

# Calendar No. 101

113TH CONGRESS }  
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
113-47

---

---

## ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2014

---

JUNE 27, 2013.—Ordered to be printed

---

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

### REPORT

[To accompany S. 1245]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1245) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

#### *New obligatory authority*

Total of bill as reported to the Senate .....	\$34,835,288,000
Amount of 2013 appropriations <sup>1 2</sup> .....	38,687,316,000
Amount of 2014 budget estimate .....	34,972,807,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2013 appropriations .....	– 3,852,028,000
2014 budget estimate .....	– 137,519,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

<sup>2</sup> Includes emergency funding of \$1,889,000,000 in the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-2).

## CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose .....	4
Summary of Estimates and Recommendations .....	4
Title I:	
Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:	
Corps of Engineers—Civil:	
General Investigations .....	24
Construction, General .....	34
Flood Control, Mississippi River, and Tributaries .....	41
Operation and Maintenance, General .....	43
Regulatory Program .....	60
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program .....	61
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies .....	62
General Expenses .....	62
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) .....	63
General Provisions—Corps of Engineers—Civil .....	63
Title II:	
Department of the Interior:	
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Water and Related Resources .....	66
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund .....	75
California Bay-Delta Restoration .....	75
Central Utah Project Completion Account .....	76
Policy and Administration .....	76
Indian Water Rights Settlements .....	77
San Joaquin Restoration Fund .....	77
General Provisions—Department of the Interior .....	77
Title III:	
Department of Energy:	
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy .....	80
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability .....	85
Nuclear Energy .....	86
Fossil Energy Research and Development .....	89
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves .....	90
Strategic Petroleum Reserve .....	90
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve .....	90
Energy Information Administration .....	90
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup .....	91
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund ..	92
Science .....	92
Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy .....	96
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program .....	97
Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program .....	97
Departmental Administration .....	97
Office of the Inspector General .....	99
Weapons Activities .....	100
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation .....	109
Naval Reactors .....	112
Office of the Administrator .....	113
Defense Environmental Cleanup .....	114
Other Defense Activities .....	116
Power Marketing Administrations:	
Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administra-	
tion .....	117
Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administra-	
tion .....	117

	Page
Title III—Continued	
Department of Energy—Continued	
Power Marketing Administrations—Continued	
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, West- ern Area Power Administration .....	117
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund .....	117
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission: Salaries and Expenses .....	118
General Provisions—Department of Energy .....	129
Title IV:	
Independent Agencies:	
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	130
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	130
Delta Regional Authority .....	130
Denali Commission .....	131
Northern Border Regional Commission .....	131
Nuclear Regulatory Commission .....	131
Office of Inspector General .....	132
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	132
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transpor- tation Projects .....	133
Title V: General Provisions .....	134
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	135
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	135
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	136
Budgetary Impact of Bill .....	145
Comparative Statement of Budget Authority .....	146

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2014 beginning October 1, 2013, and ending September 30, 2014, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities, including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Delta Regional Authority, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2014 budget estimates for the bill total \$34,972,807,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals \$34,835,288,000. This is \$137,519,000 above the budget estimates and \$3,852,028,000 below the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

## SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water held three sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2014 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

The recommendations for fiscal year 2014 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

## VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 24 to 6 the Committee on June 27, 2013, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

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

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

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

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

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

The Congress through specific authorizations and appropriations has provided the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers major Federal responsibilities for supporting flood control activities in communities across the Nation; providing navigable channels on the Nation's waterways, ports and harbors; and restoring aquatic ecosystems. The Corps also has authorities to provide water supply, shore protection, hydroelectric power, and to provide recreation opportunities at Corps projects. The Corps is the Federal Government's largest producer of hydropower, and is the number one Federal provider of outdoor recreation. The Corps of Engineers also regulates waters of the U.S. through their Regulatory program.

To meet its responsibilities for these various missions, the Corps of Engineers has built incrementally what now comprises an extensive water resources management infrastructure that includes 694 dams, 12,700 miles of levees in the Federal levee system, and 25,000 miles of deep draft and inland navigation channels and control structures. This infrastructure has been developed over nearly

two centuries, most of it on an individual project basis, within varying contexts of system planning. Large portions of the Corps' water resources infrastructure were built in the first half of the 20th century. Ecosystem restoration related to existing projects, added as a primary missions area for the Corps in 1996, has been a focus of new construction over the last 10–15 years.

While the Corps Civil Works programs impact all 50 States and virtually every citizen of our Nation, they are a relatively minor part of the Federal budget. Funding for the Corps comprises less than 0.13 percent of the total Federal budget for fiscal year 2014.

#### OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Corps of Engineers is composed of \$4,826,000,000 in new budget authority. This amount includes a rescission of \$100,000,000 of previously appropriated funds.

The tradition of this bill has been that virtually all funding for the Corps of Engineers is designated to specific studies/projects. The administration's budget request for fiscal year 2014 continues this tradition. The four major study/project accounts (General Investigations, Construction, General, Mississippi River and Tributaries, and Operation and Maintenance) comprise \$4,307,000,000 of the administration's overall budget request of \$4,826,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers; \$332,938,000 of the budget request in these four accounts is considered as programmatic funding or national programs. That is about 7.7 percent of the funding proposed in these accounts. The remainder of the \$3,974,062,000 proposed in the four major accounts is divided among 919 individual line item studies or projects proposed by the administration. As the Corps of Engineers has no inherent programmatic authorities under which the organization was created, all of these individual studies, projects and programmatic authorities are specifically authorized by Congress and specifically funded through appropriations acts.

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

The line items that were added by Congress in previous years were authorized and vetted in a public process identical to those line items that the administration included in their request. The difference between the items added by Congress and those included by the administration is that the administration applied a number of supplemental criterion for budgeting a study or project that the authorizations for these studies or projects does not require. In most cases, the criteria used for budgeting was not specifically analyzed when a project was studied prior to authorization. Establish-

ment of budget criteria was, and continues to be, an invention of the administration. It should be understood that this criteria is established not necessarily to meet the Nation's water resource needs, but rather to help the administration decide which needs they *choose* to include in their budget request. These are choices made by the administration within the context of *their* priorities. History has shown that this criteria is extremely flexible depending on what an administration wants to fund in a given year. This Committee does not believe that this budget criteria, established by the administration without input from the public or Congress, has any more validity than the criteria that the Congress has used in the past to decide which projects to fund.

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

Nearly all Corps studies and projects are cost shared. That means a local sponsor has contractually agreed to provide a proportionate non-Federal share (in most cases, ranging from 25 percent–50 percent) to match the Federal funds appropriated. When these projects are not provided funding either through the budget or an appropriations act, the work is deferred until funding is appropriated. This inconsistent funding increases project costs, defers the projects benefits to the national economy and plays havoc with the non-Federal entities' financing plans for projects and studies. Traditionally, Congress has provided the consistency for studies and projects undertaken by the Corps of Engineers through congressionally directed spending by maintaining the commitments to local sponsors and insuring consistent levels of funding for the projects or studies that were initiated or funded in appropriation acts.

Overall navigation funding is increased \$135,000,000 in this budget proposal compared to what the administration proposed in fiscal year 2013. The Committee believes this is a positive move by the administration. However, Flood Risk Management is down \$32,000,000 in this budget proposal when compared to fiscal year 2013. The Committee is puzzled by this cut, particularly after record setting floods on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers in 2011 and the impacts to the Atlantic coast from Superstorm Sandy. While \$5,350,000,000 in emergency supplemental funding was provided in January 2013 to address repairs to flood control infrastructure damaged by Superstorm Sandy, that funding did not provide for all of the damages to existing infrastructure from other

natural disasters. The Corps estimates a current backlog of \$400,000,000 in damages due to natural disasters that have yet to be appropriated or budgeted. That means that these damaged projects will remain in their potentially weakened condition. However, one would think that flood control funding should have been increased in the budget request to address the needs and weaknesses in existing flood control infrastructure as well as the needs for new infrastructure that the flooding and other natural disasters revealed.

The General Investigations Program is proposed at \$90,000,000 for fiscal year 2014. This is a decrease of \$34,750,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before the sequester and supplemental disaster appropriations. This account funds the preauthorization studies necessary to determine the Federal interests in a water resource problem or need. The request provides funding for 72 studies for a total of \$39,297,000 of the request. Of that amount, two studies are funded at \$8,285,000. The other 70 studies are funded with the remaining \$31,012,000. Six ecosystem restoration, two deep-draft navigation, one flood damaged reduction, and one nationwide study are proposed as “new study starts” in the request. Nineteen feasibility studies and two preconstruction engineering and design studies are proposed for completion within the amounts requested in the budget.

The Construction, General account is proposed at \$1,350,000,000 for fiscal year 2014. The 74 line items proposed for the Construction, General account can be broken down as follows:

- Dam safety activities \$273,910,000 (20.3 percent);
- Environmental compliance activities comprise \$189,696,000 (14.1 percent);
- Ecosystem or environmental restoration activities comprise \$198,718,000 (14.7 percent);
- Flood control and storm damage reduction activities comprise \$279,827,000 (20.7 percent);
- Coastal or deep draft navigation activities comprise \$100,299,000 (7.4 percent);
- Inland and shallow draft navigation activities comprise \$212,690,000 (15.8 percent); and
- An additional \$94,860,000 is proposed for national programs (7 percent).

