109TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
109–474

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2007

MAY 19, 2006.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 5427]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2007 totals $30,017,000,000, $545,773,000 above the President's budget request, and $172,000,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2006.

Title I of the bill provides $4,983,803,000 for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a decrease of $345,367,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level (adjusted for one-time emergency spending) and $250,803,000 over the budget request. The fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Corps of Engineers totals $4,733,000,000, which is composed of entirely of new budget authority.

The fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Corps' Civil Works program continues the performance-based ranking system instituted in fiscal year 2006 with two major modifications to the guidelines. The first allows risks to human life to be considered along with economics for flood and storm damage reduction projects. The second changes the prioritization process for environmental restoration projects. This performance-based system is intended to focus limited federal resources on the efficient completion of high economic-value projects while suspending or terminating work on other projects found not to be of as high an economic value and on

congressionally mandated projects that have been included in prior Administration requests. The Committee supports the concept of focusing limited resources on completing high-value projects already under construction, and the Committee recommendation is based in large part on the Administration's performance-based approach. The Committee bill and report retains changes to improve the Corps' project management and execution, particularly in the areas of reprogrammings, continuing contracts, and five-year budget planning.

Title II provides $940,934,000 for the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, $17,198,000 over the budget request, and $113,939,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee recommends $900,779,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, 17,198,000 above the budget request and $120,087,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The Committee recommends $40,155,000 for the Central Utah Project including $965,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account, both the same as the budget request.

Title III provides $24,373,489,000 for the Department of Energy, an increase of $326,717,000 over fiscal year 2006 and $298,772,000 over the budget request of $24,074,717,000.

The Energy Supply and Conservation account, which funds renewable energy, energy efficiency, nuclear energy, non-defense environment, safety, and health programs, and energy conservation, is funded at $2,025,527,000, an increase of $102,166,000 over the request and $212,900,000 above the current year enacted level. The Committee recommends $4,131,710,000 for the Office of Science, an increase of $30,000,000 over the budget request and $535,317,000 over the current year.

Environmental management activities (i.e., non-defense environmental cleanup, uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund, and defense environmental cleanup) are funded at $6,441,126,000, a decrease of $595,614,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and an increase of $161,088,000 over the budget request.

The Committee recommends a total of $574,500,000 for the Yucca Mountain repository. This includes $186,420,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal, an increase of $30,000,000 over the request, and $388,080,000 for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the same as the request. The additional funds are provided for the Department to begin to move spent nuclear fuel away from reactor sites to interim storage.

Funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which includes nuclear weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation, naval reactors, and the Office of the NNSA Administrator, is $9,199,811,000, an increase of $95,314,000 over fiscal year 2006. The Committee recommendation includes $1,593,101,000 for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, a decrease of $21,738,000 over the current year and $133,112,000 below the budget request.

Title IV provides $227,774,000 for several Independent Agencies, a decrease of $40,652,000 from fiscal year 2006 and $21,000,000 below the budget request of $248,774,000. The requested funding is provided for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, the Delta Regional Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission In-

spector General, and the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The request for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is increased by $40,000,000, of which $36,000,000 is offset by license fees and annual charges. An additional $5,000,000 is provided for the Denali Commission. The request for the Appalachian Regional Commission is reduced by $30,000,000, and no funds are provided for the Office of Inspector General for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The United States Army Corps of Engineers traces its history to 1775, when Congress established the Continental Army with a provision for a Chief Engineer to oversee the construction of fortifications for the Battle of Bunker Hill. An Act of Congress permanently established the Corps in 1802. The Corps' Civil Works role and mission is grounded in a series of laws enacted since 1824. A brief legislative history of the Corps follows.

• The General Survey Act of 1824 authorized the President to have surveys made of routes for roads and canals of national importance, in a commercial or military point of view, or necessary for the transportation of public mail. The President assigned responsibility for the surveys to the Corps of Engineers. A second act, also signed in 1824, appropriated $75,000 to improve navigation on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers by removing sandbags, snags and other obstacles, and was subsequently amended to include other rivers such as the Missouri. This work was also given to the Corps of Engineers. Subsequent Acts of Congress expanded the Corps' responsibilities for navigation.

• The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1909 expanded the Corps' Civil Works authority by authorizing the consideration of hydroelectric power generation in the planning, design and construction of water resource development projects.

• The 1917 Flood Control Act established a role for the Corps in flood damage reduction, which became a national flood protection role for the Civil Works program in the 1936 Flood Control Act. The Flood Control Act of 1944 gave the Corps a recreation role that was added as part of flood control at Corps reservoirs. The 1962 River and Harbor Flood Act expanded that role by authorizing the Corps to build recreational facilities as part of all water resource development projects.

• The environmental role to protect, restore and manage the environment emanates from the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 that assigned the Corps the mission to prevent obstacles in navigable waterways. As concerns over the environment grew in the late 20th Century, the Clean Water Act of 1972 broadened this responsibility by giving the Corps the authority and direction to regulate dredging and activities that result in fill being placed in the "waters of the United States," including many wetlands. Additional legislation passed in the 1986 Water Resources Development Act further ex-

panded the Corps' environmental role to include enhancing and restoring natural resources at new and existing projects, and the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 made environmental protection one of the Corps' primary water resources development missions.

• The Water Supply Act of 1958 gave the Civil Works Program the authority to include water storage in new and existing reservoir projects for municipal and industrial uses.

• The Flood Control and Coastal Emergency Act (P.L. 84–99) and the Stafford Disaster and Emergency Assistance Act gave the Civil Works program direct authority to help the nation in times of national disaster. P.L. 84–99 directed the Corps to provide emergency assistance during or following flood events to protect lives, public facilities and infrastructure. The Stafford Act authorized the Corps to support the Federal Emergency Management Agency in carrying out the Federal Response Plan (now the National Response Plan), which requires 26 federal departments and agencies to provide coordinated disaster relief and recovery operations.

• Title 10 of the U.S. Code, (Navigation and Navigable Waterways), as further outlined in Title 33, enables the Civil Works program to provide services to other federal entities, states, or local governments on a reimbursable basis. This work includes flood control, the improvement of rivers and harbors, research, and support to private engineering and construction firms competing for, or performing, work outside the United States. The Support for Others program engages the Corps in reimbursable work that is determined to be in America's best interests.

MAJOR MISSION AREAS

Currently, the Corps accomplishes the Civil Works mission through the following major business programs:

Navigation.—The role of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers with respect to navigation is to provide safe, reliable, and efficient waterborne transportation systems, such as channels, harbors and waterways, for movement of commerce, national security needs and recreation. The Corps seeks to accomplish this mission through a combination of capital improvements and the operation and maintenance of existing projects. Capital improvement activities include the planning, design, and construction of new navigation projects. In fiscal year 2004, the Corps operated and maintained 12,000 miles of commercial inland navigation channels; owned and/or operated 257 navigation lock chambers at 212 sites; and maintained 926 coastal, Great Lakes and inland harbors.

Flood damage reduction.—Section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1936 declared flood control to be a proper Federal activity since improvements for flood control purposes are in the interest of the general welfare of the public. The Act stipulated that for Federal involvement to be justified, "the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue (must be) in excess of the estimated costs, and the lives and social security of people (must be) otherwise adversely affected." In fiscal year 2004, the Corps managed 383 major lakes and reservoirs; and constructed or controlled 8,500 miles of federal levees. Over the last ten years, the average annual damages prevented by Corps projects totaled $21.1 billion.

Ecosystem restoration.—The Corps of Engineers incorporated ecosystem restoration as a project purpose within the Civil Works program in response to increasing national emphasis on environmental restoration and preservation. Historically, Corps involvement in environmental issues focused on compliance with National Environmental Protection Act requirements related to flood protection, navigation, and other project purposes. More recent efforts have involved pro-active restoration measures to damaged ecosystems, and the provision of local environmental infrastructure.

Hurricane and storm damage reduction.—Congress authorized Federal participation in the cost of restoring and protecting the shores of the United States, its territories and its possessions. Under current policy, shore protection projects are designed to reduce damages caused by wind-generated and tide-generated waves and currents along the nation's ocean coasts, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, and estuary shores. Hurricane protection was added to the erosion control mission in 1956 when Congress authorized cost-shared Federal participation in shore protection and restoration of publicly owned shore areas. Federal assistance for periodic nourishment was also authorized on the same basis as new construction, for a period to be specified for each project, when it is determined that it is the most suitable and economical remedial measure.

Water supply.—National policy regarding water supply states that the primary responsibility for water supply rests with states and local entities. The Corps may participate and cooperate in developing water supplies in connection with construction, operation and modification of Federal navigation, flood damage reduction, or multipurpose projects. Certain conditions of non-federal participation are required.

Hydroelectric power generation.—Congress, through various statutes, has directed the Corps to consider the development of hydroelectric power in conjunction with other water resources development plans. The Corps owns and operates nearly one-quarter of the United States' hydropower capacity, with 75 projects in operation.

Recreation.—The Corps is one of the nation's largest providers of outdoor recreation opportunities, and ranks first among federal providers of outdoor recreation. Although known primarily for the opportunities managed at its lake projects, the Corps also participates in the planning, design and construction of recreation facilities at a wide variety of other types of water resource projects. Such facilities might include hiking and biking trails associated with a stream channel or levee primarily designed for flood damage reduction. There is no general authority for Corps participation in a single purpose recreation project.

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

The continuing authorities program (CAP) establishes a process by which the Corps of Engineers can respond to a variety of water resource problems without the need to obtain specific congressional authorization for each project. The CAP program is comprised of individual programs for nine different types of projects, each with its own program authority and strict limits on the federal contribution, which are as follows:

Section 14 Emergency streambank and shoreline erosion.—Authorized by section 14 of the 1946 Flood Control Act, work under this authority allows emergency streambank and shoreline protection for public facilities, such as roads, bridges, hospitals, schools, and water/sewage treatment plants, that are in imminent danger of failing. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-federal; and the federal share cannot exceed $1,000,000 per project.

Section 103 Hurricane and storm damage reduction.—Authorized by section 103 of the 1962 River and Harbor Act, work under this authority provides for protection or restoration of public shorelines by the construction of revetments, groins, and jetties, and may also include periodic sand replenishment. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-federal; and the federal share cannot exceed $3,000,000 per project.

Section 107 Small navigation improvements.—Authorized by section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act, work under this authority is intended to provide improvements to navigation including dredging of channels, widening of turning basins, and construction of navigation aids. The cost share is 80% federal and 20% non-federal; and the federal share may not exceed $4,000,000 for each project.

Section 111 Storm damage attributable to federal navigation works.—Authorized by section 111 of the 1968 River and Harbor Act, work under this authority provides for the prevention or mitigation of erosion damages to public or privately owned shores along the coastline of the United States when these damages are a result of a federal navigation project. This authority cannot be used for shore damages caused by riverbank erosion or vessel-general wave wash. It is not intended to restore shorelines to historic dimensions, but only to reduce erosion to the level that would have existed without the construction of a federal navigation project. Cost sharing may not be required for this program. If the federal cost limitation of $2,000,000 per project is exceeded, specific congressional authorization is required.

Section 204 Beneficial uses of dredged material.—Authorized by section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, work under this authority provides for the use of dredged material from new or existing federal projects to protect, restore, or create aquatic and ecologically related habitats, including wetlands. The cost sharing (25% non-federal, 75% federal) would be applied to the incremental cost above the least cost method of dredged material disposal consistent with engineering and environmental criteria.

Section 205 Small flood control projects.—Authorized by section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act, work under this authority provides for local protection from flooding by the construction or improvement of flood control work such as levees, channels, and dams. Non-structural alternatives are also considered and may include measures such as installation of flood warning systems, raising and/or flood proofing of structures, and relocation of flood prone facilities. The cost share is 65%

federal and 35% non-federal; and the federal share may not exceed $7,000,000 per project.

Section 206 Aquatic ecosystem restoration.—Authorized by section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, work under this authority may carry out aquatic ecosystem restoration projects that will improve the quality of the environment, are in the public interest, and are cost-effective. There is no requirement that a Corps project be involved. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-federal; and the federal share per project cannot exceed $5,000,000 including studies, plans and specifications, and construction.

Section 208 Snagging and clearing for flood control.—Authorized by section 208 of the 1954 Flood Control Act, work under this authority provides for local protection from flooding by channel clearing and excavation, with limited embankment construction by use of materials from the clearing operation only. The cost share is 65% federal and 35% non-federal; and the federal share may not exceed $500,000 for each project.

Section 1135 Project modifications for improvement of the environment.—Authorized by section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, work under this authority provides for modifications in the structures and operations of water resources projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers to improve the quality of the environment. Additionally, the Corps may undertake restoration projects at locations where a Corps project has contributed to the degradation. The primary goal of these projects is ecosystem restoration with an emphasis on projects benefiting fish and wildlife. The project must be consistent with the authorized purposes of the project being modified, environmentally acceptable, and complete within itself. A non-federal sponsor is required to provide 25% of the cost of the project; and the federal share of each separate project may not exceed $5,000,000, including studies, plans and specifications, and construction.

FY 2007 Budget Overview

The fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Corps of Engineers totals $4,733,000,000. The Committee recommends a total of $4,983,803,000 for the Corps of Engineers, a decrease of $345,367,000 from fiscal year 2006 enacted levels (adjusted for one-time emergency spending) and $250,803,000 above the request. The budget request represents a continuation of the performance-based system based on the ratio of remaining benefits-to-remaining costs initially proposed in the fiscal year 2006 budget request. This performance-based system is intended to focus limited federal resources on the efficient completion of high economic-value projects while suspending or terminating work on other projects found not to be of as high an economic value and on Congressionally mandated projects that have been included in prior Administration requests.

The Committee has recommended a rescission of unobligated balances from construction projects in Louisiana that have been fully funded through completion, at full federal expense, in supplemental appropriations. In recognition of the continuing and very real needs

in the region for water resource projects, the majority of this funding is allocated to projects in the area not funded under the Administration's budget request.

The budget request also contains $20,000,000 in the Investigations account to continue the effort, initiated with $30,000,000 in supplemental appropriations, to create a national inventory and database of flood and storm damage reduction projects and for assessing project structural and operational integrity and their associated risks. The Committee supports this effort; however, it is concerned with the Corps proposal for the execution of this activity. Given the uncertainty associated with the scope and process for this type of national inventory, the Committee believes the Corps should reevaluate its approach. The Committee therefore directs the Corps to execute a pilot project to determine the nature and extent of the task and further define the necessary parameters prior to initiating the inventory across the nation. The Committee further directs the Corps to give priority consideration to the Sacramento area for the pilot project as the region has a clear and pressing need for such an inventory and assessment.

Until such time as the Committee is satisfied the Corps has a executable plan and direction for this activity, no additional funds are provided. Further, the Committee notes there is no explicit authorization for this activity in the Investigations account.

The Committee has recommended funding for the major rehabilitations at Markland Locks and Dam and Locks No. 27, Mississippi River, critical elements of the Ohio and Mississippi River systems. The Committee does not view the rehabilitaiton of existing infrastructure as a new construction start, but rather a necessary investment to ensure adequate functioning of the Nation's water resource infrastructure.

A summary table illustrating the fiscal year 2006 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2007 budget request and the Committee recommended levels is shown below:

[Dollars in 000s]

Account	Fiscal Year 2006 Enacted	Fiscal Year 2007 Request	Committee Recommendation
Investigations	$162,360	$94,000	$128,000
Hurricane disasters assistance	37,300		
Construction	2,348,280	1,555,000	1,929,471
Hurricane disasters assistance	101,417		
Rescission			−56,046
Mississippi River and tributaries	396,000	278,000	290,607
Hurricane disasters assistance	153,750		
Operation and maintenance, general	1,969,110	2,258,000	2,195,471
Hurricane disasters assistance	327,517		
Regulatory program	158,400	173,000	173,000
FUSRAP	138,600	130,000	130,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies		81,000	32,000
Hurricane disasters assistance	2,277,965		
General expenses	152,460	164,000	156,300
Hurricane disasters assistance	1,600		
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	3,960	([1])	5,000
Total, Corps of Engineers	8,228,719	4,733,000	4,983,803
Appropriations	5,329,170	4,733,000	4,983,803
Emergency Appropriations	2,899,549		

[1] The budget proposes to fund this office from within the General Expenses account. For purposes of comparison, the budget request includes $6,000,000 for these activities in fiscal year 2007.

FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET PRESENTATION

The Corps of Engineers has proposed several changes to the manner in which the civil works program is presented and appropriated. The most significant is the movement of four categories of projects and programs from the Construction account into Operation and Maintenance. Additionally, the budget request aggregates Operation and Maintenance projects into geographical regions and provides only a top line appropriation for all projects contained within each of the 21 regions.

The Committee supports a more systematic approach to the funding of the Operation and Maintenance account and understands the dynamic nature of the project needs within this account. The Committee is concerned that this method of budgeting provides little transparency of the proposed expenditures by project for Congress and for local and regional partners of the Corps of Engineers. We note, however, that the accountability of the Corps under this scenario differs little from that of past years, when the Corps interpreted its reprogramming authority to be 50 percent of the entire Operation and Maintenance account. In that case, while funding amounts were assigned to each project within the Act, there was no assurance that this amount of funding would be provided to the individual projects as identified.

The Committee retains Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance and beneficial use of dredged material in the Operation and Maintenance account with the exception of the Section 204 program. ESA compliance and dredged material facilities are a necessary and required cost of the nation's waterway system and are appropriately considered an operation and maintenance cost. The Section 204 program is retained in the Construction account with the remaining Continuing Authorities.

The Committee recommends that the Operation and Maintenance account be appropriated based on the geographic regions contained in the budget request with the following stipulations:

- The Corps will provide, under signature within 30 days of enactment, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations the planned funding allocations by project for this account, including a detailed accounting of activities previously funded under the Columbia River and the Missouri River Fish Mitigation projects;
- The Corps will maintain this information on its website;
- The Corps will not deviate from this allocation of funds without a clearly articulated management plan outlining the circumstances under which a reprogramming between individual projects is justified and the process by which these decisions will be made;
- This management plan shall be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriation for approval;
- As part of the management plan, the Corps is instructed to develop a communication plan for how this process will be coordinated with, and justified to, the impacted Members of Congress, water system users, and other interested parties.

Further, the Corps is instructed to reevaluate the management of this account. At a minimum, the Corps shall consider: the proper

level of decentralization versus centralized command and control; internal controls to ensure funds are spent appropriately; minimum standards of reporting for financial management purposes; and the method by which funds are allocated and shifted among specific projects. The Corps shall submit a report, with findings and recommendations, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

The proposed movement of projects from the Construction account into Operation and Maintenance obfuscates that the Administration's budget request reduces the level of funding allocated to operation and maintenance of our nation's waterways by $52 million from the fiscal year 2006 request. The following table provides a comparison.

Account	Fiscal Year 2006 Request	Fiscal Year 2006 Enacted [1]	Fiscal Year 2007 Request	Fiscal Year 2007 Adjusted
Operations and Maintenance	$1,979,000	$1,969,000	$2,258,000	$1,927,000
Construction	1,637,000	2,348,000	1,555,000	1,886,000

[1] Reflects 1% rescission.

Last year, the Gulf Coast hurricanes showed in stark relief examples of the inadequacy and neglect of our nation's water resource infrastructure. Given the lessons of last year, the level of Operations and Maintenance funding proposed by the Administration is inadequate. The Committee has reallocated funding to bring the account to approximate parity with last year's funding. The Committee has also provided an additional $10,000,000 to the Ohio River and tributaries navigation system to implement the improvements as outlined in the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division's Five Year Development Perspective. Though inadequate to address all identified needs, the additional funding is provided to support the efforts of the Division and stakeholders in the development of this perspective. This plan is discussed below in more detail under the heading Five-Year Development Plans.

Program Management and Execution

Over the past two years, the Committee has embarked on a concerted effort to improve general budgeting and project execution by the Corps. This effort was precipitated, in part, by a progressively tighter fiscal environment, the enormous backlog of Civil Works projects, and the realization that the Civil Works program has become an agglomeration of individual projects of interest to the Congress and the Administration, with little or no systematic approach to the Nation's water and coastal infrastructure underlying the selection of which projects received funding.

The Committee maintains the Civil Works program must be managed as a program rather than a collection of individual projects. The Committee supports the Corps mission and believes the Nation's water resource infrastructure is a critical element of our transportation system. Nevertheless, it is essential the Corps takes a more sophisticated, business-like approach to project execution. The Corps must restore this Committee's confidence in its ability to execute the appropriations provided by Congress as well as provide technical assessments of the Nation's water resource infrastructure needs. The Gulf Coast hurricanes of 2005 have re-

sulted in enormous pressures on the Corps; its ability to execute projects and critically assess its own performance, both past and present, are now at the forefront of the Nation's consciousness.

The Committee remains concerned that the Corps cannot provide the Congress with accurate accounting of its financial commitments, both in terms of contractual obligations and promises to repay past reprogrammings. The Committee supports the creation of a Chief Financial Officer for the Corps of Engineers and supports additional headquarters personnel to staff such a position. The level of decentralization versus command and control should be reevaluated in light of the Corps' inability to provide timely and accurate accounting of financial information. In addition, the Corps should examine revising the reporting requirements in its financial accounting system to ensure that critical information is collected and reported upward.

Last year, the Committee directed the Corps to give immediate attention to several program management issues including: five-year plans, conservative use of reprogramming and continuing contracts, performance based budgeting and Congressional justification materials. The Corps and the Administration have made progress in each of these areas, but much work remains. Collectively, the Congress, the Administration and the Corps of Engineers must work together to ensure that constrained federal resources are spent effectively, commitments to local sponsors are honored, projects are completed in an efficient manner, and taxpayers receive the greatest return on their investment.

Five-year comprehensive budget planning.—In response to growing concern that the Civil Works program lacks a clear set of priorities to guide either development of the annual budget request or annual appropriations bills, the Committee directed the Corps over the last two years to prepare and submit a comprehensive five-year plan for the Civil Works program. Such a plan, in the view of the Committee, would begin to allay the concern that the Civil Works program has become nothing more than an assortment of individual projects lacking a coherent focus.

The Committee reiterates its strong belief in the value of developing five-year plans and longer-term strategic visions to help guide budget requests and Congressional spending decisions. Such plans force discipline and regional integration in making budgetary decisions and encourage stability from year to year. By providing the Congress and the Executive Branch a view of what lies ahead in the Civil Works program, a comprehensive five-year plan may alleviate some of the pressure to fund every project in each fiscal year. The development of a plan will also require the Corps to make the necessary tradeoffs to integrate individual projects into a coherent Civil Works program for future years. In the absence of a rational strategy, the long-term vitality of the Corps is placed at risk and scarce federal resources will be squandered on projects of limited national benefit.

The Committee is pleased with the ASA(CW)'s and OMB's willingness to pursue a more robust five-year plan for the Corps of Engineers Civil Works Program. The version of the plan provided in fiscal year 2006 was an improvement over the last submission and the Committee looks forward to further refinements to the plan.

The Committee is, however, disappointed in the decision made by the ASA(CW) to instruct the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division to remove the Ohio River and Tributaries Navigation System Five-Year Development Perspective from the Division's website because it is not consistent with the Administration's policy. This plan is the most comprehensive and informative report that has come to the attention of the Committee. In it, the Corps attempts to assess the current status and "acceptable" level of performance for projects under its jurisdiction. The Committee rejects the view that this plan would in any way require the Administration or the Congress to fund these projects at the level recommended in this plan, nor does the existence of the plan insinuate that the Administration or Congress agrees with the assessment. The report is, however, an attempt from a technical perspective to assess the current state of the Ohio River's navigation infrastructure. As such, the Committee applauds the efforts of the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division and other interested parties in the development of this "perspective."

Misplaced emphasis on expenditures.—The Committee continues its direction that the Corps adhere to a fiscal management practice that fully honors congressional direction and accepts a higher level of carryover funds in order to achieve greatly increased transparency into project costs and multiyear funding commitments.

The management changes initiated last year have resulted in higher levels of carryover as predicted. However, the estimates of carryover of available funding, after adjusting for Act language, total 13 percent, of which only 5 percent is unobligated. In the Committee's view this is an acceptable level of carryover and significantly less than other agencies that execute major public infrastructure projects. In a time of limited discretionary spending, it is the Committee's belief that the Corps must execute its program in a fiscally responsible manner. This will require more attention and effort on the part of the Corps in developing project estimates, but should result in a lower level of unobligated carryover in the future as the transition to the new business model is fully executed through the budgeting process.

As noted in last year's report, prior to fiscal year 2006, the Corps operated with a formal strategy to expend 99 percent of annual appropriations. While this strategy had a justifiable basis and sounds reasonable in theory, the Corps became inordinately focused on the 99-percent expenditure goal. The strategy ignored project financial requirements in future years and congressional project allocations for the current year. The consequence of this policy, perhaps unintended, is the creation of significant payback requirements that are not currently budgeted.

Reprogrammings.—In fiscal year 2006, the Committee recommended changes to the reprogramming authorities allowed the Corps of Engineers. For the first year, these reprogramming requirements were carried in Act language rather than in the report. This change was based, in large part, on a report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) which found that the Corps had come to rely on reprogramming as its primary instrument to manage funds. It no longer reprogrammed funds in cases of unforeseen need or changed circumstances but as a substitute for an effective

and fiscally responsible financial planning, management and priority-setting system for the Civil Works program. GAO findings show that funds where moved into and subsequently, out of, projects on the same day or within a matter of days.

The Committee recognizes that there are legitimate instances where reprogramming is necessary and desirable, and has endeavored to work with the Administration and the Corps to ensure those instances are addressed expeditiously. The flexibility to move funds among projects is a necessary tool to adjust to changing project conditions and needs; the guidelines imposed by the Committee are simply a method to exercise Congressional oversight to ensure that the Civil Works program is being executed consistent with Congressional intent. The Committee reminds the Administration that once a project is provided funding in this, or any other Act, and signed by the President, all projects are of equal merit. The Committee will not accept differential treatment of projects based on whether they are contained in the bill or in report language nor on whether the Administration considers a project to be "budgetable."

One of the reasons given to allow the Corps broad reprogramming authority is that budgets are developed and submitted to the Congress months prior to the start of the fiscal year. The Committee is well aware that project circumstances may change in that timeframe, and has therefore offered the Corps and the Administration the opportunity to provide the Congress updated estimates for this subset of projects prior to the House and Senate conferencing their respective bills. This conference occurs only months prior to the start of the fiscal year and such changes can be accommodated as necessary. The Committee therefore no longer has patience for this argument. While there will likely still be changed circumstances to individual project needs during the year, these may be addressed through the reprogramming authorities and processes.

The change to a new business model within the Corps has resulted in a transition period; however, the accountability and reliability of the program will improve as Members of Congress, local sponsors, and contractors can be certain that appropriated funds will be expended on those projects for which they were intended. It is this Committee's intent that past commitments to Members and local sponsors be met. To this end, the Committee has provided funding in the Construction and Investigations accounts to address a subset of the projects that will require payback in fiscal year 2007.

Past practices have resulted in a cumulative financial obligation that is significant, a undefined, and in large part, unbudgeted. In an era of limited Federal budgets and increasing needs for our Nation's infrastructure, this practice cannot be maintained. The Committee remains concerned that neither Congress nor the Corps knows the full extent of the payback required. Accordingly, and for the second year, the Corps is directed to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of enactment of this Act summarizing, by project, the total cumulative amount of repayments owed to the donor projects. As a result of this Committee's extreme frustration in the Corps inability to pro-

vide such critical information, the Act contains general provisions which transfer $10,000,000 from the Expense account and $1,000,000 from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Works into the Operations and Maintenance account to meet unbudgeted critical needs of the nation's water resource infrastructure in the event the report is not received in the timeframe required.

To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2007 is consistent with congressional direction, to minimize the movement of funds, and to improve overall budget execution, the bill incorporates by reference the projects identified in the report accompanying this Act into statute. In addition, the bill again includes a section prohibiting the obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

(1) creates or initiates a new program, project or activity;

(2) eliminates a program, project or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel for any program, project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by this Act;

(4) reduces funds that are directed to be used for a specific activity by this Act;

(5) increases funds for any existing program, project or activity by more than $2,000,000 or 25 percent, whichever is less; or

(6) reduces funds for any program, project or activity by more than $2,000,000 or 25 percent, whichever is less.

This provision shall not apply to the initiation of new projects or activities under the continuing authorities programs. However, new projects under the continuing authorities program not identified in the conference agreement to accompany this Act must be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for approval. Reprogramming approvals shall also be required for changes in a project's scope and cost relative to what was submitted in the justification sheets. These guidelines vitiate all other reprogramming guidance provided in previous appropriations Acts or their accompanying reports and shall be applied to all accounts within the Corps of Engineers.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Corps of Engineers shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities for the current fiscal year. The report shall include:

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by Congress, adjustments due to enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation both by object class and program, project and activity as detailed in the budget appendix for the respective appropriations; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

The Corps of Engineers shall not reprogram any funds received as a non-Federal share for project costs.

Continuing contracts.—When entering into such contracts, the Corps obligates the federal government to pay certain costs from

future appropriations. Contractors may perform more work than is budgeted in any fiscal year, but when available appropriations for the current fiscal year are exhausted, work continues at the contractors' risk, with an expectation that payment will be made from subsequent appropriations. Simple interest may be added to any delayed payment that the contracting officer determines was actually earned under the terms of the contract and would have been made but for exhaustion of funds. The Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of 1890 first authorized the Corps to award continuation contracts. Later, section 10 of the Rivers and Harbor Act of 1922 provided general authority to award continuing contracts for any public work on canals, rivers, and harbors adopted by Congress. These specific authorizations for continuing contracts save the Corps from being in violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act.

Last year, the Congress limited the Corps' ability to use continuing contracts. This action was the result of several years of increasing concern with the Corps' liberal use of and inadequate budgeting for continuing contracts. The Committee recognizes the Corps has taken significant steps to curb the inappropriate use of this contracting mechanism, but believes additional action is necessary to define the scope of out-year obligations on these contracts.

Last year, the Committee requested that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) review the Corps' use of continuing contracts during fiscal years 2003 to 2005. The results of this review, though preliminary, only confirm the Committee's belief that the Corps had turned to this unique contracting authority as the rule and not the exception. Combined with the drive to expend virtually all of its annual appropriations, abuse of the continuing contract authority drove the massive merry-go-round of reprogramming.

For the period of fiscal years 2003 to 2005, GAO found that the Corps had no real basis or rationale for the use of the continuing contract clause in most of the contracts reviewed. In the sample of continuing contracts reviewed, GAO found that over 50 percent were less than 12 months in duration and valued at less than $5 million. These findings only validate the Committee's concern over excessive use of the clause. In one case, the Corps even issued a continuing contract for janitorial services. The most disturbing finding of the GAO review was that the Corps was unable to identify the total number of contracts awarded that included the continuing contract clause. This was due to the fact that the Corps did not track information on continuing contracts, despite the fact that the Corps' financial management database had a field that identified contracts with a continuing contract clause.

The Committee remains concerned that the Corps does not have an accurate accounting of existing continuing contracts. Therefore, the Corps is directed to hire a national accounting firm, utilizing General Expense funding, to audit its contracting records and provide a full accounting of all existing continuing contracts, and their corresponding obligations by fiscal year for the planned duration of the contract. The findings of this audit should be provided to the Committees on Appropriations by August 1, 2007.

The Committee reminds the Corps that Congress determines how much funding is to be available for a particular project in any given

fiscal year, and the Corps must ensure that it manages its program within the funds provided each year. The Corps abrogates its management responsibilities and improperly intrudes upon congressional prerogatives in determining annual appropriation levels when the Corps reserves insufficient funds to cover the work performed each fiscal year through the duration of the contract or when, through reprogramming, it makes available funds in excess of the amounts reserved in such contracts in any fiscal year because of unbudgeted accelerated contractor earnings. The Federal government, not the contractor, must determine how much will be spent on each project each year.

The bill includes a provision that prohibits the use of funds provided in title I of this Act to execute any new continuing contract (or modifications to any existing continuing contract) that commits an amount for a project in excess of the amount appropriated for such project in this Act. In addition, the Committee continues its direction from last year that the Corps shall:

(1) discontinue the practice of reserving insufficient funds to cover the work to be performed each fiscal year through the duration of the contract;

(2) discontinue the practice of reprogramming funds to satisfy contractor earnings in excess of the amounts reserved in the contract for the current fiscal year;

(3) discontinue the practice of issuing continuing contracts for small-scale projects that are limited in scope, schedule, construction and funding requirements;

(4) issue continuing contracts only when it is determined that such a contract is the preferred means, demonstrated by an alternative analysis, and only after the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations;

(5) budget fully the out-year costs of all existing and new continuing contracts (or, if the budget year policy is to eliminate the authority to execute such contracts, fund fully the termination costs of such contracts in the budget year);

(6) provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of enactment of this Act a report identifying all existing continuing contracts and the amount, by project, of the out-year funding requirements of those contracts; and

(7) provide a quarterly update to the report identified above in item (6).

In addition, any new continuing contract shall be submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, consistent with the reprogramming guidelines contained in this Act.

Congressional justification materials.—The congressional justifications submitted by the Corps in support of the annual budget request, while vastly improved from last year, continue to be inadequate for an appropriation request of nearly $5 billion. For the first year, the Administration presents the budget estimate by mission area and presents information on projects funded in the current year but for which no funds are requested. The Committee continues to believe the materials must include a clearly articulated overview and discussion of policy proposals included in the

annual budget request beyond that which is included in the annual summary of the President's budget request. The Committees on Appropriation should not be required to consult multiple documents to gain a semi-complete accounting of the Corps' budget request. The Committee reiterates this information shall include, but not be limited to, an analysis of appropriations language provisions and changes; comparative amounts available for obligation; comparative amounts showing obligations by object class; summary of changes from the enacted level; a delineation of responses to significant items included in the reports accompanying annual appropriations Acts; appropriations and authorizing histories; explanations of how individual projects fit in the context of larger regional objectives, and narrative and tabular summaries of program requests.

The Committee recognizes that continued improvements required in the budget justifications will need to be developed over time; however, the Committee expects major changes in the fiscal year 2008 budget submission and pledges to work with the Corps to develop implementing instructions to its program offices.

Performance-based budget.—Last year, the OMB proposed seven performance guidelines for funding Corps construction projects in order to generate greater benefits. The current budget request supports a major change to the guidelines proposed in 2006 to ensure funding for flood and storm damage reduction projects that address a significant, ongoing risk to human safety. The Committee applauds the inclusion of this consideration and appreciates the continued efforts of the Administration in refining the rationale for focusing limited federal resources on finishing the most important projects in a timely manner.

Based on concerns that the ranking system, the ratio of remaining benefits-to-remaining costs, has several inherent biases, in fiscal year 2006 the Congress directed the Corps to contract with the National Academy of Public Administration to study and recommend factors which should be used in determining the allocation of limited resources for the construction of water resource projects. In determining the projects identified in this report, the Committee used the Administration's ranking system as a guide but not as a final determinative in the allocation of funds and awaits the results of the above study to further consider project allocations.

Savings and slippage.—In fiscal year 2006, the Committee discontinued the practice of assuming an estimate for savings and slippage within the Corps of Engineers civil works program. As noted in last year's report, the practice had devolved into a method to reduce projects in order to fund more projects than an appropriation would support. This practice led to confusion, and in some cases, allocations to projects in excess of appropriated funding through reprogramming. As savings and slippage occurs on any project in the Corps civil works construction and investigations programs and the investigations and construction elements of the Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries account in fiscal year 2007, resources excess to a project's total needs shall remain available for two years after the date of enactment of the Act making appropriations for that particular project, after which time unobligated balances may be transferred to other ongoing projects, consistent with the reprogramming guidelines contained in this

Act. The Corps shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations an annual report detailing project execution relative to stated capability and enacted appropriations.

Continuing Authorities.—The Fiscal Year 2006 Act contained direction for the Corps to provide the Committees on Appropriations a management plan and delineation of all ongoing projects and out-year funding requirements; this plan has yet to be received though the Act directed it be submitted by January 7, 2006. The Committee is aware that much ado has been made with regard to Congress's inclination toward directing funding to specific projects. The Committee has repeatedly requested detailed information on this program. In response, the Corps has not been able to provide information useful in decision-making nor has it demonstrated a thorough knowledge and accounting of the existing commitments or out-year program requirements.

Until such time as the Corps can establish that it has a firm grasp of the program, Congress has no reason to give the Corps discretion. In light of the quality of information provided to date, the Committee believes it has given more than sufficient latitude by providing programmatic funding in excess of Congressionally directed projects.

In an effort to reduce the backlog of projects, the fiscal year 2006 Act placed a moratorium on the execution of new cost sharing agreements. The Committee continues this direction with the following exception: where sufficient funds are congressionally directed or otherwise available to complete the current phase, the Corps may execute the cost sharing agreement. This exception does not obviate the need for the Corps to meet all Congressionally directed project requirements prior to executing any new agreements.

Funding provided for Continuing Authorities projects in this Act shall not be available to initiate construction unless construction can be completed within the funds provided. Unobligated funds carried forward from previous years may not be used to initiate any new projects unless submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and approved by them.

INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 2006	[1] $162,360,000
Budget estimate, 2007	94,000,000
Recommended, 2006	128,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−34,360,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+34,000,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $37,300,000.

