2002	66,290,000
Committee recommendation	66,290,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a Federal cochairman who is appointed by the President.

The Committee recommendation for the Appalachian Regional Commission totals $66,290,000, the amount of the request.

Consistent with the administration's budget request, the Committee recommendation does not include funding for ARC highways. Funding for ARC development highways will be provided through the highway trust fund beginning in fiscal year 1999 through 2004 consistent with provision contained in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act.

The Committee recognizes the importance of trade and investment opportunities to the Appalachian region, and is encouraged by a preliminary trade report determining that Appalachian firms might find significant trade and investment opportunities, particularly in the energy, high technology, and transportation sectors, in the Republic of Turkey and the surrounding region. In this regard, the Committee supports the Appalachian-Turkish Trade Project (ATTP), a project to promote opportunities to expand trade, encourage business interests, stimulate foreign studies, and to build a lasting and mutually meaningful relationship between the Appalachian States and the Republic of Turkey, as well as the neighboring regions, such as Greece. The Committee commends the ARC for its leadership role in helping to implement the mission of the ATTP, and for the expertise it provided in implementing the ATTP Conference that was held in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, on March 23, 2001. The Committee expects the ARC to continue to be a prominent ATTP sponsor.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2001	$18,459,000
Budget estimate, 2002	18,500,000
Committee recommendation	18,500,000

An appropriation of $18,500,000, the amount of the request, is recommended for fiscal year 2002. This is the same as the budget request.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the Fiscal Year 1989 National Defense Authorization Act. The Board,

composed of five members appointed by the President, provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy regarding public health and safety issues at the Department's defense nuclear facilities. The Board is also responsible for investigating any event or practice at a defense nuclear facility which has or may adversely affect public health and safety. The Board is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2001	$19,956,000
Budget estimate, 2002	19,992,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

The Delta Regional Authority (DRA), authorized by Public Law 106–554, was established to assist an eight-state, 236-county region of demonstrated distress in obtaining transportation and basic public infrastructure, skills training, and opportunities for economic development essential to strong local economies.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $20,000,000 for the Delta Regional Authority. The recommended appropriations will be used to carry out the activities of Authority during fiscal year 2002.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2001	$29,934,000
Budget estimate, 2002	29,939,000
Committee recommendation	40,000,000

The Denali Commission is a regional economic development agency established in 1998 for the intended purpose of delivering basic utilities, including affordable power, and other essential infrastructure to the nation's most geographically isolated communities. The Committee is encouraged by the progress of the Denali Commission in assisting distressed communities throughout Alaska, and urges continued work among local and State agencies, nonprofit organizations and other participants in meeting the most pressing infrastructure needs.

The Committee recommendation includes $40,000,000 for the Denali Commission. The Committee has provided $10,000,000 above the President's request for the Denali Commission. Within this amount, the Committee recommends $5,000,000 to improve basic infrastructure and community facilities for community residents without running water or sewer systems.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2001	$481,825,000
Budget estimate, 2002	506,900,000
Committee recommendation	506,900,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2001	−$447,958,000
Budget estimate, 2002	−463,248,000
Committee recommendation	−463,248,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2001	$33,867,000
Budget estimate, 2002	43,652,000
Committee recommendation	43,652,000

The Committee recommendation includes $506,900,000, the same amount as the request, for the Commission, and includes a single year extension of the NRC's user fee collection authority.

The Committee directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission not to expend any funds to implement or enforce the revisions to 10 C.F.R. Part 35 which contains regulations concerning the medical use of isotopes that were adopted by the Commission on October 23, 2000. The Committee has taken this action becuase it believes that the Commission has failed to adequately consider, as it has repeatedly promised, adopting regulations which properly reflect the very low risk posed by the use of diagnostic nuclear medicine procedures.