This is a decrease of \$320,652,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount for this account before the sequester and supplemental disaster appropriations. This account funds postauthorization studies and physical construction of authorized projects. Dam safety assurance and aquatic ecosystem restoration appear to have taken the biggest reductions when compared to the fiscal year 2013 budget request. One large ecosystem restoration project, one flood control/ecosystem restoration project, one non-structural flood control project, and one deep draft navigation project are proposed as “new construction starts” in the request. Five projects are projected for completion within the amounts requested in the budget.

The Mississippi River and Tributaries account is proposed at \$279,000,000. This account funds studies, construction and operation and maintenance activities along the Mississippi River and

designated tributaries from Cape Girardeau, Missouri, to the Gulf of Mexico. This is an increase of \$27,504,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before the sequester. The increase is primarily due to the addition of two agricultural water supply projects.

The Operation and Maintenance account is proposed at \$2,588,000,000. This is an increase of \$180,824,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before the sequester and supplemental disaster appropriations. This account funds post authorization studies of operating projects, maintenance of Federal facilities and Federal operation of facilities where authorized by law. Recreation funding is proposed at \$252,000,000. At this same funding level in the fiscal year 2013 request, the Corps' budget estimated that 186 partial and 57 full recreation area closings would occur and reduced recreational opportunities would occur at one-third of the budgeted projects. Similar impacts would likely be expected to occur at this funding level for fiscal year 2014. Navigation funding from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund [HMTF] is increased to an estimated \$890,000,000 in the request. This is a \$42,000,000 increase over the fiscal year 2013 request.

The Regulatory Program is proposed at \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2014. This is an increase of \$7,386,000 over the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before the sequester. This program provides the funding for the Corps nationwide regulatory roles primarily under section 404 of the Clean Water Act and section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899.

The Committee is disappointed that funding for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] proposed at \$104,000,000 was cut by \$4,782,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before the sequester. This program was transferred to the Corps from the Department of Energy, because the Committee was concerned with management and cost issues of the program within the Energy Department. This is a program that is being well-managed by the Corps and should have stable, adequate budget resources to continue these radiological clean-up activities. This proposed decrease in funding will further stretch out the clean-up of these sites.

The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account is proposed at \$28,000,000 for fiscal year 2014. This is an increase of \$1,054,000 over the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before the sequester and supplemental disaster appropriations. These funds are proposed for readiness and preparedness activities for the Corps of Engineers.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) is proposed as a separate account for \$5,000,000. This is virtually the same as provided in fiscal year 2013. The Committee continues to believe that the Assistant Secretary's office should be funded in the Defense appropriations bill. However, until such time as this account can be reintegrated into that bill, the Committee agrees that the office should be funded as a separate account. The Assistant Secretary's duties encompass much more than the Civil Works functions of the Corps of Engineers and the budget needs of the office should be addressed separately.

The General Expenses [GE] account is proposed at \$182,000,000 for fiscal year 2014. This is a \$2,630,000 decrease from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before the sequester and supplemental disaster appropriations. The Committee notes that the Corps operates one of the most efficient headquarters staffs in the National Capital region. Only about 3.5 percent of their staffing is at headquarters as opposed to 10 percent or more for comparable agencies in the National Capital region.

#### THE NATION'S WATERWAY SYSTEM

The Nation's waterway system constructed, operated, and maintained by the Corps is an incredibly versatile and interconnected system providing vital linkages to other modes of transportation as well as providing benefits to the national economy of more than \$7,000,000,000 through transportation savings over other available modes of transportation. This system has been developed over the past 200 years and is showing its age. There are many lock chambers that are long past their design life or that need to be enlarged to handle increased traffic. Also, many harbor and channel projects need to be deepened or enlarged to handle contemporary vessel sizes. A major recapitalization of this infrastructure is needed, particularly if the Nation is to meet the President's goal of doubling exports in the next 5 years.

In 1986, two trust funds were set up to fund portions of our navigation infrastructure. The HMTF provides for 100 percent of the maintenance of eligible navigation projects, and the Inland Waterways Trust Fund [IWTF] provides for one-half of the construction cost of designated projects on the Nation's inland waterways. Both of these funds are subject to appropriation. The HMTF does a good job of collecting revenues, but appropriations generally lag considerably behind the collections so the fund balance continues to grow. The IWTF appropriations match the revenue collection, but the revenues collected are insufficient to undertake all of the needed work. Therefore the fund balance is essentially zero.

Past investments have provided adequate, albeit in some cases inefficient, infrastructure to deal with current commodity and cargo movements. Only about 23 percent of the administration's proposed construction budget is dedicated to navigation projects. The budget request for the Corps for improvements and maintenance of the waterway system falls woefully short of the needs. Ports are routinely not dredged to their full authorized dimensions.

The Committee is concerned that there are major changes in worldwide shipping and trade occurring and on the horizon that our Nation's water infrastructure is not equipped to handle. One of these changes is the enlargement and deepening of the Panama Canal that will allow a shift to larger container vessels with a need for deeper ports and navigation channels. However, larger vessels are also transiting the Suez Canal and more and more will likely be attempting to call at the Nation's ports. If larger ships are unable to dock here, they may be forced to dock in other countries with the appropriate infrastructure and then reconfigure ships and cargos to accommodate U.S. water infrastructure, leading to increased transportation costs, higher end-unit prices and loss of jobs.

Along with deeper channels to accommodate these larger vessels, ports will need efficient dockside infrastructure to handle the throughput of this increased trade. Intermodal improvements at ports and possibly short sea shipping will also be a part of trade movements in and among ports. Without this system, transportation of commodities, exports and imports, would become vastly more expensive. For more than 25 years, the current mechanisms have been in place. However, how water transportation infrastructure is planned, designed, constructed, maintained, and funded has not kept pace with the pace of change in worldwide trade.

Water transportation infrastructure was and continues to be a linchpin of our national economy. It is time to determine if there is a better way to develop this infrastructure. The Committee believes it is important for the Congress to rethink the Federal role in water transportation to determine if there is a better way to plan, build and finance this critical infrastructure. The Committee will work with the appropriate authorizing and tax writing committees as well as industry and the administration to determine a path forward to provide the water transportation infrastructure that will be required for the next 50–100 years.

#### INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND

The Committee remains concerned about the Nation's Inland Waterways. This network of waterways moves nearly 600 million tons of cargo annually or 16 percent of our domestic freight. That is 600 million tons of cargo that are not moved on our already overburdened rail and highway system.

The Inland Waterways System includes more than 12,000 miles of waterways that serve 41 States, including all States east of the Mississippi River. The Corps operates 238 lock chambers at 192 sites. Nearly 140 of these locks have been in operation more than 50 years. This means that more than one-half of the lock chambers that are vital parts of the Inland Waterways System have exceeded the economic life of the projects.

These locks, with associated dam structures, along with other waterway features provide other benefits for the Nation's economy such as recreation, hydropower, water supply and in some cases flood control. These other project benefits are a direct result of the construction of these projects to fulfill their navigation purpose.

These lock chambers are in various states of deterioration. A properly funded maintenance program can stave off the inevitable effects of this deterioration. However, it has been a very long time since the Corps budget could be considered adequate to properly fund maintenance of these structures. Inevitably, these structures must be modernized or replaced, depending on the deterioration, if they are to continue to serve the purpose for which they were originally constructed.

Current law provides that maintenance of these structures is funded from the general fund of the Treasury. This funding is intended to cover routine maintenance of the structures that maintain the functionality of the projects. Repairs are becoming more frequent, extensive and costly. Scheduled and unscheduled lock closures for maintenance purposes have almost doubled in the last 10 years.

Whenever improvements to the functionality of the project are considered for implementation they are generally cost shared in the Construction, General account. These improvements can include a major overhaul of the mechanisms that operate the locks to improvements to the foundation or other major structural elements to a complete replacement of an antiquated lock facility. These major rehabilitations or new construction are cost shared. Half comes from the General Treasury and half comes from the IWTF.

The IWTF is funded through a 20-cent-per-gallon tax on fuel used to transit the Inland Waterways System. This tax has remained 20 cents-per-gallon since 1995. Just adjusting the tax for inflation would make the fuel tax 30 cents per gallon to provide equivalent revenues to what was produced by the tax in 1995. It is estimated that more than \$340,000,000 has been lost to the IWTF since 1996 because this tax has not been adjusted for inflation.

However, it is clear that construction costs have risen much faster than revenues available in the IWTF even if they had been adjusted for inflation. Lengthening of project construction schedules due to inadequate funding has caused project costs to increase, but costs have also increased due to other unknown factors.