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $128,000,000, a decrease of $34,360,000 from the fiscal year 2006 enacted level, and $34,000,000 over the budget estimate. The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALASKA		
YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	300	300
ARIZONA		
PIMA COUNTY (TRES RIOS DEL NORTE), AZ	---	250
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	300	---
RIO SALADO DESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ	---	250
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ	200	200
ARKANSAS		
HOT SPRINGS CREEK, AR	200	200
PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	---	400
CALIFORNIA		
ARROYO SECO WATERSHED	---	200
BIG BEAR LAKE, SANTA ANNA RIVER, CA	---	850
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	300	300
CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CA	---	175
CITY OF NORWALK,CA	---	200
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	---	550
COAST OF CA, SOUTH COAST REGION (LA COUNTY), CA	---	200
CORNFIELDS, CA	---	500
CORTE MADERI CREEK WATERSHED, CA	---	200
DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA	---	600
ESTUDILLO CANAL, CA	600	600
GRAYSONS AND MURDERS CREEK, CA	---	200
LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	---	200
LLAGAS CREEK, CA	---	250
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	---	200
LOS ANGELES RIVER RESTORATION, CA	---	200
MATILIJA DAM, CA	400	500
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	300	300
OCEAN BEACH, SAN FRANCISCO, CA	---	500
PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	750
RUSSIAN RIVER RESTORATION, CA	---	200
SAN BERNARDINO LAKES AND STREAMS, CA	---	1,000
SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA	---	300
SAN FRANSIQUITO CREEK, CA	---	225
SAN JACINTO RIVER RESTORATION, CA	---	1,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS, CA	---	200
SANTA ROSA CREEK, CA	---	300
SEVEN OAKS & PRADO DAMS WATER CONS., CA	---	1,500
SUN VALLEY WATERSHED, CA	---	200
SUTTER COUNTY, CA	339	400
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	319	319
WILSON AND OAK GLEN CREEKS, CA	---	800
COLORADO		
CACHE LA POUDRE, CO	304	---
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY, FL	---	315
EGMONT KEY, FL	---	350
MILE POINT, FL	---	200
ST JOHNS COUNTY SHORE PROTECTION, FL	---	200

INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
GEORGIA		
AUGUSTA, GA	---	55
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	200	---
OATES CREEK, AUGUSTA, GA	---	750
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	1,750
GUAM		
HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GUAM	100	100
HAWAII		
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	300	300
ILLINOIS		
DES PLAINS RIVER (PHASE II), IL	---	500
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	400	400
KEITH CREEK, IL	---	300
SOUTHEAST ILLINOIS SHORELINE, IL	---	200
UPPER MISSISSIPPI COMP PLAN, IL, IA, MO, MN, WI	---	500
INDIANA		
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	300	750
KANSAS		
TOPEKA, KS	100	200
WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	80	200
KENTUCKY		
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	---	200
NORTHERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	300
WILLIAMSTOWN, KY	---	500
LOUISIANA		
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA	1,500	1,500
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	---	400
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	247	500
CALCASIEU RIVER PASS SHIP CHANNEL ENLARGEMENT, LA	---	500
CROSS LAKE, LA	---	300
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYST REST, LA (SCIENCE & TEC	5,000	5,000
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	20,000	20,000
MARYLAND		
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC	---	400
MASSACHUSETTS		
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA	300	300
MICHIGAN		
DETROIT RIVER GREENWAY, MI	---	250
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	300	2,034
MINNESOTA		
WILD RICE RIVER, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN	300	---

INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MISSOURI		
JORDAN CREEK, SPRINGFIELD, MO	---	600
HIGH SCHOOL BRANCH - NEOSHO, MO	---	175
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	500	750
SPRINGFIELD, MO	250	250
ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	243	350
ST LOUIS MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO & IL	---	200
WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY, MO	150	---
MONTANA		
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	200	250
NEBRASKA		
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	130	175
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	200	---
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH	---	200
NEW JERSEY		
HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, HUDSON-RATITAN, NJ	200	500
HIGHLANDS, RARITAN BAY & SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	---	200
LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, HUDSON-RARITAN EST., NJ	---	1,000
LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ	---	250
NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLE	200	200
NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALT NOURISHMENT, NJ	---	400
NEW MEXICO		
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	200	300
SOUTHWEST VALLEY, ALBUQUERQUE, NM	---	225
NEW YORK		
BRONX RIVER BASIN	---	400
CRESCENT BEACH, SOUTH SIDE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	---	200
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	100	200
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	400	600
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	---	750
SAW MILL RIVER BASIN, WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NY	---	200
NORTH CAROLINA		
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	150	---
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	150	150
SURF CITY & NORTH TOPSAIL, NC	---	100
OHIO		
WESTERN LAKE ERIE, OH	---	300
OREGON		
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	100	200
PENNSYLVANIA		
UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA	---	1,300

INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
SOUTH CAROLINA		
EDISTO ISLAND, SC	100	200
TENNESSEE		
MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	150	150
TEXAS		
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	500	500
BUFFALO BAYOU, TX	---	200
BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBS, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	---	200
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	500	500
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	300	650
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	300	400
LOWER SAN ANTONIA RIVER BASIC (TRI-COUNTY), TX	---	300
MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	---	325
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	---	200
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	250	250
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	300
RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX	---	250
RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	50	50
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	400	400
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	270	300
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	900	---
UPPER TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	1,600
VIRGINIA		
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE EROSION, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	39	39
DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA	62	62
FOUR MILE RUN, VA	---	800
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SEC 216)	300	300
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	349	349
MIDDLE POTOMAC, CAMERON/HOLMES RUN, VA	---	400
PHILPOT LAKE, VA	---	225
WASHINGTON		
ELLIOT BAY SEAWALL, WA	---	225
GRAYS HARBOR AT CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	---	325
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	400	500
SKAGIT RIVER, WA	---	200
SKOKOMISH RIVER, WA	---	325
WEST VIRGINIA		
PARKERSBURG/VIENNA RIVERFRONT PARK, WV	---	325
WISCONSIN		
ST CROIX RIVER RELOCATION OF ENDANGERED MUSSELS, WI	---	325
ST CROIX RIVER, WI & MN	---	250
MISCELLANEOUS		
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,400	1,400
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	50	50
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	220	220
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	5,625	6,200
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	250	250
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	200	200
NATIONAL INVENTORY OF FLOOD/STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION PRO	20,000	---
NATIONAL SHORELINE STUDY	375	375
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	3,673	3,673

INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	4,550	4,550
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	225	225
REMOTE SENSING / GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	150	150
REPROGRAMMING INVESTMENT FUND	---	15,000
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	15,200	17,734
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	50	50
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	600	600
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	350	350
TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	350	350
Total	94,000	128,000

Remaining items, planning assistance to states.—For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $4,550,000 for planning assistance to states, the same level as requested. Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to undertake the following studies with the amounts allocated below:

Guist Creek Lake, Kentucky	$160,000
Lake Rogers, North Carolina	50,000
Morgan State University, C&O Canal	100,000
Ocean Disposal Site, New Hampshire	100,000
Selmere, Tennessee	35,800
Water Quality Study, Charlottesville, Virginia	90,000

CONSTRUCTION (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Appropriation, 2006	[1] $2,348,280,000
Budget estimate, 2007	1,555,000,000
Recommended, 2007	1,947,171,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−401,109,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+392,171,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $101,417,000.

This appropriation funds construction, major rehabilitation, and related activities for water resources projects whose principal purpose is to provide commercial navigation, flood and storm damage reduction, or aquatic ecosystem restoration benefits to the nation. Portions of this account are funded from the Harbor Maintenance Trust and the Inland Waterways Trust funds.

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,947,171,000, a decrease of $401,109,000 from the fiscal year 2006 enacted appropriation and $392,171,000 over the budget estimate. This Committee's recommendation includes a rescission of $56,046,000 of funds appropriated in fiscal year 2006 for projects subsequently funded through completion in supplemental appropriations. The budget request and the Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALABAMA		
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	2,069	2,600
WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (REPLACEMENT)	5,000	5,000
ALASKA		
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	5,000	---
SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	3,500	3,500
ARIZONA		
NOGALES, AZ	---	1,000
RIO DEL FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	---	1,500
RIO SOLADA, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	---	8,400
TRES RIOS, AZ	---	2,000
TUSCON DRAINAGE AREA, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	---	2,000
ARKANSAS		
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	14,000	14,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR&OK	---	300
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	46,800	49,800
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	---	1,000
CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	---	200
FARMINGTON GROUNDWATER, CA	---	300
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	5,000	6,700
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	11,700	11,700
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT, CA	---	800
HEACOCK & CACTUS CHANNELS	---	900
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	5,564	5,564
LOS ANGELES HARBOR DEEPENING, CA	---	2,000
MURRIETA CREEK, CA	---	2,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	9,000	11,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	43,500	43,500
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	---	3,200
PLACER COUNTY SUB-REGIONAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT, CA	---	2,000
PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	5,700	---
SACRAMENTO AREA, CA	---	7,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	10,960	15,000
SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	---	500
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	54,080	56,080
SOUTH PERRIS PROJECT, CA	---	2,000
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	7,313	9,700
STOCKTON METRO FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSE, CA	---	1,500
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	25,000	25,000
SURFSIDE-SUNSET-NEWPORT BEACH, CA /1	---	1,200
UPPER NEWPORT, CA	---	5,000
YUBA BASIN, CA	---	1,500
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES /1	---	60
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY	320	---
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY, FL (CANAVERAL HARBOR) /1	---	10,000
BROWARD COUNTY, FL	---	750
CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	6,000	6,000

CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY, FL	---	1,300
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	39,884	39,884
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	---	200
LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL /1	---	2,000
NASSAU COUNTY, FL	---	6,500
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL /1	---	1,000
PORT EVERGLADES, FL	---	250
SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	164,000	164,000
ST JOHNS COUNTY, FL /1	---	200
ST LUCIE INLET, FL	---	1,000
TAMPA HARBOR, BIG BEND, FL	8,500	8,500
GEORGIA		
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	---	19,700
OATES CREEK, AUGUSTA, GA	---	750
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	4,600	---
TYBEE ISLAND, GA	---	2,000
IDAHO		
RURAL IDAHO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	3,000
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	6,800	6,800
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	10,000	10,000
COOK COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	750
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	6,000	7,000
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	2,960	---
LOCK NO 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (REHAB) /1	---	3,400
LOCK & DAM 24, IL & MO (REHAB) /1	---	3,900
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	45,000	45,000
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	110,000	110,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO &.	26,800	20,000
WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	---	250
INDIANA		
CADY MARSH DITCH, LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	---	4,000
CALUMET REGION ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	3,500
INDIANA SHORELINE, IN	---	1,000
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	2,787	---
INDIANAPOLIS ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	500
JOHN T MEYERS LOCK & DAM, IN & KY	---	2,000
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	14,000	15,500
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	6,000	6,000
IOWA		
DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER & GREENBELT, IA	---	6,000
LOCK & DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (REHAB) /1	---	20,300
LOCK & DAM 19, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (REHAB) /1	---	5,444
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	2,500	---
PERRY CREEK, IA	1,500	1,500
KANSAS		
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	4,000	4,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY)	38,000	38,000
KENTUCKY		
GREENUP LOCKS & DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	---	200
KENTUCKY LOCK & DAM, KY	---	10,000
MARKLAND LOCKS & DAM, KY & IN (REHAB) /1	---	8,000

CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	70,000	70,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	600	600
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	3,948	3,948
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	1,991	1,991
SOUTHERN & EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	1,000
WOLF CREEK, KY (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	31,000	31,000
LOUISIANA		
COMITE RIVER, LA	---	15,000
EAST BATON ROUGE, LA	---	5,000
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	---	18,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	1,500	2,000
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE, MD /1	---	2,000
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	---	2,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
MUDDY RIVER, BOSTON & BROOKLINE, MA	---	1,000
MICHIGAN		
GENESSEE COUNTY, MI	---	500
SAULT STE. MARIE, MI	---	2,200
MINNESOTA		
BRECKENRIDGE, MN	---	3,000
MILLE LACS, MN	---	3,000
NORTHEAST, MN	---	1,000
MISSISSIPPI		
DESOTO COUNTY, MS	---	2,000
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	2,000	2,000
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	9,750	9,750
BOIS BRULE, MO	---	1,060
CAPE GIRARDEAU, MO	---	3,200
CHESTERFIELD, MO	---	150
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	28,000	28,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	7,560	8,560
NEBRASKA		
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	7,500	7,500
NEVADA		
RURAL NEVADA, NV	---	400
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	12,400	12,400
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR, NJ (NJ SHORE PROT	2,500	6,000
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ /1	---	360
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ /1	---	130
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	100
MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	600	600
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE, NJ	---	4,000
RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	---	455

CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREENBROOK, NJ	---	5,000
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	5,816	5,816
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	2,400	2,400
ALAMOGORDO, NM	4,200	4,200
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	600	600
NEW YORK		
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	2,400	2,400
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY /1	---	5,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	2,500	2,500
JONES INLET TO EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	---	500
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	90,000	90,000
ONONDAGA LAKE, NJ	---	2,000
ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NY	---	250
NORTH DAKOTA		
GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	12,018	12,018
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	1,740	---
OHIO		
LOWER GIRARD DAM, OH	---	785
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	5,650	5,650
MILL CREEK, OH	800	800
OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	18,300
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	6,000	6,000
OREGON		
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA	15,000	15,000
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	6,300	6,300
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	1,440	1,440
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	2,200	2,200
PENNSYLVANIA		
EMSWORTH L&D, OHIO RIVER, PA (STATIC INSTABILITY CORRE	17,000	17,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	---	800
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	62,772	62,772
NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	2,000
PRESQUE ISLE, PA	---	200
SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	2,300	---
SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	9,000
SOUTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA INFRASTRUCTURE, PA	---	1,190
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	5,600	5,600
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO RIVER, PR	8,900	8,900
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	25,000	25,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
FOLLY BEACH, SC /1	---	25
LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	---	7,000
TENNESSEE		

CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	27,000	27,000
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	20,000	23,000
CENTRAL CITY, FORT WORTH, UPPER TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	6,000
DALAS FLOODWAY, TX	---	5,000
HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	43,076	43,076
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	500	500
NORTH PADRE ISLAND, TX	---	500
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL, TX	---	2,350
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	22,400	22,400
VIRGINIA		
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (REPLACEMENT)	11,000	11,000
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	---	3,400
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	8,300	8,300
VIRGINIA BEACH HURRICANE PROTECTION, VA	---	11,700
WASHINGTON		
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	850	850
MT. ST. HELENS, WA	---	500
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	5,470	5,470
PUGET SOUND ADJACENT WATER, WA	---	500
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	15,200	15,200
LEVISA & TUG FORKS, UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, VA, KY	---	20,000
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	50,800	50,800
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	1,800	1,800
SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	1,000
WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA.	---	750
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	4,300	4,300
WISCONSIN		
NORTHERN WISCONSIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, WI	---	8,000
ST. CROIX FALLS ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, WI	---	500
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	15,100	25,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	4,000
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL-SEC 204/207/933 /1	---	5,000
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	11,000	11,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION	1,330	15,000
EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	21,000	21,000
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PL 106-457)	5,000	---
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	16,075	29,933
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE	40	40
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE	170	170
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECTS (SEC. 111) /1	---	2,500
NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	845	8,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	15,000	25,000
REPROGRAMMING INVESTMENT FUND	---	40,000
SHORE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	550	2,000
SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECTS (SEC 208)	---	500
SUSPENSION FUND	41,372	---
Total, Construction	1,555,000	1,947,171

1/ Project contained in O&M budget request.

Deferrals and suspensions.—The Committee recognizes that a number of projects funded in fiscal year 2006 are not included in this Act. The Committee directs the Corps to determine the costs to defer or suspend those projects for which the Committee has not provided appropriations in this Act and provide those estimates on a project-by-project basis to the House Committee on Appropriations by September 1, 2006.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas and Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to complete the general reevaluation report for the developing cutoff that threatens the recently constructed Montgomery Point Lock and Dam. The funding is provided to assess best solution to ensure integrity of the navigation system.

American River watershed, California.—The Committee has provided $49,800,000 for American River watershed activities. Within this amount, not less than $15,000,000 shall be available for the permanent bridge below Folsom Dam; the remaining funds shall be directed to Folsom Dam Modifications, Common Features and the Folsom Dam Raise.

The Committee has also provided $3,000,000 for the Secretary to prepare a report that supplements the American River Watershed Project, California Supplemental Information Report dated March 1996 for the purpose of identifying and evaluating any potential for additional flood damage reduction to the Sacramento area that would result from construction of a multipurpose storage facility downstream of the confluence of the North and Middle forks of the American River.

Further, the Committee directs the Secretary to continue to expedite all actions necessary for completion of the new bridge at Folsom Dam, California, including completing the environmental review and documentation, completing the final design, negotiating and executing the project cooperative agreement, utilizing abbreviated contracting procedures and other means of simplifying and expediting necessary procedures for approval and construction. The Committee directs the Secretary to consider the new bridge at Folsom Dam, California, as a non-Central Valley Project component.

Inclusion of a feasibility study to contruct a dam in Auburn, CA, should not interfere with or delay efforts to proceed with the projects at Folsom Dam and should be viewed simply as an effort to explore additional flood control options in the region behold those that can be implemented at Folsom Dam.

Santa Ana River mainstem, California.—In total, the Committee provides $56,080,000 for Santa Ana River main stem in California, of which $2,000,000 is available for the Seven Oaks Dam water quality study.

The Committee recognizes that the raising of Prado Dam has endangered the existing Santa Ana River Interceptor brine line, which is critical to the region's water resource infrastructure. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to finalize planning and enter into a cost share agreement consistent with the existing Santa Ana mainstem cost share agreement.

Brevard County, Canaveral Harbor, Florida.—The Committee includes $10,000,000 for the project to provide for a full cycle of sand bypassing as mitigation for the erosion to the Brevard County

beaches south of the Federal navigation channel. The Committee understands that bypassing the same quantity of sand as has been accomplished in the past, for a distance of approximately 1 mile farther, will reduce the amount of maintenance material that needs to be removed from the Federal navigation channel and will have other benefits as well. The Committee urges the Corps to consider this when awarding the sand bypass contract.

Muddy River, Boston & Brookline, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for flood control and ecosystem restoration.

Stillwater, Minnesota (St. Croix River), Minnesota.—The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use previously appropriated funds to proceed with design and construction to complete the Stillwater, Minnesota, levee and flood control project.

New York and New Jersey Harbor, New York and New Jersey.—Within fund provided, the Corps is directed to use up to $2,000,000 to plan for and enter into an agreement with a state or non-Federal sponsor to develop a dredged material processing facility that would accomplish the objectives of reducing the cost of dredged material management in the port, preparing dredged material for beneficial uses, and implementing innovative dredged material management technologies.

Rural Nevada, Nevada.—Within the funds provided for Southeastern Rural Nevada infrastructure program, the committee provides $200,000 for the Hemenway Valley project and $200,000 for the Boulder City project.

Ohio environmental infrastructure.—The bill provides $18,300,000 for Ohio environmental infrastructure for fiscal year 2007. These funds shall be distributed as follows:

Clark County, Vicinity of Donnelsville waterline extension	$1,200,000
Fairfield County, Village of Rushville wastewater plant expansion	1,000,000
Fayette County, Culpepper area water system	1,500,000
Fayette County, Bloomingburg water and sewer	600,000
Franklin County Rickenbacker Airport water and sewer	500,000
Greene County Beaver Creek water and sewer project	250,000
Toledo Harbor power plant conversion	800,000
Cuyahoga County high performance shoreline management system (green bulkheads)	1,300,000
Whittier Peninsula, City of Columbus storm water tanks upgrade	750,000
Franklin County, Timberlake water treatment infrastructure upgrade	750,000
Franklin County, Harrisburg water treatment infrastructure upgrade	750,000
City of Orrville water main replacement	1,000,000
City of Louisville environmental infrastructure improvement program	1,000,000
City of Dublin sanitary sewer and water system	750,000
Montgomery County Austin Road Interchange	1,250,000
Montgomery County, City of Trotwood Landmark Stream improvements	400,000
Village of Green Springs wastewater improvements	300,000
City of Clyde waterline project	300,000
Williams County, Kunkle area sanitary sewer	300,000
City of Willoughby Hills, Euclid Creek sanitary sewer	3,600,000

Elk Creek Lake, Oregon.—The Committee provides $1,440,000 for activities at Elk Creek Lake, Oregon. None of the funds provided

shall be available to further work on the Corps' proposal to remove a section of the dam for fish passage.

Southeast, Pennsylvania.—Within the funds provided for Southeastern Pennsylvania infrastructure program, the Committee provides $100,000 for Cobbs Creek, $565,000 for Crum Creek and $525,000 for Alberts Run.

Levisa and Tug Forks and Cumberland River, WV, VA & KY.—For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends a total of $20,000,000. Within the amounts provided, $17,500,000 shall be for elements of the project in the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the remaining $2,500,000 shall be available for the Commonwealth of Virginia elements of the project.

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS

	House Recommended
SECTION 14	
Batesville Wastewater Treatment Plant, White River, AR	$50,000
27th Street Bridge, Glenwood Springs, CO	$322,000
Thieme Drive, Fort Wayne, IN	$53,000
Patuxent River, Patuxent Beach Road, MD	$565,000
Malapardis Brook, Hanover, NJ	$650,000
St. John's Landfill, Portland, OR	$809,000
Paunnacussing, Bucks County, PA	$580,000
Lenoir City, Lee Drive, TN	$200,000
Nokomis Road Bridge, Ten Mile Creek, Lancaster, TX	$515,000
SECTION 103	
Tarpon Springs, FL	$150,000
Philadelphia Shipyard, PA	$500,000
SECTION 107	
St. Jerome Creek, MD	$100,000
Westport River and Harbor, MA	$150,000
Woods Hole, Great Harbor, MA	$210,000
Northwestern Michigan, Traverse City, MI	$175,000
Blackwater River, Hampton Harbor, NH	$100,000
Northwest Tennessee Regional Harbor, TN	$2,000,000
SECTION 111	
Saco River and Ellis Beach, Saco, ME	$247,000

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS

	House Recommended
SECTION 204	
Wynn Road, Oregon, OH	$100,000
SECTION 205	
Pinhook Creek, Huntsville, AL	$500,000
San Pedro Creek, CA	$75,000
East Peoria, IL	$1,700,000
South Suburban Areas of Flood Damage Reduction, IL	$70,000
Mason City, Winnebago River, IA	$225,000
Whitewater and Walnut Rivers, KS	$355,000
Jean Lafitte, Fisher School Basin, Jefferson Parish, LA	$2,000,000
Aberjona River Watershed, Winchester, MA	$200,000
Black Rocks Creek (Blackwater River), Salisbury, MA	$250,000
Detroit Beach, Lake Erie, MI	$75,000
Montevideo, MN	$1,800,000
Livingston, MT	$157,000
Platte River, Freemont, NE	$190,000
Jackson Brook, NJ	$400,000
Upper Passaic River, Long Hill, NJ	$2,615,000
Limestone Creek, Village of Fayetteville, NY	$75,000
Hominy Creek, NC	$100,000
Lower Lycoming Creek, Lycoming County, PA	$300,000
Montoursville, PA	$450,000
Richland Creek, TN	$150,000
Sandy Creek, TN	$29,000

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS

SECTION 206	House Recommended
Huntsville Spring Branch, AL	$800,000
Brownsville Branch, AR	$154,000
Salt River, CA	$400,000
Arkansas River Fisheries Habitat Restoration, CO	$350,000
Mill River, Stamford, CT	$40,000
Big Fishweir Creek, FL	$150,000
Everglades and South Florida, FL	$85,000
Stevenson Creek, FL	$3,840,000
Tsala Apopka Littoral Shelf, FL	$300,000
Turkey Creek, Brevard County, FL	$500,000
Chattahoochee Fall Line, GA	$2,000,000
Eugene Field, IL	$400,000
Kankakee River, IL & IN	$66,000
Cedar Lake, IN	$180,000
Wolf Lake, IN	$2,900,000
Ventura Marsh, IA	$800,000
North Beach Wetland, MD	$65,000
Milford Pond Ecosystem Restoration, Milford, MA	$80,000
Nashawannuck Pond, MA	$750,000
Treats Pond, MA	$738,000
Homer Lake, St. Joeph River, MI	$80,000
Grover's Mill Pond, NJ	$800,000
Soundview Park, NY	$400,000
Ore Knob, NC	$250,000
Western Cary Streams, NC	$200,000
Olentangy River 5th Ave Dam, OH	$600,000
Fogelsville Dam, PA	$250,000
Little Parke Run, PA	$250,000
North Park Lake, PA	$350,000
Sheraden Park and Chartiers Creek, PA	$440,000
Southampton Creek, Bucks County, PA	$350,000
Ten Mile River, RI	$52,000
Lynches River / Lake City, SC	$400,000
Pocotaligo River and Swamp, SC	$650,000
Wilson Branch Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, SC	$43,000
Burgess Falls, TN	$500,000
Meridian, TX	$246,000
Lake Anna, VA	$188,000

SECTION 208	
Great Piece Meadows, Essex & Morris Counties, NJ	$200,000

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAMS

	House Recommended
SECTION 1135	
Bull Creek Channel Ecosystem Restoration Project, CA	$2,000,000
Tujunga Wash, CA	$150,000
Spunky Bottoms, IL	$150,000
Sand Creek, KS	$1,300,000
Bayou DeSiard, LA	$1,707,000
Hoosic River, Adams, MA	$500,000
Great Lakes Sea Lamprey Barrier, MI	$500,000
North Nashua, NH	$150,000
Conneaut Harbor, OH	$100,000
Joe Creek, OK	$253,000
Fairmount Dam Fishladder, PA	$400,000
Allin's Cove, Barrington, RI	$6,000
Boyd's Marsh Restoration, Portsmouth, RI	$500,000
Village of Oyster, Northampton Co, VA	$97,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriation, 2006	[1] $396,000,000
Budget estimate, 2007	278,000,000
Recommended, 2007	290,607,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−105,393,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+12,607,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $153,750.

This appropriation funds planning, construction, and operation and maintenance activities associated with projects to reduce flood damage in the lower Mississippi River alluvial valley below Cape Girardeau, Missouri. The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $290,607,000 a decrease of $105,393,000 from the fiscal year 2006 enacted appropriation and $12,607 000 over the budget estimate. The budget request and the Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
INVESTIGATIONS		
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA	200	200
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM LAND STUDY, LA	100	100
BAYOU METO, AR	---	1,550
COLDWATER RIVER BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	300	300
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	400	400
MILLINGTON & VICINITY, TN	---	27
MORGANZA TO THE GULF	---	2,800
CONSTRUCTION		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	43,092	43,092
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	40,756	43,756
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	---	4,230
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	4,840	4,840
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	27,600	27,600
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	3,212	3,212
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	2,500	4,000
SUSPENSION FUND	8,000	---
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	---	500
YAZOO BASIN - DELTA HEADWATERS, MS	---	5,000
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
REGION 8 LOWER MISSISSIPPI	145,616	147,616
MAPPING	1,384	1,384
TOTAL	278,000	290,607

Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas.—The Committee recommends $1,550,000 continue authorized preconstruction, engineering and design on this project.

Mississippi River Levees, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, TN.—The Committee provides $3,000,000 in addition to the budget request for construction activities in the State of Missouri.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas.—Within the funds provided, the Corps is directed to execute the following elements: Buffalo Island Gated Outlet Structure, Ten and Fifteen Mile Bayous, bridge relocation and lands and damages and channel enlargement.

Wappapello Lake, Missouri.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 in addition to the budget request for operation and maintenance activity.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 2006	[1] $1,969,110,000
Budget estimate, 2007	2,258,000,000
Recommended, 2007	2,195,471,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+226,361,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−62,529,000

[1] Excludes emergency appropriations of $327,517.

This appropriation funds operation, maintenance, and related activities at the water resources projects that the Corps of Engineers operates and maintains. Work to be accomplished consists of dredging, repair, and operation of structures and other facilities, as authorized in various River and Harbor, Flood Control, and Water Resources Development Acts. Related activities include aquatic plant control, monitoring of completed projects, removal of sunken vessels, and the collection of domestic waterborne commerce statistics. Portions of this account are financed through the Harbor Maintenance Trust and the Inland Waterways Trust funds.

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,195,471,000 an increase of $226,361,000 over the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and $62,529,000 below the budget estimate.

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget Request	House Recommended
Region 1 New England	42,703	45,078
Region 2 Mid-Atlantic	146,700	143,250
Region 03 South Atlantic-Gulf	318,443	297,043
Region 04 Great Lakes	96,660	101,407
Region 05 Ohio	249,331	252,886
Region 06 Tennessee	20,701	21,301
Region 07 Upper Mississippi	247,967	233,803
Region 08 Lower Mississippi	140,613	147,021
Region 09 Souris-Red-Rainy	2,999	2,999
Region 10 Missouri	180,200	151,180
Region 11 Arkansas-White-Red	176,934	178,084
Region 12 Texas-Gulf	147,422	141,113
Region 13 Rio Grande	10,209	10,209
Region 14 Upper Colorado	722	722
Region 15 Lower Colorado	3,327	3,327
Region 16 Great Basin	761	761
Region 17 Pacific Northwest	252,093	242,593
Region 18 California	98,232	102,461
Region 19 Alaska	22,204	22,204
Region 20 Hawaii	1,995	1,995
Region 21 Caribbean	4,000	4,000
Subtotal for Regions	**2,164,216**	**2,103,437**
Aquatic Nuisance Control Research	690	690
Asset Management/Facilities and Equip Maintenance (FEM)	4,000	4,000
Coastal Inlet Research Program	2,475	2,475
Cultural Resources (NAGPRA/Curation)	2,000	2,000
Dredge Wheeler Ready Reserve	8,000	8,000
Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program	18,000	18,000
Dredging Data and Lock Performance Monitoring System	1,062	1,062
Dredging Operations and Environmental Research (DOER)	6,080	6,080
Dredging Operations Technical Support Program (DOTS)	1,391	1,391
Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program	270	270
Facility Protection	12,000	12,000
Great Lakes Tributary Model	900	900
Independent Assessment of Environmental Stewardship Program	500	500
Inland Waterway Navigation Charts	3,708	3,708
Monitoring Of Completed Navigation Projects	1,575	1,575
National Coastal Mapping	2,400	2,400
National Dam Safety Program (Portfolio Risk Assessment)	6,300	6,300
National Emergency Preparedness Program (NEPP)	5,000	5,000
Performance Based Budgeting Support Program	2,540	2,540
Portfolio Assessment For Water Storage Reallocation	300	300
Program Development Technical Support (ABS, P2, WINABS)	300	300
Protection of Navigation	5,541	5,541
Recreation Management Support Program (RMSP)	1,600	1,600
Regional Sediment Management Demonstration Program	1,391	3,641
Reliability Models Program for Major Rehabilitations	608	608
Stewardship Support Program	500	500
Water Operations Technical Supports (WOTS)	653	653
Subtotal - Items Not Listed Under Regions	**89,784**	**92,034**
Total Operation and Maintenance Appropriation	**2,254,000**	**2,195,471**

Region 1

Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to prepare plans and specifications for maintenance dredging.

Connecticut River below Hartford, Connecticut.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for operation and maintenance activities.

Mystic River, Connecticut.—The Committee has provided $400,000 to perform sampling and testing in relation to maintenance dredging.

Aunt Lydia's Cove, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $341,000 to perform maintenance dredging of the entrance channeling.

Block Island Harbor, Rhode Island.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to perform maintenance dredging and related activities.

Point Judith Harbor, Rhode Island.—In addition to the amount requested, $334,000 is provided for maintenance dredging and related activities.

Region 2

Mt. Morris Lake, New York.—In addition to the amount requested, $100,000 is provided for operation and maintenance activities.

Jones Inlet, New York.—In addition to the amount requested, $4,000,000 is provided for operation and maintenance activities.

Funds requested for the following projects are provided under the Construction account:

Assateague, MD	$2,000,000
Cape May Inlet to Lower Township, NJ	360,000
Delaware Bay Coastline, Roosevelt Inlet to Lewis Beach, DE	60,000
Fier Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, NY	5,000,000
Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, NJ	130,000

Region 3

Mobile Harbor, Alabama.—In addition to the amount requested, $1,000,000 is provided for dredging and related activities.

Canaveral Harbor, Florida.—In addition to the amount requested, $1,000,000 is provided for required operation and maintenance activities.

Horseshoe Cove, Florida.—The Committee provides $2,500,000 for operation and maintenance activities.

Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam, Lake Seminole, Florida, Alabama and Georgia.—In addition to the amount requested, $900,000 is provided for activities related to the control of the growth of hydrillia.

Miami River, Florida.—In addition to the amount requested, $600,000 is provided for operation and maintenance activities.

The Committee provides no funds for the following projects in North Carolina: New River Inlet and Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay.

Funds requested for the following projects are provided under the Constructure account:

Brevard County (Canaveral Harbor), FL	$10,000,000
Folly Beach, SC	25,000
Lake Worth Sand Transfer Plant, FL	2,000,000
Nassau County, FL	6,500,000
St. John's County, FL	200,000

Region 4

Arcadia, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $120,000 for maintenance dredging and related activities.

Clinton River, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $660,000 for maintenance dredging and related activities.

Menominee, Michigan.—In addition to the amount requested, $350,000 is provided for recreation improvements.

Ontonagon Harbor, Michigan.—In addition to the amount requested, $50,000 is provided for maintenance dredging and related activities.

Penwater, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for maintenance dredging and related activities.

Duluth Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin.—In addition to the amount requested, the Committee has provided $300,000 to complete a study of steel structure corrosion.

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.—In addition to the amount requested, $400,000 is provided for maintenance dredging and related activities.

Toledo Harbor, Ohio.—In addition to the amount requested, $800,000 is provided for maintenance dredging and related activities.

Burns Harbor, Indiana.—In addition to the amount requested, $1,917,000 is provided for maintenance dredging and related activities with priority consideration to the Bailly intake pipe.

Region 5

In addition to the amount requested for the Ohio River Navigation System projects, $10,000,000 is provided to implement the improvements as outlined in the Great Lakes and Ohio River Division's Five-Year Perspective.

Ohio River Locks and Dams, Kentucky, Ohio and West Virginia.—Within the funds provided, the Corps of Engineers is directed to utilize $1,000,000 in cooperation with Operation Respond, a non-profit organization, to implement a project collecting and integrating imagery of a selected segment of the Ohio Basin, gathering data from Federal and non-Federal interests, and developing and testing software primarily for the use of emergency responders.

East Branch Clarion River Lake, Pennsylvania.—In addition to the amount requested, $100,000 is provided for recreational improvements.

Tionesta Lake, Pennsylvania.—In addition to the amount requested, $455,000 is provided to investigate and initiate recreation improvements.

Funds requested for the following projects are provided under the Construction account:

Markland Locks and Dam, KY & IN (Rehab)	$8,000,000

Region 6

J Percy Priest, Tennessee.—In addition to the amount requested, $100,000 is included for this activity.

Tennessee River, Tennessee.—In addition to the amount requested, $500,000 is provided to investigate and initiate recreation improvements.

Region 7

Kaskaskia River Navigation, Illinois.—In addition to the amount requested, $200,000 is included for this activity.

Rock Island Boat Harbor, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for maintenance dredging and related activities.

Funds requested for the following projects are provided under the Construction account:

Lock and Dam 11, Mississippi River, IA (Rehab)	$20,300,000
Lock and Dam 19, Mississippi River, IA (Rehab)	5,444,000
Lock and Dam 24, IL & MO (Rehab)	3,900,000
Lock and Dam 27, Mississippi River, IL (Rehab)	3,400,000

Region 8

Osceola Harbor, Arkansas.—In addition to the amount requested, $488,000 is provided for dredging and related activities.

Houma Navigation Channel, Louisiana.—In addition to the amount requested, $620,000 is provided for dredging and related activities.

Ouachita and Black River, Louisiana.—In addition to the amount requested, $5,300,000 is provided for ongoing operation and maintenance activities.

Region 10

Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation Activities.—The Committee has provided $51,000,000 for activities and projects associated with this program.

Region 11

Table Rock, Missouri.—In addition to the amount requested, $1,150,000 is provided to construct Cow Creek Boat Ramp and for repairing roofs and other high priority backlog maintenance.

Region 12

The Committee provides no funds for the following projects in Texas: Matagorda Ship Channel, Channel to Victoria, Channel to Port Bolivar, GIWW Pt. O'Connor to Corpus Christi Bay.

Whitney Lake, Texas.—In addition to the amount requested, $1,810,000 is provided for improvements to Ham Creek Park and $1,000,000 to Kimball Bend Park.

Region 17

Fort Peck Fish Hatchery, Montana.—The Corps is directed to complete the Fort Peck Fish Hatchery within the funds provided.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Oregon, Washington and Idaho.—The Committee has provided $85,000,000 for activities and projects associated with this program.

Coos Bay, Oregon.—In addition to the amount requested, $500,000 is included for this activity.

Region 18

Dry Creek (Warm Springs), California.—In addition to the amount requested, $104,000 is included to update inundation maps for the project.

Isabella Lake, California.—The Committee is concerned by the current condition of the dam at Isabella Lake, California, given the potential impacts to the Bakersfield metropolitan area that would result from any failure, and urges the Corps to work expeditiously to take any necessary corrective action.

Moss Landing Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to complete Dredged Material Management Plan and additional fish sampling.

Noyo Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for maintenance dredging and related activities.

San Francisco Harbor, California.—In addition to the amount requested, $353,000 is provided to study placement of dredged material from Bar Channel in offshore area near Ocean Beach to prevent erosion.

