

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

NOTICE: This is a draft for use of the Committee and its staff only, in preparation for markup.

Calendar No. _____

113TH CONGRESS } 2d Session }	SENATE	{ REPORT 113-000
----------------------------------	--------	------------------------

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS
BILL, 2015

JUNE —, 2014.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 0000]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 0000) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

New obligational authority

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	\$34,208,000,000
Amount of 2014 appropriations	34,061,799,000
Amount of 2015 budget estimate	33,683,138,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2014 appropriations	+ 146,201,000
2015 budget estimate	+ 524,862,000

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose	00
Summary of Estimates and Recommendations	00
Title I:	
Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:	
Corps of Engineers—Civil:	
General Investigations	00
Construction, General	00
Flood Control, Mississippi River, and Tributaries	00
Operation and Maintenance, General	00
Regulatory Program	00
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	00
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	00
General Expenses	00
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	00
General Provisions—Corps of Engineers—Civil	00
Title II:	
Department of the Interior:	
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Water and Related Resources	00
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	00
California Bay-Delta Restoration	00
Central Utah Project Completion Account	00
Policy and Administration	00
Indian Water Rights Settlements	00
San Joaquin Restoration Fund	00
General Provisions—Department of the Interior	00
Title III:	
Department of Energy:	
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	00
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	00
Nuclear Energy	00
Fossil Energy Research and Development	00
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	00
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	00
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve	00
Energy Information Administration	00
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup	00
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund ..	00
Science	00
Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy	00
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	00
Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program	00
Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs	00
Clean Coal Technology	00
Departmental Administration	00
Office of the Inspector General	00
Weapons Activities	00
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	00
Naval Reactors	00
Federal Salaries and Expenses	00
Defense Environmental Cleanup	00
Other Defense Activities	00
Power Marketing Administrations:	
Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administra-	
tion	00
Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administra-	
tion	00
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, West-	
ern Area Power Administration	00
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	00

Title III—Continued	
Department of Energy—Continued	
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission: Salaries and Expenses	00
General Provisions—Department of Energy	00
Title IV:	
Independent Agencies:	
Appalachian Regional Commission	00
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	00
Delta Regional Authority	00
Denali Commission	00
Northern Border Regional Commission	00
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	00
Office of Inspector General	00
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	00
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects	00
Title V: General Provisions	00
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	00
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	00
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	00
Budgetary Impact of Bill	00
Comparative Statement of Budget Authority	00

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2015 beginning October 1, 2014, and ending September 30, 2015, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities, including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Delta Regional Authority, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2015 budget estimates for the bill total \$33,683,138,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals \$34,208,000,000. This is \$524,862,000 above the budget estimates and \$146,201,000 above the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water held three sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2015 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

The recommendations for fiscal year 2015, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of — to — the Committee on ———, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

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

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

- Planning, designing, building, and operating water resources and other Civil Works projects (Navigation, Flood Control, Environmental Protection, Disaster Response, et cetera);
- Designing and managing the construction of military facilities for the Army and Air Force (Military Construction); and
- Providing design and construction management support for other Defense and Federal agencies (Interagency and International Services).

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

Unlike other Federal agencies, there is no Federal act, with accompanying generic authority, that created the civil works mission of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Rather, the Congress through specific authorizations and appropriations, has provided the Corps with ever increasing responsibilities over development of the Nation's water resources.

The Lighthouse Act of 1789 was the first act providing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers responsibilities for making improvements to navigable channels on the Nation's waterways, ports and harbors. Subsequent acts and appropriations have led to the development of the current 25,000 miles of deep draft and inland waterways, 236 lock chambers and 926 ports of our federally constructed and maintained water transportation system. This system serves 41 States and provides for the handling of over 2.3 billion tons of cargo.

In 1879, creation of the Mississippi River Commission gave rise to the Corps' flood control activities. Subsequent acts and appropriations expanded flood control activities from the Lower Mississippi River Basin to communities across the Nation. Current Federal flood control infrastructure includes 707 dams and 14,673 miles of levees. Average annual damages prevented by these projects exceeds \$30,000,000,000.

The Corps' first regulatory authority was established in 1899 when the Corps was given the responsibility to permit obstructions in navigable waters of the United States. This regulatory authority was greatly expanded by the passage of the Clean Water Act and the Corps' role in permitting activities under section 404 of the act.

In 1920, the Federal Water Power Act involved the Corps in hydroelectric power generation. Subsequent laws and appropriations have resulted in the Corps becoming the number one Federal producer of hydropower with an installed capacity of nearly 24,000 megawatts at 75 projects. These projects provide \$1,500,000,000 in revenues to the Treasury on an annual basis and provide 3 percent of total U.S. electric capacity.

The River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930, provided the Corps' first authority for shore and beach protection studies. These studies have led to extensive shore protection projects along the U.S. coastline. As 50 percent of the U.S. population now resides within 50 miles of the U.S. coastline, these projects not only provide essential storm damage reduction benefits, they also provide significant recreational benefits. California beaches alone receive about 600 million tourist visits annually, which is more than all of the tourist visits to all of the lands controlled nationwide by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management combined. Beach tourists contribute \$260,000,000,000 to the U.S. economy and \$60,000,000,000 in Federal taxes.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 provided the Corps' initial authority for recreational facilities as well as for water supply. The Corps ranks first in Federal recreation providers hosting 370 million visitors annually. The Corps hosts 20 percent of visits to Federal recreation areas on 2 percent of Federal lands. The Corps has over 4,000 recreation sites at 404 projects and more than \$16,000,000,000 is spent by visitors at these projects. A total of 10 million acre feet of authorized storage for municipal and industrial water supply is provided at 135 Corps projects in 25 States.

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of August 12, 1958 provided that fish and wildlife conservation receive equal consideration and coordination with other project purposes in Corps studies and projects. This was the initial authority for the Corps in what has become the ecosystem restoration mission. Subsequent acts and appropriations have led to the major initiatives for Everglades restoration, Columbia and Missouri River Fish Recovery programs and the Upper Mississippi River Ecosystem Management program, among others.

This water infrastructure has been developed over nearly two centuries, most of it on an individual project basis, within varying contexts of system planning. The estimated replacement value of our Federal water resources infrastructure exceeds \$250,000,000,000 with an annual economic benefit to the national economy exceeding \$50,000,000,000.

While the Corps Civil Works programs impact all 50 States and virtually every citizen of our Nation, they are a relatively minor part of the Federal budget. Funding for the Corps comprises less than 0.13 percent of the total Federal budget for fiscal year 2015.

OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

The fiscal year 2015 budget request for the Corps of Engineers is composed of \$4,533,000,000 in new budget authority. This amount includes a rescission of \$28,000,000 of previously appropriated funds.

The administration's fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 budget proposals for funding the nine accounts of the Corps of Engineers are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Account	Fiscal year 2014 budget	Fiscal year 2015 budget
General Investigations	90,000	80,000
Construction, General	1,350,000	1,125,000
Mississippi River and Tributaries	279,000	245,000
Operation and Maintenance	2,588,000	2,600,000
Regulatory	200,000	200,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	104,000	100,000
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	28,000	28,000
General Expenses	182,000	178,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	5,000	5,000
Subtotal	4,826,000	4,561,000
Proposed Rescission	-100,000	-28,000
Total	4,726,000	4,533,000

The General Investigations [GI] account is cut by \$10,000,000 from the administration's fiscal year 2014 request. Seventy-nine studies are included in the request. While as a percentage of the overall GI request, funding for individual studies is increased, nationwide programs appear to have been significantly cut. There is no explanation for the ramifications of these cuts in the budget justifications. The Committee is pleased to see that the administration was able to include new study starts as a part of its request. The Committee expects that should these new studies merit further study, the administration will budget for them accordingly in future budgets.

With the administration's emphasis on infrastructure funding, the Committee finds many of the administration's budget choices troubling. Nowhere is this more true than the Construction, General account which is cut by \$225,000,000 from the fiscal year 2014 request. This follows cuts of about \$100,000,000 annually since fiscal year 2010. Only 66 construction projects are proposed. When compared to the administration's fiscal year 2014 budget request, funding for life and safety projects is cut by \$15,000,000, environmental mitigation is cut by \$59,000,000, projects for environmental compliance are cut by \$54,000,000, "high performing" environmental projects are cut by \$27,000,000, while other "high performing" projects are cut by \$116,000,000. The only bright spot is that projects to improve dam safety are increased by \$52,000,000. Nationwide programs were substantially cut in this account including the Continuing Authorities Program that was cut by \$19,000,000 from the fiscal year 2014 request.

The Mississippi River and Tributaries account is cut by \$34,000,000 from the fiscal year 2014 request. Construction work

is limited to the mainstem of the Mississippi River and for two agricultural water supply projects. No funding for studies is proposed.

The Operations and Maintenance [O&M] account, which saw a significant boost in the President's fiscal year 2014 budget is increased by \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 2015. Funding for activities that are reimbursed from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is increased by \$25,000,000 to \$915,000,000 for fiscal year 2015. That means that other operation and maintenance items had to be cut to arrive at this number. The nationwide programs appear to have been significantly cut, but the budget justifications do not address these cuts. 725 individual line items are proposed for funding.

The Corps' other five accounts are essentially flat funded for fiscal year 2015 from the amounts proposed in fiscal year 2014.

The tradition of this bill is that virtually all funding for the Corps of Engineers is designated to specific studies/projects. This is due to the unique manner in which the Corps' civil works mission has evolved. Very little of the Corps funding is considered programmatic. The administration's budget request for fiscal year 2015 continues this tradition. The four major study/project accounts (General Investigations; Construction, General; Mississippi River and Tributaries; and Operation and Maintenance) comprise \$4,050,000,000 of the administration's overall budget request for the Corps of Engineers. Only \$276,802,000 of the budget request in these four accounts is considered programmatic funding or national programs, or about 6.8 percent of the funding proposed in these accounts. The remainder of the \$3,773,198,000 proposed in the four major accounts is divided among 899 individual line item studies or projects proposed by the administration. All of these individual studies, projects and programmatic authorities are specifically authorized by Congress and specifically funded through appropriations acts.

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

The line items that were added by Congress were authorized and vetted in a public process identical to those line items that the administration included in its request. However, in recent years the administration has applied a number of supplemental criteria for budgeting studies or projects that the authorizations for these studies and projects do not require.

For instance, the administration requires that the benefit to cost ratio must be 2.5 when analyzed, not only at the current rate authorized in law (which for fiscal year 2014 is 3.5 percent), but at a seemingly arbitrary 7 percent rate, as well, if the project is to be included in the administration's budget request. It is unknown how

many projects that provide significant national benefits are excluded from consideration in the administration's budget request based on this criterion alone.

Another budgeting metric that the administration employs for operation and maintenance for navigation projects is based primarily on the tonnage moved on the waterway or through the harbor. However, the economic foundation on which these projects were analyzed prior to construction was based on transportation savings benefits to the national economy rather than the tonnage. Many small projects that provide their anticipated economic benefits to the national economy will never be able to compete strictly on a tonnage basis. Further, operation and maintenance costs over the 50-year economic life were included as a part of the economic analysis, meaning that maintenance costs were calibrated into the economic benefit that the project was anticipated to provide.

These are only two examples that show Congress and the administration differ greatly in their views on the proper way to budget for the Corps of Engineers program. Establishment of budget criteria was, and continues to be, the prerogative of the administration. However, it should be understood that this criteria is established not necessarily to meet the Nation's water resource needs, but rather to help the administration decide which needs they choose to fund in their budget request. These are choices made by the administration within the context of its priorities.

The administration's view of what should be funded should not be deemed as correct just because it is the administration's view. History has shown that an administration's criteria is extremely flexible depending on what an administration wants to fund in a given year. This Committee does not believe that this budget criteria, established by the administration, has any more validity than the criteria that the Congress has used in the past to decide which projects to fund.

Due to the vagaries of the administration's budget criteria, Congress has traditionally provided the consistency in funding for items within the Corps of Engineers budget. Corps of Engineers projects generally have two definitive points where Congress can decide the Federal commitment to a water resources development project. The first point is when an item is being studied. By providing the initial study funding, the Congress is making a tacit commitment that it intends to see the study process through to completion. By the same token, when a project is authorized for construction and receives its initial construction funding, that is a commitment that the Congress intends to see the project through to completion. That is why so few "new" studies and projects have been funded in recent years. Congress has acknowledged the tight fiscal environment by not creating tremendous out-year obligations for the Corps with new work.

Nearly all Corps studies and projects are cost-shared. That means a local sponsor has contractually agreed to provide a proportionate non-Federal share (in most cases, ranging from 25 percent–50 percent) to match the Federal funds appropriated. When these projects are not provided funding either through the budget or an appropriations act, the work is deferred until funding is appropriated. This inconsistent funding increases project costs, defers

the projects benefits to the national economy and plays havoc with the non-Federal entities' financing plans for projects and studies. Traditionally, Congress has provided the consistency for studies and projects undertaken by the Corps of Engineers through congressionally directed spending by maintaining the commitments to local sponsors and ensuring consistent levels of funding for the projects or studies that were initiated or funded in appropriation acts.

The Committee has not included congressionally directed spending items for fiscal year 2015. To provide for funding consistency as well as for inadequacies in the administration's budget request, the Committee has included unallocated funded line items in the four major project accounts. Congress has provided some specific guidance to ensure the administration wisely uses these funds for work that was either unfunded or underfunded in the administration's budget request. However, the decision on which items the unallocated funds are applied to is left with the administration.

PROGRAM COORDINATION AND EXECUTION

The Committee is concerned about conditions within the offices of the administration which are directly affecting execution of the water resources program the Committee recommends. This has manifested itself in a number of ways. One of the most obvious impacts to the Committee has been the annual problem of the budget justifications not being released until days or weeks after the administration releases its budget request for the fiscal year. The administration has this single opportunity to present its vision of an enacted Corps of Engineers program. With the continual tardiness of submission of the details of the budget, this budget process becomes muddled and loses meaning as the details come too late for Congress to properly consider the proposals. The fiscal year 2015 budget justification materials were delivered the same day as the Committee's Civil Works oversight hearing, with no time available for proper review and consideration. The timeliness of the submission of other requested reports and analyses are also problematic for the Committee in fulfilling its oversight role of the Civil Works program.

Additionally, responses to the written questions that the Committee submits to the administration to elucidate budget decisions made by the administration in preparing the budget often are not provided to the committee until well after the bill is completed, sometimes not until after conference. Reports that are required by either the House Report, the Senate Report or the Statement of Managers are frequently late or just go undone by the administration. These reports are requested to help the Committee with its oversight activities or to help the Committee provide a better bill that can eventually become an appropriations act.

Similarly, with the demise of earmarks after fiscal year 2011, the Committee transferred to the administration the task of developing work plans to delineate how funding provided above the administration's budget request are to be allocated among projects. While Congress provides some guidance through the reports that accompany the Bills, the administration ultimately makes the decisions about which items to fund. However, appearances are that condi-

tions within levels of the administration are contributing to challenges with timeliness and the significant decline of quality of the work plans. Criteria established by the administration, which may be fine for the administration's budget process, is excluding worthwhile projects from the work plans and is deliberately slowing execution of funding provided by Congress. While this criteria is touted by the administration as trying to make the allocation process more transparent, it generally has the opposite effect and slows things down.

The Committee reminds the administration that once a bill is enacted into law, the administration is expected to execute the program laid out in the appropriation bill in the most efficient and effective way possible. The Committee endeavors to ensure that funds provided above the administration's request are executable by the Corps for items that were either underfunded or omitted from the administration's request due to other administration priorities or criteria. If this is not possible, the Committee has provided reprogramming criteria that allows the administration to move funds where they can be used. Unfortunately, the Committee has noticed that this reprogramming process has also become quite lengthy due to the amount of internal oversight and review that appear to be required from various levels of the administration. The Committee encourages the administration to find a way to shorten this internal process.

The Committee expects the administration to develop plans that execute the maximum amount of funds possible in a given fiscal year; however, the Committee recognizes there are constraints that may challenge the execution of funds. In those instances, the Committee expects funds to be obligated and carried over for expenditure in the subsequent fiscal year. Some unobligated carry-over of funds in a program the size of the Corps', with the vagaries of a construction program that takes place in rivers and streams, is inevitable, but should be an option of last resort. With the backlog of ongoing work in the Corps' program and the tight fiscal situation of the nation, there is no reason that the Corps should have large balances of unallocated funds at the end of a fiscal year.

At the outset of this discussion, the Committee noted that there may be far from perfect conditions within the various levels and offices of the administration. Whether these conditions result from leadership, communication or personality issues, or a combination is unknown, but it is obvious that the focus on program execution has been lost or at least deemphasized. The Committee believes that it would be useful for the administration to assess what can be done to ensure the various levels and offices of the administration work together in a more constructive way to execute the Corps' program rather than getting bogged down in minutia.

The Committee wants to ensure that the administration completely understands that the Committee values and believes it is imperative to retain the unfettered communication that the Committee enjoys with the various levels and offices of the administration. The administration should clearly understand that the Committee is not suggesting that the information flow to the Committee be restricted in any way from any of the offices with which the Committee communicates. Rather, the Committee would like to

see the administration return its focus to executing the civil works program and not to addressing multiple conflicting agendas with program execution as an afterthought.

THE WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2014

The Committee notes the enactment of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA) on June 10, 2014. The WRRDA provides for changes in the ways that the Corps of Engineers does business and authorizes at least \$16,000,000,000 in new projects and authorities while proposing to deauthorize \$18,000,000,000 of previously authorized projects. Enactment of the WRRDA, while providing considerable opportunities for new water resources investments, does not provide any additional funding for water resources projects.

The Committee has not yet had the opportunity to determine the full effects of the reforms of the WRRDA since it is unclear how the administration will interpret the language. As the administration's decisions for the fiscal year 2015 budget request were made in the absence of the WRRDA, few of the WRRDA provisions will be a part of this appropriations bill. Implementation guidance for the WRRDA will be developed by the administration in the coming months and it is anticipated that the provisions from this WRRDA bill will be more fully integrated into the fiscal year 2016 budget request. However, some parts of the WRRDA will have immediate impacts, as discussed in the following paragraphs.

The cost-sharing for the Olmsted Locks and Dam project on the Ohio River between Kentucky and Illinois has been modified from the traditional 50/50 cost share to 85 percent from the General Treasury and 15 percent from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund [IWTF]. The net effect of this change will be to allow additional investments on other inland waterways projects that are cost-shared with the IWTF. Appropriate language to implement this change is included in the bill within the Construction, General account. The Committee expects the administration to address these increased investment opportunities for the inland waterways system in future budget submissions. While this is a way to enhance revenues within the IWTF, the Committee is disappointed that, at a minimum, inflationary increases to the inland waterways fuel tax were not addressed.

The funding for activities funded by the harbor maintenance tax [HMT] are extensively addressed in the WRRDA. Targets for investments on HMT eligible activities are tied specifically to the amount of HMT collected in a given year. For fiscal year 2015, that target would be about \$1,200,000,000. If the target funding is met, the WRRDA provides triggers as to how the funds should be divided among the different activities that are eligible for funding. Unfortunately, the Committee's discretionary allocation does not provide sufficient funding to meet the proposed target for fiscal year 2015 so funding for HMT activities, for the most part, is recommended in a similar manner as in fiscal year 2014.

Prior to the enactment of the WRRDA, the Federal responsibility for maintenance of Federal navigation channels was 100 percent for depths less than 45 feet. The WRRDA modifies that depth to 50 feet. According to the Corps this will have a minor impact on

the fiscal year 2015 funding proposals in the administration's budget. Therefore the Committee has not addressed these increased costs in this bill except by providing unallocated funding that can be used for these maintenance requirements, as necessary. However, as more channels are deepened beyond 45 feet, the impacts will increase in the out-years and it is expected that the administration will address these increased costs in their budget requests.

The Committee notes the WRRDA included innovative reforms to enhance the project delivery, including the planning, design and construction, of Corps projects through the use of public-private partnerships. The Committee encourages the Secretary to expeditiously develop guidance to implement a pilot program to evaluate the cost effectiveness and project delivery efficiencies of allowing non-Federal interests to carry-out flood risk management, hurricane and storm damage reduction, coastal and inland navigation projects and aquatic ecosystem restoration projects, as alternatives to traditional financing, planning, design and construction models. The Committee directs the Corps to report on the progress of developing this guidance and the associated funding needs by September 30, 2014.

The WRRDA also addresses a number of issues that have been discussed in previous Energy and Water bills. Included among these are the Corps' levee vegetation policy, problems with levee certification, the Corps' planning program, the Corps' levee safety program, the Corps' policy on credits and Corps' policy on aquatic invasive species. For the most part the Committee does not address these issues in the fiscal year 2015 energy and water bill but reserves the right to review these issues if the language from the WRRDA does not alleviate the problems.

LEVELS OF SERVICE AT LOCKS AND DAMS

The Committee remains concerned about the Corps Levels of Service proposals at Locks and Dams. Chief among these concerns is the direct economic as well as unintended impacts that reduced hours of service may have on lower use waterways. One of the tools that waterway economic development proponents use in marketing an inland waterway to potential businesses is the reliability and 24-hour access to dependable navigable depths along the waterway. If 24-hour access is reduced to 12-hour access, it can be a detriment to enticing new business prospects. Businesses will be concerned about further significant reductions.

The Committee understands that operation and maintenance budgets are tight; however, the rationale for reducing hours of operation does not seem to net much in additional maintenance funding—which was the original reason given for reducing levels of service. The Committee remains concerned about the limited budgetary resources for infrastructure improvements on the Nation's locks and dams, and encourages the Corps to use all options within its statutory authority to collect additional funds. Such efforts should include acceptance of contributed funds to maintain robust lock operations and engaging in private partnerships, which the Committee believes, should be in partnership with State agencies to ensure that locks are safe and operational for purposes of eco-

conomic growth and incentives that foster economic and community development.

Due to the Committee's concerns about levels of service, the Committee believes that it would be prudent for the Corps of Engineers headquarters to suspend any reductions of service at locks and dams, except for those having limited commercial traffic with no consistent pattern of lockages, and undertake an analysis of whether this reduced service is in the best economic interest of the Nation. This analysis should include the benefits and impacts of retaining 24-hour service at each individual lock or segment of waterway where reduced hours are proposed. The current ad hoc determinations being undertaken by the individual field operating agencies of the Corps may not be examining the full ramifications of these reductions of service.

Where service levels at locks have been reduced, the Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers is authorized to open locks independently of the established levels of service for specific and unique activities where such opening and closing will be advantageous to fostering economic and community development. Local economies across the country experience economic windfalls by using locks and dams for commercial and recreational uses, such as fishing tournaments, which are unrelated to commercial barge traffic. The Committee is encouraged that the Corps has given local communities assurances that, within its current statutory authority, it will be sensitive to related impacts on local economies. The Committee expects the Corps will consider economic incentives unrelated to commercial barge traffic when presented with requests by local communities for specific and unique activities requiring locks to be operated outside of established levels of service.

CONTINUING CONTRACTS AND REPROGRAMMING

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

The Committee is retaining the reprogramming legislation provided in the Fiscal Year 2014 Energy and Water Development Act.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Energy and Water Subcommittee's 302(b) allocation for fiscal year 2015, filed on May 22, 2014, was \$34,208,000,000 with a security allocation of \$18,423,000,000 and a nonsecurity allocation of \$15,785,000,000. Except for FUSRAP, the entirety of the Corps' program funding falls within the nonsecurity allocation. It should be noted that the fiscal year 2015 nonsecurity allocation is \$1,075,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2014 enacted nonsecurity amount.

The Committee recommends the following amounts for the Corps for fiscal year 2015:

(In thousands of dollars)

Account	Fiscal year 2014 omnibus	Fiscal year 2015 recommendation
General Investigations	125,000	125,000
Construction, General	1,656,000	1,421,000
Mississippi River and Tributaries	307,000	305,000
Operation and Maintenance	2,861,000	2,800,000
Regulatory	200,000	200,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)	103,499	100,000
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	28,000	28,000
General Expenses	182,000	178,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	5,000	5,000
Subtotal	5,467,499	5,162,000
Proposed Rescission		- 28,000
Total	5,467,499	5,134,000

The Committee has accepted the administration's proposed rescission of \$28,000,000 of unobligated balances. These funds are either no longer needed for the purpose for which they were intended or the work is being addressed with other available funds.

NEW STARTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The Committee recommends new starts in both the General Investigations and Construction, General accounts for fiscal year 2015. The Committee decision is based, in part, on the budget request providing funding to complete 37 studies or project designs and 10 construction projects.

The Committee recognizes that we are in a constrained budget environment which will likely continue for the remainder of the decade. However, the Committee believes that new investment opportunities should be presented to Congress for consideration. Also, some previously authorized projects should be reviewed to ensure

that they are still economically viable, environmentally sustainable and technically sound.

The Committee includes the following 10 new starts proposed in the administration's budget request for fiscal year 2015: Allegheny River, Pennsylvania; Du Page River, Illinois; Fairfield and New Haven Counties, Connecticut; Kentucky River Locks, Kentucky; Manatee Harbor, Florida; New Haven Harbor Deepening, Connecticut; Salton Sea, California; San Juan Harbor Channel Improvement Study, Puerto Rico; Short Creek and Wheeling Creek, Ohio; and the Water Resources Priority Study.

The Committee also believes that investments in our infrastructure are investments in our economy and that these investments should be continued even during constrained budgets as the benefits to the economy from these projects continue for decades. The Committee recommends the following new construction start proposed in the administration budget request: Louisiana Coastal Area, Louisiana.

In addition, the Secretary is directed to propose a single group of new starts to the House and Senate Appropriation Committees within 45 days of enactment of this act as a part of the work plan. The new starts shall consist of 10 additional new study starts and 5 additional new construction starts.

While new elements of previously funded environmental infrastructure projects may be included in the Corps work plan, no environmental infrastructure project shall be funded where the authorization has not previously received funding through an energy and water appropriations bill.

The Committee was pleased to see that in choosing new starts to receive funding from the fiscal year 2014 Energy and Water enacted bill, the Corps considered all manner and scopes of projects rather than just those proposed in the administration's request. The final selected new construction starts represented a combination of those items proposed in the request as well as others from the Corps' backlog of construction projects. The Committee encourages the Corps to use a similar process when considering the new starts allowed in this bill.

SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE

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

When viewed in the historical context of annual Corps spending rates, reasonable percentages of S&S make sense as a way to accommodate additional projects needs, even if funding is insufficient, and has been utilized by the Committee for the four major accounts. The Committee directs that the S&S amount in each sub-

account initially be applied uniformly across all projects within the subaccounts. Upon applying the S&S amounts, normal reprogramming procedures should be undertaken to account for schedule slippages, accelerations, or other unforeseen conditions.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

Congressionally directed spending has become synonymous with earmarks in recent debates, even for agencies such as the Corps of Engineers where the majority of the budget request is based on individual line item studies and projects. Due to this ongoing debate, the Committee has voluntarily refused all congressionally directed spending requests for fiscal year 2015. That means that the administration has total discretion as to how the funding that this Committee appropriates will be spent as it relates to individual studies and projects. The Committee has retained the traditional tables for each of the four major accounts delineating the 919 line items requested by the President in the budget request. Due to inadequacies in the administration's budget request, the Committee has also inserted additional line item funding under the nationwide heading for specific categories of studies or projects that the Committee feels are underrepresented in the administration's budget request. The Corps has discretion within the guidelines provided in each account as to which line items this additional funding will be applied to. The Committee has not included any congressionally directed spending as defined in section 5(a) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2014	\$125,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	80,000,000
Committee recommendation	125,000,000

This appropriation funds studies to determine the need, engineering feasibility, economic justification, and the environmental and social suitability of solutions to water and related land resource problems; and for preconstruction engineering and design work, data collection, and interagency coordination and research activities.

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

The Committee has provided for a balanced planning program for fiscal year 2015 with 20 new study starts—10 from the budget request and an additional 10 to be selected based on the Corps’ prioritization process and included as a part of the General Investigations work plan.

The Committee has and continues to consider planning as one “seamless” phase of project development. This phase starts when Congress makes an investment decision by funding a “new start” reconnaissance level study. If the reconnaissance studies produce a recommendation that further studies are warranted, and a non-Federal sponsor is willing and able to share the costs, the Corps is expected to expeditiously budget for and continue with a feasibility level study. If the feasibility studies produce a project recommendation, and a non-Federal sponsor is willing and able to share the costs, the Corps is expected to expeditiously budget for and proceed with preconstruction engineering and design studies while awaiting project authorization. It should be understood that the only new start decision in the planning phase is whether to start a reconnaissance level study. All other studies flow from that decision point through the completion of preconstruction engineering and design. There should be no other “new starts” considered within this planning phase for funding purposes.