The Olmsted lock and dam replacement project is a case in point. This one lock and dam is intended to replace the outdated Locks and Dams 52 and 53 on the lower Ohio River. The project was authorized for construction in 1988 for a cost of \$775,000,000. Construction was initiated in 1992 and nearly \$1,700,000,000 has been appropriated towards construction since that time. The twin 1,200-foot long lock chambers are complete and the Tainter gate section of the dam is under construction.

The administration's budget request indicates that the cost of this single large project will have to be increased to \$3,104,000,000, a \$5,000,000 increase since the last estimate reported to Congress in the fiscal year 2013 budget request.

Abandoning the Olmsted project is not a viable option because Locks and Dams 52 and 53 still would have to be replaced. Replacement costs of the two existing structures could easily exceed \$3,000,000,000 on top of the nearly \$1,700,000,000 that has been invested in completing the two replacement lock chambers at Olmsted. This would be an even more expensive option than completing the work on Olmsted. The Corps should make every effort to expedite the construction schedule for this project and reduce any future cost growth.

With all of the work needed to modernize our Inland Waterways System, this funding situation for the inland waterways is intolerable. To make the type of progress necessary to modernize this system in a reasonable period of time, a new financing model must be developed and implemented. Simply increasing the fuel tax will not supply the necessary revenues without a massive increase that would lead to disruptions on the system. A new financing mechanism must be considered, that not only provides the necessary revenues, but has an inflation adjustment factor built into the financing system.

The HMTF tax offers an instructive model to consider for the IWTF. This tax is based on the value of the imports that transit

specific harbors and waterways. The fees are collected by the customs department and deposited into the HMTF to be utilized for the maintenance of these waterways. This tax burden is shared by all who utilize these imported items, whereas the Inland Waterways Tax is only contributed based on the tax collected from the fuel used by vessels transporting cargo on the Inland Waterways System.

It should be noted that the model used for the HMTF provided the bulk of all Federal revenue from 1790 until the eve of World War I, financing most Government operations. This seems an inherently fair way to collect revenue to finance waterways utilized to transport goods and materials that benefit the national economy. Corps projects are justified based on benefits to the national economy, so as the Nation benefits, the Nation should contribute towards the recapitalization of these assets.

The Inland Waterways System is far too important to allow it to continue to languish with inadequate funding and crumbling infrastructure. The Committee has been patiently waiting for six budget cycles for a solution to these problems from the administration and the appropriate congressional committees. The Senate authorizing committee has taken an initial step of attempting to address some of these problems through the Water Resources Development Act process. Due to the uncertainty of the resolution of these issues through the authorizing process, the Committee has decided to take action on its own.

For fiscal year 2014, the Committee has included legislative language directing that no costs for Olmsted Lock and Dam should be drawn from the IWTF. This action will ensure that funding for inland navigation will be consistent with the budget request without impacting the other missions of the Corps.

This action was not taken lightly by the Committee. It is a recognition that something has got to change. It should not be looked at as a permanent solution. This is a 1-year change in the proportionality of the IWTF/General Treasury split for fiscal year 2014. It does not change the ultimate cost sharing for Olmsted. It only delays the inevitable day of reckoning when the costs for Olmsted will have to be brought back into the proper 50/50 balance. Legislation must be enacted to ensure that sufficient funding is available to ensure that this transportation infrastructure will continue to function as designed providing benefits to the national economy.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING FOR INLAND WATERWAYS

The administration segregates the Inland Waterways System into at least two parts for budgeting purposes. Those that are designated as "low use" are given considerably lower budget priority for maintenance dollars than the remainder of the system. While these "low use" waterways may not have a significant impact on the national economy, they exert a tremendous influence on local and regional economies.

When these projects were analyzed for implementation, the maintenance costs for the project's 50-year economic life was calculated as a part of the benefit to cost ratio. One would assume that if the project was constructed, that the project's benefits to the national economy had to exceed the costs (including the mainte-

nance costs) to the national economy. Therefore the budget criterion currently being utilized to determine funding for these projects has nothing to do with the actual economics of the project. It is a an invention of the administration based solely on the tonnage moved. No consideration is given to the economics of whether the project benefits exceed the project costs even though the benefit to cost ratio is the rationale of choice behind other administration funding decisions in the budget request.

The “low use” waterways move more than 50 million tons annually. That obviously pales in comparison to the roughly 550 million tons moved on the “high use” waterways. However, these 50 million tons of cargo would still have to be moved somehow, if they are not moved by water transportation. The only other candidates are truck and rail. It would require 2 million trucks or 455,000 rail cars to move the same amount of cargo that can be moved on 33,500 barges. The shipping costs to the national economy to move the same commodities to the same destinations would likely increase by at least \$500,000,000 by rail or \$1,500,000,000 by truck. The costs cited do not even begin to include the costs to the economy of the increased pollution, the likely increase in transportation fatalities or other costs that would be incurred. If maintenance of all “low use” projects were fully funded, the Corps budget would be increased by less than \$200,000,000. The Committee urges the administration to reconsider this short-sighted budgetary decision in future budget submissions. Shortchanging maintenance for these projects seems to be “pennywise but pound foolish.”

#### HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND

Available revenue from the 0.125 percent tax on the value of imports at designated harbors provides roughly \$1,500,000,000 annually to this fund. Ten-year projections indicate that these collections could increase as much as \$100,000,000 per year. These revenues can be utilized for maintenance on more than 1,500 ports, harbors and waterways. The fiscal year 2014 budget proposes \$890,000,000 for maintenance of commercial waterways and ports to be appropriated from the General Treasury and ultimately reimbursed from the HMTF. This imbalance between receipts and appropriations has led to a surplus in the HMTF of some \$7,900,000,000 which grows annually.

For illustrative purposes, the Committee has included two tables that show the recent history of the HMTF collections (fiscal year 2008–2012) as well as the recent history of the administration’s budget requests for HMTF eligible work (fiscal years 2011–2014). The table is listed alphabetically by State. Due to the lag time involved in the reporting of HMT data it is not possible to include the fiscal year 2013 and 2014 HMTF collections. For HMTF eligible activities proposed by the administration, it should be noted that projects that serve multiple States are only budgeted in a single State. This fact may distort the amounts proposed to be expended in the various States with some States being under-represented and some States being over-represented. It should also be noted that the columns for the fiscal year 2011–2014 administration budget requests only include HMTF eligible work funded through the Corps’ O&M account. In a given year about 90 percent of the

annual HMT expenditures are the result of the Corps' O&M activities.

HARBOR MAINTENANCE TAX COLLECTIONS

State	Fiscal year					Average 2008-2012
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
ALASKA	\$902,435	\$811,756	\$964,509	\$1,132,274	\$1,467,912	\$1,055,777
ALABAMA	11,001,093	6,593,890	7,620,283	10,344,400	10,839,144	9,279,762
CALIFORNIA	416,603,926	318,284,030	372,335,917	431,738,528	462,867,037	400,365,888
CONNECTICUT	2,414,105	1,600,436	1,669,615	1,930,572	1,834,326	1,889,811
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					53	11
DELAWARE	7,652,443	3,740,850	5,410,192	7,026,436	10,026,534	6,771,291
FLORIDA	51,199,550	34,596,137	40,351,122	48,518,886	51,858,142	45,304,767
GEORGIA	51,690,343	40,180,614	50,178,176	62,502,409	68,943,409	54,698,990
HAWAII	6,900,957	4,033,392	4,822,109	6,050,745	7,087,708	5,778,982
ILLINOIS	676,320	397,194	568,165	850,001	392,719	576,880
INDIANA	192,181	290,046	161,060	175,646	516,089	267,004
LOUISIANA	126,962,832	64,400,843	85,797,854	75,120,837	71,661,826	84,788,838
MASSACHUSETTS	12,268,475	8,788,328	9,824,224	11,546,161	12,168,444	10,919,126
MARYLAND	36,233,352	24,294,073	31,818,856	37,000,339	40,413,798	33,952,083
MAINE	3,576,471	2,632,729	2,606,026	3,321,014	3,910,923	3,209,432
MICHIGAN	875,586	537,136	760,384	993,021	735,845	780,394
MINNESOTA	14,462,209	10,915,579	13,190,389	16,024,985	16,037,378	14,126,108
MISSISSIPPI	4,902,810	4,924,842	6,049,838	7,661,123	7,511,907	6,210,104
NORTH CAROLINA	958,318	671,041	844,091	1,282,499	1,017,902	954,770
NEW HAMPSHIRE	18,464,919	8,795,910	6,836,716	7,353,602	9,580,062	10,206,242
NEW JERSEY	174,005,325	133,602,251	155,008,501	182,022,489	196,598,965	168,247,506
NEW YORK	1,913,360	834,013	1,108,898	1,519,422	1,300,850	1,335,309
OHIO	14,626,570	8,491,149	9,374,124	9,039,173	10,899,327	10,486,069
OREGON	41,901,235	24,964,078	30,345,168	41,003,717	32,679,858	34,178,811
PENNSYLVANIA	12,699,338	8,852,039	10,263,781	11,175,861	13,719,366	11,342,077
PUERTO RICO	6,623,161	4,677,071	6,304,664	8,396,153	9,018,230	7,003,856
RHODE ISLAND	49,896,082	35,715,760	38,004,745	44,271,046	49,882,610	43,554,049
SOUTH CAROLINA	219,754,910	130,386,070	161,248,715	200,311,177	216,463,341	185,632,842
TEXAS	43,163,585	32,510,798	35,110,355	37,506,131	43,621,379	38,382,449
VIRGINIA	20,524,649	11,133,342	13,738,664	14,957,337	4,367,137	12,944,226
VIRGIN ISLANDS	80,361,629	62,494,026	71,937,804	78,373,364	89,576,228	76,548,610
WASHINGTON	453,192	183,368	297,321	203,823	216,557	270,852
WISCONSIN						

TOTAL .....	1,433,861,363	990,332,789	1,174,552,264	1,359,353,171	1,447,215,003	1,281,062,918
-------------	---------------	-------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

<sup>1</sup>The estimated HMT receipts are based on the Customs value for waterborne imports multiplied by the .125% HMT rate. Customs value is generally defined as the price actually paid or payable for merchandise when sold for exportation to the U.S. Customs value excludes U.S. import duties, freight, insurance, and other charges incurred in bringing the merchandise to the United States.