San Francisco Harbor and Bay (Drift Removal), California.—In addition to the amount requested, $1,472,000 is included for this activity.

San Francisco Bay Long Term Management Study, California.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 to continue this activity.

Funds requested for the following projects are provided under the Construction account:

Surfside-Sunset-Newport Beach, CA	$1,200,000

Remaining Items

Remaining items, regional sediment management.—Within the funds provided, the Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the evaluation of sump adjacent to the Columbia River North Jetty to provide dredged material to Benson Beach. In addition, $250,000 is provided for a demonstration project at Norfolk, Virginia.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2006	$158,400,000
Budget estimate, 2007	173,000,000
Recommended, 2007	173,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+14,600,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

This appropriation provides funds to administer laws pertaining to regulation of activities affecting U.S. waters, including wetlands, in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972. Appropriate funds are used to review and process permit applications, ensure compliance on permitted sites, protect important aquatic resources, and support watershed planning efforts in sensitive environmental areas in cooperation with States and local communities.

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $173,000,000, which is the same as the budget estimate and $14,600,000 over the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2006	$138,600,000
Budget estimate, 2006	130,000,000
Recommended, 2007	130,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−8,600,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

This appropriation funds the cleanup of certain low-level radioactive materials and mixed wastes, located mostly at sites contami-

nated as a result of the Nation's early efforts to develop atomic weapons.

The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $130,000,000, the same as the budget request, and $8,600,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

Congress transferred FUSRAP from the Department of Energy (DOE) to the Corps of Engineers in fiscal year 1998. In appropriating FUSRAP funds to the Corps of Engineers, the Committee intended to transfer only the responsibility for administration and execution of cleanup activities at FUSRAP sites where DOE had not completed cleanup. The Committee did not transfer to the Corps ownership of and accountability for real property interests, which remain with DOE. The Committee expects DOE to continue to provide its institutional knowledge and expertise to serve the Nation and the affected communities to ensure the success of this program.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 2006	.....
Budget estimate, 2007	$81,000,000
Recommended, 2007	32,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+32,000,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−49,000,000

This appropriation provides funds needed to respond to floods, hurricanes, and other natural disasters, and to support emergency operations in response to flood and hurricane disasters, including advance measures, flood fighting, emergency operations, providing potable water on an emergency basis, and the repair of certain flood and storm damage reduction projects are provided in emergency appropriations Acts on an as needed basis. In addition, the Corps has the legislative authority to tap other appropriated program funds to meet emergency requirements. The budget proposes an appropriation of $81,000,000 in fiscal year 2007 to meet the emergency needs of a typical year without disrupting activities in other program areas. The Committee recommends an appropriation for this account of $32,000,000 which is the base funding to maintain the program; the remaining requirements will be addressed with emergency funding as the need arises.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2006	$152,460,000
Budget estimate, 2007	[1] 164,000,000
Recommended, 2007	142,100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−10,360,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−21,900,000

[1] The budget proposes to fund the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Civil Works under this account. The Committee recommendation includes funding in the amount of $5,000,000 for this office under the heading "Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)."

This appropriation funds the executive direction and management of the Office of Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. This Committee recommends an appropriation of $142,100,000, a

decrease of $10,360,000 from the fiscal year 2006 enacted level and $21,900,000 less than the budget request.

The recommendation includes the following reductions: $6,000,000 due to the Committee's recommendation to fund the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) separately; a reduction of $1,700,000 for budgeted Competitive Sourcing activities; and a reduction of $14,200,000 due to the Corps and ASA(CW)'s inability to budget properly for Brunswick Harbor, Georgia.

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

Appropriation, 2006	$3,960,000
Budget estimate, 2007	[1] 6,000,000
Recommended, 2007	1,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−2,460,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−4,500,000

[1] The budget proposes this office be funded from General Expenses and reflects $1,900,000 in support services not previously sub-allocated to OSASA(CW) by the Department of Army.

The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) oversees Civil Works budget and policy. The budget request includes funding for this office in the General Expenses account. For purposes of transparency, the Committee recommends a separate appropriation for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) and has recommended $1,500,000 for this account. Given the ASA(CW) was unable to meet the commitment to submit fiscal year budget hearing questions for the record in the timeframe useful for the development of this Act, the recommended level assumes a reduction of $1,000,000 reflecting a ban on all travel and training for the office and a reduction of $3,500,000 due to the ASA(CW)'s inability to budget properly for Brunswick Harbor, Georgia.

Roles and responsibilities of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).—Army regulations and General Order No. 3 clearly stipulate that the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) (ASA(CW)) has the principal responsibility for overall policy direction and supervision of the Department of the Army functions relating to all aspects of the civil works program, including all reimbursable work performed on behalf of Federal and non-Federal entities. Among the responsibilities of the ASA(CW) are managing the Department of Army civil works program for conservation and development of the national water resources, including flood damage reduction, river and harbor navigation, environmental restoration and protection, water supply, shore protection, hydroelectric power, recreation, and related purposes. This includes the following:

(1) developing, defending, and directing the execution of the Army civil works policy, legislative, and financial programs and budget.

(2) developing policy and guidance for and administering the Department of the Army regulatory program to protect, restore, and maintain the waters of the United States in the interest of the environment, navigation, and national defense.

(3) serving as congressional liaison on civil works matters, including serving as the Department of the Army point of contact for House and Senate authorization and Appropriations

Committees charged with oversight of the Department of the Army civil works program.

The Committee is extremely disappointed in the manner that the Office of the ASA(CW) has involved itself in the reprogramming of funds between projects. The Committee reminds the Office of the ASA(CW) that once an appropriation bill is passed by Congress, and signed by the President, all project allocations contained therein are of equal merit. The reprogramming reforms of fiscal year 2006 were intended to limit reprogrammings, not to eliminate them entirely. Commitments made to Members of Congress and local sponsors will be met with or without the assistance of the Office of the ASA(CW). The Act contains a provision prohibiting the expenditure of funds to prevent or limit reprogrammings for appropriated projects to ensure the Office of the ASA(CW) does not continue to draw distinctions between projects previously funded in appropriation bills and those that meet the Administration's budgeting guidelines. Last year, the Committee articulated the expectation the Office of the ASA(CW) fully exercise its roles and responsibilities as delineated in Army General Order No. 3. In doing so, the Committee expects the ASA(CW) to work constructively with the Corps and Congress to fulfill previous commitments.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The bill includes a provision that prohibits the obligation or expenditure of funds through a reprogramming of funds in this Act except in certain circumstances. This provision is discussed more fully under "Program Management and Execution."

The bill includes a provision relating to the circumstances under which the Corps is required to issue continuing contracts.

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to carry out any continuing contract that commits an amount for a project in excess of the amount appropriated for such project in this Act.

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the use of funds in this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year to carry out the construction of the Port Jersey element of the New York and New Jersey Harbor or reimbursement to the local sponsor for the construction of the Port Jersey element until commitments for construction of container handling facilities are obtained from the non-Federal sponsor for a second user along the Port Jersey element.

The bill includes a provision that prohibits funds for the operation or maritime-related maintenance of the hopper dredge McFarland.

The bill contains a provision prohibiting the use of funds in this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year to prevent or limit any reprogramming of funds for appropriated projects.

The bill contains a provision relating to the repayment of the Department of Treasury's Judgment Fund.

The bill contains a provision prohibiting the use of funds for an A–76 study.

The bill contains a provision prohibiting the use of funds to remove a section of the dam for fish passage or to study other alternatives to the trap and haul facility at Elk Creek Dam, Oregon.

The bill includes a provision that prohibits the expenditure of funds to revise the master control plans and master manuals of the Corps of Engineers for the Alabama, Coosa, Tallapoosa River basin in Alabama and Georgia or the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, Flint River Basin in Alabama, Georgia, and Florida.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2006	$34,007,000
Budget estimate, 2007	40,155,000
Recommended, 2007	40,155,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+6,148,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

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

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2007 to carry out the Central Utah Project is $40,155,000, the same as the budget request, and $6,148,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Within the $40,155,000 provided by the Committee, the following amounts are provided for the Central Utah Valley Water Conservation District by activity, as recommended in the budget request:

Utah Lake drainage basin delivery system	$17,906,000
Water conservation measures	3,661,000
Uinta Basin replacement project	15,204,000
Other Title II programs	297,000
Total, Central Utah water conservation district	37,068,000

The Committee recommendation includes the requested amount of $965,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission. These funds, as proposed in the budget request, are to be used to implement the fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation projects authorized in Title III; and in completing mitigation measures committed to in pre–1992 Bureau of Reclamation planning documents, as follows:

Provo River/Utah Lake fish and wildlife	$293,000
Duchesne/Strawberry Rivers fish and wildlife	30,000
CRSP/Statewide fish, wildlife and recreation	454,000
Section 201(a)(1) mitigation measures	188,000
Total, Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission	965,000

For program oversight and administration, the Committee has provided $1,603,000, the same level as the budget request, and $133,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. For fish and wildlife conservation programs, the Committee has provided $519,000, the same level as the budget request.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

FY 2007 BUDGET OVERVIEW

The mission of Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public. Since its establishment by The Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, the Bureau of Reclamation has developed water supply facilities that have contributed to sustained economic growth and an enhanced quality of life in the western states. Lands and communities served by Reclamation projects have been developed to meet agricultural, tribal, urban, and industrial needs. The Bureau continues to develop authorized facilities to store and convey new water supplies. The Bureau is the largest supplier and manager of water in the 17 western states. The Bureau maintains 472 dams and 348 reservoirs with the capacity to store 245 million acre-feet of water. These facilities deliver water to one of every five western farmers for about 10 million acres of irrigated land, and to over 31 million people for municipal, rural, and industrial uses. The Bureau is also the Nation's second largest producer of hydroelectric power, generating 42 billion kilowatt hours of energy each year from 58 power plants. In addition, its facilities provide substantial flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

The fiscal year budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation totals $923,736,000, and includes $88,000,000 in rescissions. The Committee recommendation totals $900,779,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, $7,000,000 over the budget request and $124,000,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

A summary table illustrating the fiscal year 2006 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2007 budget request and the Committee recommendation is shown below:

[Dollars in 000s]

Account	Fiscal Year 2006 Enacted	Fiscal Year 2007 Request	Committee Recommendation
Water and related resources	$874,679	$833,424	$849,122
Rescission	---	−88,000	−88,000
Subtotal, water and related resources	874,679	745,424	761,122
Central Valley project restoration fund	52,219	41,478	41,478
California Bay-Delta restoration	36,630	38,610	40,110
Policy and administration	57,338	58,069	58,069
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,020,866	883,581	900,779

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS AND RESCISSION)

Appropriation, 2006	$874,679,000
Budget estimate, 2007	[1] 745,424,000
Recommended, 2007	[1] 761,122,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−25,557,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+15,698,000

[1] Includes rescission of the unobligated balances for At Risk Desert Terminus Lakes in the amount of $88,000,0000.

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 levels of benefits, to protect public safety, and to conduct studies on ways to improve the use of water and related natural resources.

The Department is directed to conform to the following reprogramming guidelines. The Bureau is permitted to transfer, without prior Congressional approval and without regard to percentage limitation, not more than $5,000,000 in any one case to provide adequate funds for settled contractor claims, increased contractor earnings due to accelerated rates of operations, and real estate deficiency judgments, provided that such reprogramming is necessary to discharge legal obligations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

As to each project within the Resources Management and Development category for which $2,000,000 or more is available at the beginning of the fiscal year, the Bureau is permitted to transfer to such project in that fiscal year no more than fifteen percent of the amount available at the beginning of the fiscal year for such project, without prior Congressional approval. As to each project within the Resources Management and Development category for which less than $2,000,000 is available at the beginning of the fiscal year, the Bureau is permitted to transfer to such project no more than $300,000 in that fiscal year without prior Congressional approval.

The Bureau is further permitted to transfer funds within the Facility Operation, Maintenance and Rehabilitation category without prior Congressional approval and without regard to percentage or dollar limitation.

The Bureau may not transfer, without prior Congressional approval, more than $500,000 from either the Facilities Operation, Maintenance and Rehabilitation category or the Resources Management and Development category to any project in the other category. The Bureau is prohibited from initiating any program, project or activity through an internal reprogramming action.

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $849,122,000, $15,698,000 above the budget request and $25,557,000 below the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. The recommended level includes a recission of unobligated balances for At Risk Desert Terminus Lakes in the amount of $88,000,000. The budget request and the approved Committee allowance for specific projects are shown, by state, in the following table:

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST RES. MGMT.	REQUEST FAC. OM&R	RECOMMENDED RES. MGMT.	RECOMMENDED FAC. OM&R
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES				
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	---	7,920	---	7,920
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, COLORADO RIVER BASIN	27,050	153	27,050	153
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	5,495	---	5,495	---
FORT MCDOWELL SETTLEMENT ACT	396	---	396	---
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	297	---	297	---
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT	198	---	198	---
SALT RIVER PROJECT	297	---	297	---
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT	297	---	297	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	4,713	---	4,713	---
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	1,074	---	1,074	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	223	---	473	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,652	21,080	2,147	21,080
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT	1,021	558	1,521	558
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	574	---	574	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT	990	---	990	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	1,815	7,158	3,065	7,158
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	4,025	---	5,025	---
DELTA DIVISION	10,819	5,840	10,819	5,840
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,598	2,523	1,598	2,523
FRIANT DIVISION	1,894	3,814	1,894	3,814
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	13,658	1,259	13,658	1,259
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT.	---	18,315	---	18,315
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVERSION	2,445	1,740	2,445	1,740
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	1,015	---	1,015	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	309	---	309	---
SHASTA DIVISION	802	7,625	802	7,625
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	7,379	3,318	7,379	3,318
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	1,648	9,483	1,648	9,483
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	3,921	6,992	3,921	6,992
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	792	---	792	---
HI-DESERT WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND REUSE	---	---	500	---
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	---	---	---	---
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	743	---	743	---
LONG BEACH DESALINATION PROJECT	---	---	---	---
IRVINE BASIN GROUND AND SURFACE WATER IMPROVEMENT	---	---	1,000	---
MISSION SPRINGS WATER REUSE, DESERT HOT SPRINGS	---	---	---	---
NAPA - SONOMA - MARIN AGRICULTURAL REUSE PROJECT	---	---	---	---
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,238	---	1,238	---
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT, PHAS	1,238	---	1,238	---
ORLANDO PROJECT	14	674	14	674
PASADENA RECLAIMED WATER PROJECT	---	---	---	---
PLACER COUNTY SUB-REGIONAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROJEC	---	---	---	---
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVERSION STUDY	---	---	1,000	---
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	743	---	2,243	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	3,465	---	3,465	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	743	---	743	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION PROJECT	---	---	10,000	---
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	495	---	495	---
SANTA MARGARITA RIVER CONJUNCTIVE USE PROJECT	---	---	---	---
SOLANO PROJECT	1,287	2,558	1,287	2,558
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	406	---	1,308	---
WATSONVILLE AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	---	---	1,000	---
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	824	---	824	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST		RECOMMENDED	
	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP SECTION 5 & 8	57,420	---	57,420	---
COLLBRAN PROJECT	170	1,370	170	1,370
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	334	14,861	334	14,861
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	396	---	396	---
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	81	144	81	144
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	196	6,868	196	6,868
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	167	882	167	882
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY	74	1,970	74	1,970
MANCOS PROJECT	50	85	50	85
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	60	2,067	60	2,067
PINE RIVER PROJECT	182	125	182	125
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT	292	5,141	292	5,141
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	128	162	128	162
HAWAII				
HAWAIIAN RECLAIM AND REUSE STUDY	---	---	---	---
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,523	2,706	2,523	2,706
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	17,325	---	17,325	---
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	574	---	574	---
LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS	339	31	339	31
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,266	2,938	3,266	2,938
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	114	---	114	---
MINIDOKA PROJECT, GRASSY LAKE SOD	---	---	---	---
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	150	---	150	---
WICHITA PROJECT	15	436	15	436
MONTANA				
FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	5,000	---	6,000	---
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	---	990	---	990
HUNTLEY PROJECT	50	131	50	131
MILK RIVER PROJECT	487	1,099	487	1,099
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS	318	---	318	---
NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA RURAL WATER PROJECT	---	---	5,500	---
ST. MARY'S FACILITIES REHABILIATION	---	---	---	---
SUN RIVER PROJECT	98	249	98	249
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	31	82	31	82
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	129	---	129	---
NEVADA				
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY	198	---	198	---
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	4,982	2,807	4,982	2,807
LAKE MEAD /LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	476	---	476	---
NORTH LAS VEGAS WATER REUSE	---	---	---	---
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	---	---	---	---
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER & RECLAMATION REUSE	---	---	---	---
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,031	1,604	2,031	1,604
CHIMAYO WATER PLAN	---	---	---	---
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY	---	---	---	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST RES. MGMT.	REQUEST FAC. OM&R	RECOMMENDED RES. MGMT.	RECOMMENDED FAC. OM&R
EASTERN NEW MEXICO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS	50	---	50	---
ESPANOLA WATER DIVERSION	---	---	---	---
JICARILLA APACHE RESERVATION RURAL WATER SYSTEM	---	---	500	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	15,470	8,290	15,470	8,290
NAVAJO GALLUP WATER SUPPLY	---	---	---	---
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	50	---	50	---
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	189	---	189
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	960	3,564	960	3,564
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	149	---	149	---
SANTA FE - WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT	---	---	---	---
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	179	---	179	---
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	23	13	23	13
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS	99	---	99	---
NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	378	---	378	---
DAKOTAS TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	---	---	---	---
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT	30	64	30	64
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT	19,255	4,966	20,255	4,966
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	37	151	37	151
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	26	545	26	545
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	6	370	6	370
NORMAN FEASIBILITY STUDY	---	---	---	---
NORMAN PROJECT	12	332	12	332
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	25	---	775	---
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	10	1,187	10	1,187
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	7	425	7	425
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	433	508	433	508
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	---	---	---	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT	330	231	330	231
DESCHUTES PROJECT-WICKIUP DAM	---	---	---	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT, TUMALO, BEND FEED CANAL	---	---	---	---
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	662	364	662	364
KLAMATH PROJECT	23,504	1,246	23,504	1,246
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	389	---	389	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	756	418	756	418
SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM REMOVAL	13,000	---	13,000	---
TUALATIN PROJECT	165	216	165	216
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY PROJECT	---	---	280	---
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	---	---	---	---
UMATILLA PROJECT	721	3,006	721	3,006
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	21,000	---	22,000	---
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	---	15	---	15
MNI WICONI PROJECT	22,914	9,256	22,914	9,256
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER DISTRICT	---	---	1,250	---
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM	---	54	---	54
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT	26	16	26	16
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	68	87	68	87
DALLAS TRINITY WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	---	---	---	---
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	---	---	---	---
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES	50	---	50	---
NUECES RIVER	27	488	27	488

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST		RECOMMENDED	
	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	6	367	6	367
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	204	---	204	---
WILLIAMSON COUNTY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	---	---	750	---
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	122	29	122	29
MOON LAKE PROJECT	3	29	3	29
NEWTON PROJECT	55	25	55	25
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	74	---	74	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	199	70	199	70
PARK CITY FEASIBILITY STUDY	---	---	200	---
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	798	321	798	321
PROVO RIVER PROJECT, DEER CREEK DAM	---	---	---	---
SCOFIELD PROJECT	72	33	72	33
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	149	---	149	---
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	199	14	199	14
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,121	406	1,121	406
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, PINEVIEW PROJECT	---	---	---	---
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	46	66	46	66
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	4,050	6,104	4,050	6,104
LOWER ELWHA KLALLAM WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	---	---	---	---
MAKAH INDIAN COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	---	---	200	---
STORAGE DAM FISH PASSAGE FEASIBILITY STUDY	693	---	693	---
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS	104	5	104	5
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	352	---	352	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	2,267	6,890	2,267	6,890
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,484	---	9,484	---
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE	---	---	2,500	---
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	109	4,265	109	4,265
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	328	2,446	328	2,446
SHOSHONE PROJECT	89	733	89	733
WYOMING INVESTIGATION PROGRAM	---	---	---	---
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	---	10,566	---	10,566
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	8,910	---	8,910	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	2,455	3,291	2,455	3,291
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8	4,455	---	4,455	---
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	401	---	401	---
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,485	---	1,485
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION	---	49,203	---	49,203
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	---	---	---	---
SAFETY OF EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	---	18,315	---	18,315
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	---	---	---	---
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	475	---	475	---
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	---	1,346	---	1,346
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	11,299	---	10,190	---
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,695	---	1,695	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	836	---	836	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	15	6,083	15	6,083
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,559	---	1,559
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	1,986	---	1,466	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	8,461	---	8,461	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	297	---	297	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	17,028	---	17,028	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	---	653	---	653

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST		RECOMMENDED	
	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	6,307	---	6,307	---
NATURAL RESOURCES DAMAGE ASSESSMENT	---	---	---	---
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,492	---	1,492	---
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	---	1,176	---	1,176
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN - OTHER PROJECTS	4,150	37,700	4,150	37,700
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	719	212	719	212
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	624	147	624	147
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	1,965	---	1,965	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT - TITLE XXVIII	---	---	---	---
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,201	---	1,201	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	25	---	25	---
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	8,514	---	8,514	---
SITE SECURITY	---	39,600	---	39,600
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	---	---	---	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,832	---	832	---
TITLE XVI, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	990	---	990	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES - TECHNICAL SUPPORT	89	---	89	---
WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM 1/	7,221	---	7,221	---
WATER 2025	14,500	---	---	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	---	---	500	---
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	---	---	---
RESCISSION - P.L.109-148	---	---	---	---
TOTAL WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	456,526	376,898	472,224	376,898

1/ Starting in FY 2008 the new line item combines two previous line items: Efficiency Incentives Program and Water Management Conservation Program

Yuma area projects, Arizona and California.—The Committee has provided a total of $23,227,000 for Yuma area projects in Arizona and California, of which $495,000 is available for renovation and refurbishment of the City of Needles, California Bureau Bay Reclamation Project site.

Auburn-Folsom South Unit, California.—The Committee has also provided $1,000,000 to complete an assessment of the feasibility of relocating the Highway 49 bridge at the Auburn-South Unit of the Central Valley Project.

Further, the Committee directs the Commissioner to expedite its review and complete all actions necessary for the new bridge at Folsom Dam, California, including coordination with the Corps of Engineers and the City of Folsom, granting necessary easements or rights-of-way and other means of simplifying and expediting necessary procedures.

The Committee also directs the Commissioner to consider the new bridge at Folsom Dam, California, as a non-Central Valley Project component.

Cachuma Project, California.—Within the funds provided for the Cachuma Project, the Committee has provided $500,000 for the Lake Cachuma Water and Sewage Project.

Central Valley project, California, American River Division.—Within the funds provided, $1,250,000 shall be available for the El Dorado Temperature Control Device.

Central Valley project, California, Auburn-Folsom South Unit.—Within the funds provided, $1,000,000 shall be available to complete an assessment of the feasibility of relocating the Highway 49 bridge.

Salton Sea research project, California.—The Committee has provided $2,243,000 for the Salton Sea research project, including $1,500,000 to continue environmental restoration efforts at the Alamo and New Rivers, and for other authorized pilot projects. The Bureau is encouraged to work jointly with the Salton Sea Authority and assist the authority in running its own pilot projects.

Southern California investigations program.—Within the funds provided for the Southern California Investigations Program, $250,000 has been included for the Los Angeles Basin Watershed Water Supply Augmentation Study; $500,000 is provided for the Upper Mohave River well field and water supply project; $300,000 is provided to assist the Lake Arrowhead Community Services District to develop an integrated water resource plan.

Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project, Kansas.—The Committee is aware that the pilot program for the Equus Beds project is complete. The Committee strongly urges the Bureau to work with the impacted communities and the state of Kansas on design and engineering of the full-scale project.

St. Mary Diversion Facilities to the Milk River Basin, Montana.—The Committee remains supportive of efforts to rehabilitate or replace the St. Mary Diversion Facilities to the Milk River Basin, Montana project given the agricultural, municipal, recreational, cultural and economic benefits the project accrues to the people its serves in North Central Montana.

Oklahoma Investigations Program.—Within the funds available, $750,000 is provided for the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer Study.

Washington investigations program.—The Committee recommendation provides $352,000 for the Washington investigations program, of which $50,000 shall be available for technical assistance and studies for solutions to address the depletion of the Odessa Subacquifer.

VARIOUS PROGRAMS

Site security.—Last year, the Committee recognized that in accordance with Federal reclamation law, specifically the Reclamation Act of 1939, annual operation and maintenance (O&M) and replacement costs on Reclamation projects are allocated to a project's various authorized purposes. The ongoing costs of the additional security guards and patrols necessary to ensure the security of a project may be considered project O&M costs. The Committee remains concerned that these costs be justified and accounted for in a transparent manner. Further, the Committee directs the Department to work closely with power customers, water users and other customers to ensure these requirements are adequately communicated and justified to those parties who share in the costs.

Technical Assistance to States.—Within the funds provided, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to contribute technical expertise and operation, educational and recreational components to the City of Chandler, AZ Veteran's Oasis Water Recharge Project.

Water 2025.—The budget request includes $14,500,000 for Water 2025. This program is intended to reduce crises and conflict over water and is to set a framework to identify problems, solutions and plans to focus a needed dialog as the Department of the Interior works with states, tribes, local governments and the private sector to meet water supply challenges. While the Committee remains supportive of the program, given its lack of authorization, the Committee has not provided funding for the Water 2025 program for fiscal year 2007.

Wetlands Development.—Within the funds provided, $500,000 has been included for the Yuma East Wetlands Restoration.

CENTRAL VALLEY PPROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 2006	$52,219,000
Budget estimate, 2007	41,478,000
Recommended, 2007	41,478,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	– 10,741,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

This fund was established to carry out the provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and to provide funding for habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition, and other fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Central Valley area of California. Resources are derived from donations, revenues from voluntary water transfers and tiered water pricing, and Friant Division surcharges. The account is also financed through additional mitigation and restoration payments collected on an annual basis from project beneficiaries.

For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $41,478,000, the same level as the budget request and $10,741,000 below the fis-

cal year 2006 enacted level. Funds, as proposed in the budget request, are provided as follows:

Anadromous fish restoration program	$4,200,000
Other Central Valley project impacts	1,500,000
Dedicated project yield	900,000
Flow fluctuation study	50,000
Restoration of riparian habitat and spawning gravel	500,000
Central Valley comprehensive assessment/monitoring program	400,000
Anadromous fish screen program	3,000,000
Refugee wheeling conveyance	8,008,000
Refuge water supply, facility construction	1,800,000
Ecosystem/water systems operations model	7,134,000
Water acquisition program	8,086,000
San Joaquin Basin action plan	1,400,000
Land retirement program	1,500,000
Coleman fish hatchery	200,000
Clear Creek restoration	800,000
San Joaquin River Basin Resource Mgmt Int	2,000,000
Total, Central Valley project restoration fund	41,478,000

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

Appropriation, 2006	$36,630,000
Budget estimate, 2007	38,610,000
Recommended, 2007	40,110,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+3,480,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+1,500,000

The purpose of the California Bay-Delta account is to fund the Federal share of water supply and reliability improvements, ecosystem improvements and other activities being developed for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and associated watersheds by a State and Federal partnership (CALFED). Federal participation in this program was initially authorized in the California Bay-Delta Environmental and Water Security Act enacted in 1996. That Act authorized the appropriation of $143,300,000 for ecosystem restoration activities in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. Absent an explicit authorization, no funds were provided in this account for the CALFED effort between fiscal years 2001 and 2005. However, the Committee funded CALFED programs and activities even though a specific programmatic authorization was lacking. In 2005, the CALFED Bay-Delta Authorization Act was enacted (P.L. 108–361), authorizing $389,000,000 in Federal appropriations for fiscal year 2005 through fiscal year 2010. The authorizing legislation required an annual cross-cut budget in order to reflect the budget requests of all Federal agencies engaged in CALFED implementation. The total Federal expenditures under this Act from fiscal year 1998 through 2006 amount to almost $867,000,000.

The Committee is pleased the CALFED Bay-Delta program was included in the fiscal year 2007 budget request and recommends $40,110,000 an increase of $1,500,000 over budget request. The Committee is also pleased the budget request included a water quality section and science program section in this year's budget. However, the budget documentation was extremely limited in justifying the various levels of funding for each program/project under the CALFED Bay-Delta program. Therefore, the Committee has redirected the funding for higher priority projects that will support the implementation of the CALFED Bay-Delta program. The fund-

ed projects will produce increased sources of water for the State of California, otherwise known as "firm yield" projects, improve drinking water quality, and improve water delivery flexibility.

The Committee recognizes the impending danger the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta levees pose to the economy, environment, water users, and general welfare of the people within the State. It is the Committee's belief that, because Reclamation relies on the Delta to move water from north to south, it should share in the responsibility of maintaining and strengthening delta levees and has provided funding under the CALFED Bay-Delta program for this purpose.

All program funds provided under the CALFED Bay-Delta program are to be considered non-reimbursable. The Committee also is aware that Reclamation is not providing all funds to project cooperators as outlined in last year's bill and insists Reclamation provide the funds listed below in full for 2007. The Committee again urges the Administration to fund all program elements at the fully authorized levels in future budget requests and include all cooperating agency budgets related to CALFED Bay-Delta program activities under this account.

The funds provided are intended to support the following activities, as delineated below:

Science	$2,970,000
Delta Levees	6,000,000
Environmental water account	6,000,000
Storage program	11,385,000
San Joaquin River basin	(3,960,000)
Los Vaqueros	(1,980,000)
Shasta enlargement	(3,960,000)
Sites	(1,485,000)
Conveyance	3,415,000
San Luis Reservoir Low Point	(1,485,000)
Temporary Barriers	(500,000)
Planning and management activities	500,000
Water use efficiency	2,850,000
Upper Feather River Basin Assessment	(750,000)
Sac Valley Int Regional Mgmt Program	(1,100,000)
Inland Empire Utilities Agency regional water recycling project	(1,000,000)
Ecosystem restoration	1,000,000
Water Quality	5,990,000
Contra Costa Water District alternative intake project	(2,000,000)
San Joaquin River Salinity Management	(3,990,000)
Total, California Bay-Delta Restoration	40,110,000

Conveyance.—Due to the legal action against the intertie project between the State Water Project California Aqueduct and the Central Valley Project Delta Mendota Canal, the Committee has eliminated the funding for this project.

Delta Levees.—The Committee provides $6,000,000, to be transferred to the Corps of Engineers, which shall be available to begin implementation of the Delta Levee Stability Program High Priority, Priority Group A projects as identified in the draft 180–day report to Congress dated March 2006.

Water Use Efficiency.—The Committee has provided funds, contingent upon completion and delivery of the appropriate feasibility report to the appropriate congressional committees by Reclamation, to be available for construction of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency Regional Water Recycling Project.

The Committee has also provided $1,100,000 for the Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Program which shall be shared between the Northern California Water Association member agencies and the counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, and Tehama, California.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2006	$57,338,000
Budget estimate, 2007	58,069,000
Recommended, 2007	58,069,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+731,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The policy and administration account provides for the executive direction and management of all Reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, D.C., and Denver, Colorado, and in five regional offices. The Denver and regional offices charge individual projects or activities for direct beneficial services and related administrative and technical costs. These charges are covered under other appropriations. For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $58,069,000, the same as the budget request and $731,000 above the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

Five-year budget planning.—Last year, the Committee directed the Department of Interior to submit with its fiscal year 2007 budget request a detailed five-year budget plan for each of the major budget components including Water and Related Resources, California Bay-Delta Restoration program, Central Valley Project Restoration Fund and Central Utah Project Completion. The Department has informed the Committee that it will be unable to provide a five-year plan this fiscal year and hopes to make the initial submission with the fiscal year 2008 budget request. Given the five-year plan will be a year late, the Committee looks forward with great expectation to finally receiving the Department's product. To reiterate last year's instruction, the program plans shall clearly state the assumptions and priorities behind the choices it will make between competing agency programs, and shall include a copy of the guidance provided to the program offices to guide their submissions into the five-year plan. The plan shall provide both fiscally constrained and unconstrained data.

Denver Technical Services Center.—The Bureau's Technical Services Center (TSC) in Denver, CO provides centralized engineering and scientific services to the area and regional offices. The Committee is aware of the National Research Council's recommendation that the Bureau reevaluate the competencies that exist at the TSC in light of current challenges faced by the Bureau. Depending upon the timeliness and thoroughness of this evaluation, the Committee will entertain an outside evaluation of the TSC's current staffing and core competencies.

General Provisions

Department of Interior

The bill includes a provision regarding the San Luis Unit and Kesterson Reservoir in California. This language has been included in annual Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts for several years.

The bill includes language prohibiting the use of funds for any water acquisition or lease in the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad Projects in New Mexico unless the acquisition is in compliance with existing state law and administered under state priority allocation.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for all Department of Energy (DOE) programs, including Energy Supply and Conservation, Clean Coal Technology, Fossil Energy Research and Development, Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, the Elk Hills School Lands Fund, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, the Energy Information Administration, Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup, Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, Science, Nuclear Waste Disposal, Departmental Administration, Office of the Inspector General, the National Nuclear Security Administration (Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and the Office of the Administrator), Defense Environmental Cleanup, Other Defense Activities, Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Energy (DOE) has requested a total budget of $24,074,717,000 in fiscal year 2007 to fund programs in its four primary mission areas: science, energy, environment, and national security. The overall DOE budget is essentially flat compared to the fiscal year 2006 enacted level, but the four mission areas fare quite differently under the Department's budget proposal. Science research would increase by 14 percent, and the budget for the National Nuclear Security Administration increases by 2.3 percent. However, the budget for applied energy research is actually down by 4.8 percent, and the environmental cleanup budget sees a reduction of 11.6 percent compared to fiscal year 2006.

The Committee makes a number of changes to the fiscal year 2007 budget request to reflect specific Congressional priorities and interests. The Committee recommendation fully funds the request for the American Competitiveness Initiative under the Office of Science, but makes significant adjustments to funding for the NNSA, applied energy research, and environmental cleanup. Total funding for the Department of Energy is $24,373,489,000, an increase of $326,717,000 over fiscal year 2006 and $298,772,000 over the budget request.

GLOBAL NUCLEAR ENERGY PARTNERSHIP (GNEP)

The Department requests $250,000,000 for a major new initiative called the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP). This initiative would address the challenges of spent fuel disposal, nuclear nonproliferation, and growth in nuclear energy through the application of advanced technologies to recycle spent nuclear fuel. The

Committee strongly endorses the concept of recycling spent nuclear fuel. Continuing the once-through fuel cycle not only would waste much of the energy content of spent fuel and leave an environmental legacy of radioactive materials, some of them useable in nuclear weapons, but will require the construction of eight more Yucca-sized repositories by the end of the century (assuming nuclear energy continues to supply twenty percent of the nation's electricity needs).

However, the Committee has serious reservations about GNEP as proposed by the Administration. The overriding concern is simply that the Department of Energy has failed to provide sufficient detailed information to enable Congress to understand fully all aspects of this initiative, including the cost, schedule, technology development plan, and waste streams from GNEP. GNEP in some ways addresses Congressional direction with respect to Integrated Spent Fuel Recycling given in the Statement of Managers accompanying the Conference Report on Energy and Water Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2006, but the GNEP proposal differs in several significant aspects from what the conferees directed last year, and the GNEP proposal falls short in a number of critical areas:

Integration of Recycling Facilities.—Congress provided funding in fiscal year 2006 for DOE to begin the competitive selection of sites willing to host integrated spent fuel recycling facilities. Integration is critical to address nonproliferation and security concerns, keeping sensitive materials and sensitive facilities within a secure perimeter and minimizing offsite transportation of special nuclear materials. Unfortunately, the Department has ignored this key concept of integration. The Request for Expressions of Interest for GNEP (solicitation DE–RP07–06ID14760) only mentions three facilities: one for the separation of usable elements from waste products in spent fuel, one for the conversion of transuranics, and an advanced fuel cycle facility. There is no mention of the requirement that these facilities be integrated or co-located at a single site, nor (as is detailed below) is there any mention of the need for interim storage as part of an integrated recycling complex.

Interim Storage.—In the Committee's view, any such integrated spent fuel recycling facility must be capable of accumulating sufficient volumes of spent fuel to provide efficient operation of the facility. A first test of any site's willingness to host such a facility is its willingness to receive into interim storage spent fuel in dry casks that provide safe storage of spent fuel for 50 to 100 years or longer. In this Committee's view, if any site refuses to provide interim storage as needed to support the operation of an integrated recycling facility, at whatever scale, then that site should be eliminated from all further consideration under GNEP. As noted above, the Department failed to include any requirement for interim storage in its Request for Expressions of Interest for hosting GNEP facilities. Further, the Department failed to include any language regarding interim storage in its legislative proposal that was submitted to Congress on April 5, 2006.

Resolution of the spent fuel problem cannot wait for the many years required for the GNEP to proceed through comprehensive planning, engineering demonstration, NRC licensing of the recycling plant, any new reactor types such as fast reactors, and each

new recycled fuel type, and ultimate operations. The credibility of the Administration's support for the future of the nuclear power industry rests on its resolution of the issues associated with taking custody of spent fuel and opening a permanent geologic repository for high-level nuclear waste (Yucca Mountain), as required by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. GNEP will not be ready to begin large-scale recycling of commercial spent fuel until the end of the next decade, and the Yucca Mountain repository will not open until roughly the same time. Such delays are acceptable only if accompanied by interim storage beginning this decade.