The Committee notes that the General Investigations table is segregated into the typical three phases of a planning study. By displaying the table in this manner, more attention can be focused on the various study phases, and a more balanced planning program can be developed by the administration. As the last two columns are generally cost shared, they demonstrate the commitment by cost-sharing sponsors to be a part of the Federal planning process. By the same token, it also shows the level of commitment of the Federal Government to these cost-sharing sponsors. The display of the table in this manner should not be interpreted by the administration that Congress supports a new start decision for each study phase nor does Congress intend for the administration to budget individual phases as new starts.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	RECON	FEAS	RECON	FEAS
ALASKA				
ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK		50		50
CRAIG HARBOR, AK		300		300
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK		300		300
ARIZONA				
LITTLE COLORADO RIVER (WINSLOW), AZ		751		751
LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ		200		200
ARKANSAS				
WHITE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE—LOWER CACHE, AR		150		150
CALIFORNIA				
ALISO CREEK, CA		717		717
ARROYO SECO, CA		450		450
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA				675
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA		449		449
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA				230
COYOTE VALLEY DAM RESTORATION, CA		200		200
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) RESTORATION, CA		200		200
N CA STREAMS, LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND & VIC, CA		800		800
PORT OF LONG BEACH NAV IMP, CA		200		200
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA		579		579
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA		500		500
SALTON SEA RESTORATION, CA	200		200	
SAN FRANCISCO CREEK, CA		900		900
WESTMINSTER (EAST GARDEN GROVE) WATERSHED, CA		452		452
YUBA RIVER FISH PASSAGE, CA (ENGBRIGHT & DAGUERRE POINT DAMS)		200		200
COLORADO				
ADAMS AND DENVER COUNTIES, CO		500		500

CONNECTICUT									
FAIRFIELD AND NEW HAVEN COUNTIES (FLOODING), CT	100				100				
NEW HAVEN HARBOR DEEPENING, CT	100				100				
FLORIDA									
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	100		3,150		100				3,150
MANATEE HARBOR, FL									
GEORGIA									
SATILLA RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, GA		200						200	
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA			1,520						
HAWAII									
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI		120						120	
HILO HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HI		469						469	
WAIKAEA-PALAH, HI		153						153	
WEST MAUI WATERSHED, MAUI, HI		1,040						1,040	
IDAHO									
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID									
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID		1,000						1,000	
ILLINOIS									
DU PAGE RIVER, IL	150				150				
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL		400						400	
INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES—MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES, IL, IN, OH & WI		500						500	
KENTUCKY									
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS 1-4 DISPOSITION, KY	100				100				1,100
LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY			1,100						
LOUISIANA									
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYS REST—MISS. RIVER HYDRO, LA		2,500						2,500	
MARYLAND									
ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD		250						250	
ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MD		250						250	
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD		600						600	
CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD, PA & VA		100						100	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	RECON	FEAS	RECON	FEAS
BOSTON HARBOR DEEP DRAFT INVESTIGATION, MA		1,800		1,800
MINNESOTA				
MINNESOTA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MN & SD (MINNESOTA RIVER AUTHORITY)		600		600
MISSOURI				
MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION, MO		593		593
MONTANA				
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT		295		295
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH & VT		23		23
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA		700		700
NEW JERSEY				
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ		52		52
NEW MEXICO				
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM		300		300
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM		276		276
RIO GRANDE BASIN WATERSHED, NM, CO & TX		300		300
NEW YORK				
HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ		202		202
NORTH CAROLINA				
WILMINGTON HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, NC		298		298
NORTH DAKOTA				
JAMES RIVER, ND		400		400
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, ND, MN, SD & MANITOBA, CANADA		600		600

OHIO									
SHORT CREEK AND WHEELING CREEK, OH	150			150					
OREGON									
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA		283			283				
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR			550			550			550
PENNSYLVANIA									
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	100			100					
DELAWARE RIVER DREDGE MATERIAL UTILIZATION, PA		200			200				
PUERTO RICO									
SAN JUAN HARBOR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT STUDY, PR	100			100					
SOUTH CAROLINA									
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC		695			695				
TEXAS									
COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY, TX		200			200				
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX			1,200			1,200			1,200
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX		200			200				
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX		300			300				
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX		583			583				
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX		600			600				
SULPHUR RIVER BASIN REALLOCATION, TX		500			500				
VIRGINIA									
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA		700			700				600
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (DEEPENING)								700	
WASHINGTON									
PUYALLUP RIVER, WA		500			500				
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA		200			200				
SKAGIT R. WA/SKAGIT CO. WA		250			250				
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA		550			550				
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES	1,100	25,580	11,125	1,100	25,580	11,125	1,100	25,580	9,605

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	RECON	FEAS	RECON	FEAS
REMAINING ITEMS				
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:				
FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION				
FLOOD CONTROL				4,000
SHORE PROTECTION				8,000
NAVIGATION				5,000
COASTAL AND DEEP-DRAFT				6,000
INLAND				4,000
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE				3,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES				2,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE				1,500
REMOTE, COASTAL, OR SMALL WATERSHED				3,000
COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES:				
ACCESS TO WATER DATA		750		750
COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS		100		100
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS:				
CALIFED		100		100
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM		75		75
COORDINATION WITH OTHER WATER RESOURCE AGENCIES		398		500
GULF OF MEXICO		100		100
INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT		400		400
INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT		721		900
INVENTORY OF DAMS		400		400
LAKE TAHOE		100		100
PACIFIC NW FOREST CASE		10		10
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS		1,350		1,350
FERC LICENSING		200		200
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES		3,500		5,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA:				
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD		251		251
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION		1,000		1,000
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES		75		75
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA		220		220

FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	8,000			8,000
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	243			243
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	150			150
PRECIPITATION STUDIES	225			225
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	75			75
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	47			47
STREAM GAGING	550			550
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	385			929
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	12,270			19,000
OTHER—MISC:				
NATIONAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	5,000			5,000
NATIONAL SHORELINE	400			675
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM	3,100			4,000
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	1,500			2,500
WATER RESOURCES PRIORITIES STUDY	500			500
SUBTOTAL	1,100	67,775	11,125	1,100
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE				
TOTAL	1,100	67,775	11,125	1,100
GRAND TOTAL		80,000		125,000

South San Francisco Bay Shoreline, California.—The Committee is concerned that progress on this study continues to be slow. The study has been underway for more than 10 years, and the latest schedule shows a Chief's report scheduled for July 2015. There is no excuse for a study process to take over 10 years. In that time-frame, the lack of a completed Chief's report has meant that opportunities for authorization of the potential project were missed in both 2007 and in 2014. The project is critically needed to prevent flooding in the Alviso, California, area as well as to restore the environment in the South San Francisco Bay area. The Corps should take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that completion of the Chief's report occurs no later than July 2015 so that authorization of the project can take place as soon as possible thereafter.

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

Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The Committee understands that during the 2011 flooding on the Mississippi River considerable damages were concentrated on the Upper Mississippi River Basin where there is no comprehensive flood risk management plan. The comprehensive Mississippi River and Tributaries Project in the lower basin incurred limited damages despite record stages in many locations. The Committee believes that a comprehensive plan for the upper basin would provide considerable benefits and urges the Corps to provide funding for these efforts.

Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota.—In the aftermath of two successive years of management challenges on the Missouri River due to flood and drought, the Committee recognizes the importance of developing information to better inform public policy decisions. The Committee encourages the Corps to reinitiate the review of the original Missouri River project purposes based on the Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended, to develop this information.

Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans.—The Committee recognizes that these plans are an integral part of the overall Great Lakes ecosystem restoration efforts and encourages the Corps to budget for these plans in future budget submissions.

National Mall and Federal Triangle Flood Protection.—The Committee expects the Corps to provide information and cooperate with other Federal agencies, District of Columbia Government, and non-profit interests including the National Coalition to Save Our Mall and Federal City Council's efforts to address ongoing flood risks facing the Federal Triangle/National Mall area. The Committee directs the Corps to provide unclassified information to the aforementioned interests for the purposes of the development of a report on a proposed cost-neutral, public-private partnership approach to combine flood protection with underground visitor amenities and parking in order to address flood risks to the Federal Triangle/Na-

tional Mall area, as well as the need to improve visitor access to National Mall museums, monuments and activities.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The fiscal year 2015 budget request does not reflect the extent of need for project studies funding. The Committee is particularly concerned that the Secretary has executed feasibility cost sharing agreements with local sponsors who have committed precious local resources under the provisions of those agreements and now find those investments stranded. Study sponsors should rightfully expect the Federal Government to honor its commitments; in fact, keeping those commitments is essential to maintaining the integrity of the Corps and its civil works mission—which is crucial to the economic vitality and environmental health of the Nation. The Corps has numerous continuing studies that will be suspended under the limits of the budget request. These studies could lead to projects with significant economic benefits, particularly by increasing national competitiveness through marine transportation improvements and by avoiding damages caused by flooding and coastal storms. Accordingly, the Committee recommends additional funds to continue ongoing studies and activities to honor those agreements. None of these funds may be used for any item where funding was specifically denied. While this additional funding is shown in the feasibility column, the Corps should utilize these funds in any applicable phase of work. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either was not included in the administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. Ongoing studies that are actively progressing and can utilize the funding in a timely manner are eligible for these additional funds.

The 10 new study starts directed as part of the work plan shall be funded from the appropriate additional funding line item. It should be understood that the Committee intends that there be no more than 20 new study starts in fiscal year 2015. When considering which new study starts to propose, the administration should give higher priority to those studies that are regional in scope, have the potential to provide greater national benefits, address endangered species concerns or provide protection to large numbers of our citizens. Additionally, recognizing the constrained fiscal environment, the administration should give careful consideration to the outyear budget impacts of the studies it chooses as well as whether there appears to be an identifiable local sponsor that will be ready and able to provide the necessary cost shares for the feasibility and preconstruction engineering and design phases of the study phase. As all of these studies are to be chosen by the administration (either through the budget request or through the work plan), and the Committee expects the administration to treat all new studies equally and include appropriate requests for funding in future budgets submissions.

Funding associated with each category may be allocated to any eligible study within that category; funding associated with each subcategory may be allocated only to eligible studies within that subcategory. The list of subcategories is not meant to be exhaustive. The Committee directs that priority in allocating these funds be given to the 10 new starts directed by the Committee: completing or accelerating ongoing studies which will enhance the Na-

tion's economic development, job growth, and international competitiveness; for projects located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters; or are for areas where revisions to flood frequency flow lines may result in a situation where existing infrastructure no longer meets the requirements under the National Flood Insurance program.

Within 45 days of enactment of this act, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is to be accomplished. The Committee directs that a listing should accompany the work plan showing all the ongoing studies that were considered eligible and could have used funding for fiscal year 2015, and the reasons these items were considered as being less competitive for inclusion in the work plan.

A study may not be excluded on the basis of being "inconsistent with administration policy". The Corps is reminded that these are funds above the administration's budget request. Administration budget request metrics should not be a reason to disqualify a study from being funded.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2014	\$1,656,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,125,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,421,000,000

The Committee recommends \$1,421,000,000 in new budget authority for this account. The Committee recognizes that this is considerably less than the needs in the program but is the best that can be provided in this constrained fiscal environment.

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

The Committee recommends six new construction starts in fiscal year 2015—one new construction start proposed in the budget request and five to be selected based on the Corps’ prioritization process and included as a part of the Construction, General work plan.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA	92,600	92,600
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA	1,200	1,200
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	1,300	1,300
HAMILTON CITY, CA	3,800	3,800
ISABELLA LAKE, CA (DAM SAFETY)	8,000	8,000
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	1,000	1,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	6,000	6,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	1,000	1,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	30,826	30,826
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	4,000	4,000
FLORIDA		
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	75,000	75,000
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	65,551	65,551
GEORGIA		
LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA	80	80
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	850	850
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA		1,520
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	200	200
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	9,810	9,810
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	29,000	29,000
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	18,500	18,500
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	3,800	3,800
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	160,000	160,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	33,170	33,170
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, DEFICIENCY CORRECTION, IL	8,650	8,650
IOWA		
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD	48,771	48,771
KENTUCKY		
ROUGH RIVER, MAJOR REHAB, KY (DAM SAFETY)	25,000	25,000
LOUISIANA		
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	9,800	9,800
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	10,000	10,000
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	900	900
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	5,000	5,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	15,100	15,100
MASSACHUSETTS		
MUDDY RIVER, MA	1,798	1,798
MISSOURI		
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	1,600	1,600
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL ...	50	50
MONARCH—CHESTERFIELD, MO	915	915
NEW JERSEY		
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	35,000	35,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	11,000	11,000
NEW YORK		
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	22,000	22,000
OHIO		
BOLIVAR DAM, OH (DAM SAFETY)	12,300	12,300
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	5,730	5,730
DOVER DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY)	2,800	2,800
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE, OK	18,000	18,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	16,333	16,333
OREGON		
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	1,000	1,000
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,400	1,400
PENNSYLVANIA		
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	64,800	64,800
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	9,032	9,032
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	1,000	1,000
PUERTO RICO		
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	3,000	3,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	1,572	1,572
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	53,400	53,400
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	1,800	1,800

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	18,993	18,993
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	4,672	4,672
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN (WHARTON/ONION), TX	3,625	3,625
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50 FOOT PROJECT), TX	4,825	4,825
VIRGINIA		
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	300	300
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	69,000	69,000
COLUMBIA RIVER ACCORDS, PACIFIC LAMPREY PASSAGE, WA	2,000	2,000
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	2,160	2,160
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	22,000	22,000
WISCONSIN		
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	127	127
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES	1,061,140	1,062,660
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:		
FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION		20,000
FLOOD CONTROL		50,000
SHORE PROTECTION		30,000
NAVIGATION		30,000
INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND PROJECTS		60,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES		20,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE		10,000
ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCURE PROJECTS		50,000
HYDROPOWER PROJECTS		5,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM		4,000
CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION:		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	3,000	11,000
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTIONS 204, 207, 933)	2,000	6,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)		5,000
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	2,000	12,500
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)		500
NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107)		3,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)	3,000	10,000
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103)		2,000
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	34,000	40,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	19,000	19,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	60	60
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	800	800
RESTORATION OF ABANDONED MINES		2,000
SUBTOTAL	63,860	390,860
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE		— 32,520
TOTAL	1,125,000	1,421,000

Savannah Harbor Expansion, Georgia.—The administration's budget requested funding for this item in the GI account. The Committee again recommends funding for this project in the Construction, General account, where it has been funded since fiscal year 2009. Congress provided a new construction start for this project in fiscal year 2009 and it is ongoing construction. In addition, the administration has provided construction funding for this project in previous work plans. The administration should consider this as an ongoing construction project.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois.—It should be noted that the Committee does not consider hydrologic separation of the Great Lakes Basin from the Mississippi River Basin to be an emergency measure under the authority provided in section 1039 of the WRRDA. The Committee believes that the issue of hydrologic separation should be fully studied by the Corps of Engineers and vetted by the appropriate congressional authorizing committees and specifically enacted into law. No funds provided in this act may be used for construction of hydrologic separation measures.

Melvin Price Lock and Dam, Illinois and Missouri.—The Committee is concerned about the length of time that it is taking the Corps to rectify the seepage problems that the impoundment of the navigation pool is causing to the Wood River Levee. These problems were identified in 2009 and a Limited Reevaluation Report [LRR] of the Wood River Levee relief wells was undertaken and completed in 2012. Since completion of the LRR, the Corps has determined that that limited reevaluation report does not adequately address the seepage impacts and is undertaking a supplement to the LRR. This supplement is not anticipated to be completed until 2015 pushing the construction of any solution until fiscal year 2016. It is also the Committee's understanding that preliminary cost estimates to eliminate the seepage problem are substantially higher than those indicated in the 2012 LRR. It would appear that the issue was not afforded sufficient importance when it was initially discovered in 2009. Now, 5 years later, there is still no solution or even the design for a solution but yet there is discussion of significantly increased costs and the threat from the underseepage remains. The Committee believes it would be prudent for the Corps to assemble technical experts (not affiliated with the Corps) to concurrently review the Corps solution and cost estimates for that solution. The Committee is not interested in further slowing progress on developing this solution and would strongly encourage the Corps to find ways to shorten the current schedule, if possible. However, the Committee believes that it is important that this review be conducted to provide assurance that the most cost effective solution will be proposed and implemented and that the review can be accomplished in a manner that will not lengthen an already long schedule.

Coastal and Ocean Resiliency.—The Committee encourages the Corps to cooperate with NOAA, other appropriate Federal agencies, Governors from coastal States, academic institutions, and nonprofit organizations to identify projects that will enhance ocean and coastal ecosystem resiliency.

Great Lakes Fisheries and Ecosystem Restoration Program.—The Committee recognizes the importance of this aquatic habitat restoration program to the overall Great Lakes Restoration effort and encourages the Corps to budget for this item in future budget submissions.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Corps has ongoing, authorized construction projects that would cost tens of billions of dollars to complete, yet the administration continues to request a mere fraction of the funding necessary to complete those projects. The Committee is particularly concerned that the Secretary has executed Project Partnership Agreements with local sponsors who have committed precious local resources under the provisions of those agreements and now find those investments stranded. Project sponsors should rightfully expect the Federal Government to honor its commitments; in fact, keeping those commitments is essential to maintaining the integrity of the Corps and its civil works mission—which is crucial to the economic vitality and environmental health of the Nation. Accordingly, the Committee recommends additional funds to continue ongoing projects and activities to honor those agreements and to enhance the Nation's economic growth and international competitiveness. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either was not included in the administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. In choosing which projects to fund, the Corps should also consider if the project is positioned to permit award of significant items of construction or otherwise realize notable construction progress in fiscal year 2015; or the project sponsor expended funds under an existing Project Partnership Agreement for creditable work, including acquisition of rights-of-way; or it is selected as one of the new starts allowed in accordance with this act and the additional direction provided below. None of these funds shall be used for projects in the Continuing Authorities Program. Ongoing construction projects that are actively progressing and can utilize the funding in a timely manner are eligible for these additional funds. This includes periodic beach renourishments.

Funding associated with each category may be allocated to any eligible project within that category; funding associated with each subcategory may be allocated only to eligible projects within that subcategory. The list of subcategories is not meant to be exhaustive. Priority in allocating additional funding should consider the following: number of jobs created directly by the funded activity; the benefits of the funded work to the national economy; ability to obligate the funds allocated within the fiscal year, including consideration of the ability of the non-Federal sponsor to provide any required cost-share; ability to complete the project, separable element, or project phase within the funds allocated; for flood and storm damage reduction (including authorized nonstructural measures and periodic beach nourishments), the contribution of the project to smart growth objectives, population at risk and economic activity or public infrastructure at risk; and for navigation, number of jobs or level of economic activity to be supported by completion of the project, separable element, or project phase. A major factor to be considered for prioritizing inland waterway funding is the economic impact on the local, regional, and national economy if the

project is not funded. In addition, priority should be given to discrete elements of work that can be completed within the funding provided in this line item.

For environmental infrastructure assistance the Committee recognizes that these authorities were originally created to assist communities that were unable to compete well in the Statewide revolving fund authorities under the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency. While the Committee believes it appropriate to prioritize those projects with the greater economic impact, it recognizes that such rigid criteria may exclude rural underserved communities with greater needs. When allocating these funds the Committee encourages the Corps to consider counties or parishes where the average family income is below the national poverty level.

The five new project starts directed as part of the work plan shall be funded from the appropriate additional funding line-item. The Committee intends a total of only six new construction starts in fiscal year 2015.

It should be understood that the administration may substitute new starts from their budget request if it appears they cannot or do not meet the criteria above or the additional criteria below. The administration shall select no more than five new construction projects from the primary Corps mission areas of navigation (including small, remote and subsistence harbors), flood risk management, and shore protection and ecosystem restoration. When considering which new starts to include in the work plan, the applicable criteria previously discussed should be considered. Additional factors that should be considered for all new starts include: the out-year budget impacts of the proposed new starts; the cost sharing sponsor's ability and willingness to promptly provide their cash contribution (if any) as well as required lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations and disposal areas; the sponsor's willingness and ability to execute a project partnership agreement during the fiscal year period covered by this act; and the benefits of the project to the local population.

Within 45 days of enactment of this act, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed in accordance with those guidelines. The Committee directs that a listing should accompany the work plan showing all the ongoing construction projects that were considered eligible and could have used funding for fiscal year 2015 and the reasons why these items were considered as being less competitive for inclusion in the work plan. A project may not be excluded on the basis of being "inconsistent with administration policy". The Corps is reminded that these are funds above the administration's budget request. Administration budget request metrics should not be a reason to disqualify a project from being funded.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—The Committee has recommended funding for this program which is the only nationwide R&D program to address invasive aquatic plants. The Committee urges the Corps to continue to support cost-shared aquatic plant management programs.

Continuing Authorities Program [CAP].—The CAP (projects which do not require specific authorizing legislation) includes

projects for flood control (section 205), emergency streambank and shoreline protection (section 14), beach erosion control (section 103), mitigation of shore damages (section 111), navigation projects (section 107), snagging and clearing (section 208), aquatic ecosystem restoration (section 206), beneficial uses of dredged material (section 204), and project modifications for improvement of the environment (section 1135). The Committee has chosen to fund eight of the nine sections of the CAP program rather than only the five sections proposed in the budget request. The Committee has not funded section 208 as it believes these projects can easily be accommodated under the authority of section 205. The Committee believes that CAP funds should be expended for the CAP sections for which they were appropriated and should be executed as quickly as possible. The Committee continues to believe that the various sections of the CAP program provide a useful tool for the Corps to undertake small localized projects without being encumbered by the lengthy study and authorization phases typical of most Corps projects.

The Committee recommends a total of \$50,000,000 spread over the eight CAP sections for work in fiscal year 2015. The Committee urges the administration to execute the program laid out by the Committee and include sufficient funding for this program in future budget requests.

The Committee recognizes the significance of the coastal environment and encourages the Corps to consider projects that enhance coastal and ocean ecosystem resiliency, where possible.

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

- capability-level funds for ongoing projects that have executed cost-sharing agreements for the applicable phase;
- capability-level funds for projects that are ready for execution of new cost-sharing agreements for the applicable phase and for which Corps headquarters authorizes execution of the agreements;
- funds, as permitted by Corps policies, for other projects previously funded for the applicable phase but not ready for execution of new cost-sharing agreements; and
- funds as permitted by Corps policies, for projects not previously funded for the applicable phase.

Funds shall be allocated by headquarters to the appropriate Field Operating Agency [FOA] for projects requested by that FOA. If the FOA finds that the study/project for which funds were requested cannot proceed, the funds shall be returned to Corps headquarters and reallocated based on the nationwide priority listing. In no case should the FOA retain these funds for use on a different project than the one for which the funds were requested without the explicit approval of the Corps' headquarters.

Within the step at which available funds are exhausted for each CAP section, funds shall be allocated to the projects in that section that rank high according to the following factors: high overall performance based on outputs; high percent fiscally complete; and high unobligated carry-in. Section 14 funds shall be allocated to the

projects that address the most significant risks and adverse consequences, irrespective of phase or previous funding history.

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

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

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

Restoration of Abandoned Mines.—The Corps is directed to work closely with Federal land management agencies, Western States and tribes with abandoned non-coal mine sites to cost effectively address the greatest number of those sites presenting threats to public health and safety.

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

Appropriations, 2014	\$307,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	245,000,000
Committee recommendation	305,000,000

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

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CONSTRUCTION		
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	9,500	9,500
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	40,861	40,861
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	9,300	9,300
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	18,947	18,947
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	2,325	2,325
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	2,505	2,505
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	83,438	83,438
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	65,739	65,739
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	250	250
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	294	294
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	198	198
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	8,890	8,890
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	5,900	5,900
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	2,485	2,485
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	170	170
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	100	100
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	13,117	13,117
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	1,843	1,843
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	51	51
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	48	48
BONNET CARRE, LA	2,214	2,214
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,399	1,399
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	498	498
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	532	532
OLD RIVER, LA	8,388	8,388
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	3,262	3,262
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	24	24
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	130	130
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	42	42
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	5,494	5,494
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	185	185
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	4,898	4,898
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	807	807
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	5,705	5,705
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	1,344	1,344
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	6,629	6,629
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	967	967
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	384	384

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	544	544
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	731	731
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	200	200
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,296	4,296
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	80	80
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	1,642	1,642
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	150,853	150,853
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK DREDGING		15,000
FLOOD CONTROL		27,000
WATER SUPPLY AND RELATED AUTHORIZED PURPOSES		18,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PURPOSES		10,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	9,646	9,646
MAPPING	1,063	1,063
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	10,709	80,709
REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE		— 10,000
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	245,000	305,000

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds above the budget request to continue ongoing studies, projects or maintenance. The Committee recommends these funds for flood control, navigation, water supply, ground water protection, waterfowl management, bank stabilization, erosion and sedimentation control, and environmental restoration work. Funding is intended for ongoing work primarily along the Mississippi River tributaries that either was not included in the administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. While this additional funding is shown under remaining items, the Corps should utilize these funds in any applicable phase of work. None of these funds may be used to start new projects or activities.

The Committee directs that priority in allocating these funds be given to completing or accelerating ongoing work which will enhance the region and Nation's economic development, job growth and international competitiveness, or is located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters. Within 45 days of enactment of this act, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed. The Committee directs that a listing should accompany the work plan showing all the studies and construction projects that were considered eligible and could have used funding for fiscal year 2015 and the reasons why these items were considered as being less competitive for inclusion in the work plan.

A study or project may not be excluded on the basis of being "inconsistent with administration policy". The Corps is reminded that these are funds above the administration's budget request. Administration budget request metrics should not be a reason to disqualify a study or project from being funded.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2014	\$2,861,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	2,600,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,800,000,000

This appropriation funds operation, maintenance, and related activities at the water resources projects that the Corps operates and maintains. Work to be accomplished consists of dredging, repair, and operation of structures and other facilities, as authorized in the various river and harbor, flood control, and water resources development acts. Related activities include aquatic plant control, monitoring of completed projects where appropriate, removal of sunken vessels, and the collection of domestic waterborne commerce statistics.

Maintenance of our aging water infrastructure inventory gets more expensive every year; however, it is consistently underfunded. If this trend continues, the Corps will not be able to maintain expected levels of service at all of its projects. The Committee is pleased that the budget request increases spending for Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund activities by \$25,000,000 over the fiscal year 2014 budget request. The Committee has increased funding in this account in order to provide in excess of \$1,060,000,000 in expenditures for Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund activities.

The Committee has maintained its tradition of supporting what the budget request terms as “low use harbors and waterways.” The Committee recognizes the importance of these facilities and will continue to provide funding for them. The Committee understands that the O&M budget fluctuates from year to year due to periodic maintenance dredging requirements, however, the general trend should be for this budget to increase. Nearly 75 percent of the O&M budget consists of labor and dredging costs in most years. Labor costs rarely decrease for the Corps as it takes roughly the same amount of manpower to operate Corps projects on a yearly basis. That means that when the budget request is reduced, the only areas available to reduce are dredging and maintenance items.

The Corps is to be commended for managing to keep as much of their infrastructure operable as they have with the O&M budgets that have been put forward and enacted.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA-COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	189	189
ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	13,443	13,443
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	21,661	21,661
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,493	5,493
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	26,633	26,633
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	148	148
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL & MS	1,700	1,700
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	24,191	24,191
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	8,101	8,101

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL	30	30
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	11,001	11,001
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	3,555	3,555
COOK INLET SHOALS, AK	2,616	2,616
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	1,140	1,140
HOMER HARBOR, AK	520	520
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	167	167
LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL (SEWARD) AK	300	300
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	319	319
NOME HARBOR, AK	1,451	1,451
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	921	921
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,859	1,859
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	105	105
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,280	1,280
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	48	48
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	405	405
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	8,000	8,000
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	7,558	7,558
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,927	1,927
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	7,523	7,523
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	9,162	9,162
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	5,652	5,652
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,912	1,912
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,631	1,631
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,509	1,509
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	7,272	7,272
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	539	539
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	27,553	27,553
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,691	2,691
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	5,639	5,639
NIMROD LAKE, AR	2,163	2,163
NORFORK LAKE, AR	6,137	6,137
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	15	15
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	9,234	9,234
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,376	6,376
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	3	3
WHITE RIVER, AR	31	31
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	3	3
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,233	2,233
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,976	1,976
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	5,249	5,249
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,106	3,106
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	5,085	5,085
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	558	558
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,059	2,059
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	1,800	1,800
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CA	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	4,329	4,329
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,560	1,560
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	7,740	7,740
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	5,884	5,884
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	394	394
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	383	383

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,060	2,060
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,639	2,639
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	2,255	2,255
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	21,970	21,970
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,700	1,700
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	3,259	3,259
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,647	1,647
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	1,900	1,900
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	7,900	7,900
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,300	1,300
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,394	1,394
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	200	200
SAN FRANCISCO BAY DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,187	1,187
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	275	275
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	3,360	3,360
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,900	1,900
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	4,952	4,952
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	2,400	2,400
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,942	3,942
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,380	2,380
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,538	1,538
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,272	2,272
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,400	2,400
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA (DAM SAFETY)	2,143	2,143
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	3,354	3,354
YUBA RIVER, CA	3,178	3,178
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	696	696
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,475	1,475
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,036	1,036
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CO	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	441	441
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	3,057	3,057
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	646	646
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,762	1,762
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	548	548
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	675	675
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	431	431
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	1,158	1,158
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CT	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	334	334
LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT	329	329
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	771	771
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	476	476
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	850	850
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	1,066	1,066
THOMASTON DAM, CT	820	820
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	647	647
DELAWARE		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DE	40	40
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	22,355	22,355
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	200	200
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,690	3,690
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	125	125
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	875	875
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	25	25

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	25	25
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	6,505	6,505
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	15,112	15,112
ESCAMBIA AND CONECHU RIVERS, FL & AL	130	130
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	1,300	1,300
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	600	600
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,450	6,450
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	7,615	7,615
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,645	2,645
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	100	100
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,159	2,159
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	3,300	3,300
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	2,084	2,084
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	500	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,306	1,306
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,200	3,200
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	33	33
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	9,031	9,031
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	10,000	10,000
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	100	100
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	7,927	7,927
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	2,541	2,541
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	176	176
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,862	3,862
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	9,547	9,547
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	8,593	8,593
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	11,052	11,052
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	277	277
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	13,477	13,477
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	125	125
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	8,759	8,759
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	16,420	16,420
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	109	109
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	7,823	7,823
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	1,412	1,412
HILO HARBOR, HI	1,900	1,900
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	2,200	2,200
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	677	677
KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	2,200	2,200
NAWILWILI HARBOR, HI	1,500	1,500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	861	861
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,160	1,160
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,732	2,732
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	355	355
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	2,618	2,618
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	578	578
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	2,523	2,523
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	5,680	5,680
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,675	2,675
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	560	560
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	370	370

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	39,389	39,389
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,826	1,826
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL	50	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	2,347	2,347
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,988	1,988
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	775	775
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,658	5,658
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION), IL	52,900	52,900
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION), IL	25,624	25,624
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	106	106
REND LAKE, IL	6,072	6,072
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	702	702
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	1,370	1,370
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,189	1,189
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	1,127	1,127
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	1,392	1,392
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	13,814	13,814
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	967	967
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	1,142	1,142
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,279	1,279
MONROE LAKE, IN	1,395	1,395
PATOKA LAKE, IN	1,168	1,168
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	185	185
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	1,129	1,129
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	139	139
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	4,084	4,084
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	695	695
MISSOURI RIVER-SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO & NE	10,624	10,624
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD	7,700	7,700
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	3,313	3,313
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	4,576	4,576
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	6,266	6,266
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,544	2,544
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,765	1,765
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	950	950
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	1,083	1,083
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,064	1,064
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	970	970
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	1,004	1,004
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,873	1,873
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,828	1,828
MARION LAKE, KS	1,997	1,997
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,660	2,660
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,174	2,174
PEARSON-SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	3,653	3,653
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,394	2,394
POMONA LAKE, KS	2,155	2,155
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	312	312
TORONTO LAKE, KS	715	715
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,258	2,258
WILSON LAKE, KS	2,014	2,014
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	9,933	9,933
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,578	2,578
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,885	1,885

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,644	1,644
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,873	1,873
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,763	1,763
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	15	15
FALLS OF THE OHIO NATIONAL WILDLIFE, KY & IN	19	19
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	2,079	2,079
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,467	1,467
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,085	2,085
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,452	2,452
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	1,028	1,028
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	10	10
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	2,587	2,587
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	257	257
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,596	2,596
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	42,856	42,856
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	5,200	5,200
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,237	1,237
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	2	2
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,660	2,660
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,170	1,170
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	8,587	8,587
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,175	1,175
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOU CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA	7,759	7,759
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	131	131
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	1,277	1,277
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	1,119	1,119
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	23	23
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	25	25
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	15	15
BAYOU TECHE, LA	156	156
CADDO LAKE, LA	204	204
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	11,721	11,721
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,789	1,789
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	20,837	20,837
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	1,652	1,652
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,044	1,044
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,260	8,260
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	14	14
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	4	4
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,471	2,471
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,985	1,985
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LA	85,341	85,341
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	59	59
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	200	200
WALLACE LAKE, LA	217	217
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	16	16
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	36	36
MAINE		
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	1,050	1,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, ME	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	127	127
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,100	1,100
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	25	25
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	23,725	23,725
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	325	325