<sup>2</sup> Many projects span and serve multiple States, but are budgeted under only one State.

## PRESIDENT'S O&amp;M BUDGET REQUESTS

[Includes coastal O&amp;M only. Excludes MR&amp;T—O&amp;M and Construction for DMDFs, sand mitigation, and beneficial use]

State	Fiscal year				Average 2011-2014
	2011	2012	2013	2014	
ALASKA .....	\$19,450,000	\$17,426,000	\$17,563,000	\$19,683,000	\$18,530,500
ALABAMA .....	23,560,000	23,460,000	31,771,000	27,148,000	26,484,750
CALIFORNIA .....	59,343,000	51,973,000	60,970,000	68,584,000	60,217,500
CONNECTICUT .....	3,610,000	1,850,000	3,550,000	9,950,000	4,740,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA .....	900,000	940,000	925,000	925,000	922,500
DELAWARE .....	40,915,000	43,413,000	45,170,000	44,268,000	43,441,500
FLORIDA .....	26,740,000	32,072,000	36,358,000	43,898,000	34,767,000
GEORGIA .....	25,661,000	20,729,000	25,351,000	29,644,531	25,346,383
HAWAII .....	604,000	1,181,000	737,000	1,713,000	1,058,750
ILLINOIS .....	7,708,000	6,977,000	6,838,000	8,493,000	7,504,000
INDIANA .....	6,056,000	7,036,000	11,276,000	13,237,000	9,401,250
LOUISIANA .....	96,804,000	97,326,000	113,060,000	117,856,000	106,261,500
MASSACHUSETTS .....	15,426,000	16,021,000	7,537,000	8,353,000	11,834,250
MARYLAND .....	20,965,000	16,459,000	18,032,000	24,358,000	19,953,500
MAINE .....	2,365,000	1,850,000	14,800,000	2,150,000	5,291,250
MICHIGAN .....	38,236,000	34,416,000	30,704,000	39,333,140	35,672,285
MINNESOTA .....	6,987,000	7,403,000	5,683,000	5,750,000	6,455,750
MISSISSIPPI .....	10,872,000	7,603,000	10,960,000	10,598,000	10,008,250
NORTH CAROLINA .....	22,357,000	20,945,000	24,960,000	25,960,000	23,555,500
NEW HAMPSHIRE .....	275,000	750,000	275,000	250,000	387,500
NEW JERSEY .....	13,031,000	10,483,000	18,164,000	9,022,000	12,675,000
NEW YORK .....	29,014,000	21,084,000	19,751,000	33,993,000	25,960,500
OHIO .....	22,076,000	18,008,000	18,527,000	20,371,000	19,745,500
OREGON .....	52,251,000	50,254,000	41,321,000	65,654,000	52,370,000
PENNSYLVANIA .....	2,629,000	1,465,000	1,100,000	4,905,000	2,524,750
PUERTO RICO .....	3,700,000	2,700,000	.....	.....	1,600,000
RHODE ISLAND .....	1,750,000	700,000	750,000	350,000	887,500
SOUTH CAROLINA .....	17,390,000	20,124,000	21,348,000	21,300,000	20,040,500
TEXAS .....	66,962,000	68,713,000	76,530,000	87,575,000	74,945,000
VIRGINIA .....	18,793,000	18,038,000	17,794,000	20,881,000	18,876,500
VIRGIN ISLANDS .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
WASHINGTON .....	23,896,000	25,896,000	42,992,000	24,820,000	29,401,000
WISCONSIN .....	4,609,000	3,694,000	3,468,000	4,355,000	4,031,500
TOTAL .....	684,935,000	650,989,000	728,265,000	795,377,671	714,891,668

## LEVEE SAFETY

One positive outcome from the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina was that the public became more aware of the levees that protect their communities. This new awareness resulted in an examination of the conditions of these projects. Concurrent with this new awareness was the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] map modernization program for flood insurance rate maps. With this remapping came the issue of certification of existing levees and the need to determine how safe these levees are. All of these factors have combined to cause a great deal of uncertainty.

The Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act was enacted with the intention to alleviate some of these uncertainties. The Committee directs the United States Army Corps of Engineers [USACE] and the Department of Homeland Security to ensure the plain language of the levee accreditation provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act are met, and that flood maps reflect protection provided by levees included in the Corps Inspection of Completed Works program that meet FEMA's accreditation standards without requiring non-

Federal sponsors to hire private engineers to fill information gaps left by Federal agencies. The Committee expects a July 2013 delivery of the Flood Protection Structure Accreditation Task Force report that was required by the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act.

While the Committee would like to believe that engineered structures will never fail, the reality is that all engineered structures have the potential for failure if the right set of circumstances happen at the right time. Risk is inherent in any man-made structure and the Corps is charged with balancing that risk with the costs of the risk reduction measures. The cost for risk-free protection is more than the Nation has been willing to consider for any project. There are always trade-offs. This is especially true with flood control structures. There is always a larger flood, or an unknown or unaccounted for failure mode that can cause the structure to fail. The Committee looks to the Corps to propose and build structures to protect people based on the risks that they may face and to communicate the residual risk that people protected by these structures still face. It should be understood that while the structures mitigate risk, they do not eliminate it.

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

#### LEVEE VEGETATION

The Committee is aware of the Corps' updated draft policy regarding the consideration of vegetation variances for levees, and appreciates the work of Corps Districts and Divisions in working with affected levee sponsors and systems. The Committee is aware that the Engineer Research and Development Center completed an initial research effort to advance the Corps' knowledge and understanding of the effects of woody vegetation on levees which indicated that minimal data exists on the scientific relationship between woody vegetation and levees. The Committee urges the Corps to continue to conduct additional scientific research on this topic. The Committee strongly encourages the Corps to take seriously its requirements under the Endangered Species Act and in meeting tribal treaty obligations, and to clarify how it will apply those considerations in the final vegetation variance policy.

#### PLANNING PROGRAM

The Committee is pleased that the Corps continues to review its planning program and is trying to make it more responsive to the local sponsors and Congress. The Committee is supportive of the Corps' announced 3-3-3 concept to reduce the maximum level of cost of completing a feasibility study to 3 years and the sum spent

to \$3,000,000. While better, faster and cheaper sounds desirable, in the Committee's experience only 2 out of those 3 items ultimately get delivered. In the pursuit of the 3-3-3 plan the Committee would caution the Corps that transferring tasks and costs to either the preconstruction engineering and design phase or the construction phase of the project is not really a solution—it just repackages the problem.

The Committee remains concerned about the inconsistent nature of the planning process across the Corps. While shortening the planning process to 3 years is a laudable goal, the Committee recognizes that some timeframes within the planning process are statutory and cannot be shortened and some studies require a more in-depth look. Items such as determining the future without project conditions and determining the array of alternatives that should be considered require careful evaluation. The bedrock of any Corps study remains these assumptions that are made at the beginning of the planning process. If they are given short shrift, then the recommendations of the planning study will be suspect.

There are certain times when speed is truly essential. One such case is when an area with a flood control system that currently is certified to meet the 100-year standard has a change in estimates of river flow conditions. In such a case the communities need to act to make improvements quickly to minimize the time they may be found out of compliance with the 100-year standard. In such cases, where speed is of the essence additional flexibility regarding the requirements should be considered.

What is clear is that a one-size-fits-all approach will not work due to the great variations in problems and needs throughout the country. More consistency as to how these problems and needs are evaluated should be the goal. The importance of these study reports cannot be overstated. They are the basis from which all of the Corps' work is derived and Congress depends heavily on these planning reports to inform the decisionmaking process for authorizing and funding these infrastructure investments. The Committee will continue to monitor the progress of improving the consistency of the planning process.