Inclusion of Fast Reactors.—When Congress provided funding in fiscal year 2006 for Integrated Spent Fuel Recycling, Congress understood integrated recycling to involve four steps: an advanced separation technology such as UREX+ that would not yield separated plutonium, fabrication of new mixed oxide (MOX) fuel for use in commercial light water power reactors thereby recycling any plutonium containing product of UREX+, vitrification of waste products, and interim storage of spent fuel to support the recycling process. GNEP envisions a very different process, using fast burner reactors to destroy more completely the plutonium and other actinides in the spent fuel. While such an approach may be desirable from a technical perspective, the inclusion of fast reactors adds significant cost, time, and risk to the recycling effort. The Department has failed to provide any comparison of the relative costs and benefits of the two approaches to convince Congress, and the public, that UREX+ coupled with fast reactors is the best approach to recycling spent fuel.

Linkage to Yucca Mountain.—Unfortunately, it appears that the Department has decided to put its emphasis on GNEP and put Yucca Mountain on the back burner. That choice is unacceptable to the Committee. The Yucca Mountain repository is essential regardless of whether GNEP is successful or the United States retains a policy of a once-through nuclear fuel cycle, and the Committee fully supports proceeding to construct and operate this repository. The latest schedule from the Department of Energy has a license application for construction being filed in fiscal year 2008, construction start three to four years later and disposal of commercial spent fuel sometime near the end of the next decade. This is a seven-year delay from the schedule just two years ago. During the delay, the Department has estimated that it will incur added costs of $500 million per year in liabilities to the nuclear utilities for the Department's failure to begin accepting commercial spent fuel. As noted above, this delay is acceptable only if accompanied by centralized interim storage in the near term. Furthermore, the Department has estimated that it will include an additional $500 million per year in costs to protect and manage its own wastes that are destined to be placed in Yucca Mountain. The Committee is reluctant to embark on any new initiative that has the potential to produce significant chemical and radioactive waste streams.

Inadequate Information on Waste Streams and Life Cycle Costs.—The cost estimates for construction and commissioning of the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) have gone from $4.3 billion to over $11 billion in just three years, and are still not yet well established. This plant is designed to process the high-level radioactive

waste derived from past reprocessing activities. The Department has failed to produce a complete accounting of the estimated volumes, composition, and disposition of the waste streams that will be involved in GNEP. The Department has also failed to produce even the most rudimentary estimate of the life-cycle costs of GNEP. Before the Department can expect the Congress to fund a major new initiative, the Department should provide Congress with a complete and credible estimate of the life-cycle costs of the program.

Future of Nuclear Energy.—At present, 103 civilian light-water nuclear reactors generate twenty percent of the nation's electricity. The generation process produces no greenhouse gases, is carefully regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and rate payers pay into the Nuclear Waste Fund for the permanent disposal of spent reactor fuel. However, the current fleet of reactors are generally one-third to half way through their expected operating lifetimes. To retain this component of our domestic energy supply, even at the twenty percent level, the United States will have to reach a consensus supporting the construction of dozens of new nuclear reactors. Delays in opening the Yucca Mountain repository cast a shadow over the future of nuclear energy, as it is doubtful that the NRC will be able to license new reactors without a clear disposal path for the spent fuel those reactors will generate. Unfortunately, the timeline for commercial-scale implementation of GNEP is too far off in the future to assist with licensing new reactors in the next decade. The Department has chosen, unwisely in this Committee's view, to seek legislation that would eliminate the availability of disposal space in a permanent repository as a consideration for NRC in licensing new reactors. Aggressive development of the initial Yucca Mountain repository, coupled with either expansion of Yucca's capacity or development of additional repositories, would be a responsible solution to the waste confidence question. The provision of centralized interim storage, so that the Department could begin moving spent fuel away from commercial reactor sites, would also be a responsible alternative. Attempting to legislate away the waste confidence problem is not.

The concept of recycling spent nuclear fuel has real promise, with benefits both domestically and internationally. However, the Committee recognizes that implementation of advanced recycling on any significant scale is at least a decade or more in the future. The Department has yet to submit a compelling and complete justification for the $250,000,000 request for GNEP in fiscal year 2007. Therefore, the Committee supports a more modest effort on GNEP, continued emphasis on Yucca Mountain, and renewed emphasis on the provision of centralized interim storage. Specific guidance on this issue is provided in the sections of the report dealing with the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative and with Nuclear Waste Disposal.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

The Committee renews the direction provided in previous fiscal years requiring the Secretary to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development, a quarterly report on the status of all projects, reports, fund transfers, and other actions directed in this House

bill and report, in the corresponding Senate bill and report, in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007, and in the statement of managers accompanying that Act. Any reports, transfers, or other actions directed in prior fiscal years that have not been completed as of the date of enactment of this Act should also be included in this quarterly report.

The Committee is disappointed that the Department is late in submitting several cruicial reports that were due in the spring of 2006. These reporting deadlines were established so that the reports could be used to inform the House appropriations process for the coming fiscal year. By failing to meet its reporting deadlines, the Department not only disregards the direction of the House of Representatives, but it misses opportunities to participate constructively in the appropriations process. Future reporting requirements will be linked directly to funding in the Departmental Administration account or the responsible program account, so that late reports will translate directly to reduced funding.

ASIA PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

In January 2006, subsequent to the formulation of the budget request for the Department of Energy, the United States government formally committed to participate in the Asia Pacific Partnership for Clean Development and Climate to accelerate the deployment of clean, energy-efficient technologies. The Department has identified a number of technology development and deployment activities within the Energy Supply and Conservation account and the Fossil Energy Research and Development account that may be relevant to the Asia Pacific Partnership. The Department should submit a reprogramming request to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations if it intends to use any appropriated fiscal year 2006 funds specifically for Asia Pacific Partnership activities. The Department's fiscal year 2007 budget request does not provide any detailed justification for Asia Pacific Partnership activities in fiscal year 2007; therefore, the Committee provides no funds for this purpose in fiscal year 2007. The Department should submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a detailed budget justification if it proposes to use any funds in fiscal year 2007 for activities specific to the Asia Pacific Partnership, and the Committee may consider the matter further at conference.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Department possesses enormous resources, both in terms of people and physical infrastructure, to conduct basic and applied research to benefit the citizens of the United States. From the perspective of most of those citizens, the taxpayers contribute an enormous amount of resources to the Department, much of it spent on activities that yield little obvious benefit. The Committee understands the long-term nature of basic research, and fully supports those activities. The Committee also supports the applied energy research programs that serve to bring more efficient and environmentally-friendly energy technologies into the marketplace.

In general, the Department performs its basic science research and applied energy research missions well. However, there is always room for improvement, and the recent report by the National

Academies, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future," makes a number of recommendations that are relevant to the Department of Energy.

One recommendation is create in DOE an organization called the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA–E) to provide funding support for creative "out-of-the-box" energy research, similar to the way that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) functions. The Committee is aware that the House Science Committee is considering legislation to create an ARPA–E. However, the proposal is not yet ripe, and no funds were requested in the fiscal year 2007 budget to fund any activities of an ARPA–E.

Another recommendation, referenced but not necessarily endorsed in the "Rising Storm" report, deals with the gap between applied research and commercial implementation of new technologies. The large industrial laboratories used to fill that niche, but more recently, U.S. businesses have largely focused on research that yields short-term benefits. It has been suggested that DOE should combine the expertise resident in its national laboratories with that available in the private sector and academia to conduct research targeted at selected high-payoff technologies that can be manufactured competitively in the United States. It is not clear that filling this gap is a federal responsibility; however, it is clear that this gap exists, and that DOE does have talent to bring to bear on this problem.

Regardless of the structure of a new research organization such as ARPA–E, and the technologies that might be selected as the focus for such work, there remains the question of how to fund such activities. As noted above, the fiscal year 2007 budget does not request any funding specifically for such purposes. However, the Committee notes that the Department is already sitting on a large untapped resource that could be used to address this problem. The Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) program consists of individual research projects selected at the discretion of the DOE laboratory directors with Department concurrence and funded via a tax on all funding, direct and reimbursable, coming into each laboratory. In fiscal year 2005, the Department spent $384,000,000 on LDRD. Although an accurate estimate is not yet available for the current fiscal year, the number will almost certainly approach $500,000,000.

The Committee understands the value of discretionary research conducted at the DOE national laboratories. However, the Committee strongly encourages the Secretary to re-focus the LDRD to address better the high-priority research needs of the nation so that the American taxpayers, rather than just the laboratory contractors, benefit from this research. The Committee is hopeful that the Under Secretary for Science, a new position in the Department created in section 1006 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–58), will provide more effective coordination of the LDRD program.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

The fiscal year 2008 budget justifications submitted by the Department must include the following: (1) a section identifying the

last year that authorizing legislation was provided by Congress for each program; (2) funding within each construction project data sheet for elimination of excess facilities at least equal to the square footage of the new facilities being requested; and (3) funding to eliminate excess facilities at least equal to the square footage of new facilities being constructed as general plant projects (GPP). The budget justifications must also include a statement that all appropriate project management requirements from DOE Order 413.3 will have been met at the time the budget justifications are submitted to Congress. The Committee understands that all such requirements may not be met, and need not be met, at the time the budget request is formulated. The Committee does expect, however, that these project management requirements will have been fulfilled at the time the fiscal year 2008 budget request is delivered to Congress.

FIVE-YEAR BUDGET PLANNING

Fiscal year 2007 was the first year in which the Department submitted five-year budget plans for all of its major programs, an integrated five-year budget plan for the entire Department, and business plans for each of the Department's national laboratories. The Committee directs the Department to submit updated versions of these plans (i.e, five-year budget plans for major DOE programs as listed in House Report 109–86, for the entire Department, and laboratory business plans) concurrent with submission of the fiscal year 2008 budget request.

The Committee renews its previous direction that program plans and the integrated Department-wide plan should state clearly the assumptions and priorities behind the choices it will make between competing Department programs, and should include a copy of the guidance provided to the program offices to guide their submissions into the five-year plan. The five-year budget plans for each major program should also clearly identify the five-year funding profiles for all major projects with total project costs in excess of $100,000,000. This direction applies to all ongoing projects (e.g., Hanford Waste Treatment Plant, Savannah River MOX plant, etc.), all new projects (e.g., ITER, NSLS–II, etc.), and all major cleanup projects in excess of the threshold. This information is generally available on the construction data sheets, but should be incorporated into the five-year plans as well.

While the Committee appreciates the effort of the Department in submitting the first version of its five-year budget plans, the quality of these plans made them of limited value to Congress. The programs of the Office of Environmental Management offer a clear example of this problem. Environmental Management has developed milestone schedules for each of its cleanup sites. These schedules were developed in cooperation with local communities and regulators, and in some cases, are the result of legally-binding agreements. There are known resource requirements that are necessary to meet these existing cleanup milestones. By summing up the funding requirements that are necessary to keep all existing cleanup sites on schedule for the next five years, the Office of Environmental Management can derive the minimum funding level required for the Environmental Management programs over the next

five years. Where OMB or the Department imposes a funding ceiling that provides less than the minimum necessary to keep all cleanup sites on schedule, the five-year plan then should identify clearly which sites would remain on schedule and which ones would see a schedule slip under the constrained funding levels and the extent of the slippage. Absent this level of detail, the five-year plan does not inform Congress of the trade-offs that are being made at the proposed five-year funding levels. A similar criticism applies to the five-year plans for the Department's other major programs. The five-year budget plan is not meant to be a promotional brochure on the Administration's budget request; it is meant to be a working tool to help both the Department and the Congress understand what will and will not be accomplished under the proposed five-year funding levels.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Committee repeats its prior guidance on the importance of improving the project management culture within the Department and on compliance with Project Management Order 413.3. It is important for the Department to maintain its focus on project management for all aspects of its work, but most especially to major capital projects.

FUNDING OF SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY ACTIVITIES

The Committee directs the Department of Energy (DOE) to continue to fund the safeguards and security activities within the DOE programs as a direct funded activity. The Committee notes security costs increases to fund increased requirements from changes to the Design Basis Threat (DBT) in the aftermath of the 9–11 attacks, requires a transparent accounting system to track funding across the Department of Energy's complex of sites. The Committee is unaware of any compelling rationale to transition back to indirect funding of security activities within the DOE accounts and therefore the Committee will continue to appropriate funds for security activities as a direct appropriation.

AUGMENTING FEDERAL STAFF

The Committee expects the Department to manage closely the number of management and operating (M&O) contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area in fiscal year 2007, in accordance with the guidance provided in the fiscal year 2006 conference report. The Committee maintains the following reporting requirements:

Report on M&O contractor employees.—The Department is to provide a report to the Committee at the end of fiscal year 2006 on the use of M&O contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area. The report is to identify all M&O contractor employees who work in the Washington metropolitan area, including the name of the employee, the name of the contractor, the organization to which he or she is assigned, the job title and a description of the tasks the employee is performing, the annual cost of the employee to the Department, the Headquarters program organization sponsoring each M&O employee, the program account

funding that employee, and the length of time the employee has been detailed to the Department or elsewhere in the Washington metropolitan area (e.g., the Congress, the Executive Office of the President, and other Federal agencies). The report should also include detailed information on the cost of maintaining each M&O office in the Washington metropolitan area. This report is to include actual data for the period October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2007.

Report on support service contractors.—The report is to include for each support service contract at Headquarters: the name of the contractor; the program organization (at the lowest organization level possible) hiring the contractor; a description and list of the tasks performed; the number of contractor employees working on the contract; and the annual cost of the contract. This report is to include actual data for the period October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2007.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

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

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

Criteria for Reprogramming.—A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if delay of the project or the activity until the next appropriations year would result in a detrimental impact to an agency program or priority. Reprogrammings may also be considered if the Department can show that significant cost savings can accrue by increasing funding for an activity. Mere convenience or preference should not be factors for consideration.

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

Reporting and Approval Procedures.—The Committee has not provided statutory language to define reprogramming guidelines, but expects the Department to follow the spirit and the letter of the guidance provided in this report. Consistent with prior years, the Committee has not provided the Department with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 2007, unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports for particular programs, projects, or activities. Any reallocation of new or prior year

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations for Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 2007 are described in the following sections. A detailed funding table is included at the end of this title.

ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION

Appropriation, 2006	$1,812,627,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	1,923,361,000
Recommended, 2007	2,025,527,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+212,900,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	+102,166,000

The Energy Supply and Conservation account includes the following programs Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Resources; Nuclear Energy; Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability; Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense); and Legacy Management. The Committee recommends that the funds for Energy Supply and Conservation activities remain available for three years.

Reprogramming authority.—In fiscal year 2006, Congress provided the Department with unprecedented reprogramming authority. The Department's mishandling of the employee layoffs at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) demonstrated clearly that the Department does not know when to use tools such as reprogramming authority to solve funding problems in a constructive manner. Accordingly, the Committee provides the Department with no reprogramming authority in fiscal year 2007 for any other projects, programs, and activities funded under the Energy Supply and Conservation account.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The total Committee recommendation for energy efficiency and renewable energy resources is $1,319,434,000 an increase of $143,013,000 compared to the budget request. This increases Weatherization Assistance funding, provides facilities and equipment for research and development to further renewable energy technology, and deploys innovative renewable technologies.

Financial Management.—The Committee is concerned about the financial management practices of the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) program. During fiscal year 2006, the EERE program was unable to account for prior year commitments and was subsequently unable to identify the amount of unobligated and obligated uncosted balances in a $1.2 billion appropriation. The Committee is especially concerned that senior DOE management directed personnel layoffs at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory when they did not know the status and availability of prior and current year funds. Such layoffs could have been avoided. The Committee sees two behaviors that contribute to this dilemma:

1. The "no-year" funds appropriations availability promotes an undisciplined approach to financial management; and,

2. A lack of accountability in tracking out-year cumulative funding commitments made by EERE over time. The Committee has heard many complaints from grant awardees that EERE initial solicitations include funding profiles that the Department fails to support because DOE does not request sufficient funding. Such "over promising" behavior was evidenced when, in February 2006, EERE issued a solicitation for $53,000,000 for a new program with funding to begin in fiscal year 2007, funding that has not yet been appropriated by the Congress.

To help remedy this situation, the Committee has imposed a three-year funds limitation on the Energy Supply and Conservation appropriation to promote a closer accounting of funds. The Committee directs EERE to report to the Committee no later than January 31, 2007, on the steps taken to improve the financial tracking of multi-year awards, identify balances from prior year projects that no longer require resources, and provide an accounting of all out-year commitments. In addition, the Committee directs EERE to report on the progress of implementing the recommendations of the Inspector General audit report DOE/IG–0689 on the insufficient management attention to EERE cooperative agreements, by January 31, 2007.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Programs include biomass and biorefinery systems R&D, geothermal technology, hydrogen technology, hydropower, solar energy, and wind energy technologies. Energy conservation activities include improving the efficiency of vehicle, building, fuel cell, and industrial technologies.

Hydrogen Technology.—The hydrogen technology program seeks to research, develop and validate fuel cell and hydrogen production, delivery, and storage technologies. This program aims to have hydrogen from diverse domestic resources used in a clean, safe, reliable, and affordable manner in fuel cell vehicles and stationary power applications. The Committee supports the Savannah River Site National Laboratory's work on hydrogen production and storage, and recommends funding levels in fiscal year 2007 no less than fiscal year 2006. The Committee recommendation for hydrogen technology is $195,801,000, the same as the budget request.

Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D.—Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D will conduct research, development and technology validation on advanced technologies that will enable future biorefineries to convert cellulosic biomass to fuels, chemicals, heat and power. The program focuses on reducing processing energy requirements and production costs in biomass processing plants and future integrated industrial biorefineries. The Committee recommendation for integrated research and development on biomass and biorefinery systems is $149,687,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides $9,967,000 for feedstock infrastructure, and $50,530,000 for platforms research and development, the same as the budget request. Within the funds provided, the Committee directs the Department to fulfill its obligation by fully funding its competitively-awarded research and development grant to NatureWorks LLC.

While the Committee supports the initiative to begin pilot scale biomass demonstrations with the private sector, the Committee also believes more bench scale research in a greater variety of feedstocks by a variety of users, such as universities, national laboratories and private interests, will yield a greater field of successes. As such, the Committee provides $69,190,000 for integration of biorefinery technologies to support two industrial scale commercial demonstration biorefineries and $15,000,000 to be used at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory to add to the existing biomass experimental facilities and complete a needed integrated biorefinery test facility (ITBF). The $15,000,000 is provided for the ITBF to perform systems experiments enabling the testing of new biomass feedstocks, the characterization of future technologies, the results of plant genomics research and to assess the many processes in an integrated biorefinery. The Committee provides $5,000,000 for grants to competitively selected colleges and universities around the country focused on conversion of cellulosic biomass to energy. Universities would: (1) Research the fundamental characteristics of cellulose in plants and how physical, biological, and chemical treatment can make the cellulose more amenable to conversion to sugars. (2) Research improved strains of bacteria or other microorganisms to convert cellulose to ethanol, particularly through breeding or engineering organisms that speedily convert cellulose to ethanol in a single step. The Committee directs that $2,000,000 of this grant money be targeted to rice straw and sugar cane bagasse as feedstocks.

The Committee directs DOE to implement an aggressive program to take advantage of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) across the country in order to deepen the recruiting pool of diverse scientific and technical staff available to support the growing renewable energy marketplace.

Solar Energy.—The Solar Energy program develops solar energy technologies, such as photovoltaics and concentrating solar power, that are reliable, affordable and environmentally sound. The Committee provides $148,372,000 for solar energy programs, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $134,472,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request; $8,900,000 for concentrating solar power; and $5,000,000 for solar heating and lighting, which was not funded in the budget request. The Committee is especially concerned that funding for solar water heater technology was eliminated, and directs the Department to prepare a report for the Committee by January 31, 2007, on the potential energy savings generated by solar water heaters, market impediments, and strategy for wider deployment of this technology.

Wind Energy.—The Wind Energy program focuses on the development of wind turbines that can operate economically in areas with low wind speeds, small wind turbines that can serve a range of distributed power applications, and system technology in support of offshore wind systems further from shore, particularly beyond the viewshed of coastal communities. The Committee recommends $43,819,000 for wind energy systems, the same as the budget request.

Geothermal Technology.—The Geothermal Technology program works in partnership with U.S. industry to establish geothermal energy as an economically competitive contributor to the U.S. energy supply. The Department proposes to close out the Geothermal Program in fiscal year 2007 and transfer results of its research and development work related to geothermal technology to industry and the public sector. The Committee provides no funding for the geothermal technology program, the same as the budget request.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommends no funding for hydropower research, the same as the budget request. The Department plans to close out the hydropower program in fiscal year 2006 and transfer results of its research and development related to testing of fish-friendly large turbines to industry.

Vehicle Technologies.—The Vehicle Technologies program seeks technology breakthroughs that will greatly reduce petroleum use by automobiles and trucks of all sizes, including R&D on lightweight materials, electronic power control, high power storage and hybrid electric drive motors. The Committee recommends $177,538,000, an increase of $11,514,000 over the budget request. The recommendation provides $19,980,000 for heavy truck engine research and development, an increase of $5,490,000 over the budget request, $10,000,000 for clean cities including $8,000,000 for development of E–85 infrastructure, an increase of $5,607,000 over the budget request and $3,479,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request for the Advanced Collaborative Emissions Study. The Committee is aware of the positive contributions of steel as an Automotive Lightweight Material in the Freedom Car project, through its USCAR and USAMP organizations. The Committee urges the Department to continue to include steel research as part of the Freedom Car program.

Building Technologies.—In partnership with the buildings industry, this program develops, promotes, and integrates energy technologies and practices to make buildings more efficient and affordable. The Committee recommends $93,029,000, an increase of $15,700,000 over the budget request, including funding for Energy Star® at $6,376,000, funding for Building Codes Training and Assistance at $5,000,000, and an increase of $10,100,000 for the acceleration of solid state lighting research and development.

Industrial Technologies.—The Industrial Technologies program cost-shares research in critical technology areas identified in partnership with industry in order to realize significant energy benefits. The Committee recommends $51,563,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes an increase of $4,000,000 for Industries of the Future, to be allocated as follows: metal casting at $1,982,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request; glass industry at $2,000,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request; and, $1,000,000 for the mining industry, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Inventions and Innovations program, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request.

Distributed Energy and Electricity Reliability Program.—This account and its activities was moved to the Electricity Delivery and

Energy Reliability program in the fiscal year 2006 Energy and Water Development conference report.

Federal Energy Management Programs.—Federal Energy Management Programs (FEMP) reduce the cost and environmental impact of the Federal government by advancing energy efficiency and water conservation, promoting the use of renewable energy, and managing utility costs in Federal facilities and operations. The Committee recommendation for Federal Energy Management Programs is $18,906,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request. The Federal government should lead by example in the area of energy efficiency, by trying to squeeze every bit of productivity from energy use. With high fuel prices, FEMP activities are likely to yield higher returns than in the past; thus, the Committee supports additional investment for more projects.

Facilities and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation for renewable energy Facilities and Infrastructure is $15,935,000, a $10,000,000 increase over the budget request. This amount includes the budget request of $5,935,000 for operations and maintenance of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) in Golden, Colorado; an increase of $5,000,000 to complete the initial research support buildings at NREL; and a $5,000,000 increase for laboratory equipment for the new Science and Technology facility at NREL.

Weatherization Assistance.—The Committee recommends $250,000,000 for weatherization assistance program grants, an increase of $90,352,000 over the budget request. The Committee is very concerned that the Department has severely under-funded this program, which readily results in significant energy savings in American homes. The Committee recommends $4,554,000 for training and technical assistance, an increase of $4,000 over the budget request, and the same as fiscal year 2006 enacted levels.

Other.—Other activities include the International Renewable Energy Program, Tribal energy activities and the Renewable Energy Production Incentive, state energy program grants, and state energy activities. Gateway deployment activities previously funded in this account have been moved to several EERE programs, and no funds are in the budget request for Gateway deployment. The Committee recommends $4,473,000 for the International Renewable Energy Program, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request; $3,957,000 for Tribal energy activities, and $4,946,000 for Renewable Energy Production Incentive, the same as the budget request.

The Committee recommends no funding for state energy activities, the same as the budget request, and no funds for state energy program grants, a reduction of $49,457,000 from the budget request. The Committee is concerned that valuable federal tax dollars within an applied research and development account are funding salaries of state employees, meetings, and travel to meetings through the "state grant" process. The Inspector General report of April 26, 2006, notes "the Department is unable to determine the cost benefit of its yearly investment of approximately $40 million in Program activities." Accordingly, the Committee has eliminated funding for these questionable activities, and restored funding to higher-priority renewable energy research and development activities, and weatherization assistance.

Program Support.—Program Support activities for the EERE program include planning, analysis and evaluation, and information, communications and outreach. The Committee recommendation for Program Support is $10,930,000, the same as the budget request.

Program Direction.—Program Direction provides for the Federal staffing resources and associated costs for supporting the management and oversight of EERE programs. The Committee recommendation for Program Direction is $91,024,000, the same as the budget request.

Congressionally Directed Technology Deployment projects.—The Committee provides $54,900,000 for the following Congressionally directed projects. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

Congressionally Directed Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Projects

Sub-Accounts	Project	Committee Recommended
EERE	Missouri Alternative/Renewable Energy Technology Center Crowder College (MO)	$1,000,000
EERE	Northfield Community LDC of Staten Island Inc. energy programs (NY)	115,000
EERE/Other	International Utility Electricity Partnership (IUEP)	3,200,000
Biomass	Biomass Research Int. at Arkansas State University (AK)	1,000,000
Biomass	Colorado Biofuel Production and Distribution Project (CO)	250,000
Biomass	Waste water treatment plant in City of Stamford (CT)	1,500,000
Biomass	Biodiesel Production Program in St.Johns County (FL)	85,000
Biomass	Florida Farm to Fuel Bio-Energy Project (FL)	1,000,000
Biomass	Kona carbon biomass Project (HI)	900,000
Biomass	Biomass Energy Conversion Project at Iowa State (BEACON) (IA)	500,000
Biomass	Digester Ethanol Project, Newton Co. (IN)	2,000,000
Biomass	Greenville Composite Biomass project (ME)	900,000
Biomass	Bioeconomy initiative at MBI International (MI)	300,000
Biomass	Missouri Forest Foundation (MO)	750,000
Biomass	Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research (Multi State)	1,250,000
Biomass	Integrated Biomass Refining Inst. North Carolina State (NC)	500,000
Biomass	Cayuga regional methane digester phase II implementation (NY)	300,000
Biomass	New York biomass/methane gas powered fuel cell project (NY)	2,000,000
Biomass	Lyonsdale Biomass Renewable Energy Project (NY)	300,000
Biomass	Waste to Bio-energy project SUNY Cobleskill (NY)	400,000
Biomass	Mill Seat Landfill Bioreactor Renewable Green Power (NY)	300,000
Biomass	Landfill power project at Delaware County (NY)	850,000
Biomass	Woody Biomass Project at SUNY-ESF (NY)	750,000
Biomass	Biomass Research at Wilberforce University (OH)	500,000
Biomass	Biomass Research at Central State University (OH)	500,000
Biomass	Biorefinery Project at Ohio University Lancaster (OH)	1,250,000
Biomass	Biomass research at Clafin University (SC)	500,000
Biomass	Biomass research at Francis Marion University (SC)	500,000
Biomass	Renewable Energy for animal waste project at Texas A&M (TX)	500,000
Biomass	Small Wood Biomass Product (WA)	1,000,000
Building Tech	Research of advanced building materials at Worthington Industries (OH)	750,000
Hydrogen	California hydrogen infrastructure storage and systems (CA)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Nano-Membrane for low temp fuel cell project (CA)	1,500,000
Hydrogen	Hydrogen Optical Fiber Sensors (CA)	950,000
Hydrogen	Combined Hydrogen Liquefaction Cycle (CT)	250,000
Hydrogen	Hydrogen Fuel Cell R&D University of South Florida Tampa (FL)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Purdue-Hydrogen Technology program (IN)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Cost-effective high performing advanced module fuel cell (MA)	500,000
Hydrogen	Silicon Based Micro Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Chip (MA)	500,000
Hydrogen	National Center for Manufacturing Sciences (MI)	1,000,000
Hydrogen	Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Development at Montana State University (MT)	750,000
Hydrogen	NaSi-NaSG Powder Fuel Cell (NJ)	1,500,000
Hydrogen	Solid Oxide Fuel Cells Research Project at the University of South Carolina (SC)	500,000
Hydrogen	Expanding Research on Solid Oxide Fuel Cells (SC)	500,000
Solar	Photovoltaic Generation project University of Hartford (CT)	500,000

Solar	Conductive Coating solar cell research project (MA)	1,500,000
Solar	Chemeketa College Nanoscience and Microtechnologies (OR)	1,500,000
Vehicle Tech	CALSTART Domestic Hybrid Truck Development (CA)	1,000,000
Vehicle Tech	Waste Heat Recovery Program (IN)	1,000,000
Vehicle Tech	Turbocharger Diesel Engine R&D (Multi-State)	4,000,000
Vehicle Tech	Consortium for Friction Reduction in Vehicles (MI)	200,000
Vehicle Tech	Southwest Gas Corporation GEDAC heat pump Development (NV)	1,850,000
Vehicle Tech	National Hybrid Truck Manufacturing Program (OH)	1,000,000
Vehicle Tech	Juniata Ultra Low Emission Locomotive Demonstration (PA)	1,000,000
Wind	Kotzebue Electric Association New Battery System (AK)	1,000,000
Wind	Iowa Stored Energy Plant related to wind energy storage (IA)	1,500,000
Wind	Wind Project at Mt. Wachusett Community College (MA)	1,000,000
Wind	Green windpower on Brownfields project at City of Wyandotte (MI)	750,000
Wind	Great Plains Wind Power Test Facility Texas Tech. University (TX)	500,000

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

The Committee recommendation for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability is $144,028,000, an increase of $19,100,000 over the budget request. Energy storage technologies are crucial to the long-run integration of wind and solar energy into the marketplace on a large scale, and the Committee provides the $2,000,000 increase for energy storage for wind and solar power. The Committee is concerned that the Gridwise, Gridworks, and Transmission Reliability initiatives, which were started by the Department several years ago, have now been terminated and collapsed into yet another new initiative called "Visualization and Controls". The Committee directs that the projects funded under the research and development programs be competitively awarded and comprehensively managed by the Department to ensure that the federal dollars provided are spent effectively. Detailed subprogram allocations are shown on the attached table at the end of Title III.

The Department's Emergency Order 202–05–03 directed the Mirant Corporation to resume operations of its Potomac River Generating Station. The Committee encourages the Secretary to develop a report in full cooperation with the General Services Administration, the D.C. Public Service Commission and the region's electric power generators and distributors, and other responsible parties that meets the Federal government's and this region's electric reliability and environmental concerns. The Department should report back to the Committees on Appropriations 180 days after enactment of this Act.

Pursuant to Section 1106 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Department of Energy is strongly encouraged to initiate a process to designate a National Power Plant Operations Technology and Educational Center that meets the criteria established in Section 1106. The Secretary shall consider non-federal commitments of support for the Center as part of the process. The Committee further encourages the Department to designate the Center by June 30, 2007.

Congressionally Directed Technology Deployment projects.—The Committee recommends $17,100,000 for the following Congressionally directed projects. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

Congressionally Directed Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability

Project	Committee Recommended
Arizona Blue Stake/Miss Utility underground Imaging Tech Pilot Program (AZ)	$500,000
Dine Power Authority Transmission Project (AZ)	500,000
Power Technologies Project (CT)	400,000
Bipolar wafer-cell Ni-MH Electric Energy Storage System (CT)	1,000,000
Energy grid modernization project at Florida State University (FL)	400,000
National SCADA test bed (ID)	5,000,000
Illinois Institute of Technology's Energy and Sustainability Institute (IL)	750,000
Electric Advanced Technology Center (IL)	250,000
Ionic Liquid Research Collaboration at Notre Dame (IN)	1,500,000
Pilot Energy Cost Control Evaluation Project (WV/IN)	1,000,000
Technology for electric transmission monitoring- University of Louisville (KY)	750,000
New Jersey Power Technologies Project	250,000
Telecommunications and Electric Power project (NY)	250,000
Research and development of emissions reduction tech. MW-scale oxide fuel cells (OH)	2,550,000
Optimization of high voltage transmission lines at Tennessee Tech University (TN)	500,000
Intelligent Power System Monitoring (TX)	200,000
Vermont Superintendents Energy Management Program (VT)	400,000
Utility Transformation Program (WA)	300,000
Center for end-of-life electronics (WV)	600,000

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy programs under the Energy Supply and Conservation appropriation is $499,805,000, a decrease of $59,947,000 below the budget request. This net decrease reflects the Committee's recommendation to fund the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) $30,000,000 below the authorization level, continue Pu–238 consolidation, and fund nuclear energy infrastructure, and education assistance. The Committee supports the Savannah River National Laboratory's work on hydrogen production and storage, and recommends funding levels in fiscal year 2007 no less than fiscal year 2006. The Committee has provided an additional $66,000,000 for increased programmatic activities for the Office of Nuclear Energy, as described below.

Of the total funding of $572,751,000 provided for Nuclear Energy programs and facilities, $72,946,000 represents costs allocated to the 050 budget function, (i.e. defense activities) for Idaho Site-wide and Security activities. Beginning in fiscal year 2007, the Idaho Facilities Management Program previously funded through Naval Reactors and Other Defense Activities is requested and appropriated under the Energy Supply and Conservation appropriation.

UNIVERSITY REACTOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

The Committee recommends $27,000,000 for grants and fellowships that support nuclear science and engineering education, and to sustain existing university reactors, an increase of $24,053,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes $2,947,000 for fuel that was requested in the Radiological Facilities Management budget under Research Reactor Infrastructure. This program is important to maintaining a supply of well trained engineers and scientists to design and operate the nuclear industry of the future. It is irresponsible for the Department to zero out education assistance at a time the nuclear industry is attempting to revitalize. The Committee does recognize that once the nuclear industry is revitalized in the United States and is a source of well-paying new jobs for trained nuclear professionals, some of the support in this program may be phased out.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Nuclear power 2010.—The Committee provides $54,031,000 for nuclear power 2010, the same as the budget request.

Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems.—The Committee supports the Department's collaborative efforts on the research and development of a generation IV reactor design that will be safer, more cost effective, and more proliferation resistant than current designs. The Committee recommends a total of $31,436,000 for generation IV nuclear energy systems, the same as the budget request. Within available funds, $4,000,000 is provided for the development of multiple high temperature fuel fabrication techniques in support of the Generation IV Nuclear Energy Systems. The Committee expects future planning for generation IV nuclear energy systems to be clearly coordinated with GNEP plans.

Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative.—The Committee provides $18,665,000 for the nuclear hydrogen initiative, the same as the

budget request. The Committee expects the Department to meet the requirements of the hydrogen future act of 1996 (P.L. 104–271) for competition and industry cost sharing, and expects the office of nuclear energy, science and technology to coordinate the nuclear hydrogen initiative fully with the other hydrogen research being conducted by the Office of Science and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.—The Committee recommendation for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative (AFCI) is $150,000,000, a decrease of $93,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee has yet to receive the spent nuclear fuel recycling technology plan from the Department due March 1, 2006, as directed by the fiscal year 2006 conference report. Without the detailed information regarding the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership Initiative, the Committee does not support activities beyond what was directed in the fiscal year 2006 bill and report and authorized in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–58). The Committee is very concerned regarding the acceleration of the UREX+ engineering scale demonstration, particularly according to DOE's own documents, "The UREX+ process has been developed and successfully demonstrated on a laboratory-scale using up to 1 kilogram of spent nuclear fuel. These tests clearly show the viability of the chemistry of the UREX+1a process, however, there are a number of engineering challenges in scaling these processes to equipment capable of processing 100s of kgs to metric tons of spent nuclear fuel per year. Additionally, the UREX+1a process produces several by-products, and the treatment, storage and handling of these by-products requires testing of new innovative equipment designs that have not been done before. Continued development of select process and equipment alternatives is also warranted, to reduce technical risk." The Committee's concern is the primary and secondary waste forms and volumes that will result from the UREX process, or any other recycling process. Because the life-cycle approach to treating, storing and disposing of these byproducts is not determined, and still technically unknown, it is unclear why the UREX+1a process was quickly chosen as the recycling technology of the future, and then recast as the keystone technology in a multi-billion dollar integrated fuel recycling endeavor. The Committee is also concerned about the role of mixed-oxide (MOX) fuel and fast reactor in GNEP, the balance in future requirements for light water reactors versus fast reactors, the costs associated with GNEP, and the role of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in regulating or participating in GNEP.

The statutory authorization level established in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, Section 951(d)(1)(A) for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative is $120,000,000. As such, the Committee's recommendation of $120,000,000 should be allocated as follows: $11,000,000 for separations technology development; $9,000,000 for advanced fuels development; $6,000,000 for transmutation engineering; $10,000,000 for systems analysis; $20,000,000 for the advanced fuel cycle facility; $39,000,000 for technology development in support of the several UREX+ processes; and $25,000,000 for the advanced burner reactor. No funds have been provided for transmutation

education. The Committee does not at this time support the development of small modular reactors for export.