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	156	156
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	140	140
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,870	1,870
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	450	450
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	62	62
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,500	1,500
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	1,110	1,110
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	851	851
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	752	752
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	15,574	15,574
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	632	632
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	265	265
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	698	698
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	702	702
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, MA	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	344	344
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	589	589
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	629	629
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA	564	564
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	900	900
TULLY LAKE, MA	673	673
WEST HILL DAM, MA	642	642
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	659	659
MICHIGAN		
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	179	179
DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,969	5,969
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	522	522
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	219	219
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	28	28
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	500	500
MONROE HARBOR, MI	1,000	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	710	710
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	3,001	3,001
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	50	50
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,561	1,561
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	39,860	39,860
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,733	2,733
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE-WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	278	278
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	5,600	5,600
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	461	461
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	657	657
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	259	259
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION), MN	54,472	54,472
ORWELL LAKE, MN	555	555
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	88	88
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	176	176
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,612	3,612
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	483	483
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	2,211	2,211
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	1	1
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	285	285
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	5,050	5,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	116	116
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	34	34
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,818	1,818

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	7,740	7,740
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	150	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	152	152
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	9	9
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS	115	115
YAZOO RIVER, MS	21	21
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	12	12
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	7,187	7,187
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	3,316	3,316
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	9,311	9,311
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	1,410	1,410
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	916	916
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	930	930
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL ...	27,146	27,146
NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MO	23	23
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,461	2,461
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	3	3
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	112	112
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,473	1,473
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	1	1
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,675	4,675
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR	9,609	9,609
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	6,098	6,098
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	185	185
LIBBY DAM, MT	1,975	1,975
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	230	230
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	9,185	9,185
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	26,398	26,398
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	466	466
MISSOURI RIVER-KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	79	79
PAPILLION CREEK, NE	863	863
SALT CREEKS AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	1,038	1,038
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	67	67
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	1,462	1,462
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	407	407
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	672	672
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	897	897
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	798	798
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,370	1,370
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	84	84
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	878	878
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	250	250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	714	714
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	420	420
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	375	375
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	15	15
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	20,445	20,445
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NJ	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	355	355
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	370	370

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	260	260
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	300	300
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	617	617
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,844	1,844
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	100	100
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	40	40
SHARK RIVER, NJ	350	350
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	2,794	2,794
COCHITI LAKE, NM	3,587	3,587
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	2,794	2,794
GALISTEO DAM, NM	1,150	1,150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NM	30	30
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	654	654
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	1,392	1,392
RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, NM	2,492	2,492
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,594	1,594
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	330	330
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	797	797
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	1,289	1,289
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	578	578
ARKPORT DAM, NY	502	502
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	4,050	4,050
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,686	1,686
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,290	1,290
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	300	300
EAST RIVER, NY	250	250
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	220	220
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	697	697
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	100	100
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	50	50
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	20	20
GREAT KILLS HARBOR, NY	30	30
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	50	50
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	5,200	5,200
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O & C)	2,500	2,500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NY	20	20
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	1,522	1,522
JAMAICA BAY, NY	220	220
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	3,842	3,842
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	450	450
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	100	100
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	7,413	7,413
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	9,300	9,300
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	1,045	1,045
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	10	10
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	2,140	2,140
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	60	60
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	786	786
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	610	610
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	905	905
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	2,600	2,600
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,856	1,856
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	483	483
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,909	1,909
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	264	264
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	800	800

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	50	50
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	4,855	4,855
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	700	700
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	550	550
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	300	300
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	3,293	3,293
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	14,127	14,127
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN HALEY, ND	302	302
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	12,703	12,703
HOMME LAKE, ND	351	351
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	339	339
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,290	1,290
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	1,076	1,076
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	106	106
SOURIS RIVER, ND	366	366
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	32	32
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	1,483	1,483
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	2,280	2,280
BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,091	2,091
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,967	1,967
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	1,494	1,494
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	7,634	7,634
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	1,553	1,553
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	2,259	2,259
DILLON LAKE, OH	1,387	1,387
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,215	1,215
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	659	659
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	51	51
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	985	985
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	906	906
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	8,514	8,514
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	298	298
OHIO-MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH	1,763	1,763
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,576	1,576
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	305	305
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	35	35
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,600	1,600
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	255	255
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	6,143	6,143
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	948	948
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	1,217	1,217
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	1,429	1,429
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	409	409
BIRCH LAKE, OK	778	778
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	3,275	3,275
CANTON LAKE, OK	2,199	2,199
COPAN LAKE, OK	4,542	4,542
EUFULA LAKE, OK	5,761	5,761
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	6,066	6,066
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	896	896
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	340	340
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	673	673
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,828	1,828
HULAH LAKE, OK	734	734
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	141	141
KAW LAKE, OK	2,244	2,244

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	5,435	5,435
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,355	5,355
OLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,580	2,580
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	27	27
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	138	138
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,884	1,884
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK	6,090	6,090
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,039	1,039
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	1,100	1,100
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,680	1,680
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	4,865	4,865
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,173	1,173
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	5,023	5,023
WISTER LAKE, OK	1,133	1,133
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	972	972
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	5,770	5,770
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,493	7,493
CHETCO RIVER, OR	26	26
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	25,463	25,463
COOS BAY, OR	6,423	6,423
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	26	26
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	1,315	1,315
COUGAR LAKE, OR	2,590	2,590
DEPOE BAY, OR	7	7
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,227	1,227
DORENA LAKE, OR	1,249	1,249
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	177	177
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	6,052	6,052
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,736	1,736
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,299	2,299
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	5,249	5,249
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	592	592
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,234	5,234
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,729	1,729
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,237	3,237
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,569	7,569
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	365	365
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	31	31
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	74	74
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	32	32
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	2,806	2,806
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	59	59
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	128	128
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	244	244
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	616	616
YAUQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	3,252	3,252
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,721	4,721
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	607	607
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	279	279
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,835	1,835
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,670	2,670
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,651	1,651
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,860	1,860
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,561	1,561
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	889	889
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	5,410	5,410
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,259	1,259
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	1,256	1,256

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	916	916
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	300	300
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, PA	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	1,222	1,222
JOHNSTOWN, PA	65	65
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,234	1,234
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,898	1,898
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,121	1,121
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	22,621	22,621
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	30,097	30,097
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	700	700
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	170	170
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	475	475
PUNKSUTAWNEY, PA	40	40
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,817	3,817
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	45	45
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,805	1,805
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	537	537
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	105	105
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,292	2,292
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,875	1,875
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	400	400
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	957	957
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	965	965
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,232	2,232
PUERTO RICO		
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	800	800
RHODE ISLAND		
FOX POINT BARRIER, NARRAGANSETT BAY, RI	3,956	3,956
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, RI	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	48	48
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	350	350
WOONSOCKET, RI	1,088	1,088
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	500	500
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	13,149	13,149
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,930	5,930
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	67	67
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	875	875
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	10,409	10,409
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	412	412
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	291	291
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	11,252	11,252
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	153	153
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	609	609
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	12,256	12,256
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	121	121
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,568	5,568
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	8,945	8,945
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	7,587	7,587
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	6,818	6,818
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	94	94
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,896	4,896
NORTHWEST TENNESSEE REGIONAL HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, TN	10	10
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	12,059	12,059

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	2	2
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	24,864	24,864
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	239	239
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	1,397	1,397
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VIII, TX	1,827	1,827
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,966	1,966
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,164	3,164
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,242	2,242
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	6,300	6,300
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,655	2,655
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,677	2,677
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	200	200
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,900	6,900
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	11,224	11,224
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	40	40
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	3,432	3,432
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	10,600	10,600
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	8,900	8,900
GIWW. CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	2,700	2,700
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,002	2,002
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,476	2,476
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	25,761	25,761
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,433	1,433
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	31,840	31,840
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	1,878	1,878
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,957	1,957
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,729	1,729
LAKE KEMP, TX	260	260
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,046	3,046
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	4,339	4,339
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,000	8,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	2,621	2,621
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,242	2,242
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,169	1,169
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,393	1,393
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,319	2,319
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	300	300
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	2,097	2,097
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	11,500	11,500
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	9,235	9,235
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	278	278
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,893	2,893
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,656	2,656
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	350	350
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	4,975	4,975
WACO LAKE, TX	2,958	2,958
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	3,353	3,353
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	6,891	6,891
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	3,495	3,495
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	40	40
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	561	561
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN, VT	1,044	1,044
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	643	643
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	105	105
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	756	756
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	1,569	1,569

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	849	849
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	694	694
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA	2,390	2,390
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA	4,555	4,555
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	500	500
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,081	2,081
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR, VA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	1,540	1,540
HAMPTON ROADS, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	104	104
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, VA	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	335	335
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,696	3,696
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	10,685	10,685
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,996	1,996
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	200	200
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	10,990	10,990
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	608	608
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	6,442	6,442
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	1,186	1,186
RUDEE INLET, VA	300	300
WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATIONS, VA	135	135
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	589	589
COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND, OR ...	47,040	47,040
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	1,199	1,199
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	4,115	4,115
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,192	1,192
GRAYS HARBOR, WA	10,256	10,256
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	3,520	3,520
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,989	4,989
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA	49	49
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	840	840
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	12,404	12,404
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,576	2,576
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,840	3,840
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,646	2,646
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	2,913	2,913
MOUNT SAINT HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	260	260
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	4,122	4,122
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	746	746
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,100	1,100
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,470	1,470
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	381	381
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	1,498	1,498
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	274	274
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	64	64
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	159	159
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	4,911	4,911
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,338	1,338
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	2,304	2,304
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,505	2,505
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	2,824	2,824
ELKINS, WV	57	57
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	438	438
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	9,035	9,035
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	31,759	31,759
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,895	2,895
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	2,322	2,322

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,270	1,270
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,547	2,547
SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,519	2,519
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,305	1,305
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	747	747
FOX RIVER, WI	2,972	2,972
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	2,881	2,881
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	55	55
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	10	10
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	2,110	2,110
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	304	304
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	21	21
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	556	556
WYOMING		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WY	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	67	67
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	2,007	2,007
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	90	90
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	2,439,962	2,439,962
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:		
NAVIGATION MAINTENANCE		20,000
DEEP-DRAFT HARBOR AND CHANNEL		110,000
INLAND WATERWAYS		40,000
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE HARBORS AND CHANNELS		35,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PURPOSES		27,300
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	675	675
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT (FEM)	3,250	3,250
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS PROGRAMS:		
STEWARDSHIP SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,000	1,000
PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	3,939	3,939
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,650	1,650
OPTIMIZATION TOOLS FOR NAVIGATION	322	322
COASTAL AND OCEAN DATA SYSTEM	3,400	5,400
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,700	2,700
RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AT CORPS PROJECTS	5,000	5,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	6,000	6,000
DREDGE MCFARLAND READY RESERVE	11,690	11,690
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	15,000	15,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,119	1,119
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,450	6,450
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	2,820	2,820
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	270
FACILITY PROTECTION (CISP)	3,500	3,500
FISH & WILDLIFE OPERATING FISH HATCHERY REIMBURSEMENT	4,700	4,700
GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL	600	600
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,000	3,000
INTERAGENCY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TASK FORCE/HURRICANE PROTECTION DECISION CHRONOLOGY (IPET/HPDC) LESSONS LEARNED IMPLEMENTATION	5,800	5,800
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	28,000	28,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,300	8,000
NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL (MULTIPLE PROJECT) NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	6,800	6,800
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM	6,072	6,072
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM (PORTFOLIO RISK ASSESSMENT)	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	4,500	4,500
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATIONS	1,071	1,071

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT	281	281
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,669	4,669
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	795	795
RECREATIONONESTOP (R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION SERVICE	65	65
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,800	1,800
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB	300	300
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	500	2,500
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	160,038	402,038
REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	- 42,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	2,600,000	2,800,000

Lowell Creek Tunnel, Alaska.—The Committee recognizes the current problems with the existing Lowell Creek Tunnel and encourages the Corps to undertake a study for an alternative method of flood diversion for Lowell Canyon.

Mud Mountain Dam, Washington.—The Committee is aware that the National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS] is preparing a Biological Opinion [BiOp] to determine the impact of ongoing operation of Mud Mountain Dam on Endangered Species Act [ESA]-listed species and is engaged in consultation with the Corps. The Committee is also aware that an updated BiOp is anticipated in Fiscal Year 2014. The Committee encourages the Corps to continue consultation with NMFS and urges the Corps to work with resource comanagers to develop interim and long-term measures to maintain fish runs past Mud Mountain Dam, while upholding ESA and tribal treaty responsibilities.

Movable Bridges at Navigation Projects.—The Committee understands that the Corps has responsibility for maintenance of movable bridges that are features of existing Corps navigation projects. The Committee is concerned that maintenance of these bridges may be deferred given constraints on civil works funding and the fact that bridge maintenance may have substantial benefits but not necessarily to the three civil works missions of commercial navigation, flood mitigation, and aquatic ecosystem restoration. It is unclear to the Committee if the Corps has a clear idea of the bridges in its national inventory and the magnitude of the maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement needs. The Corps is directed to provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report on movable bridges where the Corps has the primary maintenance responsibility 180 days after the enactment of this Act. The report should include:

- The number of movable bridges in the USACE inventory;
- the year built;
- the average daily traffic count;
- the feature for which the bridge serves as a crossing;
- the bridge's sufficiency rating;
- the bridge's current weight restriction, if any, due to maintenance issues;
- whether the bridge serves as part of an evacuation route;
- any notable impact on local traffic conditions caused by current state of maintenance, such as traffic bottlenecks or length of detour if bridge is taken out of service
- the annual cost incurred by USACE on maintenance over the last 10 years
- estimated replacement costs for the bridges if known; and
- local municipality cost-share of maintenance or replacement either provided over the last 10 years or offered currently, if any.

Dredging Study.—The Corps of Engineers shall provide a study, to House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 180 days of enactment, analyzing the impacts to the Treasury of insufficient maintenance dredging, utilizing the Corps' most recent annual overall tonnage data from the Navigation Data Center Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center, at the Nation's top 50 ranked ports by total tonnage. The study shall include the economic losses at those ports and waterways due to not being at their authorized depths

and widths, and the resulting impact to the Treasury from loss of revenue. The Corps of Engineers should also address whether fully funding the dredging needs at those with significant economic impact would result in additional revenue to the Treasury.

Zebra and Quagga Mussels.—The Committee understands the challenges posed by the invasion of zebra and quagga mussels in various places across the country, and that invasion has not yet occurred in the Pacific Northwest and Lake Tahoe. Given the significant Federal assets in the region, it is prudent to determine the vulnerabilities of the infrastructure. The Committee recognizes that the Corps of Engineers has made significant progress in completing invasive mussel vulnerability assessments at Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, and Lower Granite dams, and is working on assessments at Libby, Albeni Falls, and Chief Joseph dams. The Committee directs the Corps to initiate and complete assessments at McNary, Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Dworshak, and Little Goose dams. The Committee also recognizes that the power share of each of the assessments is reimbursed by the Bonneville Power Administration. Further, the Committee urges the Corps, where appropriate, to assist the States in their efforts to prevent the spread of invasive mussels to Federal projects in the region.

Modification of Corps Projects Utilizing Section 408 Permits.—The Committee has significant concerns over situations where communities that want to enhance their flood control systems, including the portions of those systems operated by the Corps, may be facing deadlines to complete those enhancements in order to avoid significant flood insurance premium increases due to flood risk map revisions. The Committee believes that, where there are significant populations and property at-risk, reviews under the Corps Section 408 program should be accelerated to the extent practicable. It is the Committee's understanding that the Corps intends to issue a new guidance document in the coming months containing the policy and procedures for how it will evaluate requests by others to alter Corps projects pursuant to section 408. The Committee urges the Corps to ensure delegation of permit approval authority to the district level, where possible, and the streamlining of the environmental review process to provide a more scalable process for environmental compliance. The Committee expects the Corps to report back to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 60 days after the enactment of this act on the actions taken to address this issue.

Monitoring of Completed Navigation Projects.—As Corps' navigation infrastructure continues to age, it is more important than ever to monitor this infrastructure to ensure that it continues operating as planned. The Committee has recommended additional funding to ensure that the necessary resources are available for these monitoring needs.

Water Operations Technical Support.—The Committee has recommended additional funding for research into atmospheric rivers in an effort to develop and demonstrate better prediction capabilities and apply the science to improve reservoir operations to optimize multi-purpose project objectives and to meet stakeholder water needs.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The fiscal year 2015 budget request does not fund operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of our Nation's aging infrastructure sufficiently to ensure continued competitiveness in a global marketplace. Federal navigation channels maintained at only a fraction of authorized dimensions, and navigation locks and hydropower facilities well beyond their design life result in economic inefficiencies and risks infrastructure failure, which cause substantial economic losses. The Committee believes that investing in operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of infrastructure today will save taxpayers money in the future.

The Committee recommendation includes additional funds to continue ongoing projects and activities including periodic dredging of ports and harbors. None of these funds may be used for any item where funding was specifically denied. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either was not included in the administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. The Committee directs that priority in allocating these funds be given to completing ongoing work maintaining authorized depths and widths of harbors and shipping channels, including where contaminated sediments are present, and for addressing critical maintenance backlog. Particular emphasis should be placed on projects where there is a U.S. Coast Guard or other water safety/police force presence; that will enhance national, regional, or local economic development; or that will promote job growth or international competitiveness.

The Committee is concerned that the administration's criteria for navigation maintenance does not allow small, remote, or subsistence harbors and waterways to properly compete for scarce navigation maintenance funds. The Committee urges the Corps to revise the criteria used for determining which navigation maintenance projects are funded in order to develop a reasonable and equitable allocation under this account. The criteria should include the economic impact that these projects provide to local and regional economies, in particular, those with national defense or public health and safety importance.

Funding associated with each category may be allocated to any eligible project within that category; funding associated with each subcategory may be allocated only to eligible projects within that subcategory. The list of subcategories is not meant to be exhaustive. Priority in allocating these funds should consider the following: number of jobs created directly by the funded activity; benefits to the local, regional, or national economy; ability to obligate the funds allocated within the fiscal year; ability to complete the project, separable element, or project phase within the funds allocated; and risk of imminent failure or closure of the facility.

Within 45 days of enactment of this act, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed. The plan should include: (1) the ratings system developed and used to evaluate projects; (2) a summary of the work to be accomplished with each allocation; and (3) a list and description of each discrepancy between the results of the project evaluations and the allocations made. No funds shall be obligated for any project in the work plan which has not been justified in such a report. The Committee di-

rects that a listing should accompany the work plan showing all the ongoing projects that were considered eligible and could have used funding for fiscal year 2014 and the reasons why these items were considered as being less competitive for inclusion in the work plan.

A project may not be excluded on the basis of being “inconsistent with administration policy”. The Corps is reminded that these are funds above the administration’s budget request. Administration budget request metrics should not be a reason to disqualify a project from being funded.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2014	\$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	200,000,000
Committee recommendation	200,000,000

The Committee recommends \$200,000,000 for the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers.

This appropriation provides for salaries and costs incurred administering regulation of activities affecting U.S. waters, including wetlands, in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 33 U.S.C. 401; the Clean Water Act of 1977, Public Law 95-217; and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, Public Law 92-532.

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

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2014	\$103,499,000
Budget estimate, 2015	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

The Committee recommends \$100,000,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] in fiscal year 2015.

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

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

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

The Corps is directed to prioritize sites that are nearing completion. Within the funds provided in accordance with the budget request, the Corps is directed to complete the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study of the former Sylvania nuclear fuel site at Hicksville, New York, and, as appropriate, to proceed expeditiously to a Record of Decision and initiation of any necessary remediation in

accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act [CERCLA].

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2014	\$28,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	28,000,000
Committee recommendation	28,000,000

The Committee recommends \$28,000,000 for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies. This account provides funds for preparedness activities for natural and other disasters, response, and emergency flood fighting and rescue operations, hurricane response, and emergency shore protection work. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean water where the source has been contaminated or where adequate supplies of water are needed for consumption.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2014	\$182,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	178,000,000
Committee recommendation	178,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommends \$178,000,000.

Executive Direction and Management.—The Office of the Chief of Engineers and 8 division offices supervise work in 38 district offices.

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

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

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

Office of Congressional Affairs.—The Committee believes that an Office of Congressional Affairs for the Civil Works Program would hamper the efficient and effective coordination of issues with the Committee staff and Members of Congress. The Committee believes that the technical knowledge and managerial expertise needed for the Corps headquarters to effectively address Civil Works authorization, appropriation, and headquarters policy matters resides in the Civil Works organization. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that the Office of Congressional Affairs not be a part of the process by which information on Civil Works projects, programs, and activities is provided to Congress.

The committee directs the Corps to provide an accounting of the uses, effectiveness and cost savings of Alternative Dispute Resolution, as outlined in the Handbook for Corps Managers, including in encroachment cases for calendar year 2014.

The Corps is reminded that General Expense funds are appropriated solely for the executive management and oversight of the

Civil Works Program under the direction of the Director of Civil Works.

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

Appropriations, 2014	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	5,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

The Committee has recommended \$5,000,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works [OASA[CW]].

The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works advises the Secretary of the Army on a variety of matters, including the Civil Works program of the Corps of Engineers. The Assistant Secretary is a member of the Army Secretariat with responsibilities, such as participating in continuity of Government exercises that extend well beyond Civil Works.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The bill includes language concerning reprogramming guidelines.

Section 102. The bill includes language concerning funding transfers requested by the administration related to fish hatcheries.

Section 103. The bill includes language concerning a cost ceiling increase for an R&D program.

Section 104. The bill includes language concerning allocation of funds.

Section 105. The bill includes language concerning funds cancellation.

Section 106. The bill includes language concerning a cost ceiling increase.

Section 107. The bill includes language concerning energy ports.

Section 108. The bill includes language concerning a change to the scope of a study.

TITLE II
 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
 CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2014	¹ \$8,725,000
Budget estimate, 2015	² 7,300,000
Committee recommendation	³ 7,300,000

¹Funded as a stand-alone account under the Department of Interior in the fiscal year 2014 enacted bill.

²Proposed as a separate account within the Bureau of Reclamation.

³The Committee recommendation includes this as a stand-alone account under the Department of Interior for fiscal year 2015.

The Committee recommends \$7,300,000 for the Central Utah Project Completion account which includes \$5,000,000 for Central Utah project construction, \$1,000,000 for transfer to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission and \$1,300,000 for necessary expenses of the Secretary of the Interior. Legislative language is included which allows up to \$1,500,000 of the funds provided to be used for administrative costs.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

INTRODUCTION

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

While Reclamation only has projects in the 17 Western States (that is, west of the 100th parallel), its programs impact the entire Nation. Reclamation is the largest wholesaler of water in the country, operating 348 reservoirs with a total storage capacity of 245 million acre-feet. Reclamation projects deliver 10 trillion gallons of water to more than 31 million people each year, and provide 1 out of 5 Western farmers (140,000) with irrigation water for 10 million

acres of farmland that produce 60 percent of the Nation’s vegetables and 25 percent of its fruits and nuts. Reclamation manages, with partners, 289 recreation sites that have 90 million visits annually.

OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET REQUEST

Below is a table that compares Reclamation’s fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 budget requests. Overall it is a fairly static request with the primary reduction to the Water and Related Resources account (down \$30,435,000) and the primary increase to the Indian Water Rights Settlement account (up \$11,339,000). It should be noted that the table includes the Central Utah Completion Act account as proposed in the administration’s budget request. As previously noted, it was appropriated as a separate account in fiscal year 2014 and the Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2015 also includes it as a separate account under the Department of the Interior.

[In thousands of dollars]

Account	Fiscal year 2014 administration request	Fiscal year 2015 administration request
Water and Related Resources	791,135	760,700
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	53,288	56,995
California Bay-Delta Restoration	37,000	37,000
Policy and Administration	60,000	59,500
Indian Water Rights Settlements	78,661	90,000
San Joaquin River Restoration	26,000	32,000
Central Utah Project Completion Account	8,725	7,300
Subtotal	1,049,584	1,043,495
Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account (Rescission)		- 500
Total	1,049,584	1,042,995

The Committee has concerns about the ever increasing requests in the Indian Water Rights Settlement account and the corresponding reductions to the Water and Related Resources account. Funding for Indian Water Rights Settlements was proposed at \$51,483,000 and funding for Water and Related Resources was proposed at \$805,187,000 in fiscal year 2012, the first year this account was proposed. For fiscal year 2015, the numbers are \$90,000,000 and \$760,700,000 respectively.

The Committee believes that the administration’s request for the Indian Water Rights Settlement account is not unreasonable based on the requirements of the settlements. However, the Committee is concerned that rather than increasing Reclamation’s budget to cover these settlements, it appears that the administration is just shifting funding from the Water and Related Resources account to fund the settlements leaving considerable Reclamation work, both tribal and nontribal, in the Water and Related Resources account unfunded.

The Committee fully supports these settlements but believes they should not be funded at the cost of other vitally needed work. With other proposed legislative settlements of water rights on the horizon, the Commissioner and the Secretary need to ensure that Reclamation has sufficient resources to fund these settlements while

ensuring that Reclamation's regular work of providing water and power to the West does not suffer from deferral of work due to funding shortages.

The Water and Related Resources account is proposed at \$760,700,000 a decrease of \$30,435,000 from the fiscal year 2014 budget request. This account includes funds for operating and maintaining existing facilities as well supports the development, management and restoration of water and related natural resources. Work will be done in cooperation with other Federal agencies and non-Federal entities to reduce conflict, facilitate solutions to complex water issues and stretch limited water supplies.

The Committee believes that the budget request for the Water and Related Resources account is inadequate to fund the water and power needs in the West. Aging infrastructure continues to be a major concern as to whether projects will continue to provide the benefits to the economy for which they were constructed. New stresses on water supplies from population growth to drought require innovative ways to wring every bit of efficiency that is possible out of the existing infrastructure.

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund is proposed at \$56,995,000 for fiscal year 2015. This is an increase of \$3,707,000 from the fiscal year 2014 enacted amount. This account is primarily funded from revenues collected from water and power customers. Levels of funding in this account are based on a 3-year rolling average of revenues collected.

Through revenues generated by project beneficiaries, this account provides for habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition and other fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Central Valley Project Area of California.

The California Bay-Delta Restoration account is proposed at \$37,000,000 for fiscal year 2015. This is the same as the fiscal year 2014 enacted amount.

This account funds a collaborative effort involving State and Federal agencies and other stakeholders to improve fish and wildlife habitat, water supply reliability, water quality, and levee integrity in the San Francisco Bay-San Joaquin River Delta.

The Policy and Administration account is requested at \$59,500,000 for fiscal year 2015. This is an decrease of \$500,000 from the fiscal year 2014 enacted amount.

This account supports the direction and management of all Reclamation activities as performed by the Commissioner's office and the five regional offices of Reclamation.

The Committee has accepted the \$500,000 rescission that is proposed in the budget request of unobligated balances from the Reclamation Loan Program. This account last received funds in fiscal year 2002.

DROUGHT

The Committee is particularly concerned about the continued drought in the West. The U.S. Drought Monitor for June 10, 2014, shows that only three Reclamation States (Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota) are currently not suffering from drought conditions. Ten of the remaining 14 Reclamation States are suffering from severe to exceptional drought over large portions of the individual

States. Nearly all of California, one-half of Nevada and the southern Great Plains are suffering from extreme to exceptional drought.

The Committee recognizes that drought is a difficult condition to address while a drought is occurring. However, there are many things that can be done to stretch available water supplies. Reclamation and the Department of the Interior are encouraged to use all of the flexibility and tools at their disposal to mitigate the impacts of this drought. The Committee is pleased to see that Reclamation has increased the funding for WaterSmart grants that increase efficiencies in current water uses. The Committee also appreciates Reclamation including a line in the budget request under WaterSmart to provide Drought Response and Comprehensive Drought Plans.

However, these efforts are insufficient to address the current scope of this drought and do nothing to address the next drought. The Committee believes that the only answers to these chronic droughts are a combination of additional storage, improved conveyance and increased efficiencies in the uses of water both for agriculture and potable purposes. As the West has consistently been the fastest growing part of the country, it is incumbent on Reclamation to lead the way in increasing the water that is available from one year to the next and to incentivize more efficient use of the water that is available.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The table below provides the fiscal year 2015 Committee recommendation for the Central Utah Project and the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal year 2015 as compared to the fiscal year 2014 enacted amounts.

[In thousands of dollars]

Account	Fiscal year 2014 omnibus	Fiscal year 2015 Senate recommendation
Central Utah Project Completion Account	8,725	7,300
Subtotal—CUPCA	8,725	7,300
Water and Related Resources	954,085	1,069,705
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	53,288	56,995
California Bay-Delta Restoration	37,000	37,000
Policy and Administration	60,000	59,500
Indian Water Rights Settlements
San Joaquin River Restoration
Subtotal—Bureau of Reclamation	1,113,098	1,223,200
Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account (Rescission)	— 500
Grand Total—Department of the Interior	1,113,098	1,230,000

The Committee recommends funding for Indian Water Rights Settlements and the San Joaquin River Restoration in the Water and Related Resources line in the fiscal year 2015 recommendation as was done in the fiscal year 2014 omnibus.

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2014	1 \$954,085,000
Budget estimate, 2015	760,700,000
Committee recommendation	2 1,069,705,000

¹Included \$78,700,000 for Indian water rights settlements and \$26,000,000 for the San Joaquin River settlement proposed as separate accounts in the fiscal year 2014 budget request.

²Includes \$90,000,000 for Indian water rights settlements and \$32,000,000 for the San Joaquin River settlement proposal as separate accounts in the fiscal year 2015 budget request.

An appropriation of \$1,069,705,000 is recommended for Water and Related Resources. Also included within this amount are the proposed budgeted funding levels for Indian Water Rights Settlements and the San Joaquin River Restoration.

The Water and Related Resources account supports the development, management, and restoration of water and related natural resources in the 17 Western States. The account includes funds for operating and maintaining existing facilities to obtain the greatest overall level of benefits, to protect public safety, and to conduct studies on ways to improve the use of water and related natural resources. Work will be done in partnership and cooperation with non-Federal entities and other Federal agencies.

The Committee has increased funding in the Water and Related Resources account on a number of line items to better allow Reclamation to address the immediate impacts of the drought. More than \$100,000,000 of the overall increase for the Water and Related Resources account is intended to address drought mitigation. These funds may be used for environmental restoration and compliance activities; water conservation and delivery; increased operation and maintenance funding; drought emergency assistance planning; WaterSmart grants; and drought response and comprehensive drought assistance. As this is the third year of this drought, at least in California, the Committee encourages Reclamation to include more funds in their fiscal year 2016 budget to address the continuing impacts from this drought.

The Committee urges Reclamation to examine opportunities for voluntary water conveyances from any State with excess water inventories to meet water use and mitigate drought conditions in Reclamation States.