#### CREDIT FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS

The Committee is aware that on February 17, 2012, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) issued ER 1165-2-208. This ER implemented the Secretary's decision of May 5, 2011, to no longer award credit for advance construction performed by non-Federal interests under section 104 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. The Committee is concerned that this decision may create a disincentive for non-Federal interests to construct urgently needed flood damage reduction projects. The Committee urges the Assistant Secretary to consider credits under section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, even when an associated Federal study has not yet reached the milestone required under ER 1165-2-208, if a preponderance of the following factors would support the issuance of credit: (1) the proposed construction is an improvement or modification to an existing federally authorized levee system; (2) the proposed construction will significantly follow an existing levee alignment, especially in reaches where the existing levee

alignment protects existing infrastructure; (3) the proposed construction will provide increased flood protection at least 36 months sooner than a future federally constructed project is likely to be able to; and (4) the proposed construction addresses areas with a high degree of flood damage risk or have previously flooded.

#### LEVELS OF SERVICE AT LOCKS AND DAMS

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

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

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

Where service levels at locks have been reduced, the Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers is authorized to open locks independently of the established levels of service for specific and unique activities where such opening and closing will be advantageous to fostering economic and community development. Local economies across the country experience economic windfalls by using locks and dams for commercial and recreational use, such as fishing tournaments which are unrelated to commercial barge traffic. The Committee is encouraged that the Corps has given local communities assurances that, within their current statutory au-

thority, they will be sensitive to related impacts on local economies. The Committee expects the Corps will consider economic incentives unrelated to commercial barge traffic when presented with requests by local communities for specific and unique activities requiring locks to be operated outside of established levels of service.

#### CONTINUING CONTRACTS AND REPROGRAMMING

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

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

#### NEW STARTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

The Committee has recommended funding for new starts this year. The Committee feels this is prudent since no new starts have been provided for the Corps since fiscal year 2010 while 83 studies; which includes 34 reconnaissance studies, 39 feasibility studies, and 10 preconstruction engineering and design studies; and 37 construction projects have been completed since that time.

The Committee recognizes that we are in a constrained budget environment and that environment will likely continue for the remainder of the decade. However, the Committee believes that new investment opportunities should be presented to Congress for consideration. Also, some previously authorized projects should be reviewed to ensure that they are still economically viable, environmentally sustainable and technically sound. For these reasons, the Committee has recommended the ten new study starts proposed by the administration within the General Investigations Account.

The Committee is including the following new starts proposed in the administration's budget request for fiscal year 2014: Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Delaware, and the District of Columbia; Englebright and Daguerre Point Dams (Yuba River), California; Louisiana Coastal Comprehensive Study; Houston Ship Channel, Texas; Coyote Dam, California; Dry Creek (Warm Springs), California; Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration, Texas; Seattle Harbor, Washington; Salton Sea, California; and the Water Resources Priorities Study.

The Committee also believes that investments in our infrastructure are investments in our economy and that these investments should also be continued even during constrained budgets as the benefits to the economy from these projects continue for decades. The Committee recommends the following four new construction starts proposed in the administration budget request: Hamilton City, California Flood Protection and Ecosystem Restoration; Louisiana Coastal Area, Louisiana; Lower Colorado River Basin, Onion Creek, Texas; and Columbia River at the Mouth, Oregon and Washington.

In addition, the Secretary is directed to propose a single group of new starts to the House and Senate Appropriation Committees within 45 days of enactment of this act as a part of the work plan.

The new starts shall consist of five additional new study starts and three additional new construction starts. The majority of the benefits of the selected new starts must be derived from navigation, storm damage reduction or the flood control mission areas of the Corps. The Committee understands that there are more than ninety potential new studies and more than thirty construction projects that meet this criteria. The Committee is recommending this new start proposal to provide balance to the ecosystem restoration new starts proposed in the administration's budget request. By allowing the administration to select these additional new start studies and projects and directing that they come from the navigation and flood control mission areas of the Corps the Committee is attempting to ensure that the Corps' future programs will continue to balance the various missions of the Corps.

#### SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE

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

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

#### CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

Congressionally directed spending has become synonymous with earmarks in recent debates, even for agencies such as the Corps of Engineers where the majority of the budget request is based on individual line item studies and projects. Due to this ongoing debate, the Committee has voluntarily refused all congressionally directed spending requests for fiscal year 2014. That means that the administration has total discretion as to how the funding that this Committee appropriates will be spent as it relates to individual studies and projects. The Committee has retained the traditional tables for each of the four major accounts delineating the 919 line items requested by the President in the budget request. Due to inadequacies in the administration's budget request, the Committee has also inserted additional line item funding under the nationwide heading for specific categories of studies or projects that the Committee feels are underrepresented in the administration's budget request. The Corps has discretion within the guidelines provided in each ac-

count as to which line items this additional funding will be applied to. The Committee has not included any congressionally directed spending as defined in section 5(a) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1 2</sup> .....	\$174,750,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	90,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	120,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

<sup>2</sup> Includes emergency funding of \$50,000,000 in the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113-2).

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

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

The Committee has provided for a balanced planning program for fiscal year 2014 with 15 new study starts—10 from the budget request and an additional five to be selected based on the Corps’ prioritization process and included as a part of the General Investigations work plan.

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

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

it also shows the level of commitment of the Federal Government to these cost-sharing sponsors. The display of the table in this manner should not be interpreted by the administration that Congress supports a new start decision for each study phase nor does Congress intend for the administration to budget individual phases as new starts.

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

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

Project title	Budget estimate			Committee recommendation		
	RECON	FEAS	PED	RECON	FEAS	PED
ALABAMA						
MOBILE HARBOR, AL .....			600			600
ALASKA						
ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK .....		750			750	
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK .....		100			100	
MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK .....		200			200	
ARKANSAS						
LOWER MISSISSIPPI RESOURCE ASSESSMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN .....		99			99	
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR AND MO .....		650			650	
CALIFORNIA						
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA .....		800			800	
COYOTE VALLEY DAM RESTORATION, CA .....	100			100		
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) RESTORATION, CA .....	100			100		
LOS ANGELES RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA .....		400			400	
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA .....		800			800	
SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY, CA .....		466			466	
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA .....		500			500	
SAC-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES, CA .....		447			447	
SALTON SEA RESTORATION, CA .....	200			200		
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA .....		700			700	
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, LOWER SAN JOAQUIN, CA .....		751			751	
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE, CA .....		1,035			1,035	
YUBA RIVER FISH PASSAGE, CA .....	100			100		
YUBA RIVER, CA .....						
COLORADO						
CACHE LA POUDBRE, CO .....		300			300	
FLORIDA						
FLAGLER COUNTY, FL .....		390			390	

GEORGIA	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	1,280			
HAWAII	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	400	400		
	HILO HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HI	775	775		
	WEST MAUI WATERSHED, MAUI, HI	538	538		
ILLINOIS	ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	400	400		
	INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES—MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES, IL, IN, OH, AND WI	3,000	3,000		
KANSAS	BRUSH CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	229	229		
	MANHATTAN, KS	300	300		
KENTUCKY	GREEN AND BARREN DISPOSITION, KY	150	150		
LOUISIANA	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	750	750		
	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, LA	100	100		
	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	3,321	3,321		1,964
MARYLAND	ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD	500	500		
	ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MD	500	500		
	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	400	400		
	CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD, PA, AND VA	250	250		
MASSACHUSETTS	BOSTON HARBOR DEEP DRAFT, MA	400	400		
MINNESOTA	MINNESOTA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MN AND SD (MINNESOTA RIVER AUTHORITY)	350	350		
	MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION, MO	450	450		

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

Project title	Budget estimate			Committee recommendation		
	RECON	FEAS	PED	RECON	FEAS	PED
<b>MONTANA</b>						
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT .....		750			750	
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>						
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH AND VT .....		400			400	
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH AND MA .....		200			200	
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>						
DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, NJ .....		375			375	
DELAWARE RIVER DREDGE MATERIAL UTILIZATION, NJ .....		300			300	
HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ .....		200			200	
PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ .....		240			240	
PECKMAN RIVER BASIN, NJ .....		291			291	
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>						
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM .....		300			300	
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO, AND TX .....		300			300	
<b>NEW YORK</b>						
HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, NY AND NJ .....		550			550	
WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, BYRAM RIVER BASIN, NY AND CT .....		100			100	
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>						
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC .....			450			450
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC .....			225			225
WILMINGTON HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, NC .....		500			500	
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>						
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, ND, MN, SD, AND MANITOBA, CANADA .....		433			433	
<b>OREGON</b>						
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA .....		450			450	
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR .....		200			200	

SOUTH CAROLINA							
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	1,165	1,165				1,165	
TEXAS							
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	385	385				385	
COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY, TX	100	100				100	
DALLAS FLOODWAY, UPPER TRIMITY RIVER BASIN, TX	850	850				850	1,200
FREEMPORT HARBOR, TX	488	488				488	
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	100	100	1,200			100	
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	650	650				650	
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	400	400				400	
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	800	800				800	
VIRGINIA							
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (DEEPENING)	400	400				400	
WASHINGTON							
GRAYS HARBOR, WA	200	200				200	
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	100	100				100	
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	650	650				650	
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA							
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES	1,150	32,028	6,119	1,150	32,028	4,839	
REMAINING ITEMS							
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:							
FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION						2,000	
FLOOD CONTROL						8,000	
SHORE PROTECTION						5,000	
NAVIGATION						3,000	
COASTAL AND DEEP-DRAFT						6,000	
INLAND						4,000	
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE						3,000	
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES						2,000	
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE						2,000	
REMOTE, COASTAL, OR SMALL WATERSHED						3,000	
COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES:							
ACCESS TO WATER DATA		750				750	
COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS		100				100	