The Committee agrees with the Administration's National Energy Policy Development Group, chaired by the Vice President, in its recommendation supporting the expansion of nuclear energy in the United States. The Committee has strongly supported nuclear power in the past and believes that new nuclear plants offer emission-free power sources, help maintain diversity of fuel supply, enhance energy security, meet growing electricity demand, and protect consumers against volatility in the electricity and natural gas markets. As such, the Committee recognizes the possibility that several entities are considering possible applications to the Commission for an Early Site Permit, a Combined Operating License, and/or a Design Certificate for new nuclear power plants. Should this occur, the Committee would expect that the Commission's consideration would be both thorough and adhere to a predictable schedule. Because this is the first time 10 CFR 52, which was enacted in 1992, may be used by the Commission, the Committee recommends that the cost of the activities for these initial reviews should be shared between the Federal Government and the nuclear industry. To achieve this type of cost sharing, a reduction in fees payable by the nuclear industry to the Commission is appropriate. To this end, the Committee recommendation includes an appropriation for an additional $10,000,000, of which $5,000,000 will be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and $5,000,000 will be recovered through fees assessed to NRC licensees and applicants. Of the amount appropriated, $3,000,000 may be available for supporting studies at national laboratories for fuel testing, code verification and validation, and materials testing.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2001	$5,500,000
Budget estimate, 2002	6,180,000
Committee recommendation	5,500,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2001	−$5,390,000
Budget estimate, 2002	−5,432,000
Committee recommendation	−5,432,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,500,000 for fiscal year 2002.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2001	$2,894,000
Budget estimate, 2002	3,100,000
Committee recommendation	3,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,500,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

Language is included under section 501 which provides that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 502 which requires that American-made equipment and goods be purchased to the greatest extent practicable. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The recommended appropriations in title III, Department of Energy, generally are subject to annual authorization. However, the Congress has not enacted an annual Department of Energy authorization bill for several years, with the exception of the programs funded within the atomic energy defense activities which are authorized in annual defense authorization acts. The authorization for the atomic energy defense activities, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2001, is currently being considered by the Senate.

Also, contained in title III, Department of Energy, in connection with the appropriation under the heading "Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund," the recommended item of appropriation is brought to the attention of the Senate.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee ordered reported, en bloc, S. 1171, an original fiscal year 2002 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, S. 1172, an original fiscal year 2002 Legislative Branch appropriations bill, and an original fiscal year 2002 Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill, each subject to amendment and each subject to its budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 29–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Hollings	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	

Mrs. Landrieu
Mr. Reed
Mr. Stevens
Mr. Cochran
Mr. Specter
Mr. Domenici
Mr. Bond
Mr. McConnell
Mr. Burns
Mr. Shelby
Mr. Gregg
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Campbell
Mr. Craig
Mrs. Hutchison
Mr. DeWine

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.

RECLAMATION STATES EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 1991, PUBLIC LAW 102–250

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in section 303 of this Act (relating to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more the $90,000,000 in total for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2000, [and 2001] *2001, and 2002*.

* * * * * * *

PUBLIC LAW 105–204

AN ACT

To require the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a plan to ensure that all amounts accrued on the books of the United States Enrichment Corporation for the disposition of depleted uranium hexafluoride will be used to treat and recycle depleted uranium hexafluoride.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES ENRICHMENT CORPORATION.

(a) * * *

(b) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding the privatization of the United Sates Enrichment Corporation and notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the repeal of chapters 22 through 26 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297 et seq.) made by section 3116(a)(1) of the United States Enrichment Corporation Privatization Act (104 Stat. 1321–349), *except as provided in subsection (c),* no amounts described in subsection (a) shall be withdrawn from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund established by section 1308 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297b–7) or the Working Capital Account established under section 1316 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2297b–15) until the date that is 1 year after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget request for **[**fiscal year 2002**]** *fiscal year 2005*.

* * * * * * *

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 First Concurrent Resolution for 2002: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
General purpose, defense	15,247	15,247	NA	NA
General purpose, non-defense	9,713		NA	NA
General purpose, total	24,960	15,247	24,916	[1] 24,690
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2002				[2] 16,182
2003				7,577
2004				1,159
2005				30
2006 and future years				19
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2002	NA	109	NA	34

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

NA: Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR LARRY E. CRAIG

NUCLEAR WASTE FUND

I am providing additional views with respect to both the funding level for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management and the Committee report recommendations regarding the Yucca Mountain project. The funding level of $275,000,000 represents an unwarranted cut from the Department of Energy's request of $445,000,000 and jeopardizes the ultimate success of the project. Furthermore, this blow to the Yucca Mountain project comes just months before the President is expected to make a decision about whether to move forward with Yucca Mountain's development as a geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste from commercial reactors and defense activities. His decision will be based on the many volumes of data compiled during over two decades of scientific study of the site.