The Committee has divided underfinancing between the Resources Management subaccount and the Facilities Operation and Maintenance subaccount. The Committee directs that the underfinancing amount in each subaccount initially be applied uniformly across all projects within the subaccounts. Upon applying the underfinanced amounts, normal reprogramming procedures should be undertaken to account for schedule slippages, accelerations, or other unforeseen conditions.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

The budget for the Bureau of Reclamation consists of individual line-items of projects. As presented by the President, the budget contains 242 specific line-item requests for directed spending by the administration. An additional 39 line-item requests for funding by the administration are for nationwide line-items. All of these line-items were specific requests by the administration to be funded in fiscal year 2015. The administration did not request these funds

programmatically, but rather requested them for a specific project in a specific location for a specific purpose.

Congressionally directed spending has become synonymous with earmarks in recent debates, even for agencies such as the Bureau of Reclamation where the majority of the budget request is based on individual line-item studies and projects. Due to this ongoing debate, the Committee has voluntarily refused all congressionally directed spending requests for fiscal year 2015. Accordingly, the administration has total discretion as to how the funding that this Committee appropriates will be spent as it relates to individual studies and projects. The Committee has retained the traditional table for the Water and Related Resources account delineating the line-items requested by the President in the budget request. Due to inadequacies in the administration's budget request, the Committee has also inserted some additional line-item funding under the Regional Programs heading for specific categories of studies or projects that the Committee feels are underrepresented in the administration's budget request. Reclamation has discretion within the guidelines provided as to which line-items this additional funding will be applied to. The Committee has not included any congressionally directed spending as defined in section 5(a) of rule XLIV of the standing rules of the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT		14,093		14,093
COLORADO RIVER BASIN—CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT	7,176	458	7,176	458
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	2,100		2,100	
SALT RIVER PROJECT	724	250	724	250
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	200		200	
SIERRA VISTA SUBWATERSHED FEASIBILITY STUDY	2		2	
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,446	22,541	1,446	22,541
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT		674	647	674
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, FOLSOM DAM UNIT/MORMON ISLAND	1,577	9,138	1,577	9,138
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	35	2,184	35	2,184
DELTA DIVISION	5,718	5,511	5,718	5,511
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,290	2,772	1,290	2,772
FRIANT DIVISION	2,192	3,401	2,192	3,401
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RESTORATION SETTLEMENT			32,000	
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	7,596	454	7,596	454
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT. PROGRAM		16,362		16,362
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	2,156	944	2,156	944
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	372	75	372	75
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	52		52	
SHASTA DIVISION	720	8,627	720	8,627
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	12,309	4,359	12,309	4,359
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	4,389	7,393	4,389	7,393
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	12,917	6,043	12,917	6,043
ORLAND PROJECT		930		930

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	300	300
SOLANO PROJECT	1,329	2,367	1,329	2,367
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	313	33	313	33
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	892	1,637	892	1,637
ARMEL UNIT, P-SMBP	20	449	20	449
COLLBRAN PROJECT	255	1,693	255	1,693
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	207	12,950	207	12,950
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	122	124	122	124
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	274	8,837	274	8,837
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT—ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT	500	500
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	244	1,713	244	1,713
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	1,987	1,987
MANCOS PROJECT	119	182	119	182
NARROWS UNIT, P-SMBP	37	37
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	108	2,653	108	2,653
PINE RIVER PROJECT	202	326	202	326
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN	286	3,616	286	3,616
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CONEJOS DIVISION	21	38	21	38
UNCOMPAGRE PROJECT	804	191	804	191
UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	270	270
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	3,237	2,213	3,237	2,213
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	17,000	17,000
LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS	425	30	425	30
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	2,451	4,694	2,451	4,694
PRESTON BENCH PROJECT	4	8	4	8
KANSAS				
ALMENA UNIT, P-SMBP	16	492	16	492
BOSTWICK UNIT, P-SMBP	239	935	239	935
CEDAR BLUFF UNIT, P-SMBP	11	638	11	638
GLEN ELDER UNIT, P-SMBP	25	1,840	25	1,840
KANSAS RIVER UNIT, P-SMBP	100	100
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	19	1,369	19	1,369
KIRWIN UNIT, P-SMBP	12	2,873	12	2,873
WEBSTER UNIT, P-SMBP	87	458	87	458
WICHITA PROJECT—EQUUS BEDS DIVISION	50	50
MONTANA				
CANYON FERRY UNIT, P-SMBP	246	5,703	246	5,703
EAST BENCH UNIT, P-SMBP	202	660	202	660
FORT PECK RESERVATION / DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	3,249	3,249
HELENA VALLEY UNIT, P-SMBP	19	163	19	163
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	1,014	1,014
HUNTLEY PROJECT	12	45	12	45
LOWER MARIAS UNIT, P-SMBP	102	1,622	102	1,622
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT	364	16	364	16
MILK RIVER PROJECT	548	1,287	548	1,287
MISSOURI BASIN O&M, P-SMBP	1,032	269	1,032	269
ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MT RURAL WATER SYSTEM	4,059	4,059
SUN RIVER PROJECT	53	256	53	256
YELLOWTAIL UNIT, P-SMBP	22	7,433	22	7,433
NEBRASKA				
AINSWORTH UNIT, P-SMBP	26	138	26	138
FRENCHMAN-CAMBRIDGE UNIT, P-SMBP	261	2,088	261	2,088
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	14	116	14	116

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
NORTH LOUP UNIT, P-SMBP	52	179	52	179
NEVADA				
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY				
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	5,876	3,925	5,876	3,925
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	115		115	
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	775		775	
NEW MEXICO				
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,844	1,295	2,844	1,295
EASTERN NEW MEXICO RURAL WATER SUPPLY	47		47	
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	11,009	11,726	11,009	11,726
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,224	4,182	1,224	4,182
RIO GRANDE PEUBLOS PROJECT	650		650	
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	23	11	23	11
NORTH DAKOTA				
DICKINSON UNIT, P-SMBP	404	288	404	288
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	15,502	6,417	15,502	6,417
HEART BUTTE UNIT, P-SMBP	6	1,139	6	1,139
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	69	189	69	189
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	90	796	90	796
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	25	584	25	584
NORMAN PROJECT	48	311	48	311
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	160	1,058	160	1,058
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	59	631	59	631
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	267	451	267	451
DESCHUTES PROJECT	292	269	292	269
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	584	232	584	232
KLAMATH PROJECT	13,390	4,610	13,390	4,610
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	1,527	602	1,527	602
TUALATIN PROJECT	130	642	130	642
UMATILLA PROJECT	521	3,161	521	3,161
SOUTH DAKOTA				
ANGOSTURA UNIT, P-SMBP	266	790	266	790
BELLEFOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	255	685	255	685
KEYHOLE UNIT, P-SMBP	196	558	196	558
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	2,432		2,432	
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT		15		15
MNI WICONI PROJECT		12,000		12,000
OAHE UNIT, P-SMBP	39	55	39	55
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT		92		92
RAPID VALLEY UNIT, P-SMBP		223		223
SHADEHILL UNIT, P-SMBP	75	511	75	511
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT	25	15	25	15
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	84	85	84	85
LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION PROGRAM	50		50	
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	87	787	87	787
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	57	537	57	537
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	180	173	180	173

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued
 [In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
MOON LAKE PROJECT	12	85	12	85
NEWTON PROJECT	33	94	33	94
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	240	262	240	262
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	1,260	448	1,260	448
SANPETE PROJECT	60	11	60	11
SCOFIELD PROJECT	406	84	406	84
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	822	100	822	100
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,096	1,111	1,096	1,111
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	60	86	60	86
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	3,875	7,196	3,875	7,196
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS	565	78	565	78
YAKIMA PROJECT	806	6,836	806	6,836
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,000		11,000	
WYOMING				
BOYSEN UNIT, P-SMBP	231	1,791	231	1,791
BUFFALO BILL DAM, DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	32	2,812	32	2,812
KENDRICK PROJECT	107	3,582	107	3,582
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	205	2,270	205	2,270
NORTH PLATTE AREA, P-SMBP	111	4,886	111	4,886
OWL CREEK UNIT, P-SMBP	6	95	6	95
RIVERTON UNIT, P-SMBP	12	632	12	632
SHOSHONE PROJECT	72	771	72	771
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES	183,468	273,956	216,115	273,956
REMAINING ITEMS				
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:				
RURAL WATER			55,000	
FISH PASSAGE AND FISH SCREENS			12,000	
WATER CONSERVATION AND DELIVERY			35,000	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND COMPLIANCE			20,000	
FACILITIES OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REHABILITATION				15,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I		12,670		12,670
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE II	6,360		7,860	
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT (CRSP), SECTION 5	4,103	5,592	4,103	5,592
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT (CRSP), SECTION 8	3,088		3,088	
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	620		620	
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM		1,100		1,100
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION		62,000		62,000
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS		19,784		19,784
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM			5,000	
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM		1,250		1,250
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM	22,677		22,677	
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,736		1,736	
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES		8,989		8,989
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES	2,000		2,000	
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS:				
AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT ACT			3,000	
CROW TRIBE WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 2010			2,000	
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT			81,000	
TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT			4,000	
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	9,657		9,657	
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	28,345		28,345	
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS		846		846
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	8,088		8,088	

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,984	1,984
OPERATION & PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	951	1,653	951	1,653
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	2,193	307	2,193	307
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	657	206	657	206
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	2,329	2,329
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,409	2,409
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:				
DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM	1,753	1,150	1,753	1,150
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	9,765	9,765
SITE SECURITY ACTIVITIES	26,220	26,220
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT	90	90
WATERSMART PROGRAM:				
WATERSMART GRANTS	19,000	65,000
WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICES PROGRAM	4,457	4,457
COOPERATIVE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT	250	250
BASIN STUDIES	3,850	3,850
DROUGHT RESPONSE & COMPREHENSIVE DROUGHT PLANS	1,500	15,000
RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS	1,500	1,500
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE PROGRAM	21,500	24,500
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	159,362	143,267	440,362	158,267
UNDERFINANCING	— 10,995	— 8,000
TOTAL	342,830	417,223	645,482	424,223
GRAND TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	760,053	1,069,705

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

Middle Rio Grande, New Mexico, Water Acquisition Program.—The Committee recognizes that the Middle Rio Grande basin is fully appropriated and that any change in use of native water—to benefit the Rio Grande, Bosque habitat and species protected under the Endangered Species Act—must come from some existing uses. To date, the needs of the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program [Program] have been met through the short-term acquisition of water, primarily from leasing San Juan-Chama water from willing lessors. Due to the increased demand on San Juan-Chama water, the development of an additional long-term water supply of native Rio Grande water is necessary to meet the needs and goals of the Program. The Committee urges the Program to—(1) update existing studies or complete additional studies regarding the feasibility of an agricultural water leasing program in the middle Rio Grande; (2) work cooperatively with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District [District] to implement metering and the annual allocation of water to facilitate a water leasing program within the District; (3) create a geospatial database of pre-1907 water right owners within the District along with a map of the location in relationship to the water conveyance system of the District; (4) increase outreach to irrigators in the District to identify willing lessors or sellers; and (5) determine the fair market value of leasehold and fee simple interests in native Rio Grande water rights. The Committee again encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to continue developing a long-term pilot water acquisition program involving the lease, purchase, dry-year optioning, rotational fallowing, or dedication of water or water rights within the Rio Grande Basin in New Mexico, including water and water rights native Rio Grande and from the San Juan-Chama Project under its current Middle Rio Grande Supplemental Water Acquisition Program. Water and/or water rights acquired through the Middle Rio Grande Supplemental Water Acquisition Program will be acquired only from willing lessors or sellers and designed to benefit the Rio Grande, Bosque habitat and species protected under the Endangered Species Act.

Middle Rio Grande, New Mexico, San Acacia Reach—Physical Habitat Restoration and Management.—The Committee is aware of the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program's [Program] existing habitat restoration and improvement activities in the Albuquerque and Isleta reaches of the Middle Rio Grande including physical manipulations of the Rio Grande channel (riverine restoration) and adjacent bosque (riparian restoration). The Committee recognizes that the Program has completed habitat restoration projects with a focus on the aforementioned reaches to date, however; the improvement in the San Acacia reach of the Middle Rio Grande from San Acacia Dam to the delta of Elephant Butte Reservoir is a critical component for the recovery of

the species. Because of the ecological importance of the San Acacia reach and likelihood of increased water shortfalls, the Committee urges the Program to continue conducting a comprehensive study of the infrastructure of the San Acacia reach including but not limited to the alternate configurations and/or altered management scenarios of the Low Flow Conveyance Channel, and conduct a feasibility analysis of a one-channel river system.

Scoggins Dam, Oregon.—The Committee is aware of the Scoggins Dam, Safety of Dams Corrective Actions Alternatives Study and the Tualatin Basin Water Supply Study being conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation. Because these two studies are integral to dam safety and water supply at Scoggins Dam, the Committee urges Reclamation to proceed with a Modification Report that contemplates a joint project that incorporates dam safety improvements as well as other improvements to be conducted by non-Federal interests consistent with the Tualatin Basin Water Supply Study. Furthermore, the Committee urges Reclamation to maintain its schedule for the feasibility level review of the selected preferred alternative, including the additional benefits, in fiscal year 2016 in order to address the needs in a timely coordinated and efficient manner.

Mni Wiconi Project, South Dakota.—Within the funds provided for the operation and maintenance of the project, Reclamation may use the funds for upgrading existing community water systems that have always been intended as part of the project.

Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, Washington.—The Committee supports the efforts to craft the Yakima River Basin Integrated Water Resource Management Plan [Plan]. This innovative water management plan represents the culmination of years of collaboration in the Yakima Basin among stakeholders including the State of Washington, the Yakama Nation, irrigators and farmers, conservation organizations, recreationists, and local governments. The Committee encourages the ongoing support of the Department of the Interior and Bureau of Reclamation by requesting funding in future budgets to support additional authorized elements of the Plan.

Indian Water Rights Settlements Account.—The Committee does not recommend a separate account for this work. The Committee recognizes that these are legal settlements with the affected tribes, however, believes it is prudent to keep these items within the Water and Related Resources account. Beyond the actual water rights settlement funding, many of these settlements included construction components very similar to rural water projects funded elsewhere in this account. The Committee understands that, due to the way the settlements were structured, some of the discretionary funding may not be obligated in fiscal year 2015 and will be carried over into later years. The Committee urges Reclamation to minimize this practice to the extent practicable and within the confines of these settlements. To maintain the visibility of these projects, the Committee recommends funding for the four projects under the Regional Programs heading with a subheading called Indian Water Rights Settlements.

Buried Metallic Water Pipe.—The Committee again directs Reclamation to act in a manner consistent with the direction given by

the Committee in fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2014 regarding buried metallic pipe. The Committee again notes the requirement for an objective, independently peer-reviewed analysis of pipeline reliability standards, and reminds Reclamation that this study, including all data assembly and analysis, must be conducted by an appropriate, independent third-party. The Committee expects Reclamation, and its contractors involved in these efforts, to protect business-sensitive data that is collected during this process.

Rural Water.—The Committee reminds Reclamation that the amount of non-Federal funds provided by a sponsor in excess of the authorized non-Federal cost-share should not be used as a criteria to determine how a project will be budgeted. If a sponsor is willing to provide excess funds, Reclamation should accept those excess funds, but they should not try to compel excess non-Federal funds as a means of prioritizing a sponsor's project for Federal funds. Therefore, the Committee directs that Reclamation should not use the level of excess non-Federal funding as a criteria for budgeting rural water projects.

Zebra and Quagga Mussels.—The Committee understands the challenges posed by the invasion of zebra and quagga mussels in various places across the country, and that invasion has not yet occurred in the Pacific Northwest and Lake Tahoe. Given the significant Federal assets in the region, it is prudent to determine the vulnerabilities of the infrastructure. The Committee recognizes that the Bureau of Reclamation has made progress in completing invasive mussel vulnerability assessments at Minidoka, American Falls, Ririe, Island Park, and Jackson Lake dams, and will soon initiate work on assessments at Hungry Horse dam and the Minidoka and Palisades power plants. The Committee directs Reclamation to initiate and complete assessments at Grand Coulee and additional projects. Further, the Committee urges Reclamation to assist the States, where appropriate, in their efforts to prevent the spread of invasive mussels to Federal projects in the region.

Additional Funding for Water and Related Resources Work.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds above the budget request for Water and Related Resources studies, projects, and activities. The Committee recommends that priority in allocating these funds should be given to complete ongoing work, including data collection and feasibility design work on features of authorized Reclamation multi-purpose projects; improve water supply reliability; improve water deliveries; tribal and nontribal water settlement studies and activities; ecosystem restoration; enhance national, regional, or local economic development; promote job growth and for critical backlog maintenance activities; and activities related to projects that need to reduce water demand as a part of a comprehensive program for environmental restoration and settlement of water rights claims.

For rural water projects, Reclamation shall not use the ability of a non-Federal sponsor to contribute funds in excess of the authorized non-Federal cost share as a criteria for prioritizing these funds.

The intent of these funds is for work that was either omitted from the budget request or inadequately budgeted. Within 30 days of enactment, Reclamation shall provide the House and Senate Ap-

appropriations Committees a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is being accomplished.

WaterSmart Program, Title XVI Water Reclamation/Reuse Projects.—The Committee believes there is an opportunity to enhance the program’s effectiveness through the advancement of regional-scale projects that include multiple jurisdictions and generate environmental as well as water supply benefits to be competitive. These regional projects can require longer planning and construction timeframes than other more narrowly focused projects. Accordingly, the Committee believes that the Bureau of Reclamation should consider allocating a portion of the funds within the overall title XVI program in future budget requests for advancing regional-scale water reclamation and reuse projects by providing planning and construction assistance grants that can each be used over longer periods of time. The planning assistance should be cost-shared on a 50 percent Federal cost share basis, for planning associated with authorized title XVI projects.

Additionally, the Committee is concerned that constrained budgets impact the research and development initiatives vital to improvements in water recycling and desalination technologies development and applications. The Committee believes that only through enhanced Federal and non-Federal research partnerships can research and development vital to much needed improvements in water recycling and desalination technologies development and applications be accomplished.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2014	\$53,288,000
Budget estimate, 2015	56,995,000
Committee recommendation	56,995,000

The Committee recommends \$56,995,000 for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund was authorized in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, title 34 of Public Law 102–575. This fund uses revenues from payments by project beneficiaries and donations for habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition, and other fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Central Valley project area of California. Payments from project beneficiaries include several required by the act (Friant Division surcharges, higher charges on water transferred to non-CVP users, and tiered water prices) and, to the extent required in appropriations acts, additional annual mitigation and restoration payments.

The Central Valley Project Improvement Act, enacted into law in October 1992, established 34 activities to restore and enhance fish and wildlife habitats in California’s Central Valley and Trinity Basins. The act established a Restoration Fund for the deposit of contributions from CVP water and power users to pay for those activities, along with contributions from the State of California, Federal appropriations, and other contributors. Unfortunately, a number of sources envisioned to contribute to this fund never materialized or funding is no longer available from those sources.

Power users, in particular, are paying a much greater share than anyone anticipated. This has resulted in high CVP power costs, and

unpredictable fee assessments on power agencies. The fees imposed on power users are unpredictable, since in low water years the water users pay very little and the power users make up the difference.

Since the fund was established in 1992 more than \$1,400,000,000 has been spent for restoration activities, but there has been little accountability on how effectively it has been used. There is very little assurance that the goals of the Restoration Fund will be met in the near future, such that the fees could be reduced under the statute. Therefore, the Committee urges the Commissioner to continue to work with power users to determine a more predictable payment stream for power users and to develop measures to provide more accountability and transparency to the restoration process. Further, a report covering the previous fiscal year activities should be submitted by March 1, 2015, and every year thereafter.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2014	\$37,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	37,000,000
Committee recommendation	37,000,000

The Committee recommends \$37,000,000 for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

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

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$60,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	59,500,000
Committee recommendation	59,500,000

The Committee recommends \$59,500,000 for general administrative expenses.

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

INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS

Appropriations, 2014	
Budget estimate, 2015	\$90,000,000
Committee recommendation	

The Committee recommends no funding for the Indian Water Rights Settlements account.

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

SAN JOAQUIN RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2014
Budget estimate, 2015	\$32,000,000
Committee recommendation

The Committee recommends no funding for the San Joaquin Restoration Fund account.

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

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

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

Section 203. The bill includes language increasing the cost ceiling of the Secure Water Act requested by the administration.

Section 204. The bill includes language extending the Drought Act requested by the administration and raising the appropriation ceiling.

Section 205. The bill includes language extending the CALFED Bay-Delta authorization requested by the administration.

Section 206. The bill includes language concerning pilot programs in the Colorado River Basin.

Section 207. The bill includes language concerning cooperation among agencies to address the drought in the West.

Section 208. The bill includes language concerning the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act.

Section 209. This provision concerns the Friant prepayment for the San Joaquin River Settlement currently authorized for disbursement starting in 2019. The provision advances disbursement of these prepaid funds to 2015 and limits expenditure of these authorized mandatory funds to \$40,000,000 per year. The section changes no other provisions of the San Joaquin River Settlement.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

EXASCALE INITIATIVE

The Committee recommends \$151,000,000, which includes \$91,000,000 for the Office of Science and \$60,000,000 for the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA], to support the Department's initiative to deploy the first exascale system by 2022. The Committee believes the United States must remain the world leader in high performance computing. Virtually every sector of U.S. society has become dependent on the continued growth in computing performance to advance science and technology, drive industrial productivity, and accelerate innovation. The Committee encourages the Department to continue making investments in exascale systems one of its highest priorities.

ENERGY INNOVATION HUBS

Two Energy Innovation Hubs—Fuels from Sunlight and Modeling and Simulation for Nuclear Reactors—are reaching the end of their first 5-year award and are being considered for renewal for another 5 years. The Committee is encouraged by a March 2014 Secretary of Energy Advisory Board [SEAB] study that found Hubs were resolving major technological and science roadblocks to advance energy science and technology. However, the Committee agrees with SEAB's conclusion that the bar for renewal of these Hubs should be high due to significant funding levels and high visibility. The fiscal year 2015 budget request asks the Committee to provide funding for these Hubs before thorough Departmental and independent peer reviews of these two Hubs have been completed. For this reason, the Committee recommends the amounts requested for these two Hubs only if independent peer reviews and internal Departmental reviews recommend renewal of the Hubs and the Secretary of Energy notifies the House and Senate Appropriations Committees of his decision to renew the Hubs for another 5 years along with an explanation of the benefits of extending the Hub, major accomplishments of the Hubs during the first 5-year award period, and specific milestones and objectives for each Hub over the next 5 years.

CYBERSECURITY

The Committee recommends \$303,573,000 as requested for cybersecurity activities, which includes \$154,805,000 for NNSA and \$148,768,000 to support energy, science, and environmental management missions. The Committee is encouraged by the Department's decision to establish a Cyber Council in 2013 to coordinate cyber-related activities across the Department. However, the Committee is concerned by the lack of transparency in funding cybersecurity activities and the lack of a single senior official responsible for managing those funds based on strategic priorities. Currently, cybersecurity activities for energy, science, and environmental missions are funded in 11 different accounts. The Com-

mittee believes the Department of Energy should follow NNSA's example of consolidating cybersecurity activities and funding authority to one person under one funding account. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to consolidate cybersecurity funding for energy, science and environmental missions under the Chief Information Officer within Departmental Administration starting in the fiscal year 2016 budget request. The Committee expects the budget justification to include a detailed breakdown of cybersecurity activities across the Department.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS

The Committee understands there are numerous Federal programs dedicated to increasing the energy efficiency of buildings and products, frequently each serving a distinct niche. However, as the Government Accountability Office has noted, there is potential for overlap and duplication among these programs executed by the Department of Energy, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Environmental Protection Agency, among others. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to lead completion of a report on the government-wide array of energy efficiency programs to include specific actions to eliminate or consolidate programs within the most compatible agencies within 180 days of enactment. Furthermore, the Government Accountability Office noted the absence of a coordinating council for energy efficiency programs for non-Federal buildings, as there is one for programs for Federal buildings. The Committee directs the inclusion of this function into existing coordinating bodies and directs the Department of Energy to report on how this directive has been fulfilled within 90 days of enactment.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT FUNDING

The award of grant, cooperative agreement, and loan funds for advanced energy technology development and deployment to firms that subsequently declare bankruptcy raises questions about the role of government investment. Frequently, the innovative nature of the technologies and business models involved pose risks to potential investors, including the Government. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to report on companies that have declared bankruptcy after having received grant, cooperative agreement, loan, or loan guarantee support within the last 5 years. The report shall include the types and amounts of support provided, the outcome of the bankruptcy proceedings, and value to the Government of its investment, whether through recovery of assets, assumption of intellectual property, or advancement of technology.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

The Committee recognizes that innovation, entrepreneurship and job creation are critical to the United States' economic competitiveness. To that end, the Committee is supportive of programs that help transfer taxpayer-funded technology and research from our national laboratories to commercial markets. The Committee encourages the Department of Energy to fill the position of Technology Transfer Coordinator immediately and implement the rec-

ommendations of the Department’s Office of the Inspector General as stated in the February 2014 Audit Report: Technology Transfer and Commercialization Efforts at the Department of Energy’s National Laboratories, OAS–M–14–02. As detailed in the audit report, the Committee supports the finalization of performance metrics and recommends that special emphasis be placed on establishing targets and quantitative metrics that support the growth of U.S. entrepreneurial companies. Additionally, the Committee recommends that the Department of Energy take a more forward-looking approach to implementing the Technology Commercialization Fund to enhance the effectiveness of the Department’s expenditures.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

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

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

Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

ENERGY PROGRAMS

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2014	\$1,901,686,000
Budget estimate, 2015	2,316,749,000
Committee recommendation	2,072,928,000

The Committee recommendation is \$2,072,928,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

The Committee notes that regional research bodies supported through competitive funding awards will continue to foster collaboration with educational institutions, public and private research

centers, private industries, and public organizations with strategic interests in sustainable energy. The Committee supports continuation of these efforts with the goal of fostering research collaborations, technology transfer, and commercialization efforts which will lead to increased domestic production of energy and lower prices for consumers.

The Committee encourages the Department to enter into technical assistance partnerships with non-profit partners to provide affordable grid technology testing and technical assistance to the electric industry to address the variability of renewable power generation. The partnerships should focus on deploying smart grid technologies and attendant energy storage solutions to support the continuous availability of electricity from an intermittent resource. The Department should competitively select partners who have a record of high-quality academic research and advanced technology development, and have successfully worked with the electric industry.

Hydrogen Technology.—The Committee continues to support fuel cell and hydrogen energy systems for stationary, vehicle, motive and portable power applications. The Committee recommends \$93,000,000 for the Fuel Cell Technologies program. The Committee is encouraged by the collaborative approach reflected in H2USA and sees it as an important step toward commercialization of fuel cell electric vehicles and the supply chain. With regards to infrastructure, the Department should analyze, research and make suitable investments in order to transform the size, cost, scalability (including modular stations), and interoperability of new retail hydrogen stations. The Department should focus on consumer acceptance in order to meet the needs of the initial commercial market beginning in 2015, while having the ability to increase the station capacity as commercialization develops. These investments should focus on strategic locations where early market introduction of vehicles is likely to occur.

Bioenergy Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$253,200,000 for biomass and biorefinery systems R&D. Within the available funds, the Department is directed to provide a total of \$30,000,000 for algae biofuels.

The Committee remains concerned the Department is interpreting biomass too narrowly and failing to consider promising noncellulosic forms of biomass energy technology projects. For purposes of allocating resources, the Department is directed to include biosolids derived from the municipal wastewater treatment and agricultural processes, and other similar renewables within the definition of noncellulosic. In funding biomass and biofuels refinery systems, the Department is encouraged to provide funding to projects that utilize regionally available and appropriate wood and agricultural biomass feedstock for thermal heating applications. Within available funds, \$15,000,000 is to demonstrate technologies that process biosolids from wastewater treatment into clean water; useful heat energy; products, such as wide application soil amendments; and that reduce net greenhouse gas emissions from current treatment processes and reduce the volume of material to be trucked by more than 90 percent. The Department should consider projects that utilize at least 20,000 wet tons per year of biosolids

and that create other commercially salable products or generate a synthesis gas for the production of useful heat or hydrogen.

The Committee continues to support the collaboration between the Navy, Department of Agriculture, and DOE to develop innovative technologies for jet and diesel fuels for military uses. The Committee recommends the requested \$60,000,000 to support this effort.

Solar Energy.—The Committee recommends \$248,000,000 for solar energy. The Committee supports the Department's emphasis advancing integration of distributed solar generation with the existing power grid and on lowering the "soft costs" of solar installations for residential and small-scale commercial customers. The financing, contracting, permitting, inspection, and installation costs can add significantly to the overall cost of solar system acquisition. The Department's efforts to develop the workforce, regulatory and legal expertise, and information technology tools are needed to drive cost reductions for solar technology for every day consumers. Furthermore, additional work is needed to ensure the reliability and resiliency of the power grid in face of growing distributed solar generation to ensure consumers and businesses can yield sustained value from their solar investments and utilities can reap generation benefits. Therefore, the Committee supports the proposed increases in the Systems Integration and Balance of System Soft Cost Reduction areas.

Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends \$61,500,000 for concentrating solar power projects, as improvements in this technology could address energy storage issues and are directly related to the Supercritical Transformational Electric Power Generation Initiative, which could increase efficiencies and further lower costs.

Wind Energy.—The recommendation is \$109,000,000 for wind energy. Within the available funds, \$6,400,000 is for distributed wind, \$42,600,000 is for the Offshore Wind Advanced Technology Demonstration Projects, and \$6,000,000 is to further substantiate the design and economic value proposition of alternate project designs for offshore wind power. The Committee reaffirms its direction that the Department use offshore wind technologies funding to include freshwater, deepwater, shallow water, and transitional depth installations.

Geothermal Technology.—The recommendation for geothermal technology is \$61,500,000. The funds made available by this section shall be disbursed to the full spectrum of geothermal technologies as authorized by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140). The Department of Energy is encouraged to continue its support of comprehensive programs that support academic and professional development initiatives.

To facilitate necessary technology development and expand understanding of subsurface dynamics, the Committee recommends \$29,000,000 for the Frontier Observatory for Research in Geothermal Energy, which will use a competitive process to site and construct a facility for the design, development, and testing of innovative methods of generating electricity for geothermal resources.

Water Power Energy R&D.—The Committee recommends \$69,000,000 for water power, including \$41,300,000 for marine and

hydrokinetic technology research, development and deployment, and \$27,500,000 for conventional hydropower.

None of the funding provided for marine and hydrokinetic technologies may be used for advanced design tools, the incubator program, or for the clean energy manufacturing initiative. Of the \$41,300,000 provided for marine and hydrokinetic technologies, \$25,000,000 is for competitive research, development and demonstrations of marine and hydrokinetic technologies. The \$25,000,000 should be used for new awards or to bring existing demonstration awards toward completion. The Committee directs the Department to consult with the marine and hydrokinetic energy industry on research, development and deployment priorities and ensure that related programs by the national laboratories support industry-driven technology advancement projects. The Committee directs the Department to provide not less than \$3,000,000 to continue development of an open water, fully energetic wave energy test facility.