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

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	RECON	FEAS	RECON	FEAS
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS:				
CALIFED .....		100		100
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM .....		75		75
COORDINATION WITH OTHER WATER RESOURCE AGENCIES .....		500		500
GULF OF MEXICO .....		100		100
INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT .....		500		500
INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT .....		955		955
INVENTORY OF DAMS .....		400		400
LAKE TAHOE .....		100		100
PACIFIC NW FOREST CASE .....		10		10
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS .....		1,350		1,350
FERC LICENSING .....		200		200
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES .....		4,000		4,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA:				
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD .....		350		350
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION .....		1,000		1,000
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES .....		75		75
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA .....		220		220
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES .....		9,500		9,500
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES .....		250		250
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES .....		200		200
PRECIPITATION STUDIES .....		225		225
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT .....		75		75
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS .....		50		50
STREAM GAGING .....		550		550
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS .....		950		950
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....		16,143		17,923
OTHER—MISC:				
INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW .....		300		300
NATIONAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM .....		5,000		5,000
NATIONAL SHORELINE .....		675		675
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM .....		4,000		4,000

TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM .....	1,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
WATER RESOURCES PRIORITIES STUDY .....	1,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NATIONAL FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,500	.....
SUBTOTAL .....	1,150	82,731	6,119	1,150	123,011	4,839	.....
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	- 9,000	.....	.....
TOTAL .....	1,150	82,731	6,119	1,150	114,011	4,839	.....
GRAND TOTAL .....	.....	90,000	.....	.....	120,000	.....	.....

*Mobile Harbor, Alabama.*—The Committee supports the President's budget request for this study and expects the Corps to conduct the study to account for the full depth as authorized in section 201 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

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

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

*Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota.*—In the aftermath of two successive years of management challenges on the Missouri River due to flood and drought, the Committee recognizes the importance of developing information to better inform public policy decisions. The Committee urges the Corps to reinstate the review of the original project purposes based on the Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended, and other subsequent relevant legislation and judicial rulings to determine if changes to the authorized purposes of the existing Federal water resources infrastructure may be warranted to provide solutions to these management challenges.

*Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.*—The fiscal year 2014 budget request does not reflect the extent of need for project studies funding. The Corps has numerous continuing studies that will be suspended under the limits of the budget request. These studies could lead to projects with significant economic benefits, particularly by increasing national competitiveness through marine transportation improvements and by avoiding damages caused by flooding and coastal storms. The Committee recommends additional funds to continue ongoing studies. None of these funds may be used for any item where funding was specifically denied. While this additional funding is shown in the feasibility column, the Corps should utilize these funds in any applicable phase of work. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either was not included in the administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. Ongoing studies that are actively progressing and can utilize the funding in a timely manner are eligible for these additional funds.

The five new study starts directed as part of the work plan shall be funded from the appropriate additional funding line item. It should be understood that the Committee intends that there be only fifteen new study starts in fiscal year 2014. When considering which new study starts to propose, the administration should give higher priority to those studies that are regional in scope, have the potential to provide greater national benefits, address endangered

species concerns or provide protection to large numbers of our citizens. Additionally, recognizing the constrained fiscal environment, the administration should give careful consideration to the outyear budget impacts of the studies that they choose as well as whether there appears to be an identifiable local sponsor that will be ready and able to provide the necessary cost shares for the feasibility and preconstruction engineering and design phases of the study phase. These new studies should be conducted utilizing the Corps  $3 \times 3 \times 3$  approach and completed as expeditiously as possible. As all of these studies are to be chosen by the administration (either through the budget request or through the work plan, it should be understood that all are equal and should be appropriately budgeted for in future budgets submissions to ensure they meet the  $3 \times 3 \times 3$  approach).

Funding associated with each category may be allocated to any eligible study within that category; funding associated with each subcategory may be allocated only to eligible studies within that subcategory. The list of subcategories is not meant to be exhaustive. The Committee directs that priority in allocating these funds be given to funding the five new starts directed by the Committee, completing or accelerating ongoing studies which will enhance the Nation's economic development, job growth, and international competitiveness, are for projects located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters, or are for areas where revisions to flood frequency flow lines may result in a situation where existing infrastructure no longer meets the requirements under the National Flood Insurance program.

Within 45 days of enactment of this act, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is to be accomplished. The Committee directs that a listing should accompany the work plan showing all the ongoing studies that were considered eligible and could have used funding for fiscal year 2014 and the reasons why these items were considered as being less competitive for inclusion in the work plan.

*Water Resources Priorities Study.*—Rather than fund the Water Resources Priorities Study requested in this account or the Reducing Civil Works Vulnerability Study requested in the O&M account, the Committee is funding a study that would be a combination of the two. The Committee believes that the goals of these studies are not mutually exclusive and if the study results are going to be used to set priorities, then modifications to existing infrastructure should be prioritized along with new infrastructure needs. The Committee believes that this study should examine the flood risks across the Nation in light of the conditions today and projecting the conditions into the future based on the best available science. Priority should be given to urban population centers that are currently at risk from flooding or are anticipated to be at risk based on scientific projections. As current flood control infrastructure continues to age, the viability of that infrastructure should be evaluated to determine, based on the best scientific information, how and whether that infrastructure will remain effective in the future. The report should make recommendations that include not only the usual structural measures, where no or inadequate infra-

structure currently exists, but should also include recommendations for modifications of existing infrastructure to allow it to be repurposed or deauthorized, as appropriate, to meet projected needs. This should be a forward-looking report that could make nonstructural recommendations concerning ways to accommodate potential sea level rise and its impacts on threatened coastal or riverine flood plains. While these are solutions that may necessarily be locally driven, the report recommendations should include ways for the Federal Government to incentivize local jurisdictions to undertake these socially and economically difficult alternatives. The Corps should refer to this study in all future documents as the National Flood Risk Assessment Study.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1 2</sup> .....	\$5,131,652,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	1,350,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,542,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

<sup>2</sup> Includes emergency funding of \$3,461,000,000 in the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–2).

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

The administration request for the Construction, General account is \$1,350,000,000, a decrease of \$320,652,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before sequester and supplemental disaster appropriations. By the Committee’s estimate, less than 60 percent of the needed funding is available in this account. Construction will slip due to constrained funding and benefits to the national economy will be deferred. As the Committee has noted over the last 8 years the funding proposed for this account appears to be “penny-wise and pound foolish.” As was noted in this report last year, lack of investment in this infrastructure has lead to another Katrina-style disaster along the east coast due to incomplete or damaged flood control or shore protection infrastructure. We are again expending billions trying to restore and accelerate the construction of the infrastructure that failed at a much greater cost than if the work had been planned and budgeted for in a more thoughtful manner.

The Committee recommendation includes \$1,542,000,000 in new budget authority for this account. The Committee recognizes that this is considerably less than the needs in the program but is the best that can be accomplished in this constrained fiscal environment. The Committee rejects the \$100,000,000 rescission proposed in the administration’s budget request.

The Committee has provided for seven new construction starts in fiscal year 2014—four new construction starts proposed in the

budget request and three to be selected based on the Corps' prioritization process and included as a part of the Construction, General work plan.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA .....	2,500	2,500
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODS), CA .....	66,400	66,400
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA .....	3,150	3,150
HAMILTON CITY, CA .....	15,000	15,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA (DAM SAFETY) .....	28,200	28,200
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA .....	3,200	3,200
OAKLAND HARBOR (50-FOOT PROJECT), CA .....	100	100
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA .....	3,000	3,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA .....	42,000	42,000
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA .....	1,800	1,800
FLORIDA		
FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL .....	5,200	5,200
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL) .....	86,000	86,000
NASSAU COUNTY, FL .....	9,000	9,000
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL .....	7,700	7,700
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL .....	88,000	88,000
TAMPA HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL, FL .....	3,380	3,380
GEORGIA		
LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA .....	50	50
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC .....	880	880
SAVANNAH HARBOR DISPOSAL AREAS, GA AND SC .....	8,000	8,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA .....	.....	1,280
TYBEE ISLAND, GA .....	300	300
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR) .....	400	400
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL .....	27,600	27,600
EAST ST. LOUIS, IL .....	12,855	12,855
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT LOCK AND DAM, IL (MAJOR REHAB) .....	11,400	11,400
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL .....	25,500	25,500
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL AND KY .....	163,000	163,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO, AND WI .....	31,968	31,968
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, DEFICIENCY CORRECTION AND RECONSTRUCTION, IL .....	20,860	20,860
INDIANA		
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN .....	5,000	5,000
IOWA		
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND, AND SD .....	70,000	70,000
KANSAS		
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO .....	6,000	6,000
KENTUCKY		
ROUGH RIVER, KY (MAJOR REHAB) .....	5,800	5,800
LOUISIANA		
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA .....	10,543	10,543
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA .....	1,000	1,000