A central repository for spent nuclear fuel is vital to maintain nuclear energy's role as our Nation's largest source of non-emitting electricity generation. Although spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste is currently being safely stored at approximately 150 locations around the country, those sites were never intended to be permanent storage facilities. The Department of Energy has a legal obligation to begin managing the fuel as of January 31, 1998. The urgent need for a permanent repository for spent nuclear fuel is why the Yucca Mountain site has been subjected to extensive scientific study over a period of years.

The Committee report, in my view, misrepresents the ongoing process of scientific investigation at Yucca Mountain and adds redundant and contradictory processes to those already in place to determine if the site is suitable.

The Committee report asserts that our Nation's reluctance to reprocess used nuclear fuel made a geologic repository our only option. Such an assertion ignores the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences and ignores the international consensus for deep geologic disposal. The fact is that reprocessing does not eliminate the need for a repository. Every time spent fuel is reprocessed, there are radioactive byproducts that require disposal. In fact, 16 nations are studying geologic repositories, including every nation that currently reprocesses its spent nuclear fuel.

The cost of continued technical investigation of other potential sites did not make Yucca Mountain the designated repository site by default. A total of nine sites were studied between 1982 and 1987. A comparison of the sites pointed clearly to Yucca Mountain as the best repository site, which is why scientific attention has been focused on Yucca Mountain since then.

Opponents of Yucca Mountain have also mischaracterized national policy toward used nuclear fuel as "bury it all and forget it."

The fact is that provisions are in place for continual study of Yucca Mountain for 50 to 300 years after spent fuel disposal commences, and future generations have the freedom to opt for further study.

The report mischaracterizes the ongoing, scientific studies of Yucca Mountain by stating that the Department of Energy "has not demonstrated that the proposed site at Yucca Mountain is suitable." This assertion contradicts the numerous scientific studies that have already been released nearly all of which indicate that Yucca Mountain will be suitable, based on the evidence to date.

The Committee report decries changes in the repository's operational concept from a sealed and backfilled approach to a monitored and retrievable approach by saying the changes undermine public confidence in the safety of the repository. Precisely the opposite is true. Having a repository that is more easily monitored can only strengthen public confidence in Yucca Mountain, because the public can have more assurance that rigorous scientific inquiry can easily and regularly be applied to the site.

The Committee report recommendations place an onerous burden on Yucca Mountain by upholding contradictory positions and mandating redundant processes on top of those already in place. The report language calls upon the Department of Energy to "use existing regulations to determine site suitability," even though those regulations are contradictory to the recommendation of scientific experts at the National Academy of Sciences. Those same regulations are, in fact, being revised to reflect the Environmental Protection Agency's recently issued radiation protection standard.

Additionally, the comments call for mandating an extensive process of public hearings in each of the 43 States through which spent fuel could be transported to Yucca Mountain. An extensive process for public hearings already exists, whereby States, local communities, and emergency response authorities can express concerns, have questions answered, and receive appropriate training. It is not useful to conduct the training and hearings now, when this program is at least a decade away from transporting spent fuel to Yucca Mountain and the Department of Energy has not yet selected transportation routes. These routes must also be selected in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Department of Transportation regulations.

Proponents and opponents of the Yucca Mountain project alike agree that the decision about the site's suitability as a geologic repository should be based on sound and thorough science. Unfortunately, both the funding level of $275,000,000 and the report language regarding this program frustrate a scientifically-based approach to the decision in favor of an attempt to starve the program with a lack of resources and delay it with unnecessary or duplicative processes. Our Nation's energy future, however, demands that we evaluate Yucca Mountain on its scientific merits alone.

LARRY E. CRAIG.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2001 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2001 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations	160,584	130,000	152,402	−8,182	+22,402
Construction, general	1,716,165	1,324,000	1,570,798	−145,367	+246,798
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	350,458	280,000	328,011	−22,447	+48,011
Operation and maintenance, general	1,897,775	1,745,000	1,833,263	−64,512	+88,263
Regulatory program	124,725	128,000	128,000	+3,275	.....
FUSRAP	139,692	140,000	140,000	+308	.....
General expenses	151,666	153,000	153,000	+1,334	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	4,541,065	3,900,000	4,305,474	−235,591	+405,474
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	19,524	24,169	24,169	+4,645	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	14,136	10,749	10,749	−3,387	.....
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	4,989	.....	.....	−4,989	.....
Subtotal	38,649	34,918	34,918	−3,731	.....
Program oversight and administration	1,213	1,310	1,310	+97	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	39,862	36,228	36,228	−3,634	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	678,953	647,997	732,496	+53,543	+84,499