The Committee recommends ongoing close coordination between the Department and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, other relevant agencies and industry to reduce the amount of time to permit MHK test and demonstration projects. Further, within available funding for marine and hydrokinetic technology, the Committee encourages the Department to support activities to develop advanced systems and component technologies to increase energy capture, reliability, and survivability for lower costs, and to assess and monitor environmental effects.

Vehicle Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$290,000,000 for vehicle technologies. The Committee is supportive of the \$8,000,000 for the Super Truck program and directs the Department to fulfill existing contracts to support commercialization of truck technologies demonstrated by industry partners. The Committee further directs the Department to identify future collaborative research initiatives with the freight industry to improve fuel efficiency in their vehicles. In addition, the Committee directs the Department to provide it with a report no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act on the industry's adoption rates of new fuel efficient technologies from the Super Truck program into its manufacturing lines.

Shortfalls remain in the research and development of dual-fuel systems that meet the power and reliability requirements for severe heavy duty engines used in some buses, fire trucks, on-highway construction haul trucks, and class 8 long-haul trucks. The committee directs the Department to continue research and development on dual fuel activities to address the needs of severe heavy duty engine vehicles. The research should consider whether direct fuel injected or dual fuel converted diesel engines can provide the necessary horsepower and reliability for safe and efficient long-haul trucking in consideration of the higher temperature exposure of parts and lubricants in addition to the large onboard fuel storage volume requirements. The research should incorporate highly controlled fleet operations that evaluate the practicality of both dual-fuel systems and gas-to-liquid [GTL] fuel produced directly from

natural gas. Since GTL has the potential for broad implementation without changes in truck engine technology or distribution infrastructure, the research should determine the cost, maintenance, and economy of GTL fuels produced directly from natural gas using scalable technology.

The Committee supports the grid integration activities proposed in the budget request. Further, within available funds, \$10,000,000 is provided to continue funding of section 131 of the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act.

The Committee recognizes that local initiatives to deploy alternative fuel vehicles and infrastructure are critical to wider adoption of these technologies that can diversify our fuel supply and save consumers money. The Committee recommends \$44,000,000 for Vehicle Technologies Deployment. Within the funds provided, not less than \$20,000,000 shall support the "Alternative Fuel Vehicle Community Partner Projects" for competitive demonstration of electric and advanced fuel deployment programs, with a focus on larger-scale deployment proposals.

Building Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$178,000,000 for building technologies. The Committee supports the focus on advanced technologies for heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems, recognizing that such technologies have the potential to save up to 50 percent in energy consumption. The Committee recognizes that most building standard codes are developed and implemented by State and local governments. Therefore the Committee also supports ongoing efforts to work with local agencies to incorporate the latest technical knowledge and best practices into construction requirements.

Within available funds, the Committee provides \$10,000,000 for the Department to focus on a Residential Building Integration Program for the purpose of stakeholder engagement efforts with input and direction by the existing home performance industry and the weatherization network. The Committee encourages the initiative to include regional forums and policy recommendations leading to a new residential energy efficiency retrofit program supporting all residential buildings and income levels.

Within available funds, the Committee recommends \$15,000,000 for solid state lighting technology development, including efforts to reduce the cost of organic light-emitting diodes and other technologies. To ensure that the Department meets commitments already promised for the L Prize, the Committee recommendation includes \$5,000,000 from within available Building Technologies funds in addition to funds for solid state lighting research and development, for the Bright Tomorrow Lighting Prize to fund previously announced prizes for competitions specified in section 655 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Advanced Manufacturing.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the manufacturing sector to the U.S. economy, directly generating 12 percent of U.S. GDP and employing nearly 12 million people. The Committee recommends \$231,841,000 for advanced manufacturing.

The Committee supports the Department's role in and contribution to the President's vision to strengthen domestic manufacturing and improve U.S. competitiveness through a National Network for

Manufacturing Innovation. Furthermore, the Committee agrees with the goal of each institute being financially sustainable from private sector and other sources within 5 years. Within the total for Advanced Manufacturing, the Committee provides a total of \$98,000,000 to support three Clean Energy Manufacturing Institutes, including \$42,000,000 for the wide bandgap semiconductor institute, \$28,000,000 for the advanced composites institute, and \$28,000,000 for a third institute to be awarded in fiscal year 2015. For the third and each subsequent institute, the Secretary shall conduct an open solicitation and competitive, merit-based review process. Prior to making each new award, the Secretary shall notify the Committee of the basis of the award and the relative merits of the winning applicant as compared to the other applications received. The Secretary shall also develop and implement metrics-based performance measures, which the Secretary shall submit to the Committee prior to making any new award, to assess the effectiveness of all existing and subsequent institutes. No additional institutes are to be awarded in fiscal year 2015 until success can be demonstrated and progress is made with existing efforts toward self-sufficiency.

The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for the Critical Materials Hub aimed at improving critical material supply chains that are prone to disruption. The Committee notes that the Hub has focused on high priority problems and has developed strong milestones. The Committee supports the Hub's goal of developing at least one technology adopted by U.S. companies within each of its three focus areas: diversifying and expanding production; reducing wastes; and developing substitutes. The Committee notes that since the Hub began operating in June 2013, the Hub has developed 10 invention disclosures, and has been engaged in cross-cutting efforts across the Department's energy programs, including the Office of Science and Office of Fossil Energy.

Related to critical materials and advanced fabrication techniques, the Committee further recognizes the promise of new nanostructured metals that can be used in structural applications, extreme environments, and chemical synthesis with direct relevance to advanced energy technologies. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends \$3,000,000 for a competitive solicitation for universities and industry to help bridge the gap between laboratory research and marketplace deployment of these new materials.

The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for development of additive manufacturing processes, low cost carbon fiber, and other manufacturing technologies at the existing Manufacturing Demonstration Facility. The Committee notes the ongoing emphasis on assisting small and medium-sized businesses overcome the risks and challenges of investing in specialized, high-technology equipment at the Manufacturing Demonstration Facility and the Department is encouraged to continue this emphasis in the coming year.

The Committee recommends \$1,500,000 for the joint additive manufacturing pilot institute with the Department of Defense.

The Committee supports the important research conducted through the Advanced Manufacturing Office, which is critical to improving the energy efficiency, productivity, and competitiveness of domestic manufacturers. In particular, the Committee encour-

ages the continuation of advanced manufacturing research into traditional materials like steel, which benefits from the innovative research already being done on iron-making and direct reduced iron technologies.

Federal Energy Management Program.—The Committee recommends \$29,000,000 for the Federal Energy Management Program.

Facilities and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends \$56,000,000 for facilities and infrastructure.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends \$160,000,000 for program direction.

Strategic Programs.—The Committee recommends \$22,000,000 for strategic programs.

Weatherization Assistance Program.—The Committee recommends \$227,600,000. Weatherizing homes for low-income families plays an important role in reducing energy costs for residents, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and training a skilled long-term workforce. The Committee remains concerned that all participants in this program receive high-quality retrofit services that meet or exceed building codes and standards for workmanship. The Department is urged to continue working with implementing agencies at the State level to ensure that independent, third-party audits are conducted and results are shared with the relevant parties. Worker training should continue, but contractors repeatedly failing to perform adequately should be disqualified from future work.

State Energy Program.—The Committee recommends \$50,000,000 for the State Energy Program.

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriations, 2014	\$147,306,000
Budget estimate, 2015	180,000,000
Committee recommendation	174,000,000

The Committee recommends \$174,000,000 for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.

Within the funding provided, \$36,000,000 is recommended for Clean Energy Transmission and Reliability. The Committee believes that the integration of distributed and intermittent renewable sources of generation into existing infrastructure and transmission and distribution networks is critical to the effective deployment of clean energy sources. Developing the analytical and modeling tools in collaboration with utilities, grid operators, and universities will lay the foundation for risk assessment. The Committee supports the Department’s proposed research on advanced modeling capabilities to improve electric planning and operations. Advances in big data analytic capabilities and modeling and visualization technologies offer potential for improving efficient operations of the electric grid particularly when incorporating power from variable renewable energy sources. Within Energy Systems Predictive Capability and Advanced Modeling Grid Research, the Department is directed to consider an expanded scope of projects, in addition to response to energy supply disruption, and to include university and industry teams for research and workforce development.

The Committee encourages the Secretary to consider expanding research and development partnerships, including related to the development and deployment of microgrids, with stakeholders in diverse geographic regions with unique market dynamics and policy challenges that can help to inform nationwide efforts to improve grid resiliency, reliability, security, and integration of a broad range of generation sources.

The Committee recommends \$42,000,000 for cybersecurity. The Committee remains concerned that Nation’s electrical infrastructure remains vulnerable to cyber threats. The Department has taken important steps to develop analytical and security tools with industry partners to increase situational awareness and overall resilience of the grid. Funds provided are to expand these collaborative efforts and increase the deployment of necessary tools. Ongoing coordination with the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission should also be a priority.

The Committee recommends \$22,600,000 for Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration. Severe weather events are taxing the physical infrastructure of communities around the country, including the electrical grid. The Committee recognizes the role that Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability played in helping other Federal agencies and jurisdictions respond to Superstorm Sandy in 2013. The Committee recommends funding consistent with the budget request for Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration. However, the Committee remains concerned with the lack of details related to the daily activities of the Federal personnel who will be assigned to regional Federal Emergency Man-

agement Agency regional offices. The Committee requests the Department set forth the expected activities of these personnel in greater detail.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Appropriations, 2014	\$889,190,000
Budget estimate, 2015	863,386,000
Committee recommendation	777,000,000

The Committee recommends \$777,000,000 for Nuclear Energy, including \$104,000,000 for safeguards and security at Idaho National Laboratory.

The Committee notes that the Office of Nuclear Energy relies on the expertise of the national laboratories to execute its mission. The Committee supports opportunities for strong competition among the laboratories to ensure that the limited funds appropriated this act are utilized in a manner to provide the best return to the taxpayer. In executing the Nuclear Energy program, the Department should draw upon the strengths of all the laboratories throughout the complex with expertise in nuclear issues. The Committee supports the efforts of several national laboratories to form a nuclear working group to foster collaboration and identification of nuclear capabilities, and directs the Department to provide support for reconvening the working group. Further, the Department is directed to provide the Committee, within 180 days after the enactment of this act and with input from, and review by, the working group, a comprehensive plan to integrate the missions and expertise of the national laboratories to accomplish the long-term goals in the updated Nuclear Research, Development, and Demonstration Roadmap.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Small Modular Reactor Licensing Technical Support.—The Committee recommends no new funding for Small Modular Reactor Licensing Technical Support. The Committee notes that \$85,000,000 in prior year funds exist in the program. Under this activity, the Secretary may propose to use these funds for the second award subject to the normal notice and approval reprogramming requirements.

Supercritical Transformational Electric Power Generation Initiative.—The Committee recommends \$27,500,000 for the Supercritical Transformational Electric Power Generation Initiative for an industry cost-shared demonstration project. Given the commercial promise of this technology to increase thermal to electricity conversion efficiency and lower capital costs for installation, the Committee expects this effort to be limited in scope, schedule, and cost.

Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration.—The Committee recommends \$55,000,000 for Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration. The Committee directs the Nuclear Energy Program to focus funding for Reactor Concepts Research, Development and Demonstration, which includes funding for Advanced SMRs and Advanced Reactor Concepts, on technologies that show clear potential to be safer, less waste producing,

more cost competitive, and more proliferation-resistant than existing nuclear power technologies.

The Committee recommends \$5,800,000 for the Light Water Reactor Sustainability Program. Funding should be dedicated to activities focused on improving the safety of the existing fleet by increasing the understanding of accident scenarios, such as those exhibited in the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster.

The Committee recommends \$49,200,000 for Advanced Reactor Technologies. While deployment of these technologies may occur in the long term, the Committee finds that research and development on fuel cladding, moderators, coolants, and materials continues to provide insights for increasing the safety of the current reactor fleet. The Department is encouraged to continue engagement with international partners through the Gen IV International Forum and leverage scientific and technical progress in this area. Within the amounts provided for this activity, the Committee recommends \$12,000,000 for industry-only competition to further the development of deployable advanced reactor components.

Fuel Cycle Research and Development.—The Committee recommends \$230,000,000 for Fuel Cycle Research and Development. The Committee recommends \$119,000,000 for the Used Nuclear Fuel Disposition program.

The Committee continues to strongly support the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future and believes that near-term action is needed to address this important national issue. Spent nuclear fuel continues to be discharged at an average annual rate of 2,200 metric tons. There is now approximately 70,000 metric tons in storage in pools and on dry storage pads around the country. Four reactors have recently shut down for a variety of reasons, bringing the total to 13. On-site storage, while safe and secure, is not a sustainable solution. Permanent geologic disposal, still the scientific consensus for ultimate disposition of these materials, is more than 3 decades away, whatever site is ultimately chosen. Therefore, to spur near-term progress on this issue, the Committee again includes a general provision in section 308 of this bill authorizing the Department of Energy to develop a pilot program for a consolidated storage facility, pending enactment of more comprehensive legislation. The Committee recommends \$89,000,000 for used nuclear fuel disposition to implement section 308. Within this amount funds are provided for siting, design, licensing, and construction of one or more consolidated storage facilities; for the provision of financial and technical assistance associated with a consent-based siting process, including education, technical analyses, and other support to entities considering hosting an interim storage facility; and for incentive payments to entities with signed agreements with jurisdictions eligible under the general provision. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends \$3,000,000 to design, procure, and test industry-standard compliant rail rolling stock in a timeframe that supports the transportation of spent fuel to the interim storage facility.

Research and development activities on behavior spent fuel in long-term storage, under transportation conditions, and in various geologic media will continue to be important to developing a new solution to the waste problem. Within the amounts provided for

used nuclear fuel disposition, \$30,000,000 shall be for continuance of these activities. Priority should be placed the ongoing study of the performance of high-burnup fuel in dry storage and on the potential for direct disposal of existing spent fuel dry storage canister technologies.

The Committee recommends \$60,100,000 for the Advanced Fuels program. The Committee directs the Department to continue implementation of the accident tolerant fuels development program, the goal of which is development of meltdown-resistant nuclear fuels leading to in-reactor testing and utilization in 10 years. While the benefit of incremental improvements to existing commercially-available fuels is acknowledged, the Committee is concerned that the Department's ongoing activities on accident tolerant fuels will not ultimately lead to meaningful reductions in the consequences of unexpected severe accidents in nuclear power plants. The Department is directed to provide the Committee, within 90 days of enactment of this act, a report detailing the results achieved in developing accident tolerant fuels and the expected milestones to achieving in-reactor testing and utilization by 2020. In addition, of the funds provided, \$10,000,000 is for the development and qualification of meltdown-resistant fuels based on ceramic-compacted coated particles, which could dramatically reduce radiological consequences from severe accidents when used in current and future reactors.

In addition to continuation of the industry and university cost-shared program initiated in fiscal year 2012, \$3,000,000 is recommended to advance promising and innovative research, including ceramic cladding and other technologies, emanating from qualified and competitively selected small business research task awards that complement the three major industry and university projects and are focused on the development and testing of accident tolerant fuels.

Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$73,500,000 for Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies. Within available funds, the Committee recommends \$17,563,000 for the National Scientific User Facility.

The Committee recommends \$24,300,000 for the Energy Innovation Hub for Modeling and Simulation only if the Office of Nuclear Energy completes an internal and peer review of the Hub and notifies the House and Senate Appropriations Committees of the results of the review with a determination on whether to extend the Hub for another 5 years, the benefit of extending the Hub, and specific milestones and objectives over those 5 years. If the Office of Nuclear Energy decides not to renew the Energy Innovation Hub for Modeling and Simulation, the Committee directs the Department of Energy to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 30 days of enactment a detailed accounting of how the Office of Nuclear Energy plans to spend \$24,300,000 on other modeling and simulation research.

Radiological Facilities Management.—The Committee provides \$25,000,000 for Radiological Facilities Management. Within this funding, the Committee recommends \$20,000,000 for hot cells at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. In future budget requests, the Committee directs the Office of Nuclear Energy to work with the

Office of Science to demonstrate a commitment to operation and maintenance of these capabilities that support multiple critical missions. The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 for Research Reactor Infrastructure.

Idaho Facilities Management.—The Committee recommends \$185,910,000 for Idaho Facilities Management.

International Nuclear Energy Cooperation.—The Committee provides \$3,000,000 for International Nuclear Energy Cooperation, the same as the request.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends \$73,090,000 for Program Direction to be available until September 30, 2016.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2014	\$562,065,000
Budget estimate, 2015	475,500,000
Committee recommendation	475,500,000

The Committee recommends \$475,500,000 for Fossil Energy Research and Development.

The Committee is concerned with the lack of long-term program plans and research and development roadmaps that should guide this office’s activities. The Committee notes that the Office of Fossil Energy has not presented any comprehensive and updated planning documents that set long- and short-term priorities, milestones, and goals against which the budget request should be judged. The Secretary is therefore directed to submit to the Committee, not less than 180 days after enactment of this act, a comprehensive program plan and research and development roadmap for the Office of Fossil Energy.

The Committee also notes the lack of coordination between the Office of Fossil Energy and other program offices, which has the potential to waste funds through duplication. The Committee expresses particular concern with this office’s lack of coordination with the Critical Materials Hub (funded through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy) on work examining the feasibility of recovering rare earth materials from coal and coal by-product streams. The Committee expects the Office of Fossil Energy to identify and more closely coordinate with other program offices.

The Committee recognizes that the Department has proposed changes to the process by which applications to export liquefied national gas to countries without free-trade agreements are approved. Until the proposed changes are either adopted or modified, the Committee expects the Department to continue, as it announced concurrently with the proposed changes, to make final determinations on projects that have already received conditional authorizations and completed the environmental reviews required under the National Environmental Policy Act, and to continue acting upon requests for conditional authorizations currently under review.

From funds appropriated for the Office of Fossil Energy, the Committee encourages the program to make available funds for innovative, commercial scale gas to liquid technology development that is not based on the traditional Fischer-Tropsch technology, is less capital intensive than Fischer-Tropsch technology and can be developed in smaller units that can be deployed in locations where

excessive natural gas is being flared to convert that natural gas to liquid transportation fuel.

CCS Demonstrations.—The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for the proposed natural gas carbon capture and storage demonstration project. The Committee considers this one-time funding for this demonstration project, and directs the Secretary to ensure this funding is awarded competitively. Prior to using any of the funds provided, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee which provides additional specific detail regarding cost-sharing requirements, milestones, oversight, and monitoring plans.

CCS and Power Systems.—The Committee recommends \$267,407,000 for CCS and Power Systems. The Committee includes funding for the Department of Energy's National Carbon Capture Center, consistent with the budget request. Within available funding, the Committee urges the Department to fund research and development activities to improve the efficiency of gas turbines used in power generation systems, working cooperatively with industry, small businesses, universities, and other appropriate parties. The Committee is aware of research and development efforts to develop supersonic CO₂ compression technology that could reduce the cost of carbon capture and sequestration. The Committee encourages the Department to fully complete research and development on such technology, including a pilot demonstration, prior to September 30, 2015, and to report on the results in early 2016.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends \$114,202,000 for program direction.

Natural Gas Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$40,000,000 for natural gas technologies. Of this amount, \$15,300,000 is for environmentally prudent development, \$4,700,000 is for emissions mitigation from mid-stream infrastructure, and \$20,000,000 is for methane hydrates to continue existing work, including characterization of deep water hydrates, the assessment of the potential impact of hydrate development on climate, and the characterization of Arctic off-shore hydrates.

Other Programs.—The Committee recommends \$15,294,000 for Plant and Capital Equipment; \$7,897,000 for Fossil Energy Environmental Restoration; and \$700,000 for Special Recruitment Programs. Within available funds, the Committee recommends \$2,500,000 for the Department to continue the Risk Based Data Management System.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Appropriations, 2014	\$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	19,950,000
Committee recommendation	19,950,000

The Committee recommends \$19,950,000 for Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, the same as the budget request.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2014	
Budget estimate, 2015	-\$6,600,000
Committee recommendation	-6,600,000

The Committee recommends a rescission of \$6,600,000 in prior year Clean Coal Technology funding consistent with the budget request.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

Appropriations, 2014	
Budget estimate, 2015	\$15,579,815
Committee recommendation	15,579,815

The Committee recommends \$15,579,815, consistent with the budget request, for the final payment of the settlement agreement.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Appropriations, 2014	\$189,400,000
Budget estimate, 2015	205,000,000
Committee recommendation	205,000,000

The Committee recommends \$205,000,000 for the operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The Committee notes that the Department has continued to ignore the statutory directive in Public Law 111-8 to submit a report to Congress regarding the effects of expanding the Reserve on the domestic petroleum market by April 27, 2009. The Department has not yet submitted the report, and continues to fail to meet other congressionally mandated deadlines without explanation or cause. Although now more than 5 years delayed, the information requested in the report continues to be pertinent to policy decisions, and the Secretary is directed to submit the report as expeditiously as possible to the Committee. The Committee is concerned with the Department's seeming unwillingness or inability to implement a law enacted in 2009.

SPR PETROLEUM ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2014	
Budget estimate, 2015	
Committee recommendation	-\$135,000,000

The Committee recommends the rescission of \$135,000,000 from the SPR Petroleum Account. The Reserve currently holds 691 million barrels of crude. The Administration's recent decision to devalue refined product reserves in New York and the Northeast and

further consideration of other such reserves around the country de-incentivize the use of the Account to refill the reserve with only approximately 2.7 million barrels. In light of the United States' world-wide leading role in oil production, the Committee recommends the Administration set forth a policy on the use of refined product reserves and the current Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

Appropriations, 2014	\$8,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,600,000
Committee recommendation	1,600,000

The Committee recommends \$1,600,000 for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve as requested.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$117,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	122,500,000
Committee recommendation	117,000,000

The Committee recommends \$117,000,000 for the Energy Information Administration. The Committee recognizes there is a clear need to obtain reliable, current, and comprehensive data on energy-for-water and water-for-energy use. Examples include data on water use by power plants, water for fuel extraction and liquid fuel production, energy use by water utilities, and water reuse and replacement. More accurate data and analysis can improve informed decisionmaking; help prioritize investments in energy-water infrastructure; contribute to the research and development of related technologies; and lead to more efficient and sustainable water and energy practices. In order to better understand water use for power generation and fuel processing, the Committee recommends that the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration [EIA] account for water use in the energy policy analyses it undertakes.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2014	\$231,765,000
Budget estimate, 2015	226,174,000
Committee recommendation	246,000,000

The Committee recommendations for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup is \$246,000,000.

Reprogramming Control Levels.—In fiscal year 2015, the Environmental Management program may transfer funding between operating expense funded projects within the controls listed below using guidance contained in the Department’s budget execution manual (DOE M 135.1–1A, chapter IV). All capital construction line item projects remain separate controls from the operating projects. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be formally notified in advance of all reprogrammings, except internal reprogrammings, and the Department is to take no financial action in anticipation of congressional response. The Committee recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2015:

- Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning;
- Gaseous Diffusion Plants;
- Small Sites; and
- West Valley Demonstration Project.

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

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

Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning.—The Committee recommends \$2,562,000.

Gaseous Diffusion Plants.—The Committee recommends \$104,403,000.

Small Sites.—The Committee recommends \$80,049,000 for small sites. In response to a lack of progress on addressing existing contamination and seismic deficiencies within buildings that are located in heavily used areas at some Department national laboratories, the Department is directed to use additional funding to improve health and safety by cleaning up existing contamination and improving seismic standards of buildings within Department laboratory grounds and for remediation efforts at small sites which can demonstrate new models for cleanup performed by private sector and third party organizations, such as laboratories and universities, which could save substantial resources compared to the traditional agency-led cleanup model and result in faster cleanup without compromising public safety.

West Valley Demonstration Project.—The Committee recommends \$58,986,000.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING
FUND

Appropriations, 2014	\$598,823,000
Budget estimate, 2015	530,976,000
Committee recommendation	594,000,000

The Committee recommends \$594,000,000 for Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning activities.

The Committee supports ongoing cleanup at the Gaseous Diffusion Plants and supports the Department’s efforts to complete work at the East Tennessee Technology Park, so work can commence at the Paducah, Kentucky, facility.

The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for the Title X uranium and thorium reimbursement program. The Committee is concerned by the Department’s failure to address these accumulating balances and liabilities within the annual budget request since fiscal year 2008. Moving forward, the Committee expects the Department to provide sufficient resources within its annual budget request to reimburse licensees for approved claim balances.

The Committee directs the Department to present a report consistent with section 1805 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Energy Policy Act of 1992, that requires the Department to submit to Congress a report every 3 years updating Congress on the progress and success of the cleanup since the last report which was submitted to the Congress in December of 2010. The report should include an assessment of remaining facilities that require UED&D cleanup along with any recommended changes to facilities designation for cleanup funding.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2014	\$5,071,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	5,111,155,000
Committee recommendation	5,086,000,000

The Committee recommends \$5,086,000,000 for the Office of Science.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommends \$1,806,500,000 for Basic Energy Sciences. Of these funds, \$703,161,000 is for research, \$964,639,000 is for the operations and maintenance of scientific user facilities including \$248,490,000 for high-flux neutron sources, and \$138,700,000 is for construction. In future budget requests, the Committee directs the Office of Science to work with the Office of Nuclear Energy to demonstrate a commitment to operation and maintenance of nuclear facilities at Oak Ridge National Laboratory that support multiple critical missions. As the Office of Science considers what user facilities are needed for future scientific research, the Department should look to have a balanced portfolio of user facilities that give researchers a breadth of ability to make scientific discoveries.

Research.—Within the funds for research, the Committee recommends up to \$100,000,000 for Energy Frontier Research Centers. The Committee is encouraged by recent findings of scientific and management reviews that these research centers are demonstrating scientific productivity and world leadership, and are making progress in ways that would not have been likely through individual efforts at the national laboratories and universities. The Committee recommends \$24,175,000 for the Batteries and Energy Storage Hub. The Committee recommends \$24,175,000 for the Fuels from Sunlight Hub only if the Office of Science completes an internal and peer review of the Hub and notifies the House and Senate Appropriations Committees of the results of the review with a determination on whether to extend the Hub for another 5 years, the benefit of extending the Hub, and specific milestones and objectives over those 5 years. If the Office of Science decides not to renew the Fuels from Sunlight Hub, the Committee directs the Department of Energy to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 30 days of enactment a detailed accounting of how the Office of Science plans to spend \$24,175,000 on other photochemistry and biochemistry research.

The Committee also recommends \$18,000,000 for a new computational material science effort. The Committee believes the discovery of new materials and chemical structures with novel properties are crucial to U.S. competitiveness. A wide range of products, including energy generation, transportation, electronics, buildings, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals will depend on advances in materials. However, the Committee is concerned that the United States has not developed open source codes for materials discovery and design and relies on ones developed in Europe. The high licensing fees for these European codes places a financial burden on U.S. researchers, the codes are not compatible with U.S. leadership computers, and researchers cannot tailor the codes to suit individual applications because they do not have access to the source codes. Given the importance of materials to many technologies, the Committee supports a computational materials science effort to gain U.S. leadership in this area.

The Committee also recommends \$15,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] program, which was created by Congress over concerns about the uneven distribution of Federal research and development grants.

The Committee supports the Office of Science's decision to shut down the Lujan Neutron Scattering Center at Los Alamos National Laboratory. With greater capabilities now available at the Spallation Neutron Source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the Office of Science is directed to transition the Lujan facility to a safe storage condition. The Committee directs the Office of Science to work with the National Nuclear Security Administration [NNSA] to determine whether NNSA can use existing equipment for other experiments and help transition users to other Office of Science facilities.

The Committee encourages the Department to continue funding to support research and development needs of graduate and post-graduate science programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends \$627,533,000 for Biological and Environmental Research. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$299,892,000 for biological systems science and \$327,641,000 for climate and environmental sciences.

Within the funds for climate and environmental sciences, the Committee recommends \$28,543,000 for a new initiative on climate model development and validation. The Committee supports efforts to use climate models to accurately predict future extreme weather events and the impact of those events at resolution below 10 kilometers. The Committee supports efforts to focus most of the scientific attention on tornadoes and take advantage of unique scientific instrumentation in Oklahoma. The Committee understands that climate change projections suggest the United States will experience extreme weather events with greater frequency and severity and believes this initiative will help the United States be better prepared to respond to these events. The Committee also recommends \$45,501,000 for the operation of the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommends \$557,000,000, an increase of \$16,000,000 above the request, for Advanced Scientific Computing Research. The Committee believes its recommendation would allow the Department to develop and maintain world-class computing and network facilities for science and deliver the necessary research in applied mathematics, computer science, and advanced networking to support the Department's missions.

Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$91,000,000 as requested for the exascale initiative to spur U.S. innovation and increase the country's ability to address critical national challenges. The Committee supports the Department's plan to deploy by 2022 the first exascale system that is energy efficient and can help solve the most pressing energy, national security, and environmental challenges.

The Committee also recommends \$104,317,000 for the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility, \$80,320,000 for the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, and \$85,000,000 for the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center [NERSC] facility at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. The Committee recommends additional funding for NERSC to avoid a loss of 1 billion hours, or 33 percent, of computing time available to scientists in 2015. The additional funding is provided to expand the NERSC-7 systems to make up for lost capability when NERSC-6 is decommissioned and make power and cooling upgrades to the new Computational Research and Theory Facility.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends \$774,482,000, an increase of \$30,482,000 above the request, for High Energy Physics. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for the Muon

to Electron Conversion Experiment and \$22,000,000 for project engineering and design of the Long Baseline Neutrino Experiment.

Within the funds for High Energy Physics, the Committee recommends \$156,069,000 for energy frontier experimental physics, with an additional \$2,430,000 above the request for research. The Committee also recommends \$244,939,000 for intensity frontier experimental physics, with an additional \$1,487,000 above the request for research and \$2,207,000 above the request for facility operations and experimental support. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$15,000,000 to sustain operations at the Homestake Mine in South Dakota. The Committee also recommends \$60,416,000, an increase of \$1,566,000 above the request, for Theoretical and Computational Physics. The Committee recommends \$6,000,000 as requested for the Second Generation Dark Matter Experiment, of which \$4,000,000 is for other project costs and \$2,000,000 for project engineering, design, and construction activities. The Committee also recommends \$119,638,000, an increase of \$5,396,000 above the request, for advanced technology research and development. The additional funding is provided to continue investments in superconducting radio-frequency [SRF] accelerator technology. The Committee notes that over the last decade, SRF accelerator technology has become the state-of-the-art choice for all of the world's high-power accelerators, including next-generation spallation neutron sources and 4th generation light sources. The SRF technology developed for high energy physics applications will now be used in LCLS-II, ensuring the United States is the leader in photon science for the foreseeable future. Given broad applications beyond high energy physics, the Committee encourages the Office of Science to maintain investments in this critical technology.

The Committee recommends \$106,641,000, an increase of \$5,396,000 above the request, for the cosmic frontier experimental physics. The Committee strongly supports the recommendation from the 2014 Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel [P5] report that the United States should make greater investments in small and medium scale projects for dark energy and dark matter, which will maintain U.S. leadership and promise near-term discoveries and significant contributions to science at relatively low cost. The Committee directs the Office of Science to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a work plan within 60 days of enactment of this Act that will advance second- and third-generation dark matter direct detection experiments, stage 4 cosmic microwave background experiments, and the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument.