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

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE, MD .....	1,200	1,200
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD AND VA .....	5,000	5,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD .....	18,400	18,400
MASSACHUSETTS		
MUDDY RIVER, MA .....	8,000	8,000
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO .....	3,012	3,012
KANSAS CITIES, MO AND KS .....	11,000	11,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO AND IL .....	49,690	49,690
MONARCH—CHESTERFIELD, MO .....	2,000	2,000
NEW JERSEY		
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ .....	200	200
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA, AND DE .....	20,000	20,000
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ .....	500	500
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ .....	400	400
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ .....	11,000	11,000
NEW YORK		
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY .....	300	300
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ .....	49,000	49,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC .....	6,800	6,800
WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC .....	8,000	8,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND .....	4,000	4,000
OHIO		
BOLIVAR DAM, OH (DAM SAFETY) .....	32,500	32,500
DOVER DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY) .....	3,750	3,750
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE, OK .....	16,300	16,300
OREGON		
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA .....	1,000	1,000
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR AND WA .....	250	250
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR .....	1,183	1,183
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA .....	7,080	7,080
PENNSYLVANIA		
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA .....	21,500	21,500
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3, AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA .....	1,960	1,960
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEEVE RAISING) .....	1,000	1,000
PUERTO RICO		
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR .....	17,250	17,250
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC .....	226	226
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN .....	36,500	36,500

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX .....	2,500	2,500
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN (WHARTON/ONION), TX .....	3,000	3,000
VIRGINIA		
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA .....	300	300
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR, AND ID .....	101,553	101,553
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA .....	8,500	8,500
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA .....	2,000	2,000
MOUNT SAINT HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA .....	600	600
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV .....	30,000	30,000
WISCONSIN		
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI .....	1,900	1,900
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES .....	1,255,140	1,256,420
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:		
FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION .....		20,000
FLOOD CONTROL .....		50,000
SHORE PROTECTION .....		30,000
NAVIGATION .....		30,000
INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND PROJECTS .....		40,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES .....		10,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE .....		5,000
ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS .....		50,000
HYDROPOWER PROJECTS .....		2,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM .....		4,000
CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC LEGISLATION:		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206) .....	6,100	8,000
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTIONS 204, 207, 933) .....	5,000	7,000
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205) .....	7,900	13,000
NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111) .....	500	1,300
NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107) .....		3,700
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135) .....	9,500	10,500
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103) .....		2,500
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM .....	45,000	45,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION .....	19,000	19,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE .....	60	60
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE .....	800	800
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 106-457) .....	1,000	1,000
RESTORATION OF ABANDONED MINES .....		1,000
SUBTOTAL .....	94,860	357,860
SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE .....		-72,280
TOTAL .....	1,350,000	1,542,000

*Savannah Harbor Expansion, Georgia.*—The administration budget request for this item that was proposed in the GI account has been moved to this account where it has been funded since fiscal year 2009.

*Muddy River, Massachusetts.*—Funds recommended for this project may be used for both flood risk management and environmental restoration.

*Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.*—The Corps has ongoing, authorized construction projects that would cost tens of billions of dollars to complete, yet the administration continues to request a mere fraction of the funding necessary to complete those projects. The Committee recommends additional funds to continue ongoing projects and activities to enhance the Nation's economic growth and international competitiveness. The intent of these funds is for ongoing work that either was not included in the administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. None of these funds shall be used for projects in the Continuing Authorities Program. Ongoing construction projects that are actively progressing and can utilize the funding in a timely manner are eligible for these additional funds. This includes periodic beach renourishments.

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

For environmental infrastructure assistance the Committee recognizes that these authorities were originally created to assist communities that were unable to compete well in the State-wide revolving fund authorities under the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency. While the Committee believes it appropriate to prioritize those projects with the greater economic impact, it recognizes that such rigid criteria may exclude rural underserved communities with greater needs. The Committee encourages the Corps to reserve at least 15 percent of these funds for communities that are rural by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's definition and in counties or parishes where the average family income is below the national poverty level.

The three new project starts directed as part of the work plan shall be funded from the appropriate additional funding line-item. The Committee intends only seven new construction starts in fiscal year 2014.

It should be understood that the administration may substitute new starts from their budget request if it appears they cannot or

don't meet the criteria above or the additional criteria below. The administration shall select the three new construction projects from the primary mission areas of navigation, flood risk management and shore protection. When considering which new starts to include in the work plan, the applicable criteria previously discussed should be considered. Additional factors that should be considered for all new starts include: the outyear budget impacts of the proposed new starts; the cost sharing sponsor's ability and willingness to promptly provide their cash contribution (if any) as well as required lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations and disposal areas; the sponsor's willingness and ability to execute a project partnership agreement during the fiscal year period covered by this act; and the benefits of the project to the local population.

Within 45 days of enactment of this act, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed. The Committee directs that a listing should accompany the work plan showing all the ongoing construction projects that were considered eligible and could have used funding for fiscal year 2014 and the reasons why these items were considered as being less competitive for inclusion in the work plan.

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

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

The Committee has included a total of \$50,000,000 spread over the eight CAP sections for work in fiscal year 2014. The Committee urges the administration to execute the program laid out by the Committee and include funding for this program in future budgets.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Restoration of Abandoned Mines.*—The Corps is directed to work closely with those Federal land management agencies, Western States and tribes with abandoned non-coal mine sites so that the greatest number of those sites presenting threats to public health and safety can be addressed in a cost-effective manner.

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

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$251,496,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	279,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	300,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

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

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INVESTIGATIONS		
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, STORM WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, TN .....	100	100
SUBTOTAL, INVESTIGATIONS .....	100	100
CONSTRUCTION		
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR .....	5,000	5,000
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR .....	22,000	22,000
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN .....	58,015	58,015
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN .....	22,829	22,829
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA .....	3,500	3,500
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA .....	1,750	1,750
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	113,094	113,094
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN .....	76,978	76,978
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR .....	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR .....	250	250
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR .....	287	287
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR .....	193	193
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, AND TN .....	8,479	8,479
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO .....	5,900	5,900
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA .....	1,839	1,839
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR .....	1,142	1,142
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL .....	170	170
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY .....	100	100
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA .....	9,747	9,747
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA .....	1,521	1,521
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA .....	69	69
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA .....	48	48
BONNET CARRE, LA .....	2,188	2,188
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA .....	1,007	1,007
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA .....	456	456
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA .....	472	472
OLD RIVER, LA .....	8,118	8,118
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA .....	2,414	2,414
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS .....	24	24
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS .....	130	130
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS .....	42	42
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS .....	5,354	5,354
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS .....	185	185
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS .....	4,777	4,777

## MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS .....	788	788
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS .....	5,164	5,164
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS .....	1,273	1,273
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS .....	6,493	6,493
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS .....	944	944
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M. WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS .....	375	375
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS .....	526	526
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS .....	714	714
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO .....	200	200
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO .....	4,760	4,760
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN .....	80	80
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN .....	1,803	1,803
SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	155,043	155,043
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:		
DREDGING .....		5,000
FLOOD CONTROL .....		11,000
WATER SUPPLY AND RELATED AUTHORIZED PURPOSES .....		13,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PURPOSES .....		5,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA .....	9,700	9,700
MAPPING .....	1,063	1,063
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS .....	10,763	44,763
REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE .....		– 13,000
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES .....	279,000	300,000

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

The Committee directs that priority in allocating these funds be given to completing or accelerating ongoing work which will enhance the region and Nation's economic development, job growth and international competitiveness, or is located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters. Within 45 days of enactment of this act, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed. The Committee directs that a listing should accompany the work plan showing all the studies and construction projects that were considered eligible and could have used funding for fiscal year 2013 and the reasons why these items were considered as being less competitive for inclusion in the work plan.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1 2</sup> .....	\$3,228,176,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	2,588,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,700,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

<sup>2</sup> Includes emergency funding of \$821,000,000 in the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–2).

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

Maintenance of our aging water infrastructure inventory gets more expensive every year; however, it is consistently underfunded. If this trend continues, the Corps will not be able to maintain expected levels of service at all of its projects. The Committee is pleased that the budget request increases spending from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund by \$42,000,000 over the fiscal year 2013 budget request. The Committee has increased funding in this account in order to provide \$1,000,000,000 in expenditures from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for fiscal year 2014.