No funds have been provided for conceptual design or preliminary design of the UREX+ engineering scale demonstration. At the time of the fiscal year 2006 conference report, the Committee supported recycling with a mixed-oxide fuel strategy, because MOX fuel is a demonstrated, commercially available technology with little technical uncertainty. At that time, a demonstration of UREX+ made sense as the separation step was the riskiest part of the technologies involved. Now, with GNEP proposing UREX+ and fast burner reactors, the primary technical uncertainty is no longer with the separation step, but with the design of the fast reactors and the fabrication of fuel for those reactors. The Administration argues that accelerated development of an Engineering Scale Demonstration of UREX+ will inform a key decision in 2008 on whether or not to proceed with GNEP. Unfortunately, the UREX+ Engineering Scale Demonstration will demonstrate the best-known aspect of GNEP and will do nothing to inform decision-makers on the fast reactor components of GNEP. As such, the Committee cannot support going forward with conceptual design or preliminary design of the UREX+ engineering scale demonstration.

Peer review.—Within the funds made available, the Department is directed to engage with the National Academy of Science and National Academy of Engineering for a peer review of the spent nuclear fuel recycling technology plan, encompassing all the proposed technologies and facilities. The Committee wants to be sure that the Federal government has systematically analyzed the entire nuclear fuel cycle before it begins building expensive demonstration projects.

Report requirement.—Reprocessing facilities, the associated fuel testing and fabrication facilities, and fast reactors need to be integrated as a system. Testimony before both the House Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Science underscored the need for a complete and rigorous analysis of the fuel cycle from "cradle to grave". No decisions on fuel types or technologies for the advanced burner reactor should be made before such a systems analysis has been completed and reviewed by an independent panel of experts. The Committee therefore directs the Department to prepare a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the House Committee on Science describing the status of this ongoing systems analysis, including life-cycle cost projections for the GNEP R&D program, by January 31, 2007.

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

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

Space and defense infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation is $44,650,000, an increase of $14,000,000 over the budget request. This includes the requested amounts to operate radioisotope power systems at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL), and main-

tain iridium capabilities at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and maintain and operate the Pu–238 mission at Los Alamos.

The Committee provides an increase of $9,000,000 for INL to complete the advanced conceptual design, initiate preliminary design activities, and validate process technologies associated with consolidation of Pu–238 operations at the Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee directs the Department to provide a mid-year report by January 31, 2007, on the transfer strategy and associated costs. The Committee provides an increase of $5,000,000 for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory hot cell maintenance program.

Medical isotopes infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation is $15,634,000, the same as the budget request. The recommendation provides the requested amounts for Oak Ridge buildings 3047, 5500, and 9204–3 at Y–12, and the isotope business management information system, and for various facility costs at Brookhaven, Los Alamos, and Sandia National Laboratories.

Enrichment facility infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation includes the requested $491,000, the same as the budget request, for oversight of enrichment facilities at the Government-owned, USEC-operated gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah, Kentucky.

Research reactor infrastructure.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,947,000, the same as the budget request, for fresh reactor fuel and disposal of spent fuel for university reactors, but funds these activities under the University Reactor Infrastructure and Education Assistance program.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

This program funds the operations and construction activities at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL), including the former ANL-West and the Test Reactor Area.

INL operations.—The Committee recommendation includes $97,260,000, $8,000,000 over the budget request, for INL operations. The Committee's increase is provided for the INL Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) Life Extension Program to continue safety posture improvements to ensure that the ATR remains contemporary with industry design and construction code standards and to ensure that the reactor remains a viable national resource for the next several decades.

INL Construction.—The Committee recommends $26,030,000 for Idaho facilities construction, $20,000,000 over the budget request. This includes the requested amounts for the project engineering and design work at Idaho, and $20,000,000 for four General Plant Projects that will house radio-analytical measurement laboratories, separations science chemistry laboratories, engineering and operations personnel, and operations and warehousing space.

IDAHO SITE-WIDE SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

Consistent with the budget request, this activity is funded at the requested level of $72,946,000 as a 050 Defense Activity under the Other Defense Activities account.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends a total funding level for program direction of $64,608,000, a reduction of $3,000,000 below the budget request. The reduction is commensurate with the reduction to the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership's overall programmatic funding.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation for non-defense environment, safety, and health activities is $29,121,000, the same as the budget request. Within the funds provided, the Committee directs $465,000 for the medical monitoring program at the three gaseous diffusion plants in Paducah, Kentucky, Portsmouth, Ohio, and Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation includes $33,139,000 for the Office of Legacy Management, the same as the budget request.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(RESCISSION)

The Committee recommends the rescission of $257,000,000 in clean coal technology funding. These balances are no longer needed to complete active projects in this program. For several years the Administration has proposed, and Congress has to some extent obliged, the deferral of these balances to the out-years, for the appearance of retaining them for FutureGen activities. The practice of "deferring balances" or "transferring balances" is purely a budgetary optical illusion. Congress appropriates FutureGen activities on an annual basis. There are no budgetary savings by utilizing prior year clean coal technology balances. The Committee will continue to evaluate budget requests for FutureGen activities on an annual basis, and appropriate directly, without the budget scoring gimmickry of clean coal technology prior year balances.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriation, 2006	$592,014,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	469,686,000
Recommended, 2007	558,204,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−33,810,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	+88,518,000

Fossil energy research and development programs are intended to make prudent investments in long-range research and development that help protect the environment through higher efficiency power generation, advanced technologies and improved compliance and stewardship operations. These activities safeguard our domestic energy security. This country will continue to rely on traditional fuels for the majority of its energy requirements for the foreseeable future, and the activities funded through this account ensure that energy technologies continue to improve with respect to emissions reductions and control and energy efficiency.

Fossil fuels, especially coal, are this country's most abundant and lowest cost fuels for electric power generation. The power generation technology research funded under this account has the goal of developing virtually pollution-free power plants within the next 15 or 20 years and doubling the amount of electricity produced from the same amount of fuel.

The Committee recommendation is $558,204,000, an increase of $88,518,000 over the request, and a decrease of $33,810,000 from FY 2006 enacted levels.

Clean coal power initiative.—This program researches, develops, and demonstrates commercial readiness to implement advanced clean coal-based technologies that enhance electricity reliability, increase generation capacity, and reduce emissions. The Committee recommends $36,400,000 for the clean coal power initiative (CCPI), an increase of $31,443,000 over the budget request. This funding will support the third round of demonstration projects, incorporating the latest advances in clean coal technologies. The Committee believes it is important to keep momentum in this program towards the accumulation of balances for future rounds of CCPI awards. The Committee does not accept the Department's argument that this next solicitation is not needed because the technologies demonstrated will be too late for incorporation in FutureGen. The Committee views FutureGen as a major step in the development of coal fired power plants, but not the end of new technology in this area.

FutureGen.—FutureGen is a $1 billion project, cost-shared with the private sector, to create the world's first coal-fired, zero emissions, electricity, heat and hydrogen producing power plant. The Committee recommends $54,000,000, the same as the request, for FutureGen. This funding will support the plant design and procurement activities, and continue permitting and site characterization efforts.

Fuels and Power Systems.—The Committee recommends a total of $296,237,000 for fuels and power systems, an increase of $25,075,000 over the budget request. The recommendation provides $25,000,000 for innovations for existing plants, an increase of $8,985,000 over the request and $56,000,000 for advanced Integrated Gas Combined Cycle, $2,018,000 over the budget request. These increases reflect a restoration of program research funds consistent with fiscal 2006 funding levels. The Committee provides $20,000,000 for advanced turbines, $7,199,000 over the budget request. The Committee is very concerned that the advanced turbine request was dramatically reduced, and did not accurately reflect commitments made to technology partners. The Committee recommends $73,971,000 for carbon sequestration, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $29,000,000 for fuels, an increase of $6,873,000 over the budget request, which restores program research funds consistent with fiscal 2006 funding levels. The Committee provides $63,352,000 for fuel cells, and $28,914,000 for advanced research, the same as the request.

Petroleum-Oil Technologies.—The Committee recommends $2,700,000 for petroleum-oil programs, an increase of $2,700,000 over the budget request of zero dollars. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPACT) authorizes the use of $50,000,000 of mandatory re-

ceipts for oil and gas technologies, which will fund oil and gas research and development. The Committee provides $1,500,000 for the Stripper Well Consortium, and $1,200,000 for the states Risk Based Data Management System, both important activities that fall outside of the EPACT legislation, but should continue.

Natural Gas Technologies.—The Committee recommends no funding for natural gas technologies, the same as the budget request. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 authorizes $50,000,000 of mandatory receipts for oil and gas technologies, which will fund oil and gas research and development.

Gas Hydrates.—Methane hydrates hold tremendous potential to provide abundant supplies of natural gas. Globally, more energy potential is stored in methane hydrates than in all other known fossil fuel reserves combined. It appears that the United States may be endowed with over 25 percent of total worldwide methane hydrate deposits. While EPACT authorization provides mandatory receipts for expenditures for oil and gas exploration, it is unclear where the program consortium will focus these resources. The Committee believes that the federal government should maintain a rigorous research and development program for methane hydrates, in which the research is long-term, high risk, but potentially a high pay-off. The Committee provides $12,000,000, an increase of $12,000,000 over the budget request, and the same as fiscal year 2006 enacted levels, for gas hydrates research and development funded then under Natural Gas Technologies.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $126,496,000 for program direction, a reduction of $2,700,000 from the budget request, to be taken from the Alaska natural gas transport project. The Committee finds the budget request for new federal employees for this office to be excessive and expects much of this work can be accomplished within existing FTE levels. The Committee directs the Department to continue to budget for all federal employees in the program direction account.

Other.—The Committee recommendation includes no funding for plant and capital equipment, and cooperative research and development, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides no funding for import/export authorization and advanced metallurgical processes, the same as the budget request. These accounts previously funded federal employee expenses, which are now requested and funded in the Program Direction account beginning in fiscal year 2007. The Committee provides $9,715,000 for fossil energy environmental restoration, and $656,000 for special recruitment programs, the same as the budget request.

Congressionally Directed Technology Deployment Projects.—The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for the following Congressionally directed projects. The Committee reminds recipients that statutory cost sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

Congressionally Directed Fuels & Power Projects

	Committee Recommended
GEDAC Packaged Gas Engine-Driven Heat Pump Development (AZ)	$3,000,000
Methanol Economy at the University of Southern California (CA)	1,500,000
Direct Coal fuel cell at Stanford University (CA)	1,000,000
Center for Zero Emission Research & Technology (MT)	4,500,000
Nanostructured materials at North Carolina State University (NC)	400,000
Binghamton Power Plant feasibility study (NY)	100,000
Powerspan Electro Catalytic Oxidation (OH)	1,000,000
Jupiter Oxy Fuel Technology Project (OH)	3,500,000
HydroGen air cooled phosphoric-acid fuel cells	750,000
Center for Instrumented Critical Infrastructures pipeline initiative (PA)	1,500,000
Well technology testing facility Rocky Mountain testing center (TX)	500,000
Center for Advanced Separation Technology Project (VA)	750,000
Ramgen Engine Development (WA)	1,500,000

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

The Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves no longer serve the national defense purpose envisioned in the early 1900's, and consequently the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1996 required the sale of the Government's interest in the Naval Petroleum Reserve 1 (NPR–1). To comply with this requirement, the Elk Hills field in California was sold to Occidental Petroleum Corporation in 1998. Following the sale of Elk Hills and the transfer of the oil shale reserves, DOE retains two Naval Petroleum Reserve properties: the Naval Petroleum Reserve 3 in Wyoming (Teapot Dome field), a stripper well oil field that the Department is maintaining until it reaches its economic production limit. The DOE continues to be responsible for routine operations and maintenance of NPR–3, management of the Rocky Mountain Oilfield Testing Center at NPR–3, lease management at NPR–2, and continuing environmental and remediation work at Elk Hills.

Appropriation, 2006	$21,285,000
Budget estimate, 2007	18,810,000
Recommended, 2007	18,810,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−2,475,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Committee recommends $18,810,000, the same as the budget request, for the operation of the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

Payment to the Elk Hills school lands fund was part of the settlement associated with the sale of the Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 1. Under the settlement, payments to the fund are to be made over a period of seven years. The payments to date were based on an estimate of the amount that would be required to pay the State of California nine percent of the net sales proceeds.

Appropriation, 2006	$83,160,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....
Recommended, 2007	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−$83,160,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Committee recommends no funding, the same as the budget request. The Committee understands that the final amount due will be based on the resolution of equity determinations, which cannot be completed until all divestment-related expenses are accounted.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

The mission of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) is to store petroleum to reduce the adverse economic impact of a major petroleum supply interruption to the U.S. and to carry out obligations under the international energy program. The reserve inventory reached 700 million barrels, consistent with direction, but loaned 9.8 million barrels of oil to refiners and sold 11 million barrels in response to Hurricane Katrina.

Appropriation, 2006	$164,340,000
Budget estimate, 2007	155,430,000
Recommended, 2007	155,430,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−8,910,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Committee recommends $155,430,000, the same as the budget request, for operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, a decrease of $8,910,000 from the fiscal 2006 level.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

The acquisition and storage of heating oil for the Northeast began in August 2000 when the Department of Energy, through the Strategic Petroleum Reserve account, awarded contracts for the lease of commercial storage facilities and acquisition of heating oil. The purpose of the reserve is to assure home heating oil supplies for the Northeast States during times of very low inventories and significant threats to the immediate supply of heating oil. The Northeast Heating Oil Reserve was established as a separate entity from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve on March 6, 2001. The 2,000,000 barrel reserve is stored in commercial facilities in New York Harbor, New Haven, Connecticut, and the Providence, Rhode Island area.

Appropriation, 2006	.....
Budget estimate, 2007	$4,950,000
Recommended, 2007	$4,950,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+4,950,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Committee recommends $4,950,000 the same as the budget request, for the Northeast Home Heating Oil reserve.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) is a quasi-independent agency within the Department of Energy established to provide timely, objective, and accurate energy-related information to the Congress, executive branch, state governments, industry, and the public. The information and analysis prepared by the EIA is widely disseminated and the agency is recognized as an unbiased source of energy information and projections by government organizations, industry, professional statistical organizations, and the public.

Appropriation, 2006	$85,314,000
Budget estimate, 2007	89,769,000
Recommended, 2007	89,769,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+4,455,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Committee recommends $89,769,000, the same as the budget request for the Energy Information Administration.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Non-Defense Environmental Management program includes funds to manage and clean up sites used for civilian, energy re-

search, and non-defense related activities. These past activities resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination that requires remediation, stabilization, or some other type of action.

Milestone report.—The Committee requests a report by site that tracks accelerated clean-up milestones, whether they are being met or not, and includes annual budget estimates and life-cycle costs. This report is due to the Committee by March 1 and September 1 of each year.

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee continues to support the need for flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at sites. In fiscal year 2007, the Department may transfer up to $2,000,000 between accounts, to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $2,000,000 in total once during the fiscal year. The account control points for reprogramming are the Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility, West Valley Demonstration Project, Gaseous Diffusion Plants, and construction line-items. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within thirty days of the use of this reprogramming authority.

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

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriation, 2006	$349,687,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	310,358,000
Recommended, 2007	309,946,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−39,741,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	−412,000

The Committee recommendation for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup is $312,946,000, a decrease of $412,000 from the budget request.

The recommendation provides $73,400,000 for solid waste stabilization and disposition, and nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at the West Valley Demonstration Project, and $74,860,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the gaseous diffusion plants, the same as the budget request. The recommendation provides $34,843,000 for the deactivation of facilities and surveillance and maintenance of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) and $32,556,000 for depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion at Portsmouth and Paducah, the same as the budget request. The recommendation provides $19,865,000, for soil and water remediation measures at the former Atlas uranium mill tailings site at Moab, Utah, a decrease of $3,000,000 below the budget request. The decrease accomodates higher-priority compliance driven cleanups.

Small Sites.—The Committee is concerned that funds for small sites have been maintained "flat" for years, which extend the cleanup activities, and contribute to the overall total cost of the program because cleanup takes longer. Therefore, the Committee recommends increases for several small sites that are near completion to accelerate work and close sooner. The recommendation provides $28,860,000 for Brookhaven National Laboratory, an increase of $588,000 over the budget request to accelerate the D&D of the Zero Power Reactor. The Committee recommends $11,726,000 for soil and water remediation and nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning at Argonne National Laboratory, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request to accelerate cleanup activities. The Committee recommends $7,000,000, the same as the budget request, for spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition at Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee provides $500,000, which was not in the budget request, for litigation support for closed non-defense sites such as the Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action sites.

Consolidated Business Center.—The Consolidated Business Center, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, provides administrative support and contractual assistance for the Environmental Management program, including the aforementioned Small Sites. The Committee recommendation provides $5,720,000 for the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, and $16,000,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning for the Energy Technology Engineering Center, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $1,025,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the Tritium System Test Assembly Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends $3,431,000 for soil and water remediation at the Inhalation Toxicology Laboratory, an increase of $500,000 over the budget request, to close out the clean up activities nine months earlier. The Committee recommends $160,000 for cleanup work at various sites in California, the same as the budget request.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 2006	$556,606,000
Budget estimate, 2007	579,368,000
Recommended, 2007	579,368,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+22,762,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	.....

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

The committee recommends $579,368,000 for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommis-

sioning Fund, the same as the budget request. This amount includes $559,368,000 for decontamination and decommissioning activities at the gaseous diffusion plants and $20,000,000 for Title X uranium and thorium reimbursements.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 2006	$3,596,393,000
Budget estimate, 2007	4,101,710,000
Recommended, 2007	4,131,710,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+535,317,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	+30,000,000

The Science account funds the Department's work on high energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental sciences, basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing, maintenance of the laboratories physical infrastructure, fusion energy sciences, safeguards and security, workforce development for teachers and scientists, safeguards and security at Office of Science facilities, and science program direction.

The Committee is generally pleased with the Department's budget request for the Office of Science in fiscal year 2007. This request finally reverses the trend of recent years, which saw the requests for the Office of Science held essentially flat. As a consequence, funding for physical sciences research, funded at the federal level primarily by the DOE Office of Science, lagged seriously behind funding for life sciences research. Congress was forced to provide additional funding to address obvious deficiencies in the Office of Science request. Fortunately, the fiscal year 2007 request fully funds operating time at existing DOE user facilities, funds the investment in major new research facilities such as the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor, the International Linear Collider, and the 12 GeV upgrade to the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, and maintains a healthy level of funding for ongoing research at the DOE laboratories and at universities.. The fiscal year 2007 budget request appears to strike the right balance between maximizing existing capabilities and investing in new capabilities for the future.

The Committee recognizes that funding a significant increase for the Office of Science required some difficult choices regarding other DOE programs. However, the Committee supports the Secretary's judgment that robust funding for the basic research mission of the Department represents the best long-term use of the Department's constrained resources, and the best long-term investment for the economic future of the country. The Office of Science took seriously the Congressional direction to prepare laboratory business plans and five-year budget plans, and these plans give added credibility and context to the fiscal year 2007 budget request.

The Committee recommendation is $4,131,710,000, an increase of $30,000,000 compared to the budget request and $535,319,000 over the fiscal year 2006 enacted level. Compared to the previous fiscal year, the Committee has reduced the number and dollar value of House-directed projects in the Biological and Environmental Research subaccount to $30,000,000, and has provided additional

funding for these projects so they do not diminish the proposed American Competitiveness Initiative.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends a total of $775,099,000 for high energy physics, the same as the budget request. The Committee supports the requested increase in research and development activities, from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000, to prepare for the International Linear Collider (ILC), including detailed studies of possible U.S. sites for the ILC. The Committee also supports the construction funding request of $10,300,000 for Preliminary Engineering and Design (PED) for the new Electron Neutrino Appearance detector (project 07–SC–07), which will maximize the science to be obtained from the Neutrinos at the Main Injector (NuMI) project at Fermilab.

Over the past few years, the Committee has consistently supported the DOE/NASA Joint Dark Energy Mission (JDEM), a space probe to help answer the fundamental physics question of our time what is the "dark energy" that constitutes the majority of the universe. Answering this question is among the top priorities of the physics community and of the Office of Science, and the Committee strongly believes that this initiative should move forward. DOE has done its part, developing the SuperNova Acceleration Probe (SNAP) as the DOE mission concept for JDEM. Unfortunately, NASA has failed to budget and program for launch services for JDEM. Unfortunately, in spite of best intentions, the multi-agency aspect of this initiative poses insurmountable problems that imperil its future.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to begin planning for a single-agency dark energy mission with a launch in fiscal year 2013. The Committee directs DOE to explore other launch options, including cooperative international approaches and the procurement of private launch services, to get the SNAP platform into space. DOE is to report back to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, not later than March 2, 2007, on the cost and feasibility of a single-agency mission, including the use of alternative launch options. The Committee will consider providing further guidance on this issue in the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill and report.

The control level is at the High Energy Physics level.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is $454,060,000, the same as the budget request. The requested funding will support increased operations of the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility and the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider. The requested funding will also complete PED (project 06–SC–02) and initiate construction (project 07–SC–02) for the Electron Beam Ion Source at Brookhaven National Laboratory, and initiate PED for the 12 GeV upgrade to the Continuous Beam Electron Beam Accelerator Facility at the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (project 07–SC–01).

Section 981 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–58) directs the Secretary to construct and operate a Rare Isotope Accelerator (RIA), with construction to commence no later than September 30,

2008. Unfortunately, the Department has ignored this direction, and the fiscal year 2007 budget includes no funding for RIA. Instead, the Department proposes $4,000,000 for "generic R&D activities aimed at development of exotic beam capabilities." Despite the high near-term priority assigned to RIA in the "Facilities for the Future of Science: A Twenty-Year Outlook" report, prepared by the Office of Science in 2004, RIA seems to have been supplanted by a longer-term international facility for exotic beams research. The Department, in its March 20, 2006, report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees as directed in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report for the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (P.L. 109–103), argues that this shift is a sound programmatic decision and in the best interests of the nuclear physics community. The Committee directs the Department to submit a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees providing the Department's plans to comply with Section 981 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, or the legislative proposal to seek relief from the requirements of that section. In order to inform Congress prior to conference on the fiscal year 2007 bill, this report should be submitted no later than August 11, 2006.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation for biological and environmental research is $540,263,000, an increase of $30,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides an additional $30,000,000 for House-directed university and hospital earmarks.

The Committee concurs with the proposed re-scoping of the Genomics: GTL program, from four separate facilities to two vertically-integrated sets of facilities. The Committee reiterates its previous guidance that any Genomics: GTL facilities must be fully competed. The funds appropriated in fiscal year 2005 for Preliminary Engineering and Design (PED) work for the Genomics: GTL facilities are available to fund operating expenses for the proposed new Genomics: GTL centers.

The list of House-directed projects is listed in the table below.

Congressionally Directed Office of Science Projects	Committee Recommendations
Environmental and Natural Resources Phase II Facility Univ. of Arizona (AZ)	$700,000
Synchrotron accelerator at Loma Linda University Medical Center (CA)	1,500,000
St.Mary's Medical Center San Francisco (CA)	500,000
Gene and Protein Research Children's Hospital, LA (CA)	250,000
Regis University Science Building (CO)	250,000
Live cell molecular imaging system Univ. of Connecticut health center (CT)	250,000
Upgrade of electrical utilities at Norwalk Hospital (CT)	300,000
Research and Environmental Center at Mystic Aquarium (CT)	400,000
Minority Science Center at St.Thomas University (FL)	250,000
Digital audio technology for the Blind and Dyslexic (FL)	400,000
Pediatric Neurological Institute at Miami Children's Hospital (FL)	250,000
Science center at Eckerd College (FL)	400,000
Science Facility at Florida Memorial University (FL)	250,000
Grady Health Systems Disaster Preparedness Center project (GA)	200,000
Georgia State University Science Research Laboratory (GA)	750,000
Biomass Research at the University of Hawaii (HI)	500,000
Science facility construction at Luther College (IA)	700,000
Science Building construction at Waubonsee Community College (IL)	1,000,000
Advanced Science and Technology Adjudication Resource Center (Multi State)	250,000
Children's Hospital of Illinois (IL)	400,000
Medical PACS system at Perry Memorial Hospital (IL)	200,000
Neuroscience Laboratory at Dominican University (IL)	250,000
Jackson Park Hospital (IL)	250,000
Chicago Children's Hospital (IL)	500,000
Research Facility at Chicago State University (IL)	250,000
Teaching facilities at Indiana Wesleyan University School of Nursing (IN)	200,000
Innovation Park construction at Notre Dame University (IN)	350,000
Linear Accelerator at Scheck Medical Center (IN)	200,000
Notre Dame Ecological Genomics Research Institute (IN)	1,000,000
Purdue Calumet Water Institute (IN)	500,000
Indianapolis Energy Smart Desktop Initiative (IN)	500,000
Research Lab complex at Pikeville Medical center (KY)	400,000
Nan engineering Systems at Louisiana Tech. University (LA)	400,000
Westfield State College Environmental Center (MA)	250,000
Integrative Science Building at University of Massachusetts (MA)	750,000

Pioneer Valley Life Science Initiative University of Massachusetts (MA)	500,000
Emmanuel College Center for Science Partnership (MA)	250,000
Life Science Research at Michigan Research Institute (MI)	1,000,000
Marquette General Hospital (MI)	250,000
Augsburg College (MN)	1,000,000
Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy Research at Children's National Medical Center (DC)	400,000
Pediatric Imaging Center at Carolinas Medical Center (NC)	400,000
Equipment for Biomedical Imaging University of North Carolina (NC)	900,000
Electronic patient records system at Somerset Medical Center (NJ)	700,000
Tomotherapy cancer treatment system at Valley Hospital (NJ)	200,000
Linear Accelerator at C.R. Wood Cancer Center at Glens Falls Hospital (NY)	400,000
Research at the Environmental System Center at Syracuse University (NY)	500,000
Rochester General Hospital (NY)	500,000
Fordham University Regional Science Center (NY)	500,000
Biomarker and Environmental Laboratory Core at Cincinnati Children's Hospital (OH)	400,000
Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy Research at Columbus Children's Hospital (OH)	400,000
AVETeC Network Infrastructure Improvement (OH)	1,850,000
Ohio State Univ. collaboration with Earth University (OH)	200,000
Advanced Cell Based Screening at Cleveland Clinic (OH)	400,000
Research in Electric and Aerospace Tech.at Cleveland State University (OH)	250,000
Science Building at Ohio Dominican University (OH)	200,000
Science Center at Albright College (PA)	350,000
Acute Cardiac Treatment Unit at Chester Co. Hospital (PA)	250,000
Philadelphia Educational Advancement Alliance (PA)	500,000
Advanced Building Efficiency Testbed at Carnegie Mellon University (PA)	250,000
Carolinas Neuromuscular ALS-MDA Center (SC)	250,000
Cardiac Catherization research and equipment at Metroplex Hospital (TX)	400,000
CT scan at Baptist Orange Hospital (TX)	200,000
Medical equipment for Logan's Cancer Center (UT)	200,000
Westminster College (UT)	250,000
Completion of Massey Cancer Research Center Virginia Commonwealth Univ. (VA)	400,000
Virginia Science Museum (VA)	250,000

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $1,420,980,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $286,422,000 over the current fiscal year. For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2007, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within Basic Energy Sciences, consistent with the reprogramming guidelines outlined earlier in this report.

Research.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,004,212,000 for materials sciences and engineering, and $268,499,000 for chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences. The Committee recommendation funds operations of the four completed nanoscale science research centers, instrumentation for the recently-completed Spallation Neutron Source (SNS), and the science research portion ($50,000,000) of the hydrogen initiative at the requested levels. The Committee has directed the National Nuclear Security Administration to make available, from existing stocks, sufficient heavy water to meet SNS needs. Also included within this account is $8,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), the same as the budget request.

Construction.—The Committee recommendation includes $148,269,000 for Basic Energy Sciences construction projects, the same as the requested amount. The Committee recommendation provides the requested funding of: $161,000 for completion of PED (03–SC–002) and $105,740,000 to initiate construction of the Linac Coherent Light Source (05–SC–320) at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; $18,864,000 to complete construction of the Center for Functional Nanomaterials (05–R–321) at Brookhaven National Laboratory; $257,000 to complete construction of the Molecular Foundry (04–R–313) at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; $247,000 to complete construction of the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies (03–R–313) at Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories; $20,000,000 for PED for the National Synchrotron Light Source II (07–SC–06)at Brookhaven National Laboratory; and $3,000,000 for PED for the Advanced Light Source User Support Building (07–SC–12) at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $318,654,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $83,970,000 over the current fiscal year. The Committee commends the Office of Science and the Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research for their efforts to provide cutting-edge capabilities to meet current scientific computational needs, and at the same time to extend the boundaries of that cutting edge into the next generation of high-performance scientific computers and supporting software

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $318,950,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee is pleased that the department finally requested sufficient funding for

the U.S. participation in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) Project without doing so at the expense of domestic fusion research activities or at the expense of other office of science programs.

The Committee strongly encourages the Office of Fusion Energy Sciences to invest adequately in fast ignition research and leverage the new facilities such as OMEGA–EP and FIREX–I in Japan to conduct critical research to explore the feasibility of this innovative concept. Also, the Committee is aware of the recent proposal from the Naval Research Laboratory for a fusion test facility; the Committee encourages the department to give serious consideration to providing office of science funding support in the future for these alternative approaches to fusion energy.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $50,888,000 for Science Laboratories Infrastructure, the same as the budget request. Within the requested amount, the Committee transfers $7,000,000 from the delayed demolition of the Bevatron at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory to the Physical Sciences Facility at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (project 07–SC–05) in order to accommodate the pending cleanup and closure of the 300 Area at the Hanford site. Within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to continue to make PILT payments associated with Argonne National Laboratory at $246,000.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $76,592,000, the same as the budget request, to meet additional safeguards and security requirements at Office of Science facilities.

SCIENCE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The Committee provides $10,952,000 for workforce development for teachers and scientists in fiscal year 2007, the same as the requested amount. The Committee concurs with the proposed expansion of the laboratory science teacher professional development program.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation is $170,877,000 for Science program direction, the same as the budget request. This amount includes: $95,832,000 for program direction at DOE field offices and $75,045,000 for program direction at DOE headquarters. The control level for fiscal year 2007 is at the program account level of Science Program Direction.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes an offset of $5,605,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work, as proposed in the budget request.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2006	$148,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	156,420,000
Recommended, 2007	186,420,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+37,920,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	+30,000,000

The Department of Energy requested a total of $544,500,000 for work on the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository in fiscal year 2007, $156,420,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal and $388,080,000 for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. According to the Department's testimony to the Committee, it will not submit a License Application during fiscal year 2007. The requested funds will be used for preparation of the License Application, design work on the surface and subsurface facilities, the waste packages, the national and Nevada transportation systems, and program management activities.

The Department has made a number of significant technical and management changes to the repository. In general, the Committee views these as positive changes that will put the repository program on a more secure foundation, will provide a clearer path to repository licensing, and will increase public and Congressional confidence in the safety and efficiency of the final repository. The Committee supports the adoption of the phased approach to repository licensing and construction. Such an approach is consistent with the "adaptive staging" recommended by the National Research Council in its 2003 report, "One Step at a Time: The Staged Development of Geologic Repositories for High-Level Radioactive Waste." This phased approach is also allowable under Section 114(d) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

At this time last year, the Department claimed to be on track to open the repository in 2012, a two-year slip from the schedule of the previous year. Unfortunately, a number of internal and external events the technical and management changes adopted by the Department, changes to the repository radiation standard directed by the court, internal reviews and quality control problems with the work done by the U.S. Geological Survey, and chronic underfunding by Congress have combined to push the schedule for repository operations back even further. At best, the phased approach will allow the Department to begin moving small quantities of spent fuel and high-level waste to the repository in the latter half of the next decade, with the first commercial spent fuel not moving until the end of the decade.

The observation the Committee made last year, "the net result is that the date for opening the Yucca Mountain repository continues to recede into the future", regrettably still holds true. The slow pace of Yucca Mountain development has real consequences, as it means that spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste will remain in interim storage at 129 private and governmental sites around the country. While such onsite interim storage is a manageable risk, it is an unnecessary and expensive risk. DOE estimates that every year of delay in opening the Yucca Mountain repository beyond the year 2010 will cost the federal government an additional $1 billion per year, with a conservative estimate of $500 million in legal liability for failure to take title to commercial

spent fuel, and another $500 million to monitor and guard defense spent fuel and high level radioactive waste at DOE sites. As noted in the introduction to Title III of this report, the delay in opening the Yucca Mountain may have a very real impact on the ability of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to license any new nuclear reactors in this country.

The slower schedule for Yucca Mountain may make sense. Certainly, the Committee supports changes that make the repository safer, more licensable, and more cost effective. However, a slower schedule is acceptable only if the Department addresses the dual problems of the mounting financial liability, discussed in the previous paragraph, and waste confidence for new reactors, discussed in the Title III introduction. In April 2006, the Department submitted a legislative proposal to Congress intended to facilitate the licensing, construction, and operation of the proposed repository. Two of the proposed legislative provisions would address the waste confidence problem: the Administration proposes to repeal the statutory 70,000 metric ton capacity limit on Yucca Mountain, and also proposes to direct the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to deem that the timely availability of sufficient repository capacity shall no longer be a consideration in licensing new reactors. While the Committee strongly opposes any attempt to legislative away the waste confidence problem, the Committee supports the effort to expand the capacity of Yucca Mountain. However, this capacity expansion, while it may provide sufficient waste confidence to enable the NRC to license new reactors, does nothing to resolve the problem of accumulating spent fuel, and the liability associated with that spent fuel. As discussed in the introduction to Title III of this report, the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) proposal for recycling spent fuel is a legitimate long-term strategy for spent fuel, but does nothing to address spent fuel or reactor licensing issues for at least another decade and a half.

The only constructive way to address these problems in the near term is for the Department actually to begin to move spent fuel away from commercial reactor sites and into some version of interim storage. The Committee continues to believe the Department should move aggressively to take title to commercial spent fuel and consolidating such fuel in a smaller number of more secure, aboveground interim storage facilities. The Department has taken the position that it requires additional statutory authorization for interim storage, beyond its broad authorities under the Atomic Energy Act and the limited authorities provided under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. Although the Secretary has indicated in testimony to the Committee support for the concept of interim storage, the Department's legislative proposal to Congress failed to include any language authorizing interim storage. The Committee recommendation provides $30,000,000, not derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, to initiate the process for selecting and licensing one or more interim storage sites. These interim storage sites may be located on DOE property, but the Department should also investigate the availability of other federal and private sites. If regional consolidation is not feasible, the Department should then explore consolidation of spent fuel within States with high volumes of spent fuel. The Department should conduct a voluntary, competi-

tive process to select interim storage sites. The Department can either modify and re-issue the Request for Expressions of Interest for GNEP (solicitation DE–RP07–06ID14760) to include interim storage as the initial step for integrated recycling facilities, or issue a new Request for Proposals for interim storage alone. Of the $30,000,000 made available for interim storage, $20,000,000 is available to the selected candidate sites to support their efforts to license the interim storage facilities. If the Congress has not provided the Department with clear statutory authority for interim storage by the end of fiscal year 2007, the remaining funds shall be re-directed to non-site-specific activities to select a second repository for nuclear waste disposal, consistent with Section 161 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

For Nuclear Waste Disposal in fiscal year 2007, the Committee provides $186,420,000, an increase of $30,000,000 over the budget request to fund interim storage as described above. When coupled with the $388,080,000 provided under the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, the Committee recommendation provides a total of $574,500,000 for nuclear waste disposal activities during fiscal year 2007.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Gross Appropriation:	
Appropriation, 2006	$250,289,000
Budget estimate, 2007	278,382,000
Recommended, 2007	278,382,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+28,093,000
Budget estimate, 2007	–––
Miscellaneous Revenues:	
Appropriation, 2006	−$121,770,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−123,000,000
Recommended, 2007	−123,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−1,230,000
Budget estimate, 2007	–––

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Administration is $278,382,000, the same as the budget request. Funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration. The account funds a wide array of headquarters activities not directly associated with the execution of specific programs.

The Committee renews the direction provided in the fiscal year 2006 conference report regarding the primary liaison with the House Appropriations Committee being the Department's chief financial officer rather than the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs. The Committee needs information provided in a timely, objective manner; too often, the information flow through the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, while spin-filled, has also been slow. The answers provided to questions for the record for the fiscal year 2007 appropriations have been notably content free. The Public Affairs Office is fully capable of presenting information in a manner that is to the Department's advantage, and the CFO is fully capable of providing objective,

quantitative information to the Committee. It remains unclear what value is added by the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Revenues.—The recommendation for revenues is $123,000,000, consistent with the estimate of revenues provided by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). The original request of $149,557,000 has been adjusted to reflect this CBO estimate of the revenues anticipated during fiscal year 2007.

Transfer from Other Defense Activities.—For fiscal year 2007, the Department requested $93,258,000 as the defense contribution to the Departmental Administration account. The Committee provides the requested amount and expects the Department to continue to request a proportional defense contribution to Departmental Administration in future fiscal years.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 2006	$41,580,000
Budget estimate, 2007	45,507,000
Recommended, 2007	45,507,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+3,927,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

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

The Committee recommendation is $45,507,000, the same as the budget request.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

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

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

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

weapons complex, naval reactors, and nuclear nonproliferation activities. Three offices within the NNSA carry out the Department's national security mission: the Office of Defense Programs, the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and the Office of Naval Reactors. The Office of the NNSA Administrator oversees all NNSA programs.

The Committee provides $9,199,811,000, for the NNSA, a reduction of $116,000,000 under the budget request.