The Committee recommends \$19,184,000 as requested for Accelerator Stewardship. The Committee continues to support the Office of Science's efforts to make unique test facilities available to U.S. industry to accelerate applications of accelerator technology and to work with industry to identify accelerator technologies needed to address many of the medical, industrial, and national security issues confronting the country.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommends \$601,573,000, an increase of \$8,000,000 above the request, for Nuclear Physics. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$16,500,000 in construction funds to complete the upgrade to the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility [CEBAF] and \$104,100,000, an increase of \$8,000,000 above the request, for 30 weeks of operations at CEBAF. The Committee also recommends \$90,000,000 for the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams, \$17,541,000 for operations of the Argonne Tandem Linac Accelerator System, and \$165,072,000 for the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider for 22 weeks of operations.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommends \$341,000,000, a decrease of \$75,000,000 below the request, for Fusion Energy Sciences. The Committee is concerned about the rising costs of U.S. participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor [ITER] being built in Cadarache, France and unaddressed project management problems. A May 2014 Government Accountability Office report found that since the ITER Agreement was signed in 2006, the Department of Energy's estimated cost for the U.S. portion of ITER has grown by almost \$3,000,000,000 and its estimated completion date has slipped by 20 years. The Department's preliminary cost estimate for U.S. contributions to ITER were \$1,122,000,000 with completion in 2013. The current estimate is \$3,900,000,000 with completion in 2033, but an independent cost review found that the cost could be as high as \$6,500,000,000 and the date is likely to slip further. With flat and declining budgets, the Committee does not believe ITER is affordable and funding for ITER would crowd out other science investments where the United States has maintained leadership, such as high performance computing and materials science.

In addition to rising costs, in October 2013, an independent management assessment found serious project management problems. Some of the problems include lack of strong project management; a lack of urgency or passion for success and a commitment to rapidly finding solutions to problems; too much focus on organization harmony instead of tangible project management results; insufficient number of personnel with large project management and industrial experience; and the lack of a strong nuclear safety culture required for future success. The management assessment included 11 recommendations, but the ITER Organization has been slow to adopt these recommendations and after 8 months, none have been implemented. Even more problematic is that there is no approved cost or schedule baseline for the project. The Committee cannot support a project with no specified price tag or date of completion, especially when the project is the most complicated engineering construction project in the world with significant, unresolved project management problems.

For these reasons, the Committee directs the Department of Energy to work with the Department of State to withdraw from the ITER project. The Committee recommends \$75,000,000 for ITER, which includes \$50,000,000 to complete existing contracts for the

manufacture of ITER components and \$25,000,000 for the U.S. ITER Office in Oak Ridge to terminate U.S. involvement in ITER.

Withdrawing from ITER requires new prioritization and strategic planning for the fusion program. The Committee directs the Office of Science within 90 days of enactment to convene an independent group of experts that can provide short term guidance on funding priorities for fusion in fiscal year 2016 and within 240 days of enactment submit a new strategic plan to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees for fusion without U.S. involvement in ITER.

Within the funds for Fusion Energy Sciences, the Committee recommends \$17,315,000 for High Energy Density Laboratory Plasmas, which includes \$6,700,000 for experiments on the Matter in Extreme Conditions instrument at the Linac Coherent Light Source at SLAC and \$10,615,000 for academic grants to study the behavior of matter and radiation at extreme temperatures and pressures to match funding available at NNSA for this joint program. The Committee also recommends \$2,500,000 to continue heavy ion fusion science research at the Neutralized Drift Compression Experiment-II at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory to take advantage of an \$11,000,000 Recovery Act upgrade to the facility. The Committee notes that an independent review found that this experimental capability offers unique scientific value, primarily to use heavy ions to explore warm dense matter and train graduate students in high energy density physics fields of science.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends \$66,689,000, a decrease of \$12,500,000 below the request, for Science Laboratories Infrastructure. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$12,500,000 for new infrastructure and operational improvements at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory in New Jersey. The Committee did not receive sufficient information about planned infrastructure improvements to support the full amount requested.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS AND SCIENTISTS

The Committee recommends \$29,500,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 above the request, for Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists. The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 to continue the Computational Sciences Graduate Fellowship program. The Committee also encourages the Office of Science to broadcast the 2015 National Science Bowl finals competition. This nationwide academic competition attracts middle and high school students to science and mathematics and the Committee believes making the competition available on television or through social media sites will inspire other students to pursue science and math education.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends \$187,723,000 for Program Direction. The Committee recommends no funding, including for salaries and benefits and travel, to support the Undersecretary for Science and Energy. The Committee believes organizational changes should not

result in increased costs and, if additional funding is needed, it should be requested under Departmental Administration to increase transparency.

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY

Appropriations, 2014	\$280,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	325,000,000
Committee recommendation	280,000,000

The Committee recommends \$280,000,000 for the Advanced Research Projects Agency–Energy [ARPA–E], of which \$29,250,000 is for program direction.

OFFICE OF INDIAN ENERGY POLICY AND PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2014	
Budget estimate, 2015	\$16,000,000
Committee recommendation	16,000,000

The Committee recommends \$16,000,000 for the Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs. This new office is the consolidation of two programs currently under Department Administration and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

A March 2014 Government Accountability Office report titled “Additional Actions Needed to Better Support Tribal Efforts” raised concerns about the multiple environmental reviews required by Federal agencies that fund development projects. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to coordinate with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other Federal agencies to reduce duplication in the environmental review processes.

INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$42,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	42,000,000
Committee recommendation	42,000,000

OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

Appropriations, 2014	-\$22,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	-25,000,000
Committee recommendation	-25,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	17,000,000
Committee recommendation	17,000,000

The Committee recommends \$42,000,000 in funding for the Loan Guarantee Program. This funding is offset by \$25,000,000 in receipts from loan guarantee applicants. An additional \$40,000,000 of receipts from loan guarantee applicants is credited to the bill as a scorekeeping adjustment.

The Committee notes that recent reviews of the loan program by DOE’s Office of Inspector General [OIG] and the Government Accountability Office [GAO] have shown progress in the loan program’s implementation of recommendations to improve the program’s administration and oversight, but several important deficiencies remain. The Committee is particularly concerned with the findings from GAO’s May 2014 report [GAO–14–367] that found that DOE had inconsistently adhered to its policies for monitoring and reporting on credit risk; inconsistently adhered to its policies for managing troubled loans; and did not adhere to its policy requiring it to evaluate the effectiveness of its loan monitoring. OIG’s April 2014 audit report [DOE/IG–0907] identified the failure to establish comprehensive policies, procedures, and guidance for awarding, monitoring, and administering loans. The most recent OIG audit report [DOE/IG–0909] from May 2014 noted that while the loan program was generally responsive to the recommendations from the independent consultant’s report from February 2012, the OIG was unable to determine whether these efforts were effective because a number of actions were still in progress.

Although these reports generally note the concurrence of the loan program office to the findings, the Committee is not satisfied with the speed at which the loan program is finalizing the actions taken to address the deficiencies in the program’s administration. The Committee is particularly concerned about the continued lack of comprehensive policies for oversight and monitoring of existing loan guarantees. The Committee expects this program, with more than \$32,000,000,000 in guaranteed loans, to have fully developed loan monitoring functions. The Committee therefore directs the loan program office to address the recommendations from GAO–14–367, which include completing policies for loan monitoring, and updating management and reporting software, prior to closing any additional loan guarantees. Within 60 days after enactment of this

act, the Secretary is directed to submit to the Committee a plan to comply with this directive.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2014	\$6,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	4,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,000,000

The Committee recommends \$4,000,000 for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2014	\$234,637,000
Budget estimate, 2015	248,223,000
Committee recommendation	229,171,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2014	-\$108,188,000
Budget estimate, 2015	-119,171,000
Committee recommendation	-119,171,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$126,449,000
Budget estimate, 2015	129,052,000
Committee recommendation	110,000,000

The Committee recommends \$110,000,000 for Departmental administration.

The Department is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than 180 days after enactment on options for consolidating its inventory of defense-related wastes, spent nuclear fuel, and special nuclear material at one or more private sector or Government sites to reduce ongoing maintenance, operations, and security costs.

Energy Policy and Systems Analysis.—The Committee recommends \$27,733,000 for the Energy Policy and Systems Analysis function. Last year, the Committee approved the consolidation of policy analysis functions from across the Department within this program. Given the complexities of the current energy economy and the need for policies that protect and enhance national and economic security, the Department sought to double the funding in this area. The Committee agrees with the need for additional resources, but cannot fund such a sizeable increase in the fiscal year. As the Quadrennial Energy Review and other efforts proceed in subsequent years, the Committee is willing to entertain requests for further funding increases.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2014	\$42,120,000
Budget estimate, 2015	39,868,000
Committee recommendation	39,868,000

The Committee recommends \$39,868,000 for the Office of the Inspector General.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Committee recommends \$11,890,902 for the National Nuclear Security Administration. The Committee restores funding to critical nonproliferation activities that reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism—one of the Nation’s most important national security priorities. The Committee supports accelerated efforts to secure and permanently eliminate remaining stockpiles of nuclear and radiological materials overseas and in the United States that can be used for nuclear or radiological weapons. The Committee also continues to support efforts to modernize the nuclear weapons stockpile to sustain a safe, secure, and effective nuclear arsenal without testing. However, the Committee remains concerned about NNSA’s ability to execute multiple, highly complex life extension projects and construction projects concurrently under ambitious schedules. The Committee has not seen sufficient progress in improving project management so NNSA can complete projects on time and on budget.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2014	\$7,781,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	8,314,902,000
Committee recommendation	8,314,902,000

The Committee recommends \$8,314,902,000 for Weapons Activities. The Committee’s recommendation represents an increase of \$1,930,471,000, or 30 percent, compared to fiscal year 2010 to support nuclear modernization activities.

Surveillance.—The Committee recommends \$235,022,934 for surveillance, which includes \$176,615,934 under Stockpile Systems and \$58,407,000 under Stockpile Services. The stockpile surveillance program provides information on the status of the Nation’s nuclear weapons stockpile. With the United States maintaining the oldest nuclear weapons stockpile in the Nation’s history, with an average age of 27 years for nuclear warhead and bombs, the Committee believes NNSA should complete all scheduled tests necessary to detect potential aging issues.

New Budget Structure.—The Committee directs NNSA to implement the new budget structure for the fiscal year 2016 budget submission that was developed jointly with this Committee. The budget should include four major funding categories that reflect the needs of maintaining a safe, secure, and effective nuclear weapons stockpile: Directed Stockpile Work for maintaining and refurbishing weapons systems; Science, Technology, and Engineering for science-based stockpile stewardship activities; Major Production Capabilities for new infrastructure investments in critical nuclear and non-nuclear capabilities; and Site Operations and Maintenance for non-security operations of sites and maintenance of general infrastructure. The Committee believes the new budget structure will be more transparent and reflect NNSA’s new programmatic focus on life extension programs, infrastructure modernization, and a science, technology, and engineering capability to assess the stockpile without underground testing.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

The Committee recommends \$2,673,311,000 for Directed Stockpile Work.

Life Extension Programs.—The Committee recommends \$1,067,568,000 for life extension programs.

W76 Life Extension Program.—The Committee recommends \$259,168,000 for the W76 Life Extension Program. Completing the W76 Life Extension Program, which makes up the largest share of the country's nuclear weapon deterrent on the most survivable leg of the Triad, is this Committee's highest priority for life extension programs.

B61 Life Extension Program.—The Committee recommends \$643,000,000 as requested for the B61 Life Extension Program. The Committee believes lower cost options were available that met military requirements. The Committee remains concerned about the affordability of this program, especially with likely sequester cuts starting again in fiscal year 2016. The schedule for manufacturing the first production unit, or the first refurbished bomb, has slipped again by 6 months to fiscal year 2020 compared to the original schedule estimate of fiscal year 2017 because of sequester impacts from fiscal year 2013. Given the highly integrated nature of the current B61 Mod 12 design, NNSA has no alternatives to the current design option, known as Option 3B, that would allow it to recuperate lost time and stay within the current budget estimate of \$8,200,000,000. The only choice NNSA has is delaying the first production unit and incurring more costs. The Committee is concerned that increasing costs for the B61 Mod 12 will come at the expense of other nuclear modernization priorities, such as modernizing aging infrastructure, and critical nonproliferation activities to combat nuclear terrorism. The Committee supports the Nuclear Weapons Council plan to retire the B83, the last megaton class weapon in the stockpile, by 2025 once the B61 Mod 12 life extension program is complete.

Cruise Missile Warhead LEP.—The Committee recommends no funding for a cruise missile warhead life extension study. NNSA has not provided sufficient justification for a life extension study on a warhead that is not facing any aging, performance, or reliability issues. The Committee is also concerned that NNSA's design and engineering schedule is not properly aligned with the Department of Defense's cruise missile warhead design and development efforts. The Committee is reluctant to provide funding for a new cruise missile warhead when the Air Force cannot identify sufficient funding in its budget planning documents to design and procure a cruise missile to deliver a refurbished warhead.

W78/W88-1 Life Extension Study.—The Committee supports NNSA's decision to defer the W78 life extension program for at least 5 years and recommends no funding for this effort. Limited resources can be focused on completing the W76 and B61 life extension programs.

The Committee remains concerned about NNSA's decision to pursue this life extension program without consensus from the military services on its timing, need, and affordability. For example, in a September 2013 report, the Government Accountability Office

found that the Navy was not participating in the integrated warhead effort because other, ongoing modernization programs were higher priorities and it had concerns about changing warhead designs. As a consequence, NNSA spent \$91,000,000 on studies and design work for an integrated warhead concept before terminating this program. The majority of the design work cannot be used in the future because non-nuclear components and other technologies currently available will be obsolete and new designs must be considered. Before beginning joint-service warhead studies, the Committee directs NNSA to work with the Nuclear Weapons Council and the military services to update their guidelines governing nuclear weapons refurbishments so the Air Force and Navy align their programs and resources and establish clear military requirements for integrated warheads.

W88 Alt 370.—The Committee recommends \$165,400,000 for the W88 Alt 370 arming, fuzing, and firing system.

Stockpile Systems.—The Committee recommends \$531,107,000 for stockpile systems.

Weapons Dismantlement.—The Committee recommends \$40,008,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 above the request, for weapons dismantlement and disposition activities. The Committee is concerned that the administration's proposed funding reduction would not be sufficient for NNSA to continue to meet its yearly dismantlement targets to achieve its goal of dismantling all weapons retired prior to fiscal year 2009 by the end of fiscal year 2022 and reducing the backlog of weapons components that must be dispositioned.

The Committee is also concerned by a recent finding by the Government Accountability Office in an April 2014 report that NNSA has not scheduled for dismantlement any weapons to be removed from the stockpile resulting from implementation of the 2010 New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. GAO found that these weapons are not expected to be retired until the late 2020s or early 2030s and the deferred retirement of these weapons could result in a significant dismantlement workload gap in the mid-2020s that could impact future dismantlement activities. The Committee does not believe delaying the 2022 dismantlement goal is a viable option to address this gap. Instead, the Committee directs NNSA to submit a report within 120 days of enactment of this act on the options available to avoid a dismantlement workload gap in the mid-2020s while still meeting the 2022 dismantlement goal.

Stockpile Services.—The Committee recommends \$1,034,628,000 for stockpile services. The Committee recommends \$144,575,000 as requested for Plutonium Sustainment to establish a responsive infrastructure that can fabricate different stockpile pit types. Funding is provided to manufacture up to five W87 development pits, conduct annual pit surveillance, resolve pit or plutonium issues that arise that could affect the stockpile, and fabricate complex, high-precision plutonium experimental devices to better understand the behavior of plutonium.

The Committee also recommends \$140,053,000 for Tritium Readiness. The Committee directs NNSA to make completing the Watts Bar Reactor Safety Analysis and the Tennessee Valley Authority's [TVA] License Amendment Request to the Nuclear Regulatory

Commission a high priority. The Committee is concerned that completing this critical documentation has been delayed by more than a year and NNSA withheld the \$3,500,000 needed to assist TVA until late in fiscal year 2014, causing additional delays. These assessments are needed to determine whether one or two reactors for tritium production should be used and when a domestic uranium enrichment capability is needed to supply additional unobligated uranium.

CAMPAIGNS

The Committee recommends \$1,789,541,000, a decrease of \$56,455,000 below the request, for NNSA Campaigns.

Science Campaign.—The Committee recommends \$437,431,000, a decrease of \$18,999,000 below the request, for the Science Campaign. The Committee supports efforts to assess the reuse of different pit types, secondaries, and other components for future life extension programs. Within these funds, the Committee recommends up to \$49,831,000 to develop an enhanced radiographic system to diagnose subcritical experiments at U1a at the Nevada National Security Site. However, the Committee directs that no funding shall be used for a new radiographic system until NNSA submits to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees the conceptual design of the down-selected technology and preliminary cost analysis for construction and operation. To increase transparency of this new project, the Committee directs NNSA to provide a separate data sheet consistent with DOE Order 413.3B in future budget justifications.

The Committee also directs NNSA to provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, within 120 days of enactment, a 10-year plan for subcritical experiments, including the benefits of these experiments for resolving fundamental weapons physics issues and supporting future life extension programs and estimated funding by fiscal year for subcritical component manufacturing, experiments, and data evaluation.

The Committee recommends \$8,000,000, as requested, to support the Dynamic Compression Sector at the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory.

The Committee supports efforts to explore additive manufacturing applications for nuclear weapons and broader national security missions. Additive manufacturing can save costs and reduce waste, floor space requirements, and production time. The Committee directs NNSA to provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, within 120 days of enactment, a 10-year strategic plan for using additive manufacturing to produce nuclear weapons components and reduce costs and floor space at production facilities while meeting stringent qualification requirements for using a new manufacturing technique.

Engineering Campaign.—The Committee recommends \$144,607,000, an increase of \$8,602,000 above the request, for the engineering campaign. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$46,401,000, an increase of \$8,602,000 above the request, for enhanced surveillance. The Committee strongly supports the enhanced surveillance program because it provides tools for assessing weapon aging by characterizing aging trends, developing pre-

dictive aging models, and developing new diagnostic capabilities. For example, the enhanced surveillance program developed a high-resolution computed tomography image analysis tool that significantly enhanced NNSA's ability to identify potential defects or anomalies for a particular nuclear component. With an aging and shrinking stockpile, the Committee believes efforts to develop better surveillance capabilities, especially non-destructive techniques, are critical and should not be curtailed.

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign.—The Committee recommends \$517,395,000, an increase of \$4,500,000 above the request, for the inertial confinement fusion ignition and high-yield campaign. Within these funds, \$329,000,000, not less than \$68,000,000, \$44,500,000, and at least \$6,500,000 shall be used for inertial confinement fusion activities at the National Ignition Facility [NIF], the University of Rochester's Omega facility, Sandia National Laboratory's Z facility, and the Naval Research Laboratory, respectively.

The Committee supports NIF's current experimental plan, which dedicates at least 50 percent of experimental time to stockpile stewardship applications, about 40 percent to ignition and developing a burning plasma platform, and 10 percent to fundamental science and national security applications. As NIF becomes more operationally efficient, the Committee encourages NNSA to increase the number of shots allocated to academic users to help attract top talent to stockpile stewardship.

The Committee directs the NNSA Administrator to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 90 days of enactment an assessment on whether the likelihood of achieving ignition on NIF has increased since December 2012 and the level of confidence NIF will achieve ignition by December 2015.

The Committee directs NNSA to better coordinate diagnostic development efforts across national labs and universities for use at the major inertial confinement fusion facilities—NIF, Omega, and Z—to make sure that critical diagnostics are in place at the right time to take needed scientific measurements. NNSA should develop and procure the most innovative, low cost options. The Committee directs NNSA to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 120 days of enactment a 5-year diagnostic development plan that identifies gaps in diagnostic capabilities, the highest priority for diagnostic development, and the needed resources for research, development, and procurement to deploy the highest priority devices at the lowest cost.

The Committee directs that no funds shall be used to introduce plutonium at NIF. If NNSA makes a decision to use plutonium at NIF for future experiments, the Committee directs the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs to submit a written notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with an explanation as to the unique benefits of conducting plutonium experiments at NIF along with estimated costs and required changes to NIF to handle plutonium in a safe manner.

Advanced Simulation and Computing.—The Committee recommends \$620,108,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 above the request, for advanced simulation and computing. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$60,000,000 for activities associated

with the exascale initiative, such as advanced system architecture design contracts with vendors and codesign and advanced weapons code development to effectively use new high performance computing platforms.

Readiness Campaign.—The Committee recommends \$70,000,000 for the Readiness Campaign.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Committee recommends \$2,077,521,000 for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

Operations.—The Committee recommends \$1,639,021,000 for Operations. The Committee reminds NNSA to ensure adherence to section 17.605 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation [FAR] as it moves forward in the regular process of reviewing the M&O contract of the Kansas City Plant. NNSA procedures require that the contracting officer review each M&O contract at appropriate intervals and at least once every 5 years, and he or she should determine whether meaningful improvement in performance or cost might reasonably be achieved when making a final decision to compete the existing contract.

Program Readiness.—The Committee recommends \$101,000,000 for Program Readiness. The Committee transferred \$35,700,000 requested in Program Readiness to implement the new plutonium strategy to Construction under a new line item. Within the \$101,000,000 for Program Readiness, the Committee recommends \$3,800,000 for conceptual design work to establish mission need, known as Critical Decision-0, for laboratory modules to extend PF-4 capabilities. However, the Committee recommends no funding for site preparation or construction or any activities that move beyond conceptual design for laboratory modules.

Before proposing the construction of laboratory modules, the Committee believes NNSA must first conduct a realistic and thorough assessment of alternatives which explores the use of existing facilities across DOE and NNSA labs and sites to meet plutonium mission needs. A February 2014 Congressional Research Service report found several options which have the potential to meet the goal of producing up to 80 pits per year, resolve Plutonium-238 issues, and permit other plutonium activities in a relatively short amount of time at an affordable cost with no new construction and with minimal environmental impact. The Committee encourages NNSA to explore each of the options proposed in the Congressional Research Service report. In addition, if NNSA concludes laboratory modules are needed, the Committee directs the NNSA Administrator to task an independent Red Team, similar to the UPF project, to determine whether NNSA's preferred option is the most cost effective and time-sensitive.

Recapitalization.—The Committee recommends \$231,321,000 for Recapitalization. The Committee directs that the additional funding be used for the revitalization of base, common, and shared infrastructure, including the retirement of deferred maintenance.

The Committee is concerned about the deteriorating conditions of infrastructure and capabilities across the nuclear weapons complex and believes NNSA has not made sufficient investments to improve the conditions and extend the design life of supporting infrastruc-

ture that is critical for ongoing nuclear operations as part of the nuclear modernization effort. The deferred maintenance backlog has grown to \$3,500,000,000 and despite historically high funding levels for NNSA, deferred maintenance is projected to continue growing. The advanced age of NNSA's 3,800 facilities makes sustaining them challenging and costly. About 54 percent of NNSA's buildings are over 40 years old, 29 percent are over 60 years old, and 12 percent are no longer in use. NNSA is now spending significant amounts of money to maintain about 450 facilities no longer needed for program use and that now sit empty. According to internal NNSA assessments, underinvestment in upgrading infrastructure and dispositioning unneeded facilities is starting to pose a risk to workers, public safety, and the environment.

The Committee directs NNSA to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 120 days of enactment a 10-year strategic plan that would reduce the deferred maintenance backlog below fiscal year 2014 baseline levels and disposition unneeded facilities.

Construction.—The Committee recommends \$438,500,000 for major capital construction projects.

Project 06-D-141, Uranium Processing Facility, Y-12, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.—The Committee recommends \$335,000,000 to continue design and engineering work as well as site readiness and site preparation projects for the Uranium Processing Facility.

The Committee supports efforts to replace existing uranium enrichment capabilities currently residing in Building 9212 by 2025 for not more than \$6,500,000,000. The Committee believes the recommendations from the Committee to Recommend Alternatives to the Uranium Processing Facility, known as the Red Team, are practical and lower cost solutions to the escalating costs and schedule delays facing the previous big box, single structure uranium building design. The original design, with a new cost estimate of \$8,500,000,000 and a schedule slip for completing construction to fiscal year 2027, made the project unaffordable and unnecessarily extended uranium operations in an aging facility that does not meet modern safety requirements. The Committee believes NNSA should carefully review the Red Team recommendations that would maximize the use of existing facilities at Y-12 and build smaller, more affordable facilities at the appropriate hazard and security category for remaining capabilities that cannot be housed in existing facilities.

The Committee directs NNSA to provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 90 days of enactment a program requirements document, as recommended by the Red Team, with an integrated strategy for the entire enriched uranium mission that balances operational risk reduction, sustained operations, and modernization of capabilities through technological advances, modification of existing facilities, and reduced-scope new build facilities.

The Committee directs NNSA to notify the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 90 days of enactment which senior career executive at NNSA will have responsibility and authority to manage and execute the uranium enrichment strategy.

The Committee is concerned that NNSA did not set up a Red Team sooner. The Committee believes that emerging space fit

issues last year that resulted in more than \$500,000,000 in additional costs to U.S. taxpayers presented a good opportunity to assess alternatives. Instead, NNSA proceeded with the design of a project that was unaffordable and unrealistic until finally looking for outside, independent advice. The Committee believes the Red Team, independent review team, modeled after the Office of Science's Lehman Review process should be used for all other major construction projects. Regarding the new approach for uranium capabilities at Y-12, the Committee directs NNSA to form an enduring, independent review team that will assess progress on a semiannual basis in meeting cost, scope, schedule, risk, and technology development goals in the uranium enrichment program requirements document.

Project 04-D-125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement Project, Los Alamos, New Mexico.—The Committee recommends \$35,700,000 to maximize the use of the newly constructed Radiological Laboratory Utility Office Building [RLUOB] and reuse lab space in PF-4 to transition plutonium capabilities out of the aging Chemistry and Metallurgy Research [CMR] building by 2019. Within these funds, the Committee recommends pursuing this work as sub-projects under the existing CMRR line item project with \$3,700,000 for the RLUOB Equipment Installation Phase 2 sub-project, which transfers most analytical chemistry capabilities from CMR to RLUOB, and \$32,000,000 for the PF-4 Equipment Installation sub-project which transfers material characterization and remaining analytical chemistry capabilities out of CMR to PF-4.

Domestic Uranium Enrichment.—The Committee recommends \$110,000,000 for a domestic uranium enrichment capability. The Committee directs that the Department of Energy shall use these funds only to maintain existing centrifuges and facilities associated with domestic enrichment capabilities and safeguard intellectual property rights. The Committee includes a bill provision which prohibits the Department of Energy from building a national security train in fiscal year 2015 and requires the Secretary of Energy to provide the House and Senate Appropriations with a clear justification for pursuing a national security train if he determines it is in the national security interest of the United States.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$1,954,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,555,156,000
Committee recommendation	1,978,000,000

The Committee recommends \$1,978,000,000, an increase of \$422,844,000 above the request, for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. The Committee commends NNSA for exceeding the goals of securing and removing vulnerable nuclear materials laid out in a 4-year plan which ended in December 2013. As part of the 4-year effort, NNSA removed 2,990 kilograms of highly enriched uranium and plutonium, exceeding its goal by 759 kilograms. In addition, in those 4 years, NNSA removed all highly enriched uranium from 12 countries—for a cumulative total of 26 countries where a terrorist can no longer access dangerous nuclear materials. Further, NNSA has completed security upgrades at dozens of additional buildings in Russia and other countries to reduce the threat of theft of weapons usable nuclear material.

Despite the success of securing and permanently removing dangerous nuclear materials over the last 4 years that significantly reduces the threat of nuclear terrorism, the Committee is concerned that the NNSA budget request does not make nonproliferation activities a top priority and fails to provide the necessary resources to complete critical nonproliferation efforts. Rather, the budget request would let critical milestones slip even further. For example, shutting down or converting 200 research reactors that use highly enriched uranium, which is a critical step in permanently removing highly enriched uranium from the remaining countries around the world, would take 5 years longer and would not be completed until 2035—compared to the original goal of completing conversions by 2022.

The Committee believes significant quantities of nuclear and radiological materials are still unsecure and vulnerable to theft. More than 1,000 kilograms of highly enriched uranium are still sitting in a handful of countries, large quantities of plutonium are still at risk, and over a hundred reactors still need to be converted to low enriched uranium or shut down. Further, thousands of radiological sources at medical facilities in the United States and overseas are not well protected and could be used for radiological dispersal devices, which could cause serious economic, psychological, and social disruption.

To address these concerns, the Committee has restored funding to critical nonproliferation programs that keep America safe from nuclear terrorism and dispose of dangerous nuclear and radiological materials.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Committee recommends \$469,395,000 for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative.

HEU Reactor Conversion.—The Committee recommends \$162,000,000. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$39,000,000 to continue supporting NNSA’s efforts in developing a capability which does not currently exist in the United States to produce Moly-99—a medical isotope used in 16 million nuclear

medicine procedures in the United States each year—with low enriched uranium by 2016.

The remaining \$123,000,000 shall be used to convert or verify the shut down of HEU reactors around the world. The Committee is frustrated by NNSA's failure to provide sufficient funding for this program and letting the goal of converting or shutting down HEU-fueled research reactors slip another 5 years—to 2035. HEU-fueled research reactors have some of the world's weakest security measures and a determined terrorist could use HEU reactor fuel for a nuclear device. The Committee believes permanently eliminating supplies of HEU as quickly as possible around the world significantly reduces the threat of nuclear terrorism. Because each reactor conversion takes approximately 2 to 5 years, depending on a variety of factors, such as time needed to modify facilities to accept low enriched uranium fuel, funding is needed in advance to prepare for these conversions.

The Committee directs NNSA to make converting or shutting down the 46 remaining HEU reactors outside of Russia the highest priority as negotiations with Russia on cost-sharing and access continue. The Committee also directs NNSA to accelerate high density low enriched uranium fuel work to avoid delays in converting reactors.

Nuclear and Radiological Material Removal.—The Committee recommends \$156,095,000. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$108,000,000 for Nuclear Material Removal to accelerate the removal of 2,100 kilograms of HEU and 1,302 kilograms of research plutonium that is highly portable, easily weaponizable, and located in facilities that have inadequate security. Within the funds available for nuclear and radiological material removal, the Committee also recommends \$25,000,000 for domestic radiological material removal. The Committee recommends additional funds to eliminate the existing backlog of orphaned or unused radiological sources in the United States and dispose of the remaining orphaned or unused radiological sources that present the greatest risk of use in a radiological dispersal device by 2020.

Nuclear and Radiological Material Protection.—The Committee recommends \$151,300,000. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$92,300,000 for domestic material protection and \$59,000,000 for international material protection. The Committee directs NNSA to make domestic material protection a higher priority than international material protection.