Loan program	9,348	7,495	7,495	−1,853	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(26,941)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(−941)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	38,360	55,039	55,039	+16,679	.....
California Bay-Delta restoration	.....	20,000	.....	.....	−20,000
Policy and administration	50,114	52,968	52,968	+2,854	.....
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	776,775	783,499	847,998	+71,223	+64,499
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	816,637	819,727	884,226	+67,589	+64,499
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	659,918	544,245	736,139	+76,221	+191,894
Non-defense environmental management	277,200	228,553	228,553	−48,647	.....
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	392,502	363,425	408,725	+16,223	+45,300
Science	3,180,341	3,159,890	3,268,816	+88,475	+108,926
Nuclear Waste Disposal	190,654	134,979	25,000	−165,654	−109,979
Departmental administration	225,942	221,618	208,948	−16,994	−12,670
Miscellaneous revenues	−151,000	−137,810	−137,810	+13,190	.....
Net appropriation	74,942	83,808	71,138	−3,804	−12,670
Office of the Inspector General	31,430	31,430	30,000	−1,430	−1,430
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(6,108,864)	(5,740,783)	(6,638,539)	(+529,675)	(+897,756)
Non-defense function	(669,702)	(591,978)	(637,278)	(−32,424)	(+45,300)
Total	(6,778,566)	(6,332,761)	(7,275,817)	(+497,251)	(+943,056)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	5,006,153	5,300,025	6,062,891	+1,056,738	+762,866
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	872,273	773,700	880,500	+8,227	+106,800
Naval reactors	688,645	688,045	688,045	−600	.....
Office of the Administrator	9,978	15,000	15,000	+5,022	.....
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	6,577,049	6,776,770	7,646,436	+1,069,387	+869,666
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	4,963,533	4,548,708	5,389,868	+426,335	+841,160
Defense facilities closure projects	1,080,331	1,050,538	1,080,538	+207	+30,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2001 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2001 appropriation	Budget estimate
Defense environmental management privatization	65,000	141,537	157,537	+92,537	+16,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,108,864	5,740,783	6,627,943	+519,079	+887,160
Other defense activities	582,466	527,614	564,168	−18,298	+36,554
Defense nuclear waste disposal	199,725	310,000	250,000	+50,275	−60,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	13,468,104	13,355,167	15,088,547	+1,620,443	+1,733,380
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	3,891	4,891	4,891	+1,000	
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	28,038	28,038	29,838	+1,800	+1,800
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	165,465	169,465	169,465	+4,000	
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,663	2,663	2,663		
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	200,057	205,057	206,857	+6,800	+1,800
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	175,200	181,155	181,155	+5,955	
Revenues applied	−175,200	−181,155	−181,155	−5,955	
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission)	−75,000			+75,000	
Defense environmental privatization (rescission)	−97,000			+97,000	
Total, title III, Department of Energy	18,303,148	18,106,554	20,063,775	+1,760,627	+1,957,221
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	66,254	66,290	66,290	+36	
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,459	18,500	18,500	+41	
Delta Regional Authority	19,956	19,992	20,000	+44	+8

Denali Commission	29,934	29,939	40,000	+10,066	+10,061
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	481,825	506,900	516,900	+35,075	+10,000
Revenues	−447,958	−463,248	−468,248	−20,290	−5,000
Subtotal	33,867	43,652	48,652	+14,785	+5,000
Office of Inspector General	5,500	6,180	5,500	.....	−680
Revenues	−5,390	−5,932	−5,432	−42	+500
Subtotal	110	248	68	−42	−180
Total	33,977	43,900	48,720	+14,743	+4,820
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,894	3,100	3,500	+606	+400
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	171,474	181,721	197,010	+25,536	+15,289
TITLE V—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL					
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Cerro Grande fire activities (contingent emergency appropriations)	203,012	.....	.....	−203,012	.....
Appalachian Regional Commission (contingent emergency appropriations)	10,976	.....	.....	−10,976	.....
Total, title V, Emergency Supplemental	213,988	.....	.....	−213,988	.....
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	24,046,312	23,008,002	25,450,485	+1,404,173	+2,442,483
Appropriations	(24,004,324)	(23,008,002)	(25,450,485)	(+1,446,161)	(+2,442,483)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(213,988)	.....	.....	(−213,988)	.....
Rescissions	(−172,000)	.....	.....	(+172,000)	.....
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

○