Transformation of the DOE Nuclear Weapons Complex.—This Committee tasked the previous Secretary of Energy in March 2004 with conducting an independent assessment of the Department of Energy's infrastructure requirements for the nuclear weapons complex over the next twenty-five years. The Secretary established a Task Force within the Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board (SEAB) on reform of the nuclear weapons complex infrastructure. This task force released its recommendations in July 2005, and they were formally presented from the SEAB to the Secretary in October 2005.

The SEAB Task Force found the existing DOE nuclear weapons complex to be "neither robust, nor agile, nor responsive . . .", and concluded that "status quo is neither technically credible, nor financially sustainable." The task force made five major recommendations for transforming the complex into a modern enterprise:

- Design of a reliable replacement warhead (RRW);
- Establishment of a consolidated nuclear production center;
- Consolidation of special nuclear materials (SNM);
- Accelerated warhead dismantlement; and
- Creation of an office of transformation within the NNSA.

The fiscal year 2007 budget request for the NNSA, and its subsequent testimony to the Committee, reveals that the Department has embraced the recommended reforms in only a very limited manner. While the SEAB Task Force developed their recommendations with an integrated perspective on the future of the nuclear weapons complex, the NNSA continues to propose modernization plans which maximize the physical size and the cost of the weapons complex.

The 2001 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) called for a more responsive NNSA infrastructure, able to design and produce new nuclear weapons and respond to unanticipated events in a useful time frame. The Department of Energy has adopted this objective into its Responsive Infrastructure initiative. However, an examination of the details provided in the fiscal year 2007 budget justification reveals that Responsive Infrastructure is merely a new title for the old DOE strategy of "modernization in place," a strategy specifically rejected by the SEAB Task Force. What is clear to the Committee is that the Department intends only very limited reform—RRW with a new pit facility, modernization-in-place of everything else, and only enough material consolidation and dismantlement to keep Congress satisfied. In this Committee's view, the Department missed that mark by a wide margin.

The Department's adoption of the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW), a concept introduced in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (P.L. 108–447), to design replacement warheads to meet

existing military requirements, but with greater margins, improved surety, and simplified production, maintenance, and dismantlement requirements is laudable. If successful, the RRW will form the foundation for a future nuclear stockpile that is smaller than the existing Cold War stockpile, but at the same time safer, more secure, and more reliable. The Department has used fiscal year 2006 funds to initiate a laboratory design competition for the first RRW. The Committee supports the RRW, but only if it is part of a larger package of more comprehensive weapons complex reforms.

The Committee expects the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to assist the Committee with the Committee's oversight of NNSA's transformation process. In particular, the Committee will expect the GAO to evaluate, among other things, the cost effectiveness of NNSA's proposal to build and operate the CMRR facility for less than 10 years before moving to the proposed consolidated plutonium facility, the NNSA's implementation of the results of the RRW design competition, especially the extent to which this effort can be paid for by reductions in ongoing life extensions activities and stockpile maintenance activities, and the quality and comprehensiveness of the plans and cost estimates developed by NNSA to support its transformation decisions. The Committee fences additional funds for the RRW until it receives a comprehensive complex transformation plan from the Department. Further guidance on the issues of material consolidation and dismantlement is provided in the appropriate sections of this report.

CONSOLIDATED NUCLEAR PRODUCTION CENTER

The Committee provides $100,000,000 for transition planning, site selection, and preliminary design and development for a consolidated nuclear production site for reliable replacement warheads and stockpile support. The Committee supports the recommendation of the Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure Task Force to establish a cost-effective modern production center consolidating production and dismantlement activities. The Committee does not support the Department's "modernization in place" strategy, which involves upgrading multiple redundant and inefficient facilities scattered around the country. The only production consolidation planned by the Department is for a Consolidated Plutonium Production Center to become operational by the year 2022. In the interim, the Department plans to reconstitute and upgrade pit production capabilities at the Los Alamos National Laboratory TA–55 facility, while simultaneously planning for a Chemistry and Metallurgy Research replacement (CMRR) facility at Los Alamos to support the plutonium work at TA–55. The CMRR is being designed to handle and store Category I and II inventories of special nuclear material which require elaborate and expensive security requirements. CMRR has an estimated cost of nearly $1 billion. However, because of the NNSA proposal to build a Consolidated Plutonium Production Center by 2022 and transfer all the Category I and II material out of CMRR to the new plutonium facility, the CMRR will have a very limited functional lifetime. CMRR will serve its primary production support function for only eight years before it is made obsolete by the new plutonium facility, thereby making the Category I and II security characteristics of the CMRR unneces-

sary. The Committee finds this type of planning by the NNSA simply irrational. It appears designed to maximize future budgets and the number of new facilities required, rather than provide an efficient balancing of required capabilities, limited resources, and programmatic risk.

The CMR Replacement facility may have made sense at one time as a replacement for the original CMR facility. However, consolidating activities and capabilities for future RRW production requires a reassessment of the funding decision to support a separate CMRR facility. The Committee directs the Department to terminate the CMRR project and instead co-locate future production capacity and the radiological chemistry and materials research work. A billion dollar investment in the CMRR at Los Alamos only makes sense if the NNSA is prepared to site the Consolidated Nuclear Production Center, or at a minimum the Consolidated Plutonium Production Center, at the same location. The Committee directs the Department to complete the responsive infrastructure planning in time to submit revised assumptions in the fiscal year 2008 budget request.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2006	$6,369,603,000
Budget estimate, 2007	6,407,889,000
Recommended, 2007	6,412,001,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+42,398,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+4,112,000

The goal of the Weapons Activities program is to ensure the safety, security, reliability and performance of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. The program seeks to maintain and refurbish nuclear weapons to sustain confidence in their safety and reliability under the nuclear testing moratorium and arms reduction treaties. The Committee's recommendation provides $6,412,001,000, for Weapons Activities, an increase of $4,112,000 over the budget request.

PEER REVIEW OF RRW DESIGN

JASON's Review of the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW).—Congress initiated the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447), to focus DOE and DOD on implementing a program for improving the long-term safety, reliability, and security of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The RRW warhead initiative seeks to develop a replacement warhead that improves manufacturing practices, lowers unit costs and increases performance margins while staying within the design parameters validated by past nuclear tests. The Committee understands that a competition is currently ongoing between the two nuclear weapon design laboratories to develop a design for the RRW that meets the objectives outlined by Congress and defined in testimony by the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense. The Committee also understands that a Reliable Replacement Warhead Project Officers Group (POG) will be recommending a design down select for an RRW warhead to the Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC) sometime in early fiscal

year 2007. The Committee directs the NNSA to engage the JASON Defense Advisory Group as soon as practicable in 2006 as an independent outside peer reviewer to evaluate the competing RRW designs. The JASONs should evaluate the RRW design recommended by the POG against the requirements defined by congressional legislative actions to date and the elements defined in the Department of Defense's military characteristics for a reliable replacement warhead requirements document. The JASON review should also include an analysis on the feasibility of the fundamental premise of the RRW initiative that a new nuclear warhead can be designed and produced and certified for use and deployed as an operationally-deployed nuclear weapon without undergoing an underground nuclear explosion test.

The JASON's RRW report is due March 31, 2007 to the congressional defense committees.

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee provides limited reprogramming authority within the Weapons Activities account without submission of a reprogramming to be approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. The reprogramming control levels will be as follows: subprograms within Directed Stockpile Work; Life Extension Programs, Stockpile Systems, Reliable Replacement Warhead, Warhead Dismantlement, and Stockpile Services. Additional reprogramming control levels will be as follows: Science Campaigns, Engineering Campaigns, Advanced Simulation and Computing, Pit Manufacturing and Certification, Consolidated Production Center, Readiness Campaigns, and Operations of Facilities site allocations for readiness in technical base and facilities. This should provide the needed flexibility to manage these programs.

In addition, funding of not more than $5,000,000 may be transferred between each of these categories and each construction project with the exception of the RTBF site allocations, subject to the following limitations: only one transfer may be made to or from any program or project; the transfer must be necessary to address a risk to health, safety or the environment; and funds may not be used for an item for which Congress has specifically denied funds or for a new program or project that has not been authorized by Congress.

The Department must notify Congress within 15 days of the use of this reprogramming authority. Transfers during the fiscal year which would result in increases or decreases in excess of $5,000,000 or which would exceed the limitations outlined in the previous paragraph require prior notification of and approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

The Committee's recommendation provides $1,312,180,000 for Directed Stockpile Activities, a reduction of $98,088,000 from the budget request. Directed Stockpile Work (DSW) includes all activities that directly support weapons in the nuclear stockpile, including maintenance, research, development, engineering, certification and dismantlement and disposal activities. The DSW account provides all the direct funding for the Department's life extension activities, which are designed to extend the service life of the existing

nuclear weapons stockpile, by providing new subsystems and components for each warhead thereby extending the operational service life.

Taken together, the Committee expects a rebaselined life extension program plan by weapon type, a Reliable Replacement Warhead program plan, and the Warhead Dismantlement plan will lead to reliable nuclear deterrence with a post-2030 stockpile significantly smaller that the 2012 Nuclear Stockpile levels committed to in the Moscow Treaty and specified in the revised Nuclear Stockpile Plan. The current W80 Life Extension Program will be terminated in an orderly fashion and the resources will be redeployed to support the NNSA weapons complex transformation activities. The Committee directs the NNSA to rebalance the remaining LEP workload and the additional funds for RRW and the Responsive Infrastructure line between the weapon design laboratories to ensure no adverse impact on the Livermore National Laboratory due to the reduction in funding for the W80 LEP.

Life Extension Programs.—The Committee provides $232,662,000 for the DSW life extension programs, a reduction of $80,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee directs the reduction to be taken against the W80 LEP activity. The Committee directs the NNSA to close out and catalogue the W80 LEP program.

Stockpile Systems.—The Committee provides $325,545,000 for the DSW stockpile systems activities, same as the budget request.

Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW).—The Committee recommendation provides $52,707,000 for the reliable replacement warhead (RRW) initiative, an increase of $25,000,000 from the budget request, of which $25,000,000 is available for obligation only after the official delivery of the NNSA infrastructure transformation plan to Congress. The Committee expects the initial design approved by the Department will be selected based on a combination of considerations including the ability to certify the warhead without underground nuclear testing, cost of production, and ease of maintenance and dismantlement.

Warhead Dismantlement.—The Committee recommendation provides $105,000,000 for the warhead dismantlement program, an increase of $30,000,000 over the budget request.

The Committee expects the NNSA to implement a robust warhead dismantlement program as part of a concerted effort to relieve the weapons complex of excess Cold War era warheads and continue the development of a responsive infrastructure.

Stockpile services.—The Committee recommendation provides $596,266,000 for the DSW stockpile services activities, a decrease of $73,088,000 under the request. The Committee provides additional funds to accelerate responsive infrastructure activities. The Committee's reductions in Stockpile Services are targeted as percentage decreases to W80 LEP support activities.

CAMPAIGNS

Campaigns are focused efforts involving the three weapons laboratories, the Nevada test site, the weapons production plants, and selected external organizations to address critical capabilities needed to achieve program objectives.

The Committee recommendation provides $2,033,590,000, an increase of $96,200,000 over the budget request.

From within funds provided for the various campaigns, the Committee directs that $4,500,000 be provided to continue the university research program in robotics (URPR) for the development of advanced robotic technologies for strategic national applications.

Science campaigns.—The Committee provides $263,762,000 for the science campaigns, the same as the budget request. The Committee supports the 24-month test readiness posture at the Nevada Test Site.

Engineering campaigns.—The Committee provides $160,919,000 for the engineering campaigns, the same as the budget request.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommends $6,920,000, the same as the budget request, for Project 01–D–108, Microsystems and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, New Mexico.

Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) Ignition and High Yield.—The Committee recommends $528,191,000 for the inertial confinement fusion and yield program, an increase of $77,000,000 over the budget request.

The Committee provides $58,021,000, for Facility Operations and Target Production, of which $15,000,000 is available for enhanced target production and characterization capabilities. The Committee provides $55,959,000, of which $10,000,000 is available for NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support to achieve the 2010 ignition goal. The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 to continue development of high average power lasers and supporting science and technology within the Inertial Fusion Technology program line. The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory and $54,150,000 for the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics (LLE), an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. The LLE is the principal research and experimentation laser facility for NNSA Science-based Stockpile stewardship activities. The Committee's increase is for OMEGA operations to provide additional shots to support the ICF campaign goal of an ignition demonstration in 2010. The Committee provides $2,000,000 for the Ohio State University Laboratory for Advanced Laser-Target Interactions.

The Committee provides $111,419,000 for construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF), the same as the budget request.

Advanced simulation and computing (ASCI).—The Committee recommendation for Advanced Simulation and Computing is $635,155,000, an increase of $17,200,000 over the budget request. The Committee's recommendation includes: $6,200,000 for the sensitive compartmented information facility (SCIF) at Nextedge, (OH), with the balance of funds not needed for SCIF construction to be used for advanced computing research in cooperation with Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory: $5,000,000 for the Notre Dame/Purdue Computer Gride Project, (IN); and $6,000,000 is provided to continue the demonstration at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory of advanced electronics packaging and thermal engineering for thermally-efficient electronics related to high-performance data servers using spray cooling.

Pit manufacturing and Pit certification.—The Committee recommendation for PIT manufacturing and certification campaign is $237,598,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee commends the Los Alamos National Laboratory for its work restoring the Pit production capability to the nuclear weapons production complex.

Readiness campaigns.—The Committee recommendation for Readiness Campaigns is $207,965,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request. The additional $2,000,000 is provided for Robotics Repetitive Systems Technology, (OH).

Consolidated Production Center.—The Committee provides $100,000,000 for transition planning and preliminary design of a Consolidated Production Center for reliable replacement warheads and stockpile production support.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF) program supports the physical and operational infrastructure at the laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the production plants. The Committee recommendation is $1,658,772,000, a reduction of $27,000,000 below the budget request.

Operations of facilities.—The Committee recommendation for Operations of Facilities is $1,276,786,000, an increase of $73,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $10,000,000 for the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, an additional $20,000,000 is provided for the Pantex plant in Texas, and an additional $43,000,000 is for the Y–12 Plant in Tennessee to address chronic under-funding in the maintenance of production plant facilities. From within available funds, $1,000,000 for the Advanced Engineering Environment, at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory—Sandia Laboratory (CA) and $1,000,000 for the Multi-Disciplined Integrated Collaboration (MDICE) at the Kansas City Plant (KS). The Committee directs the NNSA transfer 20 tons of Heavy Water (D_2O) for use as coolant for the target at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory's Spallation Neutron Source (SNS). The Committee provides the Operations of Facilities account funding in site specific allocations specified in the detail table at the end of Title III.

Program Readiness.—The Committee recommendation for Program Readiness is $75,167,000, the same as budget request.

Material Recycle and Recovery.—The Committee recommendation for material recycle and recovery is $69,982,000, the same as the budget request.

Containers.—The Committee recommendation for containers is $20,130,000, the same as the budget request.

Storage.—The Committee recommendation for storage is $35,285,000.

Construction projects.—

Project 07–D–140, Project engineering and design (PED)—various locations. The Committee recommends $4,977,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 07–D–220, Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility Upgrade—Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee recommends $14,828,000, the same as the budget request.

Project 04–D–125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Facility Replacement (CMRR), LANL. The Committee recommendation provides $12,422,000 for the CMRR project, a decrease of $100,000,000 from the budget request. Construction at the CMRR facility should be terminated and the Department should revise its long-term plan for developing the responsive infrastructure required to maintain the nation's existing nuclear stockpile and support replacement production for the reliable replacement warheads (RRW). Production capabilities proposed in the CMRR should be located at the future production site that supports the RRW and long term stockpile requirements.

Project 01–D–124, Highly Enriched Uranium Materials Facility, Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN. The Committee recommends $21,267,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee is disappointed that the Department of Energy's only nuclear material consolidation effort has run into management problems resulting in cost overruns that may result in schedule delays for completing the HEU Materials Facility. Consistent with the Committee's priority to address special nuclear material consolidation requirements across the DOE complex, the Committee directs the Department to report to the Committee by August 31, 2006, with a recovery plan that includes cost estimates with sources of funding to offset cost increases and mitigation measures to maintain the construction schedule and operational start of the HEU Materials Facility.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION

The Committee recommendation for Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program (FIRP) is $146,218,000, a reduction of $145,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee directs the NNSA to reassess its out-year planning for FIRP projects to ensure coordination between FIRP funds and the reduced facility requirements consistent with the consolidation of the complex under the long-term Responsive Infrastructure planning.

The Committee directs that not less than $25,000,000 of the facilities and infrastructure funding in fiscal year 2007 be used to dispose of excess facilities. The Committee encourages continuation of this program to reduce the overall facilities footprint of the complex. The Committee continues to expect that services for D&D and demolition of excess facilities services be procured through open-competition where such actions provide the best return on investment for the federal government.

The Committee recommendation provides $45,935,000 for FIRP construction projects, the same as the budget request.

Facility Infrastructure and Recapitalization Construction Projects.—

07–D–253 TA heating systems modernization (HSM), Sandia National Laboratory, NM. The Committee provides $14,500,000, the same as the budget request.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Secure Transportation Asset program provides for the safe, secure movement of nuclear weapons, special nuclear materials, and non-nuclear weapon components between military locations

and nuclear weapons complex facilities within the United States. The Committee recommendation is $209,264,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Committee recommendation for nuclear weapons incident response is $135,354,000, the same as the budget request.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS AND OPERATIONS

The Environmental Projects and Operations program operates and maintains the environmental cleanup systems and performs long-term environmental monitoring activities at the National Nuclear Security Administration sites.

The Committee provides $17,211,000 for Environmental Projects and Operations activities, the same as the budget request.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

This program provides for all safeguards and security requirements for the NNSA. The Committee recommendation is $832,412,000, an increase of $78,000,000 over the budget request. Of the total provided $89,711,000 is for Cyber Security activities, the same as the budget request. The Committee increase includes $25,000,000 for the Y–12 National Security Complex to accelerate security infrastructure upgrades and consolidate the facility footprint and an additional $12,000,000 for the Pantex Plant. The Committee provides $40,000,000 for a material consolidation and upgrade construction project at the Idaho National Laboratory, ID. The Committee provides an additional $1,000,000 for CIMTRAK cyber security software (IN).

Construction Projects.—

The Committee directs the start of a construction project at the Idaho National Laboratory retrofitting Building 651 and completing Building 691 to handle special nuclear material consolidation and storage. The Committee provides $40,000,000 for the Material Security and Consolidation Project at Building 651 and 691, Idaho National Laboratory. The Committee understands that Building 651 requires minimal upgrades to provide secure storage space for special nuclear material inventories. Building 691 requires more extensive planning for estimating total cost and schedule to complete upgrades for using the unfinished structure for SNM storage and other future radiological handling activities. The Committee directs the $5,000,000 provided to the Office of Security and Performance Assurance for planning the material consolidation construction activity in the fiscal year 2006 Conference report be reprogrammed to the NNSA Office of Safeguards and Security for its intended purpose.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The budget request included an offset of $33,000,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriation, 2006	$1,614,839,000
Budget estimate, 2007	1,726,213,000
Recommended, 2007	1,593,101,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−21,738,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	−133,112,000

The Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account includes funding for Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development; Nonproliferation and International Security (Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention and Highly Enriched Uranium Transparency Implementation programs are funded within the Nonproliferation and International Security activities); Nonproliferation Programs with Russia including International Materials Protection, Control, and Cooperation, Elimination of Weapons-Grade Plutonium Production; Fissile Materials Disposition; and Global Threat Reduction Initiative.

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation is $1,593,101,000, a decrease of $133,112,000 from the budget request of $1,726,213,000.

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation of science and technology for strengthening the United States' response to threats to national security and to world peace posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and special nuclear materials. Activities center on the design and production of operational sensor systems needed for proliferation detection, treaty verification, nuclear warhead dismantlement initiatives, and intelligence activities.

The Committee provides $308,080,000 for Nonproliferation and Verification research and development, an increase of $39,193,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $169,397,000 for proliferation detection, an increase of $21,193,000 over the budget request for high priority satellite technology research requirements; $114,601,000 for nuclear explosion monitoring, an increase of $8,000,000 for ground-based systems for treaty monitoring activities; and $6,162,000 for supporting activities. From within available funds, the Committee's recommendation includes $1,600,000 for the Nuclear Security Science and Policy Institute at Texas A&M (TX), and $1,000,000 for the National Center for Biodefense at George Mason University (VA), $1,000,000 for Offshore Detection Integrated System (OH), and $500,000 for the Global Personal Locator Beacon (VA) project.

The Committee provides $17,920,000 for Project 06–D–180, National Security Laboratory at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. The additional $10,000,000 is provided as construction funds to maintain the aggressive schedule in fiscal year 2007 for the relocation of laboratory personnel and facilities displaced by the planned shutdown and cleanup of the 300 Area at the Hanford reservation in Washington.

The Committee's increase of $8,000,000 for ground-based systems treaty monitoring activities should be allocated through a competitive process open to all Federal and non-Federal entities on an equal basis.

Annual Reporting Requirement.—The Committee directs the Department to prepare an annual report on each project with the baseline cost, scope and schedule, deliverables, and the public or private entity performing the research and development, and the proposed user and submit this with the fiscal year 2008 budget request.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The Nonproliferation and International Security program seeks to detect, prevent, and reverse the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction materials, technology, and expertise. The major functional areas of the program include: nonproliferation policy; international safeguards; export control; treaties and agreements; Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention; HEU Transparency Implementation; and international emergency management and cooperation. The Committee recommendation provides $127,411,000 for Nonproliferation and International Security, the same as the budget request.

NONPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS WITH RUSSIA

The Department of Energy funds many nonproliferation programs with Russia. These programs help secure Russian nuclear weapons and weapons material, prevent the outflow of scientific expertise from Russia, eliminate excess nuclear weapons materials, and help downsize the Russian nuclear weapons complex.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation (MPC&A) program is designed to work cooperatively with Russia to secure weapons and weapons-usable nuclear material. The focus is to improve the physical security at facilities that possess or process significant quantities of nuclear weapons-usable materials that are of proliferation concern. Activities include installing monitoring equipment, inventorying nuclear material, improving the Russian security culture, and establishing a security infrastructure.

The Committee provides $583,182,000 for MPC&A activities, an increase of $170,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee's increase to the MPC&A program recognizes the expanded opportunities for high priority work at Rosatom and the 12th Main Directorate sites in Russia. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to continue to negotiate greater access to the Russian serial production enterprise and accelerate aggressively opportunities to secure material as site access is granted. The Committee recommendation includes $121,505,000 for the Rosatom Weapons Complex, an increase of $65,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee provides $228,973,000 for the Second Line of Defense program, an increase of $105,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides an additional $40,000,000 for the core Second Line of Defense program to accelerate installation

activities in the Baltic and Caucasus regions and other critical border activities. The Committee provides $105,118,000 for the MegaPorts initiative, a $65,000,000 increase over the budget request, to accelerate this work at additional high-risk foreign ports.

ELIMINATION OF WEAPONS-GRADE PLUTONIUM PRODUCTION

The Committee provides $206,654,000, for elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production, the same as the budget request.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The fissile materials disposition program is responsible for the technical and management activities to assess, plan and direct efforts to provide for the safe, secure, environmentally sound long-term storage of all weapons-usable fissile materials and the disposition of fissile materials declared surplus to national defense needs. This program was created to execute the September 2000 agreement between the United States and Russia on plutonium management and disposition. Under that agreement, the United States and Russia each committed to dispose of 34 metric tons of surplus weapons-grade plutonium. The NNSA manages the effort to dispose of the U.S. share of surplus plutonium and provides technical assistance to Russia to support their efforts. Congressional direction from the House and Senate Armed Services Committees requires the U.S. and Russian programs to proceed in parallel.

The strategy to date has been that both the U.S. and Russia would dispose of this surplus plutonium by converting it to mixed oxide (MOX) fuel to be used as fuel in light water reactors in each country. The U.S. portion of this plan would require a Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility, a MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility, and a Waste Facility, all to be built at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. To date, Congress has appropriated $1.37 billion for the domestic MOX program facilities without any nonproliferation benefit accrued to the U.S. taxpayer. The Committee acknowledges that most of the real work had been delayed due to an impasse with the Russian government over liability protection for U.S. contractors working in Russia. However, that situation has not changed. For several years in a row, the Department has assured this Committee that the liability problem was on the verge of being resolved so that work could proceed. While the Committee does not believe the Department was intentionally misleading the Committee, clearly these assurances were in error. An agreement with the Russian government resolving the liability issue has yet to be finalized. The Committee reiterates the obvious—that as has been the case over the past three years, the Department is precluded from beginning construction activities in fiscal year 2006 without a U.S.-Russian bilateral liability agreement ratified by the Russian Federation. These series of unfulfilled promises has led to the accumulation of substantial unobligated balances in the Fissile Materials Disposition account, including over $500 million in the MOX construction project alone.

Unfortunately, in 2006 it has become obvious the Russian government is not going to participate in the MOX-light water reactor disposition path for surplus Russian plutonium unless the U.S. and

international community bear the full cost of such disposition. Instead, the Russian government now prefers a new approach, with limited disposition in an existing BN–600 fast breeder reactor and the bulk of disposition to be accomplished in the yet-to-be-built BN–800 fast reactor. The U.S. continues to have proliferation concerns about the use of fast reactors for plutonium disposition.

Compounding the Committee's lack of confidence in this program's future is the DOE Inspector General (DOE/Inspector General Report 0713) and Government Accountability Office findings that the U.S. MOX project has experienced significant cost overruns and management deficiencies. In February 2002, the Department reported to Congress that the construction of the MOX facility would start in fiscal year 2004, begin operations in fiscal year 2007, and cost nearly $1 billion to design and construct.

As of July 2005, NNSA's unvalidated estimate for design and construction of the MOX facility was $3.5 billion, an increase of $2.5 billion. Now with the Russian government abandoning the MOX-light water reactor strategy for surplus Russian plutonium, it is clear to the Committee that there is no longer any justification for proceeding unilaterally with the U.S. MOX program for disposing of U.S. surplus plutonium. Converting plutonium to MOX fuel has always been the most expensive disposition option for plutonium, but it was a cost that Congress was willing to accept in order to help the Russian MOX program stay on track for disposing of Russian weapons origin plutonium. Further, the U.S. MOX program at one time had potential for domestic civilian applications, as the UREX+ separation technology, coupled with MOX, was being considered as a means for recycling domestic spent nuclear fuel. With the advent of the Administration's Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP), the Department has abandoned MOX for domestic spent fuel and instead shifted to a strategy of UREX+ coupled with fast reactors.

Given these changes in the United States and Russia, the Committee sees no further reason to proceed with the U.S. MOX program. The Committee provides $282,651,000 for fissile material disposition activities, a reduction of $320,610,000 from the budget request. The Committee provides no funds for the pit disassembly and conversion facility project and for the MOX fuel fabrication facility project and directs the Department to suspend all ongoing and planned construction activities associated with those projects. The Committee directs the Department to use the balance of prior year funds to close out ongoing design work and government obligations under existing contracts. The Department should also conduct an orderly suspension of technology development and supporting work relating to the U.S. MOX project, pending submission to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report re-defining the comprehensive plutonium disposition for the United States, in light of Russia actions and domestic choices on GNEP. This report should provide a life cycle cost analysis of all reasonable domestic plutonium disposition alternatives, including the no action alternative. The reduced MOX funding is redirected to higher priority international nonproliferation activities and to other environmental cleanup and plutonium immobilization needs at Savannah River Site.

Plutonium Immobilization, Savannah River Site, SC.—The Committee provides $111,000,000 to continue conceptual design and commence preliminary design for a plutonium disposition facility utilizing immobilization technology, to enable the Department to address the material disposition requirements for the plutonium stored at the Savannah River Site.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI) mission is to identify, secure, remove and facilitate the disposition of high-risk, vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials and equipment around the world. The Committee provides $119,818,000 for GTRI activities, an increase of $13,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee provides an additional $5,000,000 for Russian Research Reactor Fuel Return, $3,000,000 for U.S. Radiological Threat Reduction to address domestic radiological sealed source recovery, and $5,000,000 in Emerging Threats and Gap Materials for recovery of U.S. origin orphaned material overseas. The Committee recommendation includes $3,934,000 for the Kazakhstan Spent Fuel Disposition initiative, the same as the budget request. None of the funds provided for this activity in fiscal year 2007, or previous fiscal years, may be obligated for transportation equipment or activities without written notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriation, 2006	$781,605,000
Budget estimate, 2007	795,133,000
Recommended, 2007	795,133,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+13,528,000
Budget estimate, 2007	– – –

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion from technology development through reactor operations to ultimate reactor plant disposal. The program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. These efforts are critical to ensuring the safety and reliability of 102 operating Naval reactor plants and to developing the next generation reactor. The Committee recommendation provides $795,133,000, the same as the request, for Naval Reactors activities.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriation, 2006	$338,450,000
Budget estimate, 2007	386,576,000
Recommended, 2007	399,576,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+61,126,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+13,000,000

The Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) provides corporate planning and oversight for Defense Programs, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors, including the NNSA field offices in New Mexico, Nevada, and California. The Committee recommendation is

$399,576,000, an increase of $13,000,000 above the budget request, of which $399,576,000 is available for obligation only after the Administrator has officially retained the JASON Defense Advisory Group as an independent peer review evaluation committee to assess the competing reliable replacement warhead designs against the design criteria in the RRW competition between Los Alamos and Livermore National Laboratories. The increase is provided as the NNSA contribution to the Department's support for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). The Committee expects the Administrator to continue to maintain separate program direction budget and reporting accounting codes for the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation to maintain cost accountability between the separate programs within the NNSA.

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

Support to Minority Colleges and Universities.—The Committee appreciates the serious effort of the NNSA to follow last year's Congressional direction to implement an aggressive program to take advantage of the HBCU educational institutions across the country in order to deepen the recruiting pool of diverse scientific and technical staff available to the NNSA and its national laboratories in support of the nation's national security programs. The Committee is again providing $13,000,000 of additional funding to expand the support to the HBCUs scientific and technical programs in FY 2006. The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 each for Wilberforce University and Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio; and $2,500,000 for Claflin College in Orangeburg, SC; $3,000,000 for Allen University in Columbia, SC; and $1,000,000 each for Voorhees College in Denmark, SC and South Carolina State University in Orangeburg, SC; $500,000 for Denmark Technical College (SC); $300,000 for the ACE program at Maricopa Community Colleges (AZ); and $700,000 for Morehouse College (GA). The Committee directs the Department to provide funds to HBCU institutions to allow for infrastructure improvements and technical programs. The Committee expects the Department to ensure the Dr. Samuel P. Massie Chairs of Excellence are fully supported within the HBCU program. The Committee expects the Department to provide financial support in rough parity to both HBCUs and the Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI).

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Defense Environmental Management program is responsible for identifying and reducing risks and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out defense-related nuclear research and production activities that resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination requiring remediation, stabilization, or some other type of cleanup action.

Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP).—This project has been plagued with a long history of cost overruns and mismanagement. "The relative lack of outrage over a baseline change of that magnitude speaks volumes about what the Congress

and public have come to expect from the Department's clean-up program. The tank waste treatment project has a long and sordid history that indicates both the magnitude of the task before the Department, as well as the Department's historic combination of overly optimistic cost estimates couples with consistent project mismanagement. The Committee notes its concerns in the demonstrated pattern of Departmental officials announcing reform of some aspect of the clean-up program, only to depart and be replaced by a new set of officials coming before the Committee to describe the dramatic cost overruns on the project baselines promised by their predecessors, and claiming no responsibility for the assumptions underlying those previous commitments." These observations which capture accurately the frustration of Congress with the WTP, were made by our Senate counterparts nearly three years ago, when the WTP increased in cost by a mere $1.4 billion to $5.78 billion.

Last fall, the House and Senate conferees raised concerns about the total cost of WTP increasing to $9.3 billion and start-up being delayed to 2015. The situation is now even worse. Only five months later—on April 6, 2006—the Government Accountability Office (GAO) testified before the Committee that the cost of the Hanford waste treatment plant is now nearly $11 billion, and the completion schedule has been extended to at least 2017.

The inability of the contractor and the Department to estimate with any credibility the cost and schedule of the project is troubling in and of itself, but it also symptomatic of more serious underlying management issues. As root causes for the uncontrolled cost growth, the GAO identified contractor performance problems, DOE management shortcomings and difficulties addressing various technical challenges encountered during design and construction. According to GAO, "by just about any measure, the Hanford waste treatment project is in disarray". . . "what is happening on this project is uncharacteristic of a well-planned and well-managed construction project.". . . "A great concern to us is the fact that many nuclear safety and other technical problems have occurred on the project."

Years of revolving door DOE officials, continual promises to improve management controls and oversight, and sky-rocketing costs have led the Committee to the point where it no longer has confidence in the Department's estimates in the WTP nor in the Department's ability to manage its way back on this project. Given the potential for serious safety accidents as the result of the lack of management and safety discipline demonstrated on this one-of-a-kind nuclear construction project, the Committee has no other choice than to direct serious management reforms.

As such, the Committee directs the following changes to the project, as recommended by the Government Accountability Office:

1. *Discontinue using a fast-track, design-build approach* for WTP, and complete at least 90 percent of the facility design or components of the facility before restarting construction. DOE needs to follow nuclear industry construction guidelines and take a more conservative approach to design and construction activities that avoids carrying out these activities concurrently.

2. *Develop revised contract incentives for WTP* that better balance cost and schedule incentives and incentives to ensure that the facilities operate safely and effectively, as well as improve the Department's management and oversight of contractor activities. The Committee understands that the Department is already renegotiating its WTP contract with Bechtel National, Incorporated. It is not acceptable to renegotiate this contract with an expanded scope of work, a delayed schedule, and higher performance fees for the project. The Department must modify this contract to reflect an accurate scope, a firm cost and schedule, appropriate performance fees or performance incentive fees, and appropriate penalties for non-performance.

In addition, the Committee directs the Department to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), to be signed no later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, to provide nuclear safety oversight of the design and construction of the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant. Under this approach, NRC would conduct a initial safety review of all WTP design and construction work completed to date, leading to the publication of a safety evaluation report. The NRC would then have a role to monitor DOE's implementation of the findings, and ongoing monitoring of DOE's nuclear safety compliance at WTP. NRC would review safety-related design documents and integrated safety measures, develop requests for additional information, write a safety evaluation report, and monitor the DOE contractor's progress in addressing safety concerns raised by the NRC. Technical interactions with DOE and contractor would be conducted, as necessary and appropriate, in public meetings. NRC would also conduct one or more public presentations near the site to discuss its safety review with stakeholders. The Committee directs the NRC to report its findings directly to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Bill language has been included making the fiscal year 2007 appropriation for the WTP available only for one fiscal year. The Committee may reconsider this limitation in the future pending assurances from the Department that it will implement the management and contracting changes directed above and will execute the funding transfer and Memorandum of Understanding providing for Nuclear Regulatory Commission oversight of nuclear safety on the WTP.

Milestone report.—The Committee requests a report, by site, that tracks accelerated clean-up milestones, whether they are being met or not, and includes annual budget estimates and life-cycle costs, due to Committee by March 1 and September 1 of each year.

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

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee continues to support the need for flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at sites. In fiscal year 2007, the Department may transfer up to $5,000,000 within accounts, and between accounts, as noted in the table below, to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 in total during the fiscal year. This reprogram-

ming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within thirty days of the use of this reprogramming authority.

Account Control Points:

Closure Sites
Savannah River site, 2012 accelerations
Savannah River site, 2035 accelerations
Savannah River Tank Farm
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
Idaho National Laboratory
Oak Ridge Reservation
Hanford site 2012 accelerated completions
Hanford site 2035 accelerated completions
Office of River Protection (ORP) Waste Treatment & Immobilization (WTP) Pretreatment facility
ORP WTP High-level waste facility
ORP WTP Low activity waste facility
ORP WTP Analytical laboratory
ORP WTP Balance of facilities
Program Direction
Program Support
UE D&D Fund contribution
Technology Development

Details of the recommended funding levels follow below for the Defense Environmental Cleanup account.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriation, 2006	$6,130,448,000
Budget estimate, 2007	5,390,312,000
Recommended, 2007	5,551,812,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−578,636,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+161,500,000

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Cleanup totals $5,551,812,000, an increase of $161,500,000 over the budget request of $5,390,312,000. Within the amounts provided, the Department is directed to fund hazardous waste worker training at $10,000,000.

Closure Sites.—The Committee recommendation provides $321,937,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request. The recommendation provides $25,896,000 for Closure Sites Administration, the same as the budget request. The recommendation provides $258,877,000 for Fernald, Ohio and $34,869,000 for Miamisburg, Ohio, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides $1,295,000 for Ashtabula, Ohio, an increase of $1,000,000 to close out the project. The Committee provides $1,000,000 for remaining close-out activities at Rocky Flats, the same as the budget request.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,195,394,000 for cleanup at the Savannah River Site an increase of $111,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee provides an increase of $111,000,000 over the request for radioactive liquid

tank waste stabilization and disposition, to cover shortfalls in the tank waste program. Within available funds, the Committee directs $2,000,000 for AEA Technology to address alternative cost effective technologies for cleaning up legacy waste.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).—The Committee recommendation provides $213,278,000 for the Waste Isolation Pilot Project, the same as the budget request

Idaho National Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation provides $544,604,000, an increase of $32,000,000 for design work on calcine processing in preparation for final disposition.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The Committee recommendation provides $199,362,000, an increase of $39,500,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes an increase of $25,000,000 for the disposition of material in building 3019. The recommendation includes an increase of $14,360,000 for the acceleration of cleanup activities at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory Central Campus. The Committee's recommendation also includes a reallocation of the budget request, to better reflect current program needs. The effect of this redistribution is reflected in the detail table at the end of Title III.