The Committee is concerned that NNSA abandoned the goal of securing by 2025 approximately 2,900 buildings in the United States which legitimately use nuclear and radiological sources but, if stolen, could be used as effective improvised nuclear devices or radiological dispersal devices. Radiological materials in particular are used at hospitals and universities to treat diseases and for other medical purposes but they have little or no security. As the only government program that provides physical protection upgrades for civilian sites with nuclear and radiological materials, GTRI has only installed security upgrades at less than 20 percent of buildings that have high-priority, vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials. The Committee recommends additional funds to address the expected increase in demand by medical and industrial

facilities to conduct vulnerability assessments and install security upgrades based on a new bill provision that requires radiological source licensees to comply with more stringent, mandatory Nuclear Regulatory Commission security standards. Licensees of Category 1 and 2 radiological materials have an incentive to volunteer for GTRI's radiological protection program and take advantage of the 50 percent cost share because after 5 years, licensees will have to bear the full cost.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIAL PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The Committee recommends \$355,811,000. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$150,000,000 for Second Line of Defense [SLD]. The additional funding will complete installation of fixed detection equipment at vulnerable border crossings and airports in Kazakhstan and Belarus and expand work in high threat areas in the Middle East. Additional funding for material protection and consolidation activities will complete radio communications and entry control point upgrades at several nuclear weapons sites and characterize and dispose of legacy nuclear material.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends \$393,401,000 to support investments in developing advanced nuclear detection technologies. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$240,210,000 for proliferation detection. Within the funds for proliferation detection, the Committee recommends \$66,900,000 for the National Center for Nuclear Security. The additional funding restores efforts to develop the next generation of warhead monitoring technologies, improve low yield nuclear test monitoring capabilities, and test long range remote monitoring technologies for plutonium production detection.

The Committee directs NNSA to conduct a joint assessment with the Department of Defense within 120 days of enactment on the continued need to build and deploy space sensors for atmospheric testing and provide the results to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. These types of sensors were critical during the cold war when nuclear weapons states were conducting above ground nuclear weapons tests. Since the moratorium on underground nuclear weapons testing, it is not clear these sensors are needed and the Committee is concerned that continued production of these sensors is drawing resources away from developing detection technologies that address likely proliferation threats, such as low yield nuclear tests and concealed uranium and plutonium production capabilities.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The Committee recommends \$515,125,000 to support plutonium and uranium disposition activities and construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility [MFFF].

Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$400,000,000 to continue construction of MFFF. The Committee directs the NNSA Administrator to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations

Committees within 120 days of enactment of this act his assessment of alternatives for plutonium disposition and his recommended approach.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2014	\$1,095,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,377,100,000
Committee recommendation	1,208,000,000

The Committee recommends \$1,208,000,000 for Naval Reactors. The Committee recommends no funding for the design and construction of a new spent fuel handling facility. NNSA cannot identify needed funding for the construction of this \$1,500,000,000 facility in its 5-year Future Years Nuclear Security Program budget and the Committee does not believe NNSA should complete the design of a facility it cannot afford to build. The Committee recommends no funding for the construction of the Central Office and Prototype Staff Building to fund higher priorities within Naval Reactors.

FEDERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2014	\$377,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	410,842,000
Committee recommendation	390,000,000

The Committee recommends \$390,000,000. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$19,900,000 to fund the move to a new leased facility for the NNSA Albuquerque complex and \$11,809,000 for Corporate Project Management.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2014	\$5,000,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	4,864,538,000
Committee recommendation	5,101,971,000

The Committee recommendation for Defense Environmental Cleanup is \$5,101,971,000. Within the total provided, the Department is directed to fund the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program.

Reprogramming Control Levels.—In fiscal year 2015, the Environmental Management program may transfer funding between operating expense funded projects within the controls listed below using guidance contained in the Department’s budget execution manual (DOE M 135.1–1A, chapter IV). All capital construction line item projects remain separate controls from the operating projects. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be formally notified in advance of all reprogrammings, except internal reprogrammings, and the Department is to take no financial action in anticipation of congressional response. The Committee recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2015:

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

Internal Reprogramming Authority.—The new reprogramming control points above obviates, in most cases, the need for internal reprogramming authority. However, at the few sites to which the internal reprogramming statute still applies, Environmental Management site managers may transfer up to \$5,000,000, one time, between accounts listed above to reduce health and safety risks, gain cost savings, or complete projects, as long as a program or project is not increased or decreased by more than \$5,000,000 in total during the fiscal year.

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

Closure Sites.—The Committee recommends \$4,889,000 for Closure Sites activities.

Hanford Site.—As a signatory to the Tri-Party Agreement, the Department of Energy is required to meet specific compliance milestones toward the cleanup of the Hanford site. Among other things,

the Department committed to provide the funding necessary to enable full compliance with its cleanup milestones. Unfortunately, if the Department's fiscal year 2015 budget request were enacted, several Tri-Party Agreement milestones would be delayed in fiscal year 2015 and additional milestones in future fiscal years could be at risk. This could threaten high risk cleanup projects near the city of Richland, Washington and the economically and environmentally important Columbia River. The Committee recognizes that significant progress has been made at the Hanford Site. However, because the Department's budget request could slow or halt critical cleanup work and threaten the Department's compliance with its legal obligations under the Tri-Party Agreement, the Committee recommends \$941,000,000 for Richland Operations. Additional funding is provided for work related to the deconstruction of the Plutonium Finishing Plant, cleanup of remaining 300 area waste sites, cesium/strontium capsule storage, K basin sludge removal, groundwater treatment, and community and regulatory support. Within available funds in the River Corridor control point, the Department is directed to carry out maintenance and public safety efforts at the B Reactor, and the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response facilities.

Idaho National Laboratory.—The Committee recommends \$367,203,000 for Idaho National Laboratory.

NNSA Sites.—The Committee recommends \$293,635,000 for NNSA sites, of which \$224,617,000 is for work at Los Alamos National Laboratory, including the Hexavalent Chromium Pump and Treat project.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The Committee recommends \$228,887,000 for Oak Ridge Reservation.

Building 3019.—The Committee recommends \$53,000,000 for the cleanup of Building 3019. This project will result in security cost savings at Oak Ridge National Laboratory once complete.

Oak Ridge Reservation Mercury Containment.—The Committee recommends \$9,400,000 for remediation of mercury contamination at the Oak Ridge Reservation to advance planning, engineering, and construction of the wastewater treatment facility. While full site remediation cannot be undertaken at this time, reducing the mercury being released into the East Fork of Poplar Creek is a high priority for the Environmental Management program. Given the significant risk to public health the Committee urges the Department to continue to pursue efforts to prevent mercury from escaping into the environment.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee recommends \$1,235,000,000 for the Office of River Protection.

The Committee is supportive of the Department's efforts at technology development efforts to reduce the overall volume of radioactive wastes needing treatment and disposal. Preliminary work on technologies capable of removing the salts from the low-activity tank waste streams has been undertaken, and the Department is encouraged to complete this effort by conducting system conceptual design and cost estimate activities in order to gain a deeper understanding of its potential within recent waste treatment system changes.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee recommends \$1,150,106,000 for the Savannah River site.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.—The Committee recommends \$318,020,000 for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

The Committee is very concerned about both the salt haul truck fire and radiological release in February 2014. An accident investigation report into the truck fire in an underground mining area found that the Department's contractors had failed to perform periodic preventive maintenance and had deactivated onboard automatic fire suppression systems on underground vehicles. Worker safety should always be the first priority for the Department and its contractors. The Committee recommendation recognizes that operational decisions and maintenance activities that ensure worker safety are extremely important and are fully funded in the amounts provided.

The Committee is concerned that a detailed budget justification for recovery dollars for WIPP has not been provided by the Department of Energy and the administration. The Committee is prepared to fund necessary additional investigation and recovery operations at WIPP to ensure the safe rehabilitation and continuation of the facility, but urges the Department of Energy to submit an official position and detailed plan to address all critical needs, including an explanation of the remediation plan, so that resources are properly allocated. Additionally, the Department should report to the Committee regularly to facilitate tracking of recovery funds.

The full cause of the radiological release on February 14 is still under investigation. However, initial indications of a heat-related rupture of a waste container and displacement of inert stabilizing material in an emplacement area suggest issues with packaging and characterization at one or more generating sites. The Committee recommends that the Department of Energy conduct an independent review of the radiological release at WIPP. The Committee recommends that the Department of Energy consult with academic institutions in New Mexico to identify appropriately qualified technical experts who could participate in such an investigation.

During the course of the Department's investigation, including all independent reviews, the Department is directed to brief the Committees on Appropriation in the both the House and the Senate regularly on progress in understanding the incident, formulating a response, and implementing needed remedial actions. None of the funds provided for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant shall be used to fund incident recovery or other transuranic waste activities at any other site.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee recommends \$13,007,000 for technology development and deployment.

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommends \$254,461,000 for safeguards and security around the complex. The Committee remains concerned with the Department's consistently inadequate budget requests in the area of safeguards and security of nuclear facilities and materials rather than undertaking efforts to reduce these costs over time. Therefore, the Committee directs the completion of a report under Departmental Administration re-

garding the potential consolidation of nuclear materials and wastes as one way to address this issue.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING
FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

Appropriations, 2014
Budget estimate, 2015	\$463,000,000
Committee recommendation	463,000,000

The Committee recommends \$463,000,000 for the Federal Government's contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2014	\$755,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	753,000,000
Committee recommendation	753,000,000

The Committee recommends \$753,000,000 for Other Defense Activities. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends up to \$2,000,000 for the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health, if Congress establishes it in the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act. The board would be comprised of members representing the scientific, medical, legal, worker and worker advocate communities to review and report on the scientific soundness of the Department of Labor's implementation of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program generally and the site exposure matrix specifically. This advisory board would add transparency and certainty to decisions made affecting workers' compensation and access to benefits.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Department of Energy's marketing agency for electric power in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides electricity to a 300,000-square-mile service area in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets the power from Federal hydropower projects in the Northwest, as well as power from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada and California. The Committee recommends no new borrowing authority for BPA during fiscal year 2015.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2014
Budget estimate, 2015
Committee recommendation

For the Southeastern Power Administration, the Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$0 as the appropriations are offset by collections.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$11,892,000
Budget estimate, 2015	11,400,000
Committee recommendation	11,400,000

For the Southwestern Power Administration, the Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$11,400,000.

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

Appropriations, 2014	\$95,930,000
Budget estimate, 2015	93,372,000
Committee recommendation	93,372,000

For the Western Area Power Administration, the Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$93,372,000.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriations, 2014	\$420,000
Budget estimate, 2015	228,000
Committee recommendation	228,000

For the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, the Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$228,000.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2014	\$304,600,000
Budget estimate, 2015	327,277,000
Committee recommendation	327,277,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2014	-\$304,600,000
Budget estimate, 2015	- 327,277,000
Committee recommendation	- 327,277,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
ENERGY PROGRAMS					
ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY					
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy RDD&D:					
Vehicle technologies	289,910	359,000	290,000	+90	-69,000
Bioenergy technologies	232,429	253,200	253,200	+20,771
Hydrogen and fuel cell technologies	92,983	92,983	93,000	+17	+17
Solar energy	257,211	282,300	248,000	-9,211	-34,300
Wind energy	88,179	115,000	109,000	+20,821	-6,000
Water power	58,600	62,500	69,000	+10,400	+6,500
Geothermal technologies	45,802	61,500	61,500
Advanced manufacturing	180,579	305,100	231,841	+51,262	-73,259
Federal energy management program	28,265	36,200	29,000	+735	-7,200
Building technologies	177,974	211,700	178,000	+26	-33,700
Weatherization and intragovernmental:					
Weatherization assistance	171,000	224,600	224,600	+53,600
Training and technical assistance	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal	174,000	227,600	227,600	+53,600
Other:					
State energy program grants	50,000	63,100	50,000	-13,100
Tribal energy activities	7,000	-7,000
Clean energy and economic development partnerships	14,000	-14,000
Subtotal, Weatherization and intragovernmental	231,000	304,700	277,600	+46,600	-27,100
Facilities and infrastructure:					
National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)	46,000	56,000	56,000	+10,000
Program direction	162,000	160,000	160,000	-2,000
Strategic programs	23,554	21,779	22,000	-1,554	+221

Subtotal, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy RDD&D	1,914,486	2,321,962	2,078,141	+ 163,655	- 243,821
Use of prior year balances	- 2,382	- 5,213	- 5,213	- 2,831
Subtotal, Energy efficiency and renewable energy	1,912,104	2,316,749	2,072,928	+ 160,824	- 243,821
Rescission	- 10,418	+ 10,418
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,901,686	2,316,749	2,072,928	+ 171,242	- 243,821
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY					
Research and development:					
Clean energy transmission and reliability	32,400	36,000	36,000	+ 3,600
Smart grid research and development	14,600	24,400	24,400	+ 9,800
Cyber security for energy delivery systems	43,500	42,000	42,000	- 1,500
Energy storage	15,200	19,000	15,000	- 200	- 4,000
Subtotal	105,700	121,400	117,400	+ 11,700	- 4,000
National electricity delivery	6,000	7,000	6,000	- 1,000
Infrastructure security and energy restoration	8,000	22,600	22,600	+ 14,600
Program direction	27,606	29,000	28,000	+ 394	- 1,000
Subtotal, Electricity Delivery and EnergyReliability	147,306	180,000	174,000	+ 26,694	- 6,000
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY	147,306	180,000	174,000	+ 26,694	- 6,000
NUCLEAR ENERGY					
Research and development:					
Nuclear energy enabling technologies	71,130	78,246	73,500	+ 2,370	- 4,746
Integrated university program	5,500	- 5,500
Reactor concepts RD&D	113,000	100,540	55,000	- 58,000	- 45,540
Fuel cycle research and development	186,500	189,100	230,000	+ 43,500	+ 40,900
International nuclear energy cooperation	2,500	3,000	3,000	+ 500
Small modular reactor licensing technical support	110,000	97,000	- 110,000	- 97,000
Subtotal	488,630	467,886	361,500	- 127,130	- 106,386
Infrastructure:					
Radiological facilities management:					
Space and defense infrastructure	20,000	20,000	+ 20,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Research reactor infrastructure	5,000	5,000	5,000		
Subtotal	25,000	5,000	25,000		+20,000
INL facilities management:					
INL Operations and infrastructure	180,162	180,541	180,541	+379	
Construction:					
13-D-905 Remote-handled low level waste disposal project, INL	16,398	5,369	5,369	-11,029	
Subtotal, Construction	16,398	5,369	5,369	-11,029	
Subtotal, INL facilities management	196,560	185,910	185,910	-10,650	
Subtotal, Infrastructure	221,560	190,910	210,910	-10,650	+20,000
Idaho statewide safeguards and security	94,000	104,000	104,000	+10,000	
STEP (Supercritical CO2)		27,500	27,500	+27,500	
Program direction	90,000	73,090	73,090	-16,910	
Use of prior year balances	-5,000			+5,000	
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	889,190	863,386	777,000	-112,190	-86,386
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	889,190	863,386	777,000	-112,190	-86,386
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY (RESCISSION)					
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT					
CCS demonstrations:					
Natural gas carbon capture and storage		25,000	25,000	+25,000	
CCS and power systems:					
Carbon capture	92,000	77,000	77,000	-15,000	

Total, CCS demonstrations	92,000	102,000	102,000	+ 10,000
Carbon storage	108,900	80,084	80,084	-28,816
Advanced energy systems	99,500	51,000	46,000	-53,500	-5,000
Cross cutting research	41,925	35,292	30,292	-11,633	-5,000
NETL Coal Research and Development	50,011	34,031	34,031	-15,980
Subtotal, CCS and power systems	392,336	277,407	267,407	-124,929	-10,000
Natural Gas Technologies	20,600	35,000	40,000	+ 19,400	+ 5,000
Unconventional fossil energy technologies from Petroleum—oil technologies	15,000	5,000	5,000	-10,000	+ 5,000
Program direction	120,000	114,202	114,202	-5,798
Plant and Capital Equipment	16,032	15,294	15,294	-738
Fossil energy environmental restoration	5,897	7,897	7,897	+ 2,000
Special recruitment programs	700	700	700
Use of prior year balances	-8,500	+ 8,500
Subtotal, Fossil Energy Research and Development	562,065	475,500	475,500	-86,565
TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	562,065	475,500	475,500	-86,565
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	20,000	19,950	19,950	-50
TOTAL, NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	20,000	19,950	19,950	-50
ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND
California Teacher's Pension Fund Payment	15,580	15,580	+ 15,580
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	189,400	205,000	205,000	+ 15,600
SPR PETROLEUM ACCOUNT
SPR PETROLEUM ACCOUNT (RESCISSION)	-135,000	-135,000	-135,000
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	8,000	1,600	1,600	-6,400
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	117,000	122,500	117,000	-5,500
Rescission

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
TOTAL ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	117,000	122,500	117,000	- 5,500
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP					
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	2,545	2,562	2,562	+ 17
Gasous Diffusion Plants	96,222	104,403	104,403	+ 8,181
Small sites	71,204	60,223	80,049	+ 8,845	+ 19,826
West Valley Demonstration Project	64,000	58,986	58,986	- 5,014
Use of prior year balances	- 2,206	+ 2,206
Subtotal, Non-defense Environmental Cleanup	231,765	226,174	246,000	+ 14,235	+ 19,826
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	231,765	226,174	246,000	+ 14,235	+ 19,826
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND					
Oak Ridge	195,990	137,898	182,922	- 13,068	+ 45,024
Paducah	265,220	198,729	198,729	- 66,491
Construction:	8,486	8,486	+ 8,486
15-U-407 On-site waste disposal facility Paducah (PA-0040)
Total, Paducah	265,220	207,215	207,215	- 58,005
Portsmouth	137,613	131,461	139,461	+ 1,848	+ 8,000
Construction:	28,539	28,539	+ 28,539
15-U-408 On-site waste disposal facility Portsmouth (PO-0040)
Total, Portsmouth	137,613	160,000	168,000	+ 30,387	+ 8,000
Pension and community and regulatory support:
Oak Ridge	21,693	21,693	+ 21,693
Paducah	2,375	2,375	+ 2,375

Portsmouth	1,795	1,795	+ 1,795
Total, Pension and community and regulatory support	25,863	25,863	+ 25,863
TITLE X URANIUM/THORIUM REIMBURSEMENTS	10,000	+ 10,000	+ 10,000
Subtotal, UED&D Fund	530,976	594,000	- 4,823	+ 63,024
TOTAL, UED&D FUND	530,976	594,000	- 4,823	+ 63,024
SCIENCE				
Advanced scientific computing research	478,593	541,000	+ 78,407	+ 16,000
Basic energy sciences:	1,610,757	1,667,800	+ 57,043
Research	26,300	- 26,300
Construction:	75,700	138,700	+ 63,000
07-SC-06 National synchrotron light source II, BNL
13-SC-10 LINAC coherent light source II, SLAC
Subtotal, Construction	102,000	138,700	+ 36,700
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	1,712,757	1,806,500	+ 93,743
Biological and environmental research	610,196	628,000	+ 17,337	- 467
Fusion energy sciences:	305,677	266,000	- 39,677
Research	200,000	150,000	- 125,000	- 75,000
Construction:
14-SC-60 ITER
Subtotal, Fusion energy sciences	505,677	416,000	- 164,677	- 75,000
High energy physics:	746,521	719,000	- 19,039	+ 8,482
Research
Construction:	16,000	22,000	+ 6,000	+ 22,000
11-SC-40 Project engineering and design (PED) long baseline neutrino experiment, FNAL	35,000	25,000	- 10,000
11-SC-41 Muon to electron conversion experiment, FNAL
Subtotal, Construction	51,000	47,000	- 4,000	+ 22,000
Subtotal, High energy physics	797,521	774,482	- 23,039	+ 30,482

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Nuclear physics:					
Operations and maintenance	489,438	487,073	495,073	+ 5,635	+ 8,000
Construction:					
14-SC-50 Facility for rare isotope beams, Michigan State University	55,000	90,000	90,000	+ 35,000
06-SC-01 12 GeV continuous electron beam facility upgrade, JINAF	25,500	16,500	16,500	- 9,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	569,938	593,573	601,573	+ 31,635	+ 8,000
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	26,500	19,500	29,500	+ 3,000	+ 10,000
Science laboratories infrastructure:					
Infrastructure support:					
Payment in lieu of taxes	1,385	1,412	1,412	+ 27
Oak Ridge landlord	5,951	5,777	5,777	- 174
Facilities and infrastructure	900	3,100	3,100	+ 2,200
Subtotal	8,236	10,289	10,289	+ 2,053
Subtotal					
15-SC-78 Integrative genomics building, LBNL		12,090	12,090	+ 12,090
15-SC-77 Photon science laboratory building, SLAC		12,890	12,890	+ 12,890
15-SC-76 Materials design laboratory, ANL		7,000	7,000	+ 7,000
15-SC-75 Infrastructure and operational improvements, PPPL		25,000	12,500	+ 12,500	- 12,500
13-SC-70 Utilities upgrade, FNAL	34,900	- 34,900
13-SC-71 Utility infrastructure modernization/JINAF	29,200	- 29,200
12-SC-70 Science and user support building, SLAC	25,482	11,920	11,920	- 13,562
Subtotal	89,582	68,900	56,400	- 33,182	- 12,500
Subtotal, Science laboratories infrastructure	97,818	79,189	66,689	- 31,129	- 12,500
Safeguards and security	87,000	94,000	94,000	+ 7,000
Science program direction	185,000	189,393	187,723	+ 2,723	- 1,670
Subtotal, Science	5,071,000	5,111,155	5,086,000	+ 15,000	- 25,155

Rescission									
TOTAL, SCIENCE	5,071,000	5,111,155	5,086,000	+ 15,000	- 25,155				
ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY									
ARPA-E projects	252,000	295,750	250,750	- 1,250	- 45,000				
Program direction	28,000	29,250	29,250	+ 1,250					
TOTAL, ARPA-E	280,000	325,000	280,000		- 45,000				
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION									
Administrative operations:									
Salaries and expenses:									
Office of the Secretary:									
Program direction	5,008	5,008	5,008						
Chief Financial Officer	47,825	47,182	47,182	- 643					
Management	57,599	68,293	62,946	+ 5,347	- 5,347				
Chief human capital officer	24,488	25,400	25,400	+ 912					
Chief Information Officer	35,401	33,188	33,188	- 2,213					
Office of Indian energy policy and programs	2,506			- 2,506					
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,700	6,300	4,700		- 1,600				
Office Of Small and disadvantaged business utilization		2,253	2,253	+ 2,253					
Economic impact and diversity	6,197	5,574	5,574	- 623					
General Counsel	33,053	33,000	33,000	- 53					
Energy policy and systems analysis	16,181	38,545	27,733	+ 11,552	- 10,812				
International Affairs	12,518	18,441	17,148	+ 4,630	- 1,293				
Public affairs	3,597	3,431	3,431	- 166					
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	249,073	286,615	267,563	+ 18,490	- 19,052				
Program support:									
Economic impact and diversity	2,759	1,673	1,673	- 1,086					
Policy analysis and system studies	441			- 441					
Environmental policy studies	520			- 520					
Climate change technology program (prog. supp)	5,482			- 5,482					
Cybersecurity and secure communications	30,795	21,364	21,364	- 9,431					
Corporate IT program support (CIO)	15,866	19,612	19,612	+ 3,746					
Subtotal, Program support	55,863	42,649	42,649	- 13,214					

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Subtotal, Administrative operations	304,936	329,264	310,212	+ 5,276	- 19,052
Cost of work for others	48,537	42,000	42,000	- 6,537
Subtotal, Departmental administration	353,473	371,264	352,212	- 1,261	- 19,052
Use of prior year balances	- 4,205	- 4,205	- 4,205
Funding from other defense activities	- 118,836	- 118,836	- 118,836
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	234,637	248,223	229,171	- 5,466	- 19,052
Miscellaneous revenues	- 108,188	- 119,171	- 119,171	- 10,983
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	126,449	129,052	110,000	- 16,449	- 19,052
INDIAN ENERGY PROGRAMS					
Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs (IE)	2,510	2,510	+ 2,510
Tribal energy program	13,490	13,490	+ 13,490
TOTAL, INDIAN ENERGY PROGRAMS	16,000	16,000	+ 16,000
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL					
Office of the Inspector General	42,120	50,288	50,288	+ 8,168
Use of prior year balances	- 10,420	- 10,420	- 10,420
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	42,120	39,868	39,868	- 2,252
TITLE 17—INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PGM					
Administrative expenses	42,000	42,000	42,000
Offsetting collection	- 22,000	- 25,000	- 25,000	- 3,000

TOTAL, TITLE 17—INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM	20,000	17,000	17,000	- 3,000
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PGM					
Administrative expenses	6,000	4,000	4,000	- 2,000
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM	6,000	4,000	4,000	- 2,000
TOTAL, ENERGY PROGRAMS	10,210,804	10,592,890	10,109,826	- 100,978	- 483,064
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES					
Directed stockpile work:					
B61 Life extension program	537,044	643,000	643,000	+ 105,956
W76 Life extension program	248,454	259,168	259,168	+ 10,714
W78 Life extension program	38,000	- 38,000
W88 Alt 370	169,487	165,400	165,400	- 4,087
Cruise missile warhead life extension program	9,418	- 9,418
Stockpile systems:					
B61 Stockpile systems	83,536	109,615	109,615	+ 26,079
W76 Stockpile systems	47,187	45,728	45,728	- 1,459
W78 Stockpile systems	54,381	62,703	62,703	+ 8,322
W80 Stockpile systems	50,330	70,610	70,610	+ 20,280
B83 Stockpile systems	54,948	63,136	63,136	+ 8,188
W87 Stockpile systems	101,506	91,255	91,255	- 10,251
W88 Stockpile systems	62,600	88,060	88,060	+ 25,460
Subtotal	454,488	531,107	531,107	+ 76,619
Weapons dismantlement and disposition	54,264	30,008	40,008	- 14,256	+ 10,000
Stockpile services:					
Production support	345,000	350,942	345,000	- 5,942
Research and Development support	24,928	29,649	25,000	+ 72	- 4,649
R and D certification and safety	151,133	201,479	160,000	+ 8,867	- 41,479
Management, technology, and production	214,187	241,805	220,000	+ 5,813	- 21,805
Plutonium sustainment	144,575	144,575	+ 144,575
Plutonium infrastructure sustainment	125,048	- 125,048

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Tritium readiness	80,000	140,053	140,053	+ 60,053
Subtotal	940,296	1,108,503	1,034,628	+ 94,332	- 73,875
Subtotal, Directed stockpile work	2,442,033	2,746,604	2,673,311	+ 231,278	- 73,293
Campaigns:					
Science campaign:					
Advanced certification	58,747	58,747	58,747
Primary assessment technologies	92,000	112,000	102,000	+ 10,000	- 10,000
Dynamic materials properties	104,000	117,999	109,000	+ 5,000	- 8,999
Advanced radiography	29,509	79,340	79,340	+ 49,831
Secondary assessment technologies	85,467	88,344	88,344	+ 2,877
Subtotal	369,723	456,430	437,431	+ 67,708	- 18,999
Engineering campaign:					
Enhanced safety	51,771	52,003	52,003	+ 232
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	23,727	20,832	20,832	- 2,895
Nuclear survivability	19,504	25,371	25,371	+ 5,867
Enhanced surveillance	54,909	37,799	46,401	- 8,508	+ 8,602
Subtotal	149,911	136,005	144,607	- 5,304	+ 8,602
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign:					
Ignition	80,245	77,994	77,994	- 2,251
Support of other stockpile programs	15,001	23,598	23,598	+ 8,597
Diagnostics, cyogenics and experimental support	59,897	61,297	61,297	+ 1,400
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	5,024	5,024	5,024
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	8,198	9,100	9,100	+ 902
Facility operations and target production	345,592	335,882	340,382	- 5,210	+ 4,500
Subtotal	513,957	512,895	517,395	+ 3,438	+ 4,500
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	569,329	610,108	620,108	+ 50,779	+ 10,000

Readiness campaign:									
Nonnuclear readiness	55,407	125,909	70,000	+ 14,593	- 55,909				
Subtotal, Campaigns	1,658,327	1,841,347	1,789,541	+ 131,214	- 51,806				
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF):									
Operations of facilities:									
Kansas City Plant	135,834	125,000	125,000	- 10,834					
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	77,287	71,000	71,000	- 6,287					
Los Alamos National Laboratory	213,707	198,000	198,000	- 15,707					
Nevada Test Site	100,929	89,000	89,000	- 11,929					
Pantex	81,420	75,000	75,000	- 6,420					
Sandia National Laboratory	115,000	106,000	106,000	- 9,000					
Savannah River Site	90,236	81,000	81,000	- 9,236					
Y-12 National Security Complex	170,042	151,000	151,000	- 19,042					
Subtotal	984,455	896,000	896,000	- 88,455					
Program readiness	67,259	136,700	101,000	+ 33,741	- 35,700				
Material recycle and recovery	125,000	138,900	138,900	+ 13,900					
Containers	26,000	26,000	26,000						
Storage	35,000	40,800	40,800	+ 5,800					
Maintenance and repair of facilities	227,591	205,000	205,000	- 22,591					
Recapitalization	180,000	209,321	231,321	+ 51,321	+ 22,000				
Construction:									
15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12		2,000	2,000	+ 2,000					
15-D-612 Emergency Operations Center, LLNL		2,000	2,000	+ 2,000					
15-D-611 Emergency Operations Center, SNL		4,000	4,000	+ 4,000					
15-D-301, HE Science & Engineering Facility, PX		11,800	11,800	+ 11,800					
15-D-302, TA-55 Reinvestment project Phase 3, LANL		16,062	16,062	+ 16,062					
12-D-301 TRU waste facility project, LANL	26,722	6,938	6,938	- 19,784					
11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project II, LANL	30,679	10,000	10,000	- 20,679					
06-D-141 Uranium Processing Facility, Oak Ridge, TN	309,000	335,000	335,000	+ 26,000					
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility, LANL	45,114			- 45,114					
07-D-220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL	10,605	15,000	15,000	+ 4,395					
04-D125 Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building replacement project, LANL			35,700	+ 35,700	+ 35,700				
Subtotal	422,120	402,800	438,500	+ 16,380	+ 35,700				
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	2,067,425	2,055,521	2,077,521	+ 10,096	+ 22,000				

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Secure transportation asset:					
Operations and equipment	112,882	132,851	132,851	+ 19,969
Program direction	97,118	100,962	100,962	+ 3,844
Subtotal, Secure transportation asset	210,000	233,813	233,813	+ 23,813
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	228,243	173,440	173,440	- 54,803
Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs	76,901	70,000	+ 70,000	- 6,901
Environmental projects and operations	53,000	53,000	+ 53,000
Nuclear materials integration	16,218	16,218	+ 16,218
Corporate project management
Minority serving institution partnerships program	13,231	13,231	+ 13,231
Site stewardship	87,326	- 87,326
Subtotal, Site stewardship	87,326	- 87,326
Defense nuclear security	664,981	618,123	618,123	- 46,858
Subtotal, Defense nuclear security	664,981	618,123	618,123	- 46,858
Information technology and Cyber security	145,068	179,646	179,646	+ 34,578
Legacy contractor pensions	279,597	307,058	307,058	+ 27,461
Domestic uranium enrichment	62,000	110,000	+ 48,000	+ 110,000
Use of prior year balances
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	7,845,000	8,314,902	8,314,902	+ 469,902
Rescission	- 64,000	+ 64,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	7,781,000	8,314,902	8,314,902	+ 533,902