Hanford Site.—The Committee recommendation provides $832,716,000 for the Hanford Site, an increase of $28,000,000 over the budget request, and $59,870,000 over fiscal year 2006 enacted levels. The Committee recommendation provides $7,500,000 for the Volpentest Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) training and education center, and $500,000 for preservation of the B Reactor as a historic landmark. The recommendation provides $81,651,000 for nuclear material stabilization and disposition at the Plutonium Finishing Plant, and $221,022,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning river corridor closure project, the same as the budget request. The recommendation provides $78,937,000 for spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition, a decrease of $2,132,000 below the budget request, which reflects the movement of spent nuclear fuel storage costs to canister storage funding activities.

The recommendation includes $191,121,000 for solid waste stabilization and disposition in the 200 Area, an increase of $2,132,000 over the budget request, which reflects the movement of spent nuclear fuel storage costs to canister storage funding. The recommendation includes $75,973,000 for soil and water remediation, and $94,270,000 for nuclear facility decontamination and decommissioning for the remainder of Hanford, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides $3,534,000 to operate the waste disposal facility, and $18,332,000 for Richland community and regulatory support, the same as the budget request. The recommendation provides $20,000,000, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request for Columbia River cleanup technologies. In fiscal year 2006, the conference report provided $10,000,000 in the Technology Development account for "analyzing contaminant migration to the Columbia River, and for introduction of new technology approaches to solving contamination migration issues." The Committee is pleased with the progress that has been made, and recommends increasing the level of effort to identify migration of contaminants and strategies to stop it.

Office of River Protection.—The Committee recommendation provides $894,127,000 for the Office of River Protection, a decrease of $70,000,000 below the request, and an increase of $47,211,000 over FY 2006 enacted levels.

Federal budget procedures require that DOE and other agencies develop work plans and schedules that support a budget request and demonstrate how the funds will be spent. The Department has done a poor job justifying the budget request of $690,000,00 for the waste treatment and immobilization plant. As of April 2006, the project was substantially behind schedule and over budget. During fiscal year 2005 and 2006, DOE slowed construction on the pretreatment and high-level waste facilities to address the technical and management problems. This slowdown is expected to continue through at least half of fiscal year 2007, and possibly through 2008, resulting in uncommitted carryover from fiscal year 2006 that will likely be available to offset a portion of the fiscal 2007 funding request. Based on this slowdown of work pending technical and managerial resolution, the GAO estimates that WTP costs in fiscal year 2007 would be approximately $510 million.

The Hanford/ORP combined request for $1,768,000,000 is a nine percent increase over fiscal year 2006 levels, mostly due to the "placeholder" $690,000,000 request for WTP. It is difficult to reward the WTP project with the full request, when it has been poorly managed, and construction dollars will not be spent for some time on the pretreatment facility, and the vitrification facility, and budget justifications and workplans are poor or nonexistent. Additionally, the remainder of the nuclear waste cleanup sites budget requests are reduced from fiscal year 2006 levels, and the entire clean-up program's request is declining by 3 percent.

As such, the Committee recommendation includes $600,000,000 for the waste treatment and immobilization plant, a decrease of $90,000,000 below the request of $690,000,000, and an increase of $79,206,000 over FY 2006 enacted levels. This level reflects a compromise between the Department's request, and the GAO budget scrub. The Committee recommends allocating additional funds amongst the subprojects that are not subject to the seismic recalculations, and less for pretreatment and vitrification, which are still subject to technical uncertainties. The recommendation includes $218,500,000 for the pretreatment facility; $171,700,000 for the high level waste vitrification facility; $112,200,000 for the low activity waste facility; $45,200,000 for the analytical laboratory; and $52,400,000 for the balance of facilities.

The recommendation includes $293,656,000 for radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition, an increase of $20,000,000 over the request of $273,656,000, to determine a go/no go strategy for the bulk vitrification demonstration in order to maintain a strategy for low level tank waste. The recommendation provides $471,000, the same as the budget request, for community and regulatory support.

The Committee directs the Government Accountability Office to review and report on the budget and life-cycle costs estimates for bulk vitrification, and the technical challenges and/or the technical performance issues that have emerged so far on the demonstration of this technology.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation provides $301,216,000 an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request for program direction. The Committee directs the Department to transfer $10,000,000 to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and to conclude a Memorandum of Understanding with the NRC for WTP oversight activities, no later than 60 days following enactment of this bill.

Program Support.—The Committee recommendation provides $37,881,000 for program support, the same as the budget request.

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

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee recommendation provides $31,389,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. The EM technology development program funding has declined over the years, while at the same time, many technological challenges continue to face the program. For example, the National Research Council's 2005 report on "Improving the Characterization and Treatment of Radioactive Wastes", recommends that "an improved capability for environmental monitoring would strengthen EM's plans to leave waste and contaminated media at DOE sites", and, "Monitoring systems at EM closure sites have been estimated to be some 25 years behind the state-of-art." The Committee directs the increase to address the technology shortfalls identified by this report. The Committee supports an increased, expanded technology development program, and directs the Department to prepare an EM technology roadmap, that identifies technology gaps that exist in the current program, and a strategy with funding proposals to address them. The report is due to the Committee by January 31, 2007.

NNSA sites.—The Committee recommendation provides $232,068,000, the same as the budget request.

Safeguards and Security.—The Committee recommendation provides $295,840,000, the same as the budget request.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2006	$635,577,000
Budget estimate, 2007	717,788,000
Recommended, 2007	720,788,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+85,211,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+3,000,000

This account provides funding for the Office of Security and Performance Assurance; Intelligence; Counterintelligence; Environment, Safety and Health (Defense); Legacy Management; Funding for Defense Activities in Idaho; Defense Related Administrative Support; and the Office of Hearings and Appeals. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

OFFICE OF SECURITY AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Office of Security and Performance Assurance (SSA) provides domestic safeguards and security for nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, nuclear facilities, and classified and unclassified information against sabotage, espionage, terrorist activities, or any loss or unauthorized disclosure that could endanger the national security or disrupt operations. The Committee recommendation for security and emergency operations is $301,497,000 an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request. The increase is for high priority security priorities.

In fiscal year 2007, the Department of Energy will spend $1.5 billion on safeguards and security activities at Headquarters and field locations. Funding for safeguards and security activities at Departmental facilities and laboratories for programmatic activities in the field is included within each program budget.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE

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

OFFICE OF COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The Office of Counterintelligence seeks to develop and implement an effective counterintelligence program throughout the Department of Energy. The goal of the program is to identify, neutralize, and deter foreign government or industrial intelligence threats directed at the Department's facilities, personnel, information, and technologies.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health develops programs and policies to protect the workers and the public, conducts independent oversight of performance, and funds health effects studies. The Committee recommendation is $80,814,000, the same as the budget request.

LEGACY MANAGEMENT

The Committee provides a total of $200,990,000 for the Office of Legacy Management to manage the long-term stewardship responsibilities at the Department of Energy clean up sites. The Committee provides $167,851,000 in Other Defense Activities and the balance of $33,139,000 is provided in the non-defense Energy Supply account.

FUNDING FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES IN IDAHO

The Committee recommendation includes $75,949,000 to fund the defense-related (050 budget function) activities at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL).

DEFENSE RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $93,258,000, the same as the budget request, to provide administrative support for programs funded in the atomic energy defense activities accounts. This will fund Departmental activities performed by offices such as the Secretary, Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary, the General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, Human Resources, Congressional Affairs, and Public Affairs, which support the organizations and activities funded in the atomic energy defense activities accounts.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) is responsible for all of the Department's adjudicatory processes, other than those administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommendation is $4,422,000, the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation for funding adjustments includes an offset of $3,003,000 for the safeguards and security charge for reimbursable work, the same as the budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2006	$346,500,000
Budget estimate, 2007	388,080,000
Recommended, 2007	388,080,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+41,580,000
Budget Estimate, 2007	– – –

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The Committee recommendation is $388,080,000, the same as the budget request. Combined with the funding recommended for the Nuclear Waste Disposal, this will provide a total of $574,500,000 for nuclear waste disposal activities in fiscal year 2007.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Management of the Federal power marketing functions was transferred from the Department of Interior to the Department of Energy by the Department of Energy Organization Act (P.L. 95–91). These functions include the power marketing activities authorized under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation that have been transferred to the Western Area Power Administration.

The Committee rejects the administration proposal to recover expenses related to operations and maintenance activities and program direction expenditures using offsetting collections and the proposal to increase the power marketing administration rates to reflect market based rates.

All power marketing administrations except the Bonneville Power Administration are funded annually with appropriated funds. Revenues collected from power sales and transmission services are deposited in the treasury to offset expenditures. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2005 does not support the Administration proposal to continue the phase-out of Federal financing of the customers' purchase power and wheeling expenses for the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration. Also, the Committee recommendation does not at this time incorporate the administration proposal for the power marketing administrations to fund directly from revenues the costs of operation and maintenance of federal hydropower facilities at Corps of Engineers dams.

Operations of the Bonneville Power Administration are self-financed under the authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act (P.L. 93–454). Under this Act, the Bonneville Power Administration is authorized to use its revenues to finance the costs of its operations, maintenance, and capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any additional capital program requirements.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Department of Energy's marketing agency for electric power in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides electricity to a 300,000 square mile service area in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets the power from Federal hydropower projects in the Northwest, as well as power from non-Federal generating facilities in the region, and exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada and California. The Committee recommendation provides no new borrowing authority during fiscal year 2007.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2006	$5,544,000
Budget estimate, 2007	5,723,000
Recommended, 2007	5,723,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+179,000
Budget estimate, 2007	– – –

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

The Committee recommendation for the Southeastern Power Administration is $5,723,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Southeastern in fiscal year 2007 is

$53,726,000, with $48,003,000 for purchase power and wheeling and $5,723,000 for program direction. The purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by collections of $48,003,000 provided in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2006	$29,864,000
Budget estimate, 2007	31,539,000
Recommended, 2007	31,539,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+1,675,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

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

The Committee recommendation for the Southwestern Power Administration is $31,539,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Southwestern in fiscal year 2007 is $45,139,000, including $7,145,000 for operating expenses, $13,600,000 for purchase power and wheeling, $20,782,000 for program direction, and $3,612,000 for construction. The offsetting collections total of $13,600,000 from collections for purchase power and wheeling yields a net appropriation of $31,539,000.

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

Appropriation, 2006	$231,652,000
Budget estimate, 2007	212,213,000
Recommended, 2007	212,213,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−19,439,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing the electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission. Western also operates and maintains a system of transmission lines nearly 17,000 miles long. Western provides electricity to 15 Central and Western states over a service area of 1.3 million square miles.

The Committee recommendation for the Western Area Power Administration is $212,213,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2007 is $688,511,000, which includes $60,205,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $45,734,000 for system operation and maintenance, $427,931,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $147,748,000 for program direction. The Committee recommendation includes $6,893,000 for the Utah Mitigation and Conservation Fund.

Offsetting collections total $472,593,000; with the use of $3,705,000 of offsetting collections from the Colorado River Dam

Fund (as authorized in P.L. 98–381), this requires a net appropriation of $212,213,000.

Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 to upgrade the Topock-Davis-Mead line including the interconnection and extension to Needles, CA, to provide additional transmission capacity by using aluminum matrix composite conductor technology. Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for Dynamic Engineering Studies on the TOT–3 and Wyoming West Transmission projects.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 2006	$2,665,000
Budget estimate, 2007	2,500,000
Recommended, 2007	2,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−165,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam are two international water projects located on the Rio Grande River between Texas and Mexico. Power generated by hydroelectric facilities at these two dams is sold to public utilities through the Western Area Power Administration. The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 created the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund to defray the costs of operation, maintenance, and emergency activities. The Fund is administered by the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

The Committee recommendation is $2,500,000, the same as the budget request.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2006	$218,196,000
Budget estimate, 2007	230,800,000
Recommended, 2007	230,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+12,604,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 2006	−$218,196,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−230,800,000
Recommended, 2007	−230,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−12,604,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Committee recommendation for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is $230,800,000, the same as the budget request. Revenues for FERC are established at a rate equal to the budget authority, resulting in a net appropriation of $0.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's detailed funding recommendations for programs in Title III are contained in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION			
ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY			
Hydrogen Technology:			
Hydrogen technology	80,288	195,801	195,801
Fuel cell technologies	75,339	---	---
Subtotal, hydrogen technology	155,627	195,801	195,801
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	90,718	149,687	149,687
Solar energy	83,113	148,372	148,372
Wind energy	38,857	43,819	43,819
Geothermal technology	23,066	---	---
Hydropower	495	---	---
Vehicle technologies	182,104	166,024	177,538
Building technologies	69,266	77,329	93,029
Industrial technologies	56,855	45,563	51,563
Federal Energy Management Program:			
Departmental energy management program	1,999	---	---
Federal energy management program	16,976	16,906	18,906
Subtotal, Federal Energy Management Program	18,975	16,906	18,906
Facilities and infrastructure:			
National Renewable Energy Laboratory	5,742	5,935	10,935
Research Support Buildings	9,900	---	5,000
Construction			
02-E-001 Science and technology facility, NREL	10,410	---	---
Total, Facilities and infrastructure	26,052	5,935	15,935
Weatherization programs			
Weatherization assistance	237,996	159,648	250,000
Training and technical assistance	4,554	4,550	4,554
Subtotal, Weatherization programs	242,550	164,198	254,554
Other:			
State energy program grants	35,640	49,457	---
State energy activities	495	---	---
Gateway deployment	25,400	---	---
International renewable energy program	3,871	2,473	4,473
Tribal energy activities	3,960	3,957	3,957
Renewable energy production incentive	4,950	4,946	4,946
Subtotal, Other	74,316	60,833	13,376
Program Direction	98,529	91,024	91,024
Program Support	13,321	10,930	10,930
Congressionally directed technology deployments	---	---	54,900
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,173,844	1,176,421	1,319,434
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY			
High temperature superconductivity R&D	49,995	45,468	45,468
Transmission reliability R&D	12,870	---	---
Electricity distribution transformation R&D	60,059	---	---
Energy storage R&D	2,970	---	---
Gridwise	5,445	---	---
Gridworks	4,950	---	---
Visiualization and controls	---	17,551	17,551
Energy storage and power electonics	---	2,965	4,965

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Distributed energy resources	---	29,652	29,652
Total, Research and development	136,289	95,636	97,636
Electricity restructuring	12,276	---	---
Operations and analysis	---	12,009	12,009
Program direction	13,313	17,283	17,283
Congressionally directed technology deployments	---	---	17,100
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY	161,878	124,928	144,028
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
University reactor infrastructure and education assist	26,730	---	27,000
Research and development			
Nuclear power 2010	65,340	54,031	54,031
Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative	54,450	31,436	31,436
Nuclear hydrogen initiative	24,750	18,665	18,665
Advanced fuel cycle initiative	79,200	243,000	120,000
Total, Research and development	223,740	347,132	224,132
Infrastructure			
Radiological facilities management			
Space and defense infrastructure	39,303	30,650	44,650
Medical isotopes infrastructure	14,251	15,634	15,634
Subtotal, Medical isotopes infrastructure	14,251	15,634	15,634
Enrichment facility and uranium management	495	491	491
Research reactor infrastructure	---	2,947	---
Subtotal, Radiological facilities management	54,049	49,722	60,775
Idaho facilities management			
INL Operations and infrastructure	101,878	89,260	97,260
INL infrastructure			
Construction			
06-E-200 Project engineering and design (PED), INL, ID	7,791	6,030	6,030
Research support buildings	---	---	20,000
06-E-201 Gas test loop in the ATR, INL, ID	3,054	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	10,845	6,030	26,030
Subtotal, Idaho facilities management	112,723	95,290	123,290
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	74,258	72,946	72,946
Total, Infrastructure	241,030	217,958	257,011
Program direction	60,498	67,608	64,608
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy	551,998	632,698	572,751
Funding from other defense activities	-122,634	-72,946	-72,946
Funding from Naval Reactors	-13,365	---	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	415,999	559,752	499,805

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Office of Environment, Safety and Health (non-defense)	7,029	9,128	9,128
Program direction	20,691	19,993	19,993
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	27,720	29,121	29,121
OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT			
Legacy management	33,187	33,139	33,139
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY AND CONSERVATION	1,812,628	1,923,361	2,025,527
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY			
Deferral of unobligated balances, FY 2005	257,000	---	---
Deferral of unobligated balances, FY 2007	-257,000	257,000	257,000
Rescission Request	---	-203,000	-257,000
Rescission, uncommitted balances	-20,000	---	---
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D (FutureGen)	---	-54,000	---
Total, Clean Coal Technology	-20,000	---	---
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
Clean coal power initiative	49,500	4,957	36,400
FutureGen	17,820	54,000	54,000
Fuels and Power Systems:			
Innovations for existing plants	25,146	16,015	25,000
Advanced integrated gasification combined cycle	55,886	53,982	56,000
Advanced turbines	17,820	12,801	20,000
Carbon sequestration	66,330	73,971	73,971
Fuels	28,710	22,127	29,000
Fuel cells	61,380	63,352	63,352
Advanced research	52,622	28,914	28,914
U.S./China Energy and environmental center	984	---	---
Subtotal, Fuels and power systems	308,878	271,162	296,237
Subtotal, Coal	376,198	330,119	386,637
Natural Gas Technologies	32,670	---	---
Petroleum - Oil Technologies	31,680	---	2,700
Methane hydrates R&D	---	---	12,000
Program direction	105,872	129,196	126,496
Plant and Capital Equipment	19,800	---	---
Fossil energy environmental restoration	9,504	9,715	9,715
Import/export authorization	1,781	---	---
Advanced metallurgical research	7,920	---	---
Special recruitment programs	649	656	656
Cooperative research and development	5,940	---	---
Congressionally directed technology deployments	---	---	20,000
Total, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	592,014	469,686	558,204
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	21,285	18,810	18,810
ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUNDS	83,160	---	---
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	164,340	155,430	155,430
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	---	4,950	4,950
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	85,314	89,769	89,769

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP			
West Valley Demonstration Project	76,329	73,400	73,400
Gaseous Diffusion Plants	48,325	74,860	74,860
Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion, 02-U-101	84,945	32,556	32,556
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	45,652	34,843	34,843
Small Sites:			
Argonne National Lab	10,382	10,726	11,726
Brookhaven National Lab	33,985	28,272	28,860
Idaho National Lab	5,221	7,000	7,000
Consolidated Business Center:			
California Site support	99	160	160
Inhalation Toxicology Lab	302	2,931	3,431
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	3,861	---	---
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center	3,465	5,720	5,720
Energy Technology Engineering Center	8,910	16,000	16,000
Los Alamos National Lab	485	1,025	1,025
Moab	27,726	22,865	19,865
UMTRA site litigation	---	---	500
Subtotal, small sites	94,436	94,699	94,287
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	349,687	310,358	309,946
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and decommissioning	536,806	559,368	559,368
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	19,800	20,000	20,000
SUBTOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND	556,606	579,368	579,368
Uranium sales and barter (scorekeeping adjustment)	(3,000)	---	---
TOTAL, UED&D FUND/URANIUM INVENTORY CLEANUP	(556,606)	(579,368)	(579,368)
SCIENCE			
High energy physics			
Proton accelerator-based physics	388,172	376,536	376,536
Electron accelerator-based physics	131,494	117,460	117,460
Non-accelerator physics	38,203	59,271	59,271
Theoretical physics	48,612	52,056	52,056
Advanced technology R&D	110,213	159,476	159,476
Subtotal	716,694	764,799	764,799
Construction			
07-SC-07 Project engineering and design (PED)			
Electron neutrino appearance (EvA)	---	10,300	10,300
Total, High energy physics	716,694	775,099	775,099
Nuclear physics	365,054	439,540	439,540
Construction			
07-SC-001 Project engineering and design (PED)			
12 GeV continuous electron beam accelerator facility upgrade, Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator facility, Newport News, VA	---	7,000	7,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
07-SC-002 Electron beam ion source Brookhaven National Laboratory, NY	---	7,400	7,400
06-SC-02 Project engineering and design (PED), Electron beam ion source, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY	1,980	120	120
Total, Nuclear physics	367,034	454,060	454,060
Biological and environmental research	579,831	510,263	540,263
Basic energy sciences			
Research			
Materials sciences and engineering research	738,682	1,004,212	1,004,212
Chemical sciences, geosciences and energy biosciences	219,583	268,499	268,499
Subtotal, Research	958,265	1,272,711	1,272,711
Construction			
07-SC-06 Project engineering and design (PED) National Synchrotron light source II (NSLS-II)	---	20,000	20,000
07-SC-12 Project engineering and design (PED) Advanced light source user building, LBNL	---	3,000	3,000
05-R-320 LINAC coherent light source (LCLS)	82,170	105,740	105,740
05-R-321 Center for functional nanomaterials (BNL)	36,187	18,864	18,864
04-R-313 The molecular foundry (LBNL)	9,510	257	257
03-SC-002 Project engineering & design (PED) SLAC	2,519	161	161
03-R-313 Center for Integrated Nanotechnology	4,580	247	247
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	41,327	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	176,293	148,269	148,269
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,134,558	1,420,980	1,420,980
Advanced scientific computing research	234,684	318,654	318,654
Fusion energy sciences program	287,645	318,950	318,950
Science laboratories infrastructure			
Laboratories facilities support			
Infrastructure support	1,505	1,520	1,520
General plant projects	2,970	---	---
Construction			
07-SC-04 Science laboratories infrastructure project engineering and design (PED)	---	8,908	8,908
04-SC-001 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	2,970	---	---
03-SC-001 Science laboratories infrastructure MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	14,720	19,033	19,033
07-SC-05 Physical sciences facility at PNNL	---	---	7,000
Subtotal, Construction	17,690	27,941	34,941

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Subtotal, Laboratories facilities support	22,165	29,461	36,461
Oak Ridge landlord	5,028	5,079	5,079
Excess facilities disposal	14,491	16,348	9,348
Total, Science laboratories infrastructure	41,684	50,888	50,888
Safeguards and security	73,574	76,592	76,592
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	7,120	10,952	10,952
Science program direction			
Field offices	90,677	95,832	95,832
Headquarters	68,441	75,045	75,045
Total, Science program direction	159,118	170,877	170,877
Subtotal, Science	3,601,942	4,107,315	4,137,315
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-5,549	-5,605	-5,605
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,596,393	4,101,710	4,131,710
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Repository program	19,800	80,986	80,986
Interim storage	---	---	30,000
Program direction	79,200	75,434	75,434
Integrated spent fuel recycling	49,500	---	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	148,500	156,420	186,420
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and expenses			
Office of the Secretary	5,345	5,539	5,539
Board of contract appeals	642	147	147
Chief financial officer	---	36,790	36,790
Management	---	55,237	55,237
Human capital management	---	22,029	22,029
Chief information officer	38,991	47,722	47,722
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,778	4,866	4,866
Economic impact and diversity	5,298	5,144	5,144
General counsel	22,985	24,725	24,725
Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation	108,207	---	---
Policy and international affairs	14,843	18,744	18,744
Public affairs	4,459	4,419	4,419
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	205,548	225,362	225,362
Program support			
Minority economic impact	815	825	825
Policy analysis and system studies	388	612	612
Environmental policy studies	556	520	520
Cybersecurity and secure communications	24,486	38,183	38,183
Corporate management information program	22,824	22,917	22,917
Subtotal, Program support	49,069	63,057	63,057
Competitive sourcing initiative (A-76)	2,455	2,982	2,982

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Total, Administrative operations	257,072	291,401	291,401
Cost of work for others	79,916	80,239	80,239
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	336,988	371,640	371,640
Funding from other defense activities	-86,699	-93,258	-93,258
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	250,289	278,382	278,382
Miscellaneous revenues	-121,770	-123,000	-123,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	128,519	155,382	155,382
Office of Inspector General	41,580	45,507	45,507
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Life extension program			
B61 Life extension program	50,302	58,934	58,934
W76 Life extension program	148,270	151,684	151,684
W80 Life extension program	99,238	102,044	22,044
Subtotal, Life extension program	297,810	312,662	232,662
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	65,390	63,782	63,782
W62 Stockpile systems	8,877	3,738	3,738
W76 Stockpile systems	62,903	56,174	56,174
W78 Stockpile systems	32,306	50,662	50,662
W80 Stockpile systems	26,052	27,230	27,230
B83 Stockpile systems	26,127	23,365	23,365
W84 Stockpile systems	4,358	1,465	1,465
W87 Stockpile systems	50,171	59,333	59,333
W88 Stockpile systems	32,503	39,796	39,796
Subtotal, Stockpile systems	308,687	325,545	325,545
Reliable replacement warhead	24,750	27,707	52,707
Warheads Dismantlement	59,400	75,000	105,000
Stockpile services			
Production support	227,700	236,115	200,698
Research and development support	60,640	63,948	54,356
Research and development certification and safety	225,450	194,199	165,069
Management, technology, and production	167,891	159,662	135,713
Responsive infrastructure	---	15,430	40,430
Subtotal, Stockpile services	681,681	669,354	596,266
Total, Directed stockpile work	1,372,328	1,410,268	1,312,180
Campaigns			
Science campaign			
Primary assessment technologies	49,221	50,527	50,527
Test readiness	19,800	14,757	14,757
Dynamic materials properties	83,055	80,727	80,727

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Advanced radiography	49,025	36,745	36,745
Secondary assessment technologies	75,569	81,006	81,006
Subtotal, Science campaigns	276,670	263,762	263,762
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	39,600	26,731	26,731
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	17,365	21,156	21,156
Nuclear survivability	22,162	14,973	14,973
Enhanced surveillance	99,205	86,526	86,526
Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), other project costs	4,667	4,613	4,613
Construction			
01-D-108 Microsystem and engineering science applications (MESA), SNL, Albuquerque, NM	64,908	6,920	6,920
Subtotal, MESA	69,575	11,533	11,533
Subtotal, Engineering campaign	247,907	160,919	160,919
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign:			
Ignition	74,859	79,763	79,763
Support of stockpile programs	19,673	5,872	5,872
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experiment support	42,578	45,959	55,959
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	10,902	10,603	10,603
University grants/other support	7,623	8,903	8,903
Facility operations and target production	63,977	43,021	58,021
Inertial fusion technology	47,520	---	40,000
NIF demonstration program	101,307	143,438	143,438
High-energy petawatt laser development	34,650	2,213	14,213
Subtotal	403,089	339,772	416,772
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	140,494	111,419	111,419
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	543,583	451,191	528,191
Advanced simulation and computing	599,772	617,955	635,155
Pit manufacturing and certification			
W88 pit manufacturing	119,717	147,658	147,658
W88 pit certification	61,276	56,605	56,605
Pit manufacturing capability	22,840	33,335	33,335
Pit campaign support activities at NTS	34,830	---	---
Subtotal, Pit manufacturing and certification	238,663	237,598	237,598
Readiness campaign			
Stockpile readiness	31,086	17,576	17,576
High explosives and weapons operations	16,926	17,188	17,188
Non-nuclear readiness	28,344	31,171	31,171
Advanced design and production technologies	53,500	53,645	55,645
Tritium readiness	62,067	86,385	86,385
Construction			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	24,645	---	---
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	86,712	86,385	86,385
Subtotal, Readiness campaign	216,568	205,965	207,965

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Total, Campaigns	2,123,163	1,937,390	2,033,590
Consolidated Production Center (CPC)	---	---	100,000
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant	---	98,057	98,057
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	---	96,906	106,906
Los Alamos National Laboratory	---	306,258	306,258
Nevada Test Site	---	67,687	67,687
Pantex	---	96,124	116,124
Sandia National Laboratory	---	163,627	163,627
Savannah River Site	---	100,013	100,013
Y-12 Production Plant	---	191,092	234,092
Institutional Site Support	---	84,022	84,022
Total, Operations and facilities	1,159,192	1,203,786	1,276,786
Program readiness	104,681	75,167	75,167
Material recycle and recovery	72,003	69,982	69,982
Containers	17,075	20,130	20,130
Storage	24,970	35,285	35,285
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,377,921	1,404,350	1,477,350
Construction			
07-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	---	4,977	4,977
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	---	14,828	14,828
06-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	13,972	51,577	51,577
06-D-402 NTS replace fire stations 1 & 2 Nevada Test Site, NV	8,201	13,919	13,919
06-D-403 Tritium facility modernization Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA	2,574	7,810	7,810
06-D-404 Building remediation, restoration, and upgrade, Nevada Test Site, NV	15,840	---	---
05-D-140 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	6,930	9,615	9,615
05-D-401 Building 12-64 production bays upgrades, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	10,890	---	---
05-D-402 Berylium capability (BEC) project, Y-12 National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	7,623	5,084	5,084
04-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	1,980	---	---
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	54,450	112,422	12,422
04-D-128 TA-18 mission relocation project, Los Alamos Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	12,870	24,197	24,197
03-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	28,710	14,161	14,161

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
01-D-103 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	8,910	1,565	1,565
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	80,537	21,267	21,267
Subtotal, Construction	253,487	281,422	181,422
Total Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,631,408	1,685,772	1,658,772
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	99,840	245,283	100,283
Construction			
07-D-253 TA 1 heating systems modernization (HSM) Sandia National Laboratory	---	14,500	14,500
06-D-160 Project engioneering and design (PED), various locations	5,753	2,700	2,700
06-D-601 Electrical distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,960	6,429	6,429
06-D-602 Gas main and distribution system upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,663	3,145	3,145
06-D-603 Steam plant life extension project (SLEP), Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, TN	722	17,811	17,811
05-D-160 Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program project engineering design (PED), various locations	10,538	648	648
05-D-601 Compressed air upgrades project (CAUP), Y-12, National security complex, Oak Ridge, TN	9,644	702	702
05-D-602 Power grid infrastructure upgrade (PGIU), Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	8,415	---	---
05-D-603 New master substation (NMSU), SNL	6,831	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	49,526	45,935	45,935
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	149,366	291,218	146,218
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	142,328	130,484	130,484
Program direction	67,651	78,780	78,780
Total, Secure transportation asset	209,979	209,264	209,264
Nuclear weapons incident response	117,608	135,354	135,354
Environmental projects and operations			
Long term response actions	---	17,211	17,211
Safeguards and security	756,841	665,701	702,701
Cybersecurity	---	88,711	89,711
Construction			
05-D-170 Project engineering and design (PED), various locations	40,590	---	---
Material security and consolidation project, Idaho National Lab, ID	---	---	40,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Total, Safeguards and security	797,431	754,412	832,412
Subtotal, Weapons activities	6,401,283	6,440,889	6,445,001
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-31,680	-33,000	-33,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	6,369,603	6,407,889	6,412,001
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	305,910	260,967	290,160
Construction			
06-D-180 06-01 Project engineering and design(PED) National Security Laboratory, PNNL	12,870	7,920	17,920
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification R & D	318,780	268,887	308,080
Nonproliferation and international security	74,250	127,411	127,411
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	422,730	413,182	583,182
Global initiatives for proliferation prevention	39,600	---	---
HEU transparency implementation	19,288	---	---
Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production program	174,423	206,654	206,654
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus materials disposition	193,050	235,051	171,651
Russian surplus materials disposition	34,163	34,695	---
Construction			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	23,760	78,700	---
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	217,800	289,510	---
Subtotal, Construction	241,560	368,210	---
Plutonium Immobilization, Savannah River Site, SC	---	---	111,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	468,773	637,956	282,651
Use of prior year balances	---	-34,695	-34,695
Total, Fissile materials disposition	468,773	603,261	247,956
Global threat reduction initiative	96,995	106,818	119,818
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,614,839	1,726,213	1,593,101
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,614,839	1,726,213	1,593,101
NAVAL REACTORS			
Naval reactors development	721,512	761,176	761,176
Construction			
07-D-190 Materials research technology complex (MRTC)	---	1,485	1,485
06-D-901 Central office building II	6,930	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Transfer to Nuclear Energy	13,365	---	---
05-N-900 Materials development facility building, Schenectady, NY	9,801	1,287	1,287
Subtotal, Construction	30,096	2,772	2,772
Total, Naval reactors development	751,608	763,948	763,948
Program direction	29,997	31,185	31,185
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	781,605	795,133	795,133
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR			
Office of the Administrator	345,277	386,576	399,576
Use of prior year balances	-6,827	---	---
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	338,450	386,576	399,576
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	9,104,497	9,315,811	9,199,811
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP			
Closure Sites:			
Ashtabula	15,840	295	1,295
Columbus	9,405	---	---
Closure sites administration	---	25,896	25,896
Fernald	324,333	258,877	258,877
Miamisburg	104,475	34,869	34,869
Rocky Flats	564,251	1,000	1,000
Total, closure sites	1,018,304	320,937	321,937
Hanford Site:			
Nuclear material stabilization & disposition PFP	196,681	81,651	81,651
SNF stabilization and disposition	57,894	81,069	78,937
Nuclear facility D&D, river corridor closure project	176,716	221,022	221,022
Solid waste stablilzation and disposition	---	39,876	39,876
HAMMER facility	7,425	---	7,500
B-reactor museum	1,980	---	500
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	440,696	423,618	429,486
Solid waste stabilization & disposition - 2035	165,442	188,989	191,121
Soil & water remediation - groundwater/vadose zone	73,750	75,973	75,973
Nuclear facility D&D - remainder of Hanford	70,104	94,270	94,270
Operate waste disposal facility	5,802	3,534	3,534
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage	1,795	---	---
Richland community and regulatory support	15,257	18,332	18,332
Columbia River Cleanup Technologies	---	---	20,000
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	332,150	381,098	403,230
Total, Hanford Site	772,846	804,716	832,716
Office of River Protection:			
01-D-16A Low activity waste facility	161,370	77,800	112,200
Analytical laboratory	44,550	21,800	45,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Balance of facilities	64,350	48,900	52,400
High-level waste facility	102,960	253,700	171,700
Pretreatment facility	147,510	287,800	218,500
Subtotal, Waste treatment & immobilization plant	520,740	690,000	600,000
Tank Farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabil. and disposition	325,710	273,656	293,656
River protection community and regulatory support	466	471	471
Subtotal, Tank Farm activities	326,176	274,127	294,127
Total, Office of River Protection	846,916	964,127	894,127
Idaho National Laboratory:			
SNF stabilization and disposition/storage	12,539	---	---
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	1,539	1,000	1,000
SNF stabilization and disposition - 2012	18,966	18,415	18,415
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	138,615	193,910	193,910
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	91,273	73,514	73,514
06-D-401, Sodium bearing waste treatment project, ID	53,727	31,000	31,000
04-D-414, Sodium bearing waste treatment facility, PED ID	9,108	---	32,000
Soil and water remediation - 2012	159,874	120,510	120,510
Nuclear facility D&D	4,976	67,562	67,562
Non-nuclear facility D&D	38,714	3,010	3,010
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,511	3,683	3,683
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	532,842	512,604	544,604
NNSA:			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	29,282	11,580	11,580
NNSA Service Center	8,221	26,122	26,122
Nevada	84,174	79,668	79,668
Kansas City Plant	4,481	---	---
California site support	545	370	370
Pantex	19,457	23,726	23,726
Sandia National Laboratories	9,671	---	---
Nevada off-sites	2,818	---	---
Los Alamos National Laboratory	140,787	90,602	90,602
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	299,436	232,068	232,068
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Solid waste stabilization and completion - 2006	4,584	---	---
Soil and water remediation - Melton Valley	46,308	---	---
Solid waste stabilization and disposition - 2012	67,676	48,888	68,809
Soil and water remediation - offsites	16,318	15,381	7,033
Nuclear facility D&D, E. Tenn. Technology Park	5,974	10,094	11,056
Nuclear facility D&D Y-12	40,152	40,000	19,817
Nuclear facility D&D ORNL	15,874	21,956	41,316
Solid waste stabilization & disp. - science current gen	18,084	18,544	21,332
OR reservation community & regulatory support	5,613	4,999	4,999
Building 3019	17,820	---	25,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	238,403	159,862	199,362
Savannah River site:			
Nuclear facility D&D	---	3,664	3,664
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition 2012	247,800	208,233	208,233
04-D-423 Container surveillance capability in 235F	---	21,300	21,300
04-D-414 Project Engineering and Design, 105-K	18,414	2,935	2,935

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Subtotal, 2012 accelerated completions	266,214	236,132	236,132
SNF stabilization, disposition/storage	13,750	---	---
SR community and regulatory support	12,916	12,542	12,542
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	74,354	41,160	41,160
Spent nuclear fuel stabilization and disposition	11,160	22,668	22,668
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	111,863	85,276	85,276
Soil and water remediation	93,421	103,150	103,150
Nuclear facility D&D	56,644	12,542	12,542
Subtotal, 2035 accelerated completions	374,108	277,338	277,338
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabil. & disposition	495,965	507,724	618,724
05-D-405, Salt waste processing facility	495	25,700	25,700
04-D-408, Glass waste storage building #2	6,905	---	---
03-D-414, Salt waste processing facility PED SR	34,989	37,500	37,500
SWPF FY 2005 uncosted balances	-19,800	---	---
Subtotal, Tank farm activities	518,554	570,924	681,924
Total, Savannah River site	1,158,876	1,084,394	1,195,394
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant:			
Operate WIPP	116,769	132,026	132,026
Central Characterization Project	38,117	23,190	23,190
Transportation	37,255	32,940	32,940
Community and regulatory support	36,183	25,122	25,122
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	228,324	213,278	213,278
Program direction	241,378	291,216	301,216
Program support	32,518	37,881	37,881
Safeguards and Security:			
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,181	4,324	4,324
Oak Ridge Reservation	28,566	22,889	22,889
Fernald	1,377	1,216	1,216
West Valley	1,782	1,600	1,600
Paducah	10,904	8,707	8,707
Portsmouth	17,664	15,642	15,642
Richland/Hanford Site	81,333	77,836	77,836
Rocky Flats	3,168	---	---
Savannah River Site	135,376	163,626	163,626
Total, Safeguards and Security	284,351	295,840	295,840
Technology development	29,764	21,389	31,389
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	446,490	452,000	452,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	6,130,448	5,390,312	5,551,812
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Office of Security and safety performance assurance			
Nuclear safeguards and security	185,009	182,548	185,548
Security investigations	46,258	40,000	40,000
Program direction	72,757	75,949	75,949
Subtotal, Office of Security and safety performance assurance	304,024	298,497	301,497
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	56,908	60,738	60,738
Program direction - EH	19,351	20,076	20,076

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	76,259	80,814	80,814
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	31,107	156,790	156,790
Program direction	13,518	11,061	11,061
Subtotal, Office of Legacy Management	44,625	167,851	167,851
Nuclear energy			
Infrastructure			
Idaho facilities management	17,584	---	---
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	74,258	75,949	75,949
Subtotal, Infrastruture	91,842	75,949	75,949
Program direction	30,792	---	---
Subtotal, Nuclear energy	122,634	75,949	75,949
Defense related administrative support	86,699	93,258	93,258
Office of hearings and appeals	4,309	4,422	4,422
Subtotal, Other Defense Activities	638,550	720,791	723,791
Less security charge for reimbursable work	-2,973	3,003	-3,003
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	635,577	717,788	720,788
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	346,500	388,080	388,080
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	16,217,022	15,811,991	15,860,491
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Purchase power and wheeling	32,386	48,003	48,003
Program direction	5,544	5,723	5,723
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	37,930	53,726	53,726
Less alternative financing (PPW)	---	-13,611	---
Offsetting collections	-32,386	---	-48,003
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	---	-34,392	---
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	5,544	5,723	5,723
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	6,972	7,145	7,145
Purchase power and wheeling	2,970	13,600	13,600
Program direction	19,758	20,782	20,782
Construction	3,134	3,612	3,612
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	32,834	45,139	45,139
Less alternative financing (PPW)	---	-10,600	---
Offsetting collections	-2,970	---	-13,600
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	---	-3,000	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,864	31,539	31,539
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	53,417	60,205	60,205
Operation and maintenance	46,822	45,734	45,734
Purchase power and wheeling	276,210	427,931	427,931
Program direction	128,900	147,748	147,748
Utah mitigation and conservation	6,633	6,893	6,893
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	511,982	688,511	688,511
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	---	-1,091	---
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	---	-33,928	---
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	---	-9,643	---
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	---	-153,079	---
Offsetting collections	-276,210	---	-472,593
Offsetting collections (P.L. 98-381)	-4,120	-3,705	-3,705
Offsetting collections (P.L. 106-377)	---	-274,852	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	231,652	212,213	212,213
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	2,665	2,500	2,500
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	269,725	251,975	251,975
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	218,196	230,800	230,800
FERC revenues	-218,196	-230,800	-230,800
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	24,046,773	24,074,717	24,373,489
(Total amount appropriated)	(24,031,133)	(24,277,717)	(24,630,489)
(Advance appropriations from previous years)	(35,640)	---	---
(Rescissions)	(-20,000)	(-203,000)	(-257,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS			
Energy supply and conservation	1,812,628	1,923,361	2,025,527
Clean coal technology	-20,000	---	---
Fossil Energy Research and Development	592,014	489,686	558,204
Naval Petroleum & Oil Shale Reserves	21,285	18,810	18,810
Elk Hills School Lands Fund	83,160	---	---
Strategic petroleum reserves	164,340	155,430	155,430
Northeast home heating oil reserve	---	4,950	4,950
Energy Information Administration	85,314	89,769	89,769
Non-defense environmental clean up	349,687	310,358	309,946
Uranium enrichment D&D fund	556,606	579,368	579,368
Science	3,596,393	4,101,710	4,131,710
Nuclear waste disposal	148,500	156,420	186,420
Departmental administration	250,289	278,382	278,382
Revenues	-121,770	-123,000	-123,000
Total, Departmental administration	128,519	155,382	155,382
Office of the Inspector General	41,580	45,507	45,507
Atomic energy defense activities:			
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
Weapons activities	6,369,603	6,407,889	6,412,001
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,614,839	1,728,213	1,593,101
Naval reactors	781,605	795,133	795,133
Office of the Administrator	338,450	386,576	399,576
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Admin.	9,104,497	9,315,811	9,199,811
Defense environmental cleanup	6,130,448	5,390,312	5,551,812
Other defense activities	635,577	717,788	720,788
Defense nuclear waste disposal	346,500	388,080	388,080
Total, Atomic energy defense activities	16,217,022	15,811,991	15,860,491
Power marketing administrations			
Southeastern Power Administration	5,544	5,723	5,723
Southwestern Power Administration	29,884	31,539	31,539
Western Area Power Administration	231,652	212,213	212,213
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,665	2,500	2,500
Total, Power marketing administrations	269,725	251,975	251,975
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:			
Salaries and expenses	218,196	230,800	230,800
Revenues	-218,196	-230,800	-230,800
TOTAL, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS	24,046,773	24,074,717	24,373,489
FUNCTION RECAP:			
NON-DEFENSE	7,829,751	8,262,726	8,743,998
DEFENSE	16,217,022	15,811,991	15,629,491
Environmental restoration and waste management:			
Defense function	(6,130,448)	(5,390,312)	(5,551,812)
Non-defense function	(934,516)	(640,316)	(640,904)
Total, Environmental restoration and waste mgmt.	(7,064,964)	(6,030,628)	(6,192,716)
Nuclear waste disposal:			
Defense function	(346,500)	(388,080)	(388,080)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	Enacted	Budget Request	House Recommended
Non-defense function	(148,500)	(156,420)	(186,420)
Total, Nuclear waste disposal	(495,000)	(544,500)	(574,500)

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Contract Competition.—Section 301 modifies language carried in the conference report for the Energy and Water Development Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–137), requiring the competition of the management and operating contracts for Ames, Argonne, and Lawrence Livermore. The Committee renews the statutory requirement to compete these contracts to be sure the Department follows through on the commitments made by the present Secretary.

Section 301 also reiterates language from previous Energy and Water Development Acts requiring notification of Congress if the Secretary awards a management and operating contract in excess of $100 million in annual funding at a current or former management and operating contract site or facility, or awards a significant extension or expansion to an existing management and operating contract, or other contract covered by this section, unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures, or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. At least 90 days before granting such a waiver, the Secretary of Energy must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth, in specificity, the reasons for the waiver. Section 301 does not preclude extensions of a contract awarded using competitive procedures, but does establish a presumption of competition unless the Secretary invokes the waiver option. The waiver for non-competitive awards or extensions should be invoked only in truly exceptional circumstances or in the case of exceptional performance, not as a matter of routine. A non-competitive award or extension may be in the taxpayers' interest, but the burden of proof is on the Department to make that case in the waiver request.

Workforce Restructuring.—Section 302 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to prepare or implement workforce restructuring plans or provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484. The Committee has provided no funds to implement workforce restructuring plans which would provide benefits to Federal employees of the Department of Energy which are not available to other Federal employees of the United States Government. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

Section 3161 Assistance.—Section 303 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used for enhanced severance payments to contractors and other benefits and community assistance grants authorized under the provisions of section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484.

Unfunded Requests for Proposals.—Section 304 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate requests for proposals or other solicitations or expressions of interest for new programs which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission, and which have not yet been approved

and funded by Congress. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

Unexpended Balances.—Section 305 permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

Bonneville Power Administration Service Territory.—Section 306 provides that none of the funds in this or any other Act may be used by the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory unless the Administrator certifies in advance that such services are not available from private sector businesses. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005.

User Facilities.—Section 307 establishes certain notice and competition requirements with respect to the involvement of universities in Department of Energy user facilities. A similar provision was included in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005. The detailed guidance on the application of this provision was provided in House Report 107–681 and continues to apply.

Intelligence Activities.—Section 308 authorizes intelligence activities of the Department of Energy for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 during fiscal year 2006 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2005.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—Section 309 provides for authorization of Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD), Site Directed Research and Development, and Plant Directed Research and Development (PDRD) activities.

Technology Commercialization Fund.—Section 310 includes a funding limitation on the Technology Commercialization Fund.

Contractor Pension Benefits.—Sec. 311 includes language prohibiting funding to implement Department of Energy Order N 351.1 modifying contractor employee pension and medical benefits policy from defined benefit plans to a defined contribution plan.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2006	$64,817,000
Budget estimate, 2007	65,472,000
Recommended, 2007	35,472,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−29,345,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−30,000,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is comprised of the Governors of the thirteen Appalachian States and has a Federal co chairman, who is appointed by the President. For fiscal year 2007, the budget includes $65,472,000, of which $54,079,000 is for program development; $5,301,000 is local development districts and technical assistance; and $5,437,000 is for salaries and expenses.

The ARC budget justification indicates that it targets fifty percent of its funds to distressed counties or distressed areas in the Appalachian region. In times of budget austerity, the Committee believes this should be the primary focus of the ARC. The Committee recommendation for ARC is $35,472,000, $30,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2005 enacted level and the budget estimate. The reduction is to be taken from the area development activities that serve other than distressed counties and distressed areas.

Within the funds provided, the Committee has included the following activities:

Portsmouth, OH, Shawnee State University Motion Capture Facility	$1,050,000
North Carolina WNC Center for Entrepreneurial Growth	1,000,000
North Carolina Blue Ridge Food Ventures	500,000
Kentucky Bluegrass Pride Wastewater	1,000,000
Mahoning County, OH, Petersburg Water Project	500,000
Perry County, OH, Clover Hill-Saltillo Waterline Extension	290,000
Perry County, OH, Village of Corning Wastewater Project	1,000,000
Perry County, OH, New Lexington water treatment facility	432,000
Ross County, OH, Chillicothe Veteran's Memorial Stadium	315,000
Guernsey County, OH, Sewer Project	750,000
Ross County, OH, Richmond Dale Sewer Project	500,000
Vinton County, OH, Water Project	250,000
Carroll County, OH, Village of Leesville Sewer Project	500,000
Morgan County, OH, Tri-County Rural Water Project	250,000
Central West Virginia Environmental Infra	1,000,000

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2006	$21,812,000
Budget estimate, 2007	22,260,000
Recommended, 2007	22,260,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+448,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) was created by the Fiscal Year 1989 National Defense Authorization Act. The Board, composed of five members appointed by the President, provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy regarding public health and safety issues at the Department's defense nuclear facilities. The Board is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2007 is $22,260,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee is disappointed in the Board's oversight of the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization project (WTP). This is not a criticism of the professionals who performed the role, rather an acknowledgement that the mission, mandate and resources of the Board do not provide the rigor of oversight necessary in the construction of a first-of-a-kind nuclear facility with an environmental mission. As such, the Committee directs the Board to close out its oversight activities with the WTP, coinciding with the beginning of the oversight activities of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The Committee directs the Board to work with the Department and the NRC on this transition plan, and report to the Committee within 30 days of enactment of this bill on the plan. Funds proposed for fiscal year 2007 that otherwise would be used for Board oversight of WTP may be distributed to other high priority projects within the Board's mission.

DELTA REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2006	$11,880,000
Budget estimate, 2007	5,940,000
Recommended, 2007	5,940,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−5,940,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Delta Regional Authority (DRA) is a federal-state partnership serving a 240-county/parish area in an eight-state region. Led by a Federal Co-Chairman and the governors of each participating state, the DRA is designed to remedy severe and chronic economic distress by stimulating economic development and fostering partnerships that will have a positive impact on the region's economy. The DRA seeks to help economically distressed communities leverage other federal and state programs, which are focused on basic infrastructure development and transportation improvements, business development, and job training services. Under federal law, at least 75 percent of funds must be invested in distressed counties and parishes and pockets of poverty, with 50 percent of the funds

earmarked for transportation and basic infrastructure improvements. For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $5,940,000, the same as the enacted level and the budget estimate.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2006	$49,500,000
Budget estimate, 2007	2,536,000
Recommended, 2007	7,536,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−41,964,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+5,000,000

Introduced by Congress in 1998, the Denali Commission is a federal-state partnership designed to provide critical utilities, infrastructure, and economic support throughout Alaska. For fiscal year 2007, the Committee recommends $7,536,000 for the costs of the Commission's operations, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget estimate. The Committee provides the $5,000,000 increase for Phase 2 of the coal to synthetic gas Blue Sky Project project located in Kenai, Alaska.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2006	$727,032,000
Budget estimate, 2007	768,410,000
Recommended, 2007	808,410,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+81,378,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+40,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2006	−611,010,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−628,328,000
Recommended, 2007	−656,328,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−45,318,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−36,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2006	116,022,000
Budget estimate, 2007	148,896,000
Recommended, 2007	152,082,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+36,060,000
Budget estimate, 2007	+4,000,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2007 is $808,410,000, an increase of $40,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee provides an additional $40,000,000 of budget authority to prepare for the anticipated growth in new reactor licensing. The additional funds are available to hire, relocate, and train additional staff, support pre-application activities not chargeable to a specific licensee, and build out, equip, and rent additional office space. The total amount of budget authority is offset by estimated revenues of $656,328,000, resulting in a net appropriation of $152,082,000. The recommendation includes the requested amount of $40,981,840 to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund to sup-

port the Department of Energy's effort to develop a permanent geologic repository at Yucca Mountain for spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste.

Fee Recovery.—The Committee recommendation assumes that the NRC will recover 90 percent of its budget authority from user fees and annual charges, as authorized in Section 637 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–58), less the appropriation derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, the amount necessary to implement Section 3116 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (P.L. 108–375), and the amount necessary for homeland security activities of the Commission. Of the $808,410,000 gross appropriation for fiscal year 2007, $40,981,840 is drawn from the Nuclear Waste Fund, $2,867,000 is drawn from the General Fund of the Treasury to execute NRC's responsibilities to provide oversight of certain Department of Energy activities under Section 3116 of Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (P.L 108–375), and $35,308,000 is drawn from the General Fund of the Treasury to execute NRC's homeland security responsibilities. Ninety percent of the balance of $729,253,160 (i.e., $656,328,000) is funded by fees collected from NRC licensees, and the remaining 10 percent (i.e., $72,925,000) is funded from the General Fund of the Treasury.

NRC Oversight of Hanford Waste Treatment Plant.—The NRC had significant involvement in the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) at Hanford during 1997–2000. When the Department of Energy (DOE) was pursuing its privatization strategy for the WTP, the NRC would have been responsible for licensing the private facility. When DOE terminated the privatization approach in 2000, the NRC role at Hanford was also terminated, as DOE intended to self-regulate itself and its contractor for the new non-privatized WTP. As detailed elsewhere in this report, there are major cost overruns and schedule delays for the WTP. In addition, there are technical and management problems with this project that have very significant nuclear safety implications. Because of these concerns, because of the NRC's past involvement with the privatized precursor to WTP, and because of the NRC's current role at Idaho and Savannah River with respect to Waste Incidental to Reprocessing, the Committee directs the NRC to provide nuclear safety oversight of the WTP. Elsewhere in this report, the Committee directs the DOE to transfer $10,000,000 to the NRC and to conclude a Memorandum of Understanding with the NRC to define the scope of these oversight responsibilities. The Committee does not intend by this action to give the NRC the authority to license or otherwise regulate the WTP.

Reports.—The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide quarterly reports on the status of its licensing and other regulatory activities. In addition, the Committee directs the NRC to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, not later than February 28, 2007, that provides Congress and interested parties with a comprehensive roadmap on the actions and tasks that must be completed prior to and during the new plant application process. The roadmap should allow for the early identification of issues requiring management intervention to maintain established licensing schedules. The Committee has been

very supportive of the Commission in recent years by providing substantial additional resources to meet an anticipated round of new plant licensing activities. The Committee believes the NRC should use these additional resources, both from taxpayer funds and from licensees, to conduct an efficient, understandable, and predictable licensing process. Further, this roadmap report should include, at a minimum: detailed schedules for the completion of the revised Standard Review Plan, Early Site Permit (ESP) applications, design certification applications, Combined Operating License (COL) applications, the Part 52 rulemaking, and all related guidance documents; details on current and future activities to improve the 21-month goal for completing the FSAR and FEIS for ESP applications, and the 42-month goal of completing action on COL applications. Thereafter, the Committee expects to be notified promptly of any changes or additions to the schedules and plans listed in the initial report, the reasons for the change, and efforts underway to ameliorate or eliminate delays. Included in these monthly reports should be an update on the number of new hires, including the organizational location of permanent assignments for each.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2006	$8,233,000
Budget estimate, 2007	8,144,000
Recommended, 2007	8,144,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−89,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2006	−$7,410,000
Budget estimate, 2007	−7,330,000
Recommended, 2007	−7,330,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+80,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2006	$823,000
Budget estimate, 2007	814,000
Recommended, 2007	814,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	−9,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,144,000, the same as the budget request. Given the formula for fee recovery, the revenue estimate is $7,330,000, resulting in a net appropriation for the NRC Inspector General of $814,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 2006	$3,572,000
Budget estimate, 2007	3,670,000
Recommended, 2007	3,670,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	+98,000
Budget estimate, 2007	.....

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,670,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board in fiscal year 2007, the same as the budget request and an increase of $98,000 over fiscal year 2006 funding.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2006	.....
Budget estimate, 2007	$15,100,000
Recommended, 2007	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	.....
Budget estimate, 2007	−15,100,000

OFFSET FROM TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriation, 2006	.....
Budget estimate, 2007	−15,100,000
Recommended, 2007	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2006	.....
Budget estimate, 2007	+15,100,00

The Committee recommendation does not include the Administration proposal to establish a Congressionally-funded Office of Inspector General to oversee the Tennessee Valley Authority. In recent years, the TVA has funded the requests of the TVA–IG office out of power revenues and receipts. This process has worked well and the Committee sees no compelling reason to change that mechanism for financing the TVA–IG.

Reports.—The Committee directs the Inspector General to forward copies of all audit and inspection reports to the Committee immediately after they are issued, and immediately make the Committee aware of any review that recommends cancellation of, or modification to, any major acquisition project or grant, or which recommends significant budgetary savings. The Inspector General is also directed to withhold from public distribution for a period of 15 days any final audit or investigation report that was requested by the House Committee on Appropriations.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommendation includes several general provisions pertaining to specific programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

Prohibition on lobbying.—The bill includes a provision that none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code.

Transfers.—The bill includes language regarding the transfer of funds made available in this Act to other departments or agencies of the Federal government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that:

> Each report of a committee on a public bill or public Joint resolution shall contain the following: (1) A statement citing the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states:

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

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

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Clause 3(c)2 of ru1e XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an explanation of compliance with section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, which requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how that authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most re-

cently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year from the Committee's section 302(a) allocation. This information follows:

[in millions of dollars]

	302(b) Allocation		This bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	30,017	31,414	30,017	31,411
Mandatory	.....	5	.....	5

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is a statement of general performance goals and objectives for which this measure authorizes funding:

The Committee on Appropriations considers program performance, including a program's success in developing and attaining outcome-related goals and objectives, in developing funding recommendations.

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 933–44), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority in the accompanying bill:

	Millions
Budget Authority	$30,017
Outlays:	
2007	18,787
2008	9,005
2009	2,022
2010	151
2011 and beyond	65

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 933–44), as amended, the financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

	Millions
Budget authority	$45
Fiscal year 2006 outlays resulting therefrom	7

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is submitted describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources:

- of which $57,298,000 shall be available or transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund $26,952,000 and

shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; * * *

• Provided further, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriations under this heading: * * *

Under Title III, General Provisions:

Sec. 305.—The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1)(A) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing for detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing that amounts made available under this paragraph shall be provided in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, to provide appropriations that remain available until expended for South Florida Everglades Restoration projects.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, providing that amounts made available under this paragraph shall be provided in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this Act.

Language has been included under the Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, stating that funds can be used for: providing security at facilities owned and operated by or on behalf of the Corps of Engineers, including the Washington Aqueduct; maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency that serve essential navigation needs of general commerce; and surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters, clearing and straightening channels, and removing obstructions to navigation.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund; providing for the use of funds from a special account for resource protection, research, interpretation,

and maintenance activities at outdoor recreation areas; and allowing use of funds to cover the cost of operation and maintenance of dredged material disposal facilities for which fees have been collected.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Operations and Maintenance, providing that amounts made available under this paragraph shall be provided in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the report accompanying this Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Expenses, regarding support of the Humphreys Engineer Support Center Activity, the Institute for Water Resources, the United States Army Corps of Engineers Research and Development Center, and headquarters support functions at the United States Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Expenses, prohibiting the use of funds other funds in this Act for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the division offices.

Language has been included to provide for funding for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Administrative Provisions, providing that funds are available for official reception and representation expenses, and for purchase and hire of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, pertaining to the reprogramming of funds contained in title I of this Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, pertaining to the oversight and execution of continuing contracts.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, prohibiting the execution of any continuing contract that reserves an amount for a project in excess of the amount appropriated for such project in this Act.

Language has been included prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to carry out the construction of the Port Jersey element of the New York and New Jersey Harbor or reimbursement to the local sponsor for the construction of the Port Jersey element until commitments for construction of container handling facilities are obtained from the non-Federal sponsor for a second user along the Port Jersey element.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, prohibiting the expenditure of funds for operation or maritime related maintenance of the hopper dredge McFarland.

Language has been included prohibiting the expenditure of funds to prevent or limit any reprogramming of funds for a project to be carried out by the Crops of Engineers.

Language has been included relating to the repayment of the Department of Treasury's Judgment Fund.

Language has been included relating to the funding of A–76 studies.

Language has been included relating to Elk Creek Dam, Oregon.

Language has been included relating to the master control plans and master manuals of the Corps of Engineers for the Alabama, Coosa, Tallapoosa River basin in Alabama and Georgia or the Apa-

lachicola, Chattahoochee, Flint River Basin in Alabama, Georgia, and Florida.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources providing that funds are available for fulfilling Federal responsibilities to Native Americans and for grants to and cooperative agreements with State and local governments and Indian tribes.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources allowing fund transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; providing that such sums as necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; providing that funds may be used for work carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps; and providing that transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund or the special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 4601–6a(i); that funds contributed under 43 U.S.C. 395 by non-Federal entities shall be available for expenditure; and that funds advanced under 43 U.S.C. 397a for operation and maintenance of reclamation facilities are to be credited to the Water and Related Resources account. Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources permitting the use of funds available for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program for site remediation on a non-reimbursable basis.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Central Valley Project Restoration Fund directing the Bureau of Reclamation to assess and collect the full amount of additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102–575.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Central Valley Project Restoration Fund providing that none of the funds under the heading may be used for the acquisition or lease of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court order adopted by consent or decree.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, California Bay-Delta Restoration permitting the transfer of funds to appropriate accounts of other participating Federal agencies to carry out authorized programs; providing that funds made available under this heading may be used for the Federal share of the costs of the CALFED Program management; providing that use of any funds provided to the California Bay-Delta Authority for programwide management and oversight activities shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior; providing that CALFED implementation shall be carried out with clear performance measures demonstrating concurrent progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the program.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Policy and Administration providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund and providing that no part of any other ap-

propriation in the Act shall be available for activities budgeted as policy and administration.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Administrative Provisions providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Title II, General Provisions, regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under Title II, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds for any water acquisition or lease in the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad Projects in New Mexico unless the acquisition is in compliance with existing state law and administered under state priority allocation.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Language has been included under Clean Coal Technology rescinding prior year balances.

Language has been included under Fossil Energy Research and Development providing for vehicle and guard services, and uniform allowances; providing funding and limitations for the FutureGen program; specifying certain conditions for the Clean Coal Power Initiative; and, prohibiting the field-testing of nuclear explosives for the recovery of oil and gas.

Language has been included under the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, permitting the use of unobligated balances, and the hire of passenger vehicles.

Language has been included under the Strategic Petroleum Reserve providing for vehicle, aircraft, and guard services, and uniform allowances.

Language has been included under Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Science providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Nuclear Waste Disposal limiting the use of external oversight funds.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and consistent with the authorization in Public Law 95–238, to permit the Department of Energy to use revenues to offset appropriations. The appropriations language for this account reflects the total estimated program funding to be reduced as revenues are received. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration providing, notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act, such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others, as long as such increases are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amounts. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration providing not to exceed $35,000 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Weapons Activities providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under the Office of the Administrator providing not to exceed $12,000 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Defense Environmental Cleanup for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment. Language has also been included requiring the completion of a memorandum of understanding between the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Language has been included under Other Defense Activities providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Bonneville Power Administration Fund providing not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and precluding any new direct loan obligations. Language has also been included providing for expenditure of funds on specific fish recovery projects.

Language has been included under Southwestern Power Administration providing that, not withstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures, and to provide not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration, providing not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration, providing that, not withstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to permit the hire of passenger motor vehicles, to provide official reception and representation expenses, and to permit the use of revenues collected to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received. This language has been included in prior appropriation Acts.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 301, providing that none of the funds may be used to make payments for a noncompetitive management and operating contract unless certain conditions are met.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 302, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare workforce restructuring plans or to provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Department of Energy employees under section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 303, prohibiting the use of funds to augment the funding provided for section 3161 of Public Law 102–484 unless a reprogramming is submitted to the Committee.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 304, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare or initiate requests for proposals or other solicitations for programs that have not yet been funded by Congress.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 305, providing that unexpended balances of prior appropriations may be transferred and merged with new appropriation accounts established in this Act.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 306, prohibiting the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to enter into any agreement to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 307, requiring the Department of Energy to ensure broad public notice when it makes a user facility available to universities and other potential users or seeks input regarding significant characteristics or equipment in a user facility or a proposed user facility, and requiring competition when the Department partners with a university or other entity for the establishment or operation of a user facility.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 308, providing that funds for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 during fiscal year 2007 until enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2007.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 309, regarding the laboratory directed research and development activities.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 310, prohibiting a tax on research and development activities to fund the Technology Commercialization Fund.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, Section 311, prohibiting funding to implement Department of Energy Order N 351.1 modifying contractor employee pension and medical benefits policy.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Language has been included under General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress.

Language has been included under General Provisions, prohibiting the transfer of funds in this Act except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 3 OF RULE XIII (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, there are no changes in existing law made by the bill.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

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

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

[In thousand dollars]

Agency/Progam	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriation in last year of authorization
Corps of Engineers:			
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action programs	(1)	(1)	140,000
Energy Supply and Conservation:			
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy:			
Hydrogen Technology	2006	530,500	155,627
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D	2006	629,000	90,718
Solar Energy	2006	100,000	83,113
Wind Energy	1993	55,000	23,841
Geothermal Technology	1993	23,000	23,252
Hydropower	1980	100,000	20,939
Vehicle Technologies	2006	495,000	182,104
Building Technologies	2006	56,000	69,266
Federal Energy Management Program	2000	10,000	23,918
Facilities and Infrastructure	1977	(2)	(2)
Weatherization and Intergovernmental Activities	2006	880,000	242,550
Program Direction	2006	110,500	164,198
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	1992	2	2
Nuclear Energy	1974	2	2
Environment, Safety and Health	1977	2	2
Legacy Management (non-defense)	2004	29,547	29,705
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	2005	20 000	18,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	2005	(2)	(2)
Energy Information Administration	2006	(2)	85,314
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup:			
West Valley Demonstration	1981	5,000	5,000
Commercial Waste Management/Operating Expenses	1984	300,000	(2)
Commercial Waste Management/Plant and Capital Equipment	1982	975	(2)
UMTRA Groundwater and Long-Term Surveillance and Maintenance	1998	(2)	5,052
Other Uranium Activities:			
DUF6 Conversion	2004	(3)	98,800
Departmental Administration	1984	246,963	185,682
Office of Economic Impact and Diversity	1981	6,000	583
Office of Inspector General	1984	(2)	14,670
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:			
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
Weapons Activities	2006	6,433,936	6,369,597
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2006	1,631,151	1,614,839
Naval Reactors	2006	789,500	781,605
Office of Administrator	2006	341,869	338,450
Defense Environmental Cleanup:			
Defense Site Acceleration Completion	2006	5,286,037	(2)
Defense Environmental Services	2006	831,331	(2)
Other Defense Activities	2006	641,998	635,578
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	2006	350,000	346,500
Power Marketing Administrations:			
Southeastern	1984	24,240	20,594
Southwestern	1984	40,254	36,229
Western Area	1984	269,700	194,630
WAPA Emergency Fund	1984	500	500
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	1984	(2)	(2)

[1] Program was initiated in 1972 and has never received a separate authorization.
[2] No amount specified.
[3] Such sums as necessary.

RESCISSIONS

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

RESCISSIONS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Department or Activity	*Amount*
Bureau of Reclamation: At Risk Desert Terminal Lakes Program ...	$88,000,000
Corps of Engineers: Construction	56,046,000
Department of Energy: Clean Coal Technology	257,000,000

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

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

ROLL CALL NO. 1

Date: May 17, 2006
Measure: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, FY 2007
Motion by: Mr. Visclosky
Description of Motion: To increase funding for the Corps of Engineers by $250,000,000 and for the Department of Energy by $750,000,000, offset by a reduction to tax cuts for certain income groups.
Results: Rejected 23 yeas to 32 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Berry	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Bishop	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Carter
Mr. Clyburn	Mr. Crenshaw
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Culberson
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Doolittle
Mr. Farr	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Fattah	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Hinchey	Ms. Granger
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Istook
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Kirk
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Knollenberg
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. LaHood
Mr. Moran	Mr. Latham
Mr. Obey	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Olver	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Price	Mr. Peterson
Mr. Rothman	Mr. Regula
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Rehberg
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Rogers
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Sherwood
	Mr. Simpson
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Dr. Weldon
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
Investigations	162,360	94,000	128,000	-34,360	+34,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	37,300	---	---	-37,300	---
Construction	2,348,280	1,555,000	1,947,171	-401,109	+392,171
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	101,417	---	---	-101,417	---
Rescission	---	---	-56,046	-56,046	-56,046
Sutbtotal, Construction	2,449,697	1,555,000	1,891,125	-558,572	+336,125
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	396,000	278,000	290,607	-105,393	+12,607
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	153,750	---	---	-153,750	---
6.65	1,969,110	2,258,000	2,195,471	+226,361	-62,529
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	327,517	---	---	-327,517	---
Regulatory program	158,400	173,000	173,000	+14,600	---
FUSRAP	138,600	130,000	130,000	-8,600	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	---	81,000	32,000	+32,000	-49,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	2,277,965	---	---	-2,277,965	---
General expenses	152,460	164,000	142,100	-10,360	-21,900
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-148)	1,600	---	---	-1,600	---
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	3,960	---	1,500	-2,460	+1,500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil...	8,228,719	4,733,000	4,983,803	-3,244,916	+250,803
Appropriations.....	(5,329,170)	(4,733,000)	(4,983,803)	(-345,367)	(+250,803)
Emergency appropriations.....	(2,899,549)	---	---	(-2,899,549)	---
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction.....	31,351	37,587	37,587	+6,236	---
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation.....	937	965	965	+28	---
Subtotal.....	32,288	38,552	38,552	+6,264	---
Program oversight and administration.....	1,719	1,603	1,603	-116	---
Total, Central Utah project completion account..	34,007	40,155	40,155	+6,148	---
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources.....	874,679	833,424	849,122	-25,557	+15,698
Rescission.....	---	-88,000	-88,000	-88,000	---
Subtotal, water and related resources.....	874,679	745,424	761,122	-113,557	+15,698
Central Valley project restoration fund.....	52,219	41,478	41,478	-10,741	---
California Bay-Delta restoration.....	36,630	38,610	40,110	+3,480	+1,500
Policy and administration.....	57,338	58,069	58,069	+731	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	1,020,866	883,581	900,779	-120,087	+17,198
Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....	1,054,873	923,736	940,934	-113,939	+17,198

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply and conservation	1,812,627	1,923,361	2,025,527	+212,900	+102,166
Clean coal technology:					
Deferral of unobligated balances, FY 2005	257,000	---	---	-257,000	---
Deferral of unobligated balances, FY 2007	-257,000	257,000	257,000	+514,000	---
Rescission, uncommitted balances	-20,000	-203,000	-257,000	-237,000	-54,000
Transfer to Fossil Energy R&D	---	-54,000	---	---	+54,000
Total, Clean coal technology	-20,000	---	---	+20,000	---
Fossil Energy Research and Development	592,014	469,686	558,204	-33,810	+88,518
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	21,285	18,810	18,810	-2,475	---
Elk Hills School Lands Fund	83,160	---	---	-83,160	---
Strategic petroleum reserve	164,340	155,430	155,430	-8,910	---
Northeast home heating oil reserve	---	4,950	4,950	+4,950	---
Energy Information Administration	85,314	89,769	89,769	+4,455	---
Non-defense environmental clean up	349,687	310,358	309,946	-39,741	-412
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	556,606	579,368	579,368	+22,762	---
Science	3,596,393	4,101,710	4,131,710	+535,317	+30,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal	148,500	156,420	186,420	+37,920	+30,000
Departmental administration	250,289	278,382	278,382	+28,093	---
Miscellaneous revenues	-121,770	-123,000	-123,000	-1,230	---
Net appropriation	128,519	155,382	155,382	+26,863	---
Office of the Inspector General	41,580	45,507	45,507	+3,927	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	6,369,603	6,407,889	6,412,001	+42,398	+4,112
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,614,839	1,726,213	1,593,101	-21,738	-133,112
Naval reactors	781,605	795,133	795,133	+13,528	---
Office of the Administrator	338,450	386,576	399,576	+61,126	+13,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	9,104,497	9,315,811	9,199,811	+95,314	-116,000
Defense environmental cleanup	6,130,448	5,390,312	5,551,812	-578,636	+161,500
Other defense activities	635,577	717,788	720,788	+85,211	+3,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal	346,500	388,080	388,080	+41,580	---
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,217,022	15,811,991	15,860,491	-356,531	+48,500
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	37,930	40,115	53,726	+15,796	+13,611
Offsetting collection	-32,386	-34,392	-48,003	-15,617	-13,611
Subtotal, O&M, Southeastern Power Administration	5,544	5,723	5,723	+179	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	32,834	34,539	45,139	+12,305	+10,600

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Offsetting collection	-2,970	---	-13,600	-10,630	-13,600
Offsetting collection (P.L. 106-377)	---	-3,000	---	---	+3,000
Subtotal, O&M, Southwestern Power Administration	29,864	31,539	31,539	+1,675	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	511,982	490,770	688,511	+176,529	+197,741
Offsetting collection	-276,210	---	-472,593	-196,383	-472,593
Offsetting collection (P.L. 98-381)	-4,120	-3,705	-3,705	+415	---
Offsetting collection (P.L. 106-377)	---	-274,852	---	---	+274,852
Subtotal, O&M, Western Area Power Administration	231,652	212,213	212,213	-19,439	---
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	2,665	2,500	2,500	-165	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	269,725	251,975	251,975	-17,750	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	218,196	230,800	230,800	+12,604	---
Revenues applied	-218,196	-230,800	-230,800	-12,604	---
Total, title III, Department of Energy	24,046,772	24,074,717	24,373,489	+326,717	+298,772
Appropriations	(24,031,132)	(24,277,717)	(24,630,489)	(+599,357)	(+352,772)
Advance appropriations from previous years	(35,640)	---	---	(-35,640)	---
Rescissions	(-20,000)	(-203,000)	(-257,000)	(-237,000)	(-54,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	64,817	65,472	35,472	-29,345	-30,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	21,812	22,260	22,260	+448	---
Delta Regional Authority	11,880	5,940	5,940	-5,940	---
Denali Commission	49,500	2,536	7,536	-41,964	+5,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	727,032	768,410	808,410	+81,378	+40,000
Revenues	-611,010	-620,328	-656,328	-45,318	-36,000
Subtotal	116,022	148,082	152,082	+36,060	+4,000
Office of Inspector General	8,233	8,144	8,144	-89	---
Revenues	-7,410	-7,330	-7,330	+80	---
Subtotal	823	814	814	-9	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	116,845	148,896	152,896	+36,051	+4,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,572	3,670	3,670	+98	---
Tennessee Valley Authority: Office of Inspector General	---	15,100	---	---	-15,100
Offset	---	-15,100	---	---	+15,100
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	268,426	248,774	227,774	-40,652	-21,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2006
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2007
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grand total	33,598,790	29,980,227	30,526,000	-3,072,790	+545,773
Appropriations	(30,683,601)	(30,271,227)	(30,871,000)	(+187,399)	(+599,773)
Emergency appropriations	(2,899,549)	---	---	(-2,899,549)	---
Rescission	(-20,000)	(-291,000)	(-345,000)	(-325,000)	(-54,000)
Advance appropriations from previous years	(35,640)	---	---	(-35,640)	---