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION								
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs								
Global threat reduction initiative:								
Global threat reduction initiative	162,000	333,488	469,395	+469,395			+135,907	
HEU reactor conversion	200,102			-162,000				
International nuclear and radiological material removal and protection	80,000			-200,102				
Domestic radiological material removal and protection				-80,000				
Subtotal, Global threat reduction initiative	442,102	333,488	469,395	+27,293			+135,907	
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	398,838			-398,838				
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D		360,808	393,401	+393,401			+32,593	
Nonproliferation and international security	128,675	141,359	141,359	+12,684				
International materials protection and cooperation	419,625	305,467	355,811	-63,814			+50,344	
Fissile materials disposition:								
U.S. plutonium disposition	157,557	85,000	85,000	-72,557				
U.S. uranium disposition	25,000	25,000	25,000					
Construction:								
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	343,500	196,000	400,000	+56,500			+204,000	
99-D-141-02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC		5,125	5,125	+5,125				
Subtotal, Construction	343,500	201,125	405,125	+61,625			+204,000	
Total, Fissile materials disposition	526,057	311,125	515,125	-10,932			+204,000	
Legacy contractor pensions	93,703	102,909	102,909	+9,206				
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,009,000	1,555,156	1,978,000	-31,000			+422,844	
Use of prior year balances	-55,000			+55,000				
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,954,000	1,555,156	1,978,000	+24,000			+422,844	
NAVAL REACTORS								
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	356,300	412,380	408,480	+52,180			-3,900	
Naval reactors development	414,298	425,700	425,600	+11,302			-100	
OHIO replacement reactor systems development	126,400	156,100	156,100	+29,700				
S8G Prototype refueling	144,400	126,400	126,400	-18,000				
Program direction	43,212	46,600	46,600	+3,388				

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Construction:					
15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3		400	400	+ 400	
15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade		600	600	+ 600	
15-D-902 KS Engine room team Trainer facility		1,500	1,500	+ 1,500	
15-D-901 KS Central office building and prototype staff facility		24,000			- 24,000
14-D-902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL	1,000			- 1,000	
14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF		141,100			- 141,100
13-D-905 Remote-handled low-level waste disposal project, INL	21,073	14,420	14,420	- 6,653	
13-D-904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO	600	20,100	20,100	+ 19,500	
10-D-903 Security upgrades, KAPL		7,400	7,400	+ 7,400	
08-D-190 Expanded Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, NRF, ID	1,700	400	400	- 1,300	
Subtotal, Construction	24,373	209,920	44,820	+ 20,447	- 165,100
Use of prior year balances	- 13,983			+ 13,983	
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	1,095,000	1,377,100	1,208,000	+ 113,000	- 169,100
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	377,000			- 377,000	
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	377,000			- 377,000	
FEDERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES		410,842	390,000	+ 390,000	- 20,842
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	11,207,000	11,658,000	11,890,902	+ 683,902	+ 232,902
Closure sites	4,702	4,889	4,889	+ 187	

Total, Closure sites	4,702	4,889	4,889	+ 187
Hanford Site:					
River corridor and other cleanup operations:					
River corridor and other cleanup operations	408,634	332,788	377,788	- 30,846	+ 45,000
Central plateau remediation	512,665	474,292	517,221	+ 4,556	+ 42,929
Construction:					
15-D-401 Contaminized sludge (RL-0012)		26,290	26,290	+ 26,290
Subtotal, Central plateau remediation	512,665	500,582	543,511	+ 30,846	+ 42,929
Richland community and regulatory support	19,701	14,701	19,701	+ 5,000
Total, Hanford Site	941,000	848,071	941,000	+ 92,929
Idaho National Laboratory:					
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	383,300	364,293	364,293	- 19,007
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,700	2,910	2,910	- 790
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	387,000	367,203	367,203	- 19,797
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites					
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	314,676	- 314,676
Separations process research unit	1,366	1,366	+ 1,366
Nevada
Sandia National Laboratory	64,851	64,851	+ 64,851
Los Alamos National Laboratory	2,801	2,801	+ 2,801
Construction:					
15-D-406 Hexavalent chromium D & D (VL-ANL 0030)	196,017	196,017	+ 196,017
Total, Los Alamos National Laboratory	28,600	28,600	+ 28,600
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	314,676	224,617	224,617	+ 224,617
Oak Ridge Reservation:					
OR Nuclear facility D&D	73,716	73,155	73,155	- 561
Construction:					
14-D-403 Outfall 200 mercury treatment facility	4,608	9,400	9,400	+ 4,792

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Total, OR Nuclear facility D&D					
U233 disposition program	45,000	41,626		-45,000	-41,626
OR cleanup and disposition	83,220	71,137	137,767	+54,547	+66,630
Construction:					
15-D-405 Sludge buildout		4,200	4,200	+4,200	
Total, OR cleanup and disposition					
OR reservation community & regulatory support	4,365	4,365	4,365		
Oak Ridge Technology development	4,091	3,000		-4,091	-3,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	215,000	206,883	228,887	+13,887	+22,004
Office of River Protection:					
Waste Treatment & Immobilization Plant:					
01-D-16 A-D/ORP-0060/Major construction	510,000	575,000	575,000	+65,000	
01-D-16 E Pretreatment facility	180,000	115,000	115,000	-65,000	
Subtotal, Waste Treatment & Immobilization Plant	690,000	690,000	690,000		
Tank Farm activities:					
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	520,216	522,000	522,000	+1,784	
Construction:					
15-D-405 Low activity waste pretreatment system Hanford		23,000	23,000	+23,000	
Total, Tank farm activities					
Total, Office of River Protection	1,210,216	1,235,000	1,235,000	+24,784	

Savannah River Site:							
Cleanup and waste disposition:							
SR site risk management operations	432,491	416,276	416,276	416,276	-16,215		
Savannah River community and regulatory support	11,210	11,013	11,013	11,013	-197		
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	565,533	553,175	553,175	553,175	-12,358		
Construction:							
15-D-402 Saltstone disposal Unit #6		34,642	34,642	34,642	+34,642		
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	125,000	135,000	135,000	135,000	+10,000		
Subtotal	125,000	169,642	169,642	169,642	+44,642		
Total, Savannah River Site	1,134,234	1,150,106	1,150,106	1,150,106	+15,872		
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant:							
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	216,193	216,020	318,020	318,020	+101,827		+102,000
Program direction	300,000	280,784	280,784	280,784	-19,216		
Program support	17,979	14,979	14,979	14,979	-3,000		
Safeguards and Security	241,000				-241,000		
Oak Ridge Reservation		16,382	17,882	17,882	+17,882		+1,500
Paducah		7,297	7,297	7,297	+7,297		
Portsmouth		8,492	8,492	8,492	+8,492		
Richland/Hanford Site		63,668	68,668	68,668	+68,668		+5,000
Savannah River Site		132,196	145,196	145,196	+145,196		+13,000
Waste Isolation Pilot Project		4,455	5,455	5,455	+5,455		+1,000
West Valley		1,471	1,471	1,471	+1,471		
Total, Safeguards and Security	241,000	233,961	254,461	254,461	+13,461		+20,500
Technology development	18,000	13,007	13,007	13,007	-4,993		
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	5,000,000	4,864,538	5,101,971	5,101,971	+101,971		+237,433
Uranium enrichment D&D fund distribution		463,000	463,000	463,000	+463,000		
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES							
Health, safety and security:							
Health, safety and security	143,616				-143,616		
Program direction	108,301				-108,301		

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Total, Health, safety and security	251,917			- 251,917	
Specialized security activities	202,242	202,152	202,152	- 90	
Environment, health, safety and security:					
Environment, health, safety and security		118,763	118,763	+ 118,763	
Program direction		62,235	62,235	+ 62,235	
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security		180,998	180,998	+ 180,998	
Independent enterprise assessments:					
Independent enterprise assessments		24,068	24,068	+ 24,068	
Program direction		49,466	49,466	+ 49,466	
Total, Independent enterprise assessments		73,534	73,534	+ 73,534	
Office of Legacy Management:					
Legacy management	163,271	158,639	158,639	- 4,632	
Program direction	13,712	13,341	13,341	- 371	
Total, Office of Legacy Management	176,983	171,980	171,980	- 5,003	
Defense related administrative support	118,836	118,836	118,836		
Office of hearings and appeals	5,022	5,500	5,500	+ 478	
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	755,000	753,000	753,000	- 2,000	
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	16,962,000	17,738,538	18,208,873	+ 1,246,873	+ 470,335

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS ¹				
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION:				
Operation and maintenance:				
Purchase power and wheeling	89,710	89,710	89,710	-3,574
Program direction	7,750	7,220	7,220	-530
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	96,930	96,930	96,930	-4,104
Less alternative financing (PPW)	-16,131	-16,131	-16,131	-928
Offsetting collections (for PPW)	-73,579	-73,579	-73,579	-73,579
Offsetting collections (PD)	-85,831	-2,220	-2,220	+83,611
Use of prior year balances	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION:				
Operation and maintenance:				
Operating expenses	15,174	15,174	15,174	+1,576
Purchase power and wheeling	63,000	63,000	63,000	+11,000
Program direction	29,939	31,089	31,089	+1,150
Construction	6,227	13,403	13,403	+7,176
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	101,764	122,666	122,666	+20,902
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	-5,934	-5,934	-5,934	-5,934
Less alternative financing (for PPW)	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000
Less alternative financing (Const)	-7,492	-7,492	-7,492	-7,492
Less alternative financing	-14,308	-14,308	-14,308	+14,308
Offsetting collections	-75,564	-29,402	-29,402	+46,162
Offsetting collections (for O&M)	-5,438	-5,438	-5,438	-5,438
Offsetting collections (Const)	-53,000	-53,000	-53,000	-53,000
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	11,892	11,400	11,400	-492
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION:				
Operation and maintenance:				
Construction and rehabilitation	86,645	86,645	86,645	-35,792
Operation and maintenance	82,843	81,958	81,958	-885
Purchase power and wheeling	407,109	441,223	441,223	+34,114
Program direction	217,709	227,905	227,905	+10,196

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	830,098	837,731	837,731	+ 7,633
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	-293,349	-5,197	-5,197	+288,152
Less alternative financing (for Construction)	-74,448	-74,448	-74,448
Less alternative financing (for Program Dir.)	-5,300	-5,300	-5,300
Less alternative financing (for PPW)	-180,713	-180,713	-180,713
Offsetting collections (Public Law 98-381)	-6,092	+ 6,092
Offsetting collections (for program direction)	-168,193	-174,285	-174,285	-6,092
Offsetting collections (for O&M)	-35,796	-36,745	-36,745	-949
Offsetting collections (Public Law 108-477, Public Law 109-103)	-230,738	-260,510	-260,510	-29,772
Offsetting collections (Public Law 98-381)	-7,161	-7,161	-7,161
Transmission Infrastructure Program:
Operating expenses	15,629	15,629	+ 15,629
Offsets and funding sources	-15,629	-15,629	-15,629
Total, Transmission Infrastructure Program
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	95,930	93,372	93,372	-2,558
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND:
Operation and maintenance	6,196	5,529	5,529	-667
Offsetting collections	-4,911	-4,499	-4,499	+ 412
Less alternative financing	-865	-802	-802	+ 63
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD O&M FUND	420	228	228	-192
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	108,242	105,000	105,000	-3,242
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	304,600	327,277	327,277	+ 22,677
FERC revenues	-304,600	-327,277	-327,277	-22,677

GENERAL PROVISIONS								
Sec. 313 Rescissions:								
Department of Energy:								
Energy efficiency and renewable energy (rescission)								-18,965
Electricity delivery and energy reliability (rescission)								-4,851
Nuclear Energy (rescission)								-1,046
Fossil energy research and development (rescission)								9,905
Science (rescission)								-7,022
Advanced Research Projects Agency (rescission)								-619
Nuclear waste disposal (rescission)								-4,068
Weapons activities (050) (rescission)								-13,038
Federal salaries and expenses (050) (rescission)								-2,678
Defense nuclear waste disposal (050) (rescission)								-2,157
TOTAL, GENERAL PROVISIONS								-64,349
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	27,281,046	28,436,428	28,359,350	+1,078,304	-77,078			
(Total amount appropriated)	(27,355,464)	(28,443,028)	(28,565,299)	(+1,209,835)	(+122,271)			
(Rescissions)	(-74,418)	(-6,600)	(-205,949)	(-131,531)	(-199,349)			
SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS								
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	1,901,686	2,316,749	2,072,928	+171,242	-243,821			
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	147,306	180,000	174,000	+26,694	-6,000			
Nuclear energy	889,190	863,386	777,000	-112,190	-86,386			
Clean coal technology		-6,600	-6,600					
Fossil Energy Research and Development	562,065	475,500	475,500	-86,565				
Naval Petroleum & Oil Shale Reserves	20,000	19,950	19,950	-50				
Strategic petroleum reserves	189,400	205,000	205,000	+15,600				
Strategic petroleum account			-135,000	-135,000	-135,000			
Northeast home heating oil reserve	8,000	1,600	1,600	-6,400				
Energy Information Administration	117,000	122,500	117,000	-5,500				
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup	231,765	226,174	246,000	+14,235	+19,826			
Uranium enrichment D&D fund	598,823	530,976	594,000	-4,823	+63,024			
Science	5,071,000	5,111,155	5,086,000	+15,000	-25,155			
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy	280,000	325,000	280,000		-45,000			
Departmental administration	126,449	129,052	110,000	-16,449	-19,052			
Indian energy program		16,000	16,000	+16,000				
Office of the Inspector General	42,120	39,868	39,868	-2,252				
Title 17 Innovative technology loan guarantee program	20,000	17,000	17,000	-3,000				

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				Enacted	Budget estimate
Advanced technology vehicles manufacturing loan pgm	6,000	4,000	4,000	-2,000
Atomic energy defense activities:					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	7,781,000	8,314,902	8,314,902	+533,902
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,954,000	1,555,156	1,978,000	+24,000	+422,844
Naval reactors	1,095,000	1,377,100	1,208,000	+113,000	-169,100
Office of the Administrator	377,000	-377,000
Federal Salaries and expense	410,842	390,000	+390,000	-20,842
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Admin	11,207,000	11,658,000	11,890,902	+683,902	+232,902
Defense environmental cleanup	5,000,000	4,864,538	5,101,971	+101,971	+237,433
Uranium enrichment D&D fund distribution	463,000	463,000	+463,000
Other defense activities	755,000	753,000	753,000	-2,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,962,000	17,738,538	18,208,873	+1,246,873	+470,335
Power marketing administrations: ¹					
Southeastern Power Administration	11,892
Southwestern Power Administration	95,930	11,400	11,400	-492
Western Area Power Administration	420	93,372	93,372	-2,558
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	228	228	-192
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	108,242	105,000	105,000	-3,242
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	304,600	327,277	327,277	+22,677
Revenues	-304,600	-327,277	-327,277	-22,677
General Provisions	-64,349	-64,349	-64,349
Total Summary of Accounts, Department of Energy	27,281,046	28,436,428	28,359,350	+1,078,304	-77,078

FUNCTION RECAP:							
DEFENSE	17,064,000	17,897,638	18,345,100	+ 1,281,100	+ 452,462		
NON-DEFENSE	10,217,046	10,543,790	10,014,250	- 202,796	- 529,540		
Environmental management	(5,830,588)	(5,621,688)	(5,941,971)	(+ 111,383)	(+ 320,283)		
DEFENSE RELATED	(5,000,000)	(4,864,538)	(5,101,971)	(+ 101,971)	(+ 237,433)		
NON-DEFENSE	(830,588)	(757,150)	(840,000)	(+ 9,412)	(+ 82,850)		

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

Section 301. Language is included on unexpended balances.

Section 302. Language is included specifically authorizing intelligence activities pending enactment of the fiscal year 2015 Intelligence Authorization Act.

Section 303. The Committee has included a provision related to nuclear safety requirements.

Section 304. The Committee has included language related to independent cost estimates.

Section 305. Language is included related to the provision of uranium.

Section 306. Language is included related to laboratory directed research and development.

Section 307. Language is included related reports on warhead refurbishment programs.

Section 308. The Committee has included a provision on a pilot program related to consolidated storage of spent nuclear fuel.

Section 309. Language is included related to domestic uranium enrichment technology.

Section 310. Language is included related to non-Federal contribution to uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning.

Section 311. Language is included related to the alternative fuels.

Section 312. Language is included related to SPR drawdown notification.

Section 313. Language is included rescinding unobligated prior year funds.

TITLE IV

The Committee believes it is the mission of all the regional commissions to maximize spending on programs rather than personnel. Given the budget cuts the regional commissions have experienced in recent years, the Committee directs the regional commissions to provide a detailed accounting of all personnel costs, including an accounting for employees who are designated as non-Federal employees, in their annual budget request to Congress. If the regional commissions are to continue to be successful they need to show they are maximizing the public good and making sound personnel management decisions.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2014	\$80,317,000
Budget estimate, 2015	68,200,000
Committee recommendation	80,000,000

Established in 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] is an economic development agency composed of 13 Appalachian States and a Federal co-chair appointed by the President. For fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommends \$80,000,000 for the ARC. Within the funding provided, \$10,000,000 is recommended to support a workforce training program in Southern Appalachia, primarily focused on the automotive supplier industry. The program will benefit economically distressed counties in Southern Appalachia. This funding shall be in addition to any funds otherwise directed to distressed counties. The funds shall be distributed according to ARC's Distressed Counties Formula which includes land area, population estimates, and the number of distressed counties.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2014	\$28,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	30,150,000
Committee recommendation	28,000,000

The Committee recommends \$28,000,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2014	\$12,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	12,319,000
Committee recommendation	12,000,000

For the Delta Regional Authority, the Committee recommends \$12,000,000. The Delta Regional Authority was established to assist the eight State Mississippi Delta Region in obtaining basic infrastructure, transportation, skills training, and opportunities for economic development.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2014	\$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	7,396,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

The Denali Commission is a Federal-State partnership responsible for promoting infrastructure development, job training, and other economic development services in rural areas throughout Alaska. For fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommends \$10,000,000.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2014	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	3,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 for the Northern Border Regional Commission.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2014	\$1,043,937,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,047,433,000
Committee recommendation	1,047,433,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2014	-\$920,721,000
Budget estimate, 2015	-925,155,000
Committee recommendation	-925,155,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$123,216,000
Budget estimate, 2015	122,278,000
Committee recommendation	122,278,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC] for fiscal year 2015 is \$1,047,433,000. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of \$925,155,000 resulting in a net appropriation of \$122,278,000.

The Committee recommends no less than \$5,000,000 for the Integrated University Program to maintain specialists in radiation safety needed in healthcare, energy, defense, homeland security, environmental protection, agriculture, science, space exploration, construction, and industrial applications.

The Committee is very concerned about the security of radiological materials at U.S. medical and industrial facilities. A National Academies report found that there are more than 5,000 devices containing high-activity radiation sources in the country, including 700 with category-1 sources, at over 2,000 facilities. Taken out of their shielding containers, category-1 sources can kill anyone who is exposed to them at close range for a few minutes to an hour. The National Nuclear Security Administration found that these devices are vulnerable to theft and could be used by terrorists to build dirty bombs.

The Committee believes the NRC's security regulations have not been sufficient to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism. A 2012 Government Accountability Office [GAO] report found that NRC security regulations are non-prescriptive and leave too much discretion to facility managers. When GAO investigators visited a number of hospitals all over the country to see how the NRC's security rules were being implemented, they found serious vulnerabilities. For example, they found that one hospital kept a blood irradiator, a category-1 source containing 1,500 curies of cesium-137, in a room with the access code written on the door frame. Another hospital kept a similar device on a wheeled pallet down the hall from a loading dock. The GAO investigation also casts doubt on the quality of regulatory oversight. The hospitals GAO visited passed routine NRC inspections despite observed vulnerabilities.

For these reasons, the Committee recommends a new general provision that will strengthen radiological security in the United States. The provision requires, among other things, for the NRC to establish mandatory security standards for category 1 and 2 radiological materials and increase the frequency of inspections.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$11,955,000
Budget estimate, 2015	12,071,000
Committee recommendation	12,071,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 2014	-\$9,994,000
Budget estimate, 2015	-10,099,000
Committee recommendation	-10,099,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2014	\$1,961,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,972,000
Committee recommendation	1,972,000

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$1,972,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2014	\$3,400,000
Budget estimate, 2015	3,400,000
Committee recommendation	3,400,000

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was established to evaluate the scientific and technical validity of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board reports its findings no fewer than two times a year to Congress and to the Secretary of Energy. For fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommends \$3,400,000.

GENERAL PROVISION

Section 401. The Committee has included a provision instructing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on responding to congressional requests for information.

Section 402. The Committee has included a provision related to protecting radiological material.

Section 403. The Committee has included a provision related to budget justifications and annual reports.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

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

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

Section 503. The provision relates to Executive Order No. 12898.

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

In fiscal year 2015, for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended, the following information provides the definition of the term “program, project or activity” for departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation bill. The term “program, project or activity” shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, 2015 and the report accompanying the bill.

If a sequestration order is necessary, in implementing the Presidential order, departments and agencies shall apply any percentage reduction required for fiscal year 2015 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–177 to all items specified in the report accompanying the bill by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in support of the fiscal year 2015 budget estimates as modified by congressional action.

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

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

The Committee is filing an original bill, which is not covered under this rule, but reports this information in the spirit of full disclosure.

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2015:

Corps of Engineers.—Individual studies and projects proposed for appropriations within this bill are specifically authorized by law. The appropriation accounts where the funding for the studies and projects are recommended are not considered to be authorized as there is no originating act providing for these appropriation accounts.

Department of Energy: Energy Conservation and Supply Activities:

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

Health, Safety and Security;

Non-Defense Environmental Management;

Office of Science;

Department of Administration;

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

Defense Environmental Management, Defense Site Acceleration Completion;

Other Defense Activities;

Defense Nuclear Waste Fund;

Office of Security and Performance Assurance;

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;

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

Energy Information Administration.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on June —, 2014, the Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill (S. 0000) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, provided, that the bill be subject to amendment and that the bill be consistent with its spending allocations, by a recorded vote of 00–00, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas

Nays

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI, OF THE
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include “(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the Committee.”

In compliance with this rule, changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

TITLE 16—CONSERVATION

**CHAPTER 52—SALMON AND STEELHEAD
CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT**

SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

§ 3301. Congressional findings and declaration of purpose

(a) The Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(5) The supply of salmon and steelhead can be increased through carefully planned enhancement measures designed to improve the survival of stocks and to augment the production of artificially propagated stocks. By careful choice of species, areas, and stocking procedures, enhancement programs can be used to—

* * * * *

SHORT TITLE

Pub. L. 96-561, title I, § 101, Dec. 22, 1980, 94 Stat. 3275, provided that: “This title [enacting this chapter and provisions set out as a note under section 1823 of this title] may be cited as the ‘Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Enhancement Act of 1980.’”

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO IMPROVE SALMON SURVIVAL

Pub. L. 104-303, title V, § 511, Oct. 12, 1996, 110 Stat. 3761, as amended by Pub. L. 106-53, title V, § 582, Aug. 17, 1999, 113 Stat. 375; Pub. L. 110-114, title V, § 5025, Nov. 8, 2007, 121 Stat. 1203, provided that:

“(a) SALMON SURVIVAL ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) * * *

* * * * *

“(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated ~~[\$25,000,000]~~ \$61,500,000 to carry out research and development activities under paragraph (3).

**TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE
CHAPTER 23—DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF
ATOMIC ENERGY**

Division B—United States Enrichment Corporation

**SUBCHAPTER VII—DECONTAMINATION AND
DECOMMISSIONING**

§ 2297g-1. Deposits

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) Special assessment

The Secretary shall collect a special assessment from domestic utilities *only to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Amounts authorized to be collected pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the Fund and credited as offsetting receipts.* The total amount collected for a fiscal year shall not exceed **[\$150,000,000] \$200,000,000** (to be annually adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the Department of Labor). The amount collected from each utility pursuant to this subsection for a fiscal year shall be in the same ratio to the amount required under subsection (a) of this section to be deposited for such fiscal year as the total amount of separative work units such utility has purchased from the Department of Energy for the purpose of commercial electricity generation, before October 24, 1992, bears to the total amount of separative work units purchased from the Department of Energy for all purposes (including units purchased or produced for defense purposes) before October 24, 1992. For purposes of this subsection—

* * * * *

(e) Termination of assessments

The collection of amounts under subsection (c) of this section shall cease after **[the earlier of—**

[(1) 15 years after October 24, 1992; or

[(2) the collection of \$2,250,000,000 (to be annually adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the Department of Labor) under such subsection.] September 30, 2015.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 109B—SECURE WATER

§ 10364. Water management improvement

(e) Authorization of appropriations

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section **[\$200,000,000] \$400,000,000**, to remain available until expended.

TITLE 43—PUBLIC LANDS

**CHAPTER 12—RECLAMATION AND IRRIGATION OF
LANDS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

SUBCHAPTER XI—RECLAMATION SAFETY OF DAMS

§ 507. Construction for dam safety

【Construction】 *Except as provided in section 5B, construction authorized by this subchapter shall be for the purposes of dam safety and not for the specific purposes of providing additional conservation storage capacity or of developing benefits over and above those provided by the original dams and reservoirs. Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to reduce the amount of project costs allocated to reimbursable purposes heretofore authorized.*

* * * * *

§ 509. Authorization of appropriations; report to Congress

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1979 and ensuing fiscal years such sums as may be necessary and, effective October 1, 1983, not to exceed an additional \$650,000,000 (October 1, 1983, price levels), and, effective October 1, 2000, not to exceed an additional \$95,000,000 (October 1, 2000, price levels), and, effective October 1, 2001, not to exceed an additional \$32,000,000 (October 1, 2001, price levels), and, effective October 1, 2003, not to exceed an additional \$540,000,000 (October 1, 2003, price levels), *and effective October 1, 2014, not to exceed an additional \$1,100,000,000 (October 1, 2003, price levels)*, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein, to carry out the provisions of this subchapter to remain available until expended if so provided by the appropriations Act: *Provided*, That no funds exceeding **【\$1,250,000】** *\$20,000,000* (October 1, 2003, price levels), as adjusted to reflect any ordinary fluctuations in construction costs indicated by applicable engineering cost indexes, shall be obligated for carrying out actual construction to modify an existing dam under authority of this subchapter prior to 30 calendar days from the date that the Secretary has transmitted a report on such existing dam to the **【Congress】** *Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate*. The report required to be submitted by this section will consist of a finding by the Secretary of the Interior to the effect that modifications are required to be made to insure the safety of an existing dam. Such finding shall be accompanied by a technical report containing information on the need for structural modification, the corrective action deemed to be required, alternative solutions to structural modification that were considered, the estimated cost of needed modifications, and environmental impacts if any resulting from the implementation of the recommended plan of modification. *For modification expenditures between \$1,800,000 and \$20,000,000 (October 1, 2013 price levels), the Secretary of the Interior shall, at least 30 days before the date on which the funds are expended, sub-*

mit written notice of the expenditures to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate that provides a summary of the project, the cost of the project, and any alternatives that were considered.

* * * * *

§ 509a. Project beneficiaries

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d) Waiver

The Secretary may waive 1 or more of the requirements of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, if the Secretary determines that implementation of the requirement could have an adverse impact on dam safety or security.

SEC. 5B. Notwithstanding section 3, if the Secretary, in her judgment, determines that additional project benefits, including but not limited to additional conservation storage capacity, are necessary and in the interests of the United States and the project and are feasible and not inconsistent with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to develop additional project benefits through the construction of new or supplementary works on a project in conjunction with the Secretary's activities under section 2 of this Act and subject to the conditions described in the feasibility study, provided the costs associated with developing the additional project benefits are allocated to the authorized purposes of the structure and repaid consistent with all provisions of Federal Reclamation law (the Act of June 17, 1902, 43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.) and acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 40—RECLAMATION STATES

SUBCHAPTER III—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

§ 2241. Authorization of appropriations

Except as otherwise provided in section 2243 of this title (relating to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more than **[\$90,000,000]** *\$110,000,000* in total for the period of fiscal years 2006 through **[2012]** *2017*.

**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000,
PUBLIC LAW 106-541**

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 536. LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER AND TILLAMOOK BAY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section **[\$50,000,000]** *\$75,000,000*.

WATER SUPPLY, RELIABILITY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT ACT, 2005, PUBLIC LAW 108-361

TITLE I—CALIFORNIA WATER SECURITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

* * * * *

SEC. 103. BAY DELTA PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

* * * * *

(e) NEW AND EXPANDED AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The heads of the Federal agencies described in this subsection are authorized to carry out the activities described in subsection (f) during each of fiscal years 2005 through **[2015]** *2018*, in coordination with the Governor.

* * * * *

(f) DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES UNDER NEW AND EXPANDED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) CONVEYANCE.— * * *

* * * * *

(3) LEVEE STABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.— * * *

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that describes the levee stability reconstruction projects and priorities that will be carried out under this title during each of fiscal years 2005 through **[2015]** *2018*.

* * * * *

SEC. 107. FEDERAL SHARE OF COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of implementing the Calfed Bay-Delta Program for fiscal years 2005

through **[2015] 2018** in the aggregate, as set forth in the Record of Decision, shall not exceed 33.3 percent.

* * * * *

SEC. 109. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary and the heads of the Federal agencies to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out the new and expanded authorities described in subsections (e) and (f) of section 103 \$389,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2005 through **[2015] 2018**, to remain available until expended.

**OMNIBUS PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2009,
PUBLIC LAW 111-11**

TITLE X—WATER SETTLEMENTS

**Subtitle A—San Joaquin River Restoration
Settlement**

PART I—San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act

SEC. 10009. APPROPRIATIONS; SETTLEMENT FUND.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) FUND.—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(2) AVAILABILITY.—All funds deposited into the Fund pursuant to subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) are authorized for appropriation to implement the Settlement and this part, in addition to the authorization provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 10203, except that \$88,000,000 of such funds are available for expenditure without further appropriation; provided that after **[October 1, 2019, all funds in the Fund shall be available for expenditure without further appropriation.]** *October 1, 2015, all funds in the Fund shall be available for expenditure on an annual basis in an amount not to exceed \$40,000,000 without further appropriation.*

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 in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the subcommittee allocation for 2015: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Mandatory				1
Discretionary	34,208		34,208	1
Security	18,423		NA	NA
Nonsecurity	15,785		NA	NA
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2015				2
2016				
2017				
2018				
2019 and future years				
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2015	NA		NA	

¹ Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

² Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2014 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2014 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					