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

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

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA-COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL .....	250	250
ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL .....	16,327	16,327
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL .....	25,436	25,436
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL .....	5,469	5,469
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL .....	100	100
MOBILE HARBOR, AL .....	27,000	27,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL .....	148	148
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL AND MS .....	1,820	1,820
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS .....	23,431	23,431
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA .....	8,562	8,562
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK .....	9,431	9,431
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK .....	2,921	2,921
COOK INLET SHOALS, AK .....	6,188	6,188
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK .....	1,080	1,080
HOMER HARBOR, AK .....	487	487
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK .....	155	155
LOWELL CREEK TUNNEL (SEWARD) AK .....	150	150
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK .....	400	400
NOME HARBOR, AK .....	1,244	1,244
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK .....	853	853
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ .....	1,103	1,103
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ .....	101	101
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ .....	907	907
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ .....	53	53
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ .....	319	319
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR .....	7,187	7,187
BLAKELY MT. DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR .....	7,938	7,938
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR .....	1,909	1,909
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR .....	11,564	11,564
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR .....	7,750	7,750
DEGRAY LAKE, AR .....	5,637	5,637
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR .....	1,902	1,902
DIERKS LAKE, AR .....	1,586	1,586
GILLHAM LAKE, AR .....	1,735	1,735
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR .....	7,405	7,405
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR .....	26	26
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR .....	517	517
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR .....	28,558	28,558
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR .....	2,706	2,706
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR .....	5,841	5,841
NIMROD LAKE, AR .....	2,016	2,016
NORFORK LAKE, AR .....	8,148	8,148
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR .....	15	15
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA .....	9,786	9,786
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR .....	6,287	6,287
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR .....	2	2
WHITE RIVER, AR .....	31	31
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR .....	3	3
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA .....	2,564	2,564
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA .....	2,052	2,052
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA .....	3,277	3,277
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA .....	5,151	5,151
FARMINGTON DAM, CA .....	490	490
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA .....	2,067	2,067
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA .....	2,730	2,730
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CA .....	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA .....	3,987	3,987
ISABELLA LAKE, CA .....	1,282	1,282
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA .....	4,809	4,809
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA .....	6,440	6,440

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA .....	400	400
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA .....	353	353
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA .....	2,353	2,353
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA .....	2,593	2,593
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA .....	1,937	1,937
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA .....	22,069	22,069
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA .....	1,600	1,600
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA .....	3,593	3,593
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA .....	1,663	1,663
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA .....	2,750	2,750
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA .....	7,000	7,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30-FOOT PROJECT), CA .....	1,500	1,500
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA .....	1,437	1,437
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA .....	200	200
SAN FRANCISCO BAY DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA .....	864	864
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL) .....	3,100	3,100
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA .....	3,025	3,025
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA .....	5,573	5,573
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA .....	750	750
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA .....	3,865	3,865
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA .....	2,665	2,665
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA .....	1,435	1,435
SUCCESS LAKE, CA .....	2,563	2,563
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA .....	2,026	2,026
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA .....	2,417	2,417
VENTURA HARBOR, CA .....	4,071	4,071
YUBA RIVER, CA .....	301	301
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO .....	912	912
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO .....	1,847	1,847
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO .....	1,947	1,947
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CO .....	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO .....	322	322
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO .....	2,668	2,668
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO .....	608	608
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO .....	1,680	1,680
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT .....	666	666
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT .....	744	744
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT .....	411	411
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT .....	1,067	1,067
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CT .....	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT .....	268	268
LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT .....	500	500
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT .....	1,081	1,081
NEW HAVEN HARBOR, CT .....	8,600	8,600
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT .....	434	434
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT .....	850	850
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT .....	679	679
THOMASTON DAM, CT .....	821	821
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT .....	678	678
DELAWARE		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DE .....	40	40
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY .....	18,918	18,918
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE .....	200	200
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE .....	5,405	5,405
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC .....	115	115

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL) .....	875	875
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC .....	25	25
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC .....	25	25
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL .....	4,398	4,398
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL .....	14,791	14,791
ESCAMBIA AND CONECHU RIVERS, FL AND AL .....	34	34
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL .....	1,500	1,500
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL .....	250	250
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL .....	9,014	9,014
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL, AND GA .....	8,117	8,117
MANATEE HARBOR, FL .....	3,365	3,365
MIAMI HARBOR, FL .....	4,355	4,355
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL .....	2,467	2,467
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL .....	2,500	2,500
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL .....	2,070	2,070
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL .....	300	300
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL .....	1,465	1,465
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL .....	3,500	3,500
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL .....	35	35
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL .....	9,053	9,053
TAMPA HARBOR, FL .....	10,400	10,400
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA .....	8,165	8,165
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL, AND FL .....	1,324	1,324
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA .....	164	164
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA .....	5,311	5,311
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA .....	8,971	8,971
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA .....	8,128	8,128
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC .....	10,728	10,728
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA .....	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA .....	180	180
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC .....	9,939	9,939
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA .....	161	161
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC .....	8,707	8,707
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA .....	24,065	24,065
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA .....	202	202
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL .....	7,518	7,518
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI .....	434	434
HILO HARBOR, HI .....	206	206
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI .....	206	206
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI .....	885	885
KAHULUI HARBOR, HI .....	206	206
NAWILIWILI HARBOR, HI .....	206	206
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI .....	683	683
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID .....	1,244	1,244
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID .....	4,802	4,802
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID .....	358	358
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID .....	2,383	2,383
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID .....	580	580
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN .....	4,912	4,912
CARLYLE LAKE, IL .....	5,542	5,542
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL .....	2,264	2,264
CHICAGO RIVER, IL .....	680	680

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL .....	312	312
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL AND IN .....	39,581	39,581
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL AND IN .....	3,891	3,891
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL .....	50	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL .....	2,556	2,556
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL .....	1,928	1,928
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL .....	739	739
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL .....	5,711	5,711
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION), IL .....	63,739	63,739
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION), IL .....	26,319	26,319
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL .....	106	106
REND LAKE, IL .....	5,581	5,581
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL .....	706	706
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL .....	472	472
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN .....	1,791	1,791
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN .....	2,079	2,079
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN .....	1,175	1,175
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE, IN .....	1,798	1,798
INDIANA HARBOR, IN .....	10,973	10,973
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN .....	1,008	1,008
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN .....	1,310	1,310
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN .....	1,466	1,466
MONROE LAKE, IN .....	1,148	1,148
PATOKA LAKE, IN .....	1,140	1,140
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN .....	185	185
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN .....	1,241	1,241
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN .....	135	135
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA .....	4,368	4,368
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA .....	656	656
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO, AND NE .....	8,384	8,384
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND, AND SD .....	2,200	2,200
RATHBUN LAKE, IA .....	3,192	3,192
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA .....	4,721	4,721
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA .....	11,330	11,330
KANSAS		
BRUSH CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO .....		
CLINTON LAKE, KS .....	2,453	2,453
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS .....	1,859	1,859
EL DORADO LAKE, KS .....	1,011	1,011
ELK CITY LAKE, KS .....	1,107	1,107
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS .....	1,192	1,192
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS .....	1,129	1,129
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS .....	983	983
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS .....	1,565	1,565
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS .....	1,431	1,431
MARION LAKE, KS .....	2,081	2,081
MELVERN LAKE, KS .....	2,173	2,173
MILFORD LAKE, KS .....	2,375	2,375
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS .....	1,382	1,382
PERRY LAKE, KS .....	2,323	2,323
POMONA LAKE, KS .....	2,004	2,004
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS .....	355	355
TORONTO LAKE, KS .....	896	896
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS .....	2,093	2,093
WILSON LAKE, KS .....	2,343	2,343

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

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
<b>KENTUCKY</b>		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN .....	9,828	9,828
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY .....	2,671	2,671
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY .....	1,829	1,829
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY .....	1,712	1,712
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY .....	1,861	1,861
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY .....	1,025	1,025
DEWEY LAKE, KY .....	1,754	1,754
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY .....	15	15
FALLS OF THE OHIO NATIONAL WILDLIFE, KY AND IN .....	19	19
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY .....	2,019	2,019
GRAYSON LAKE, KY .....	1,498	1,498
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY .....	2,055	2,055
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY .....	2,733	2,733
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY .....	1,033	1,033
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY .....	10	10
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY .....	1,940	1,940
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY .....	1,089	1,089
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY .....	250	250
NOLIN LAKE, KY .....	2,781	2,781
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, AND OH .....	43,435	43,435
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA, AND WV .....	5,500	5,500
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY .....	1,179	1,179
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY .....	2	2
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY .....	2,693	2,693
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY .....	1,344	1,344
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY .....	8,467	8,467
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY .....	1,135	1,135
<b>LOUISIANA</b>		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, LA .....	8,912	8,912
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA .....	264	264
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA .....	1,204	1,204
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA .....	1,053	1,053
BAYOU PIERRE, LA .....	23	23
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA .....	63	63
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA .....	15	15
BAYOU TECHE, LA .....	165	165
CADDO LAKE, LA .....	207	207
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA .....	16,240	16,240
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA .....	1,695	1,695
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA .....	24,524	24,524
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA .....	1,467	1,467
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA .....	1,174	1,174
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA .....	8,795	8,795
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA .....	15	15
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA .....	4	4
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA .....	1,370	1,370
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA .....	2,177	2,177
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LA .....	84,074	84,074
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA .....	59	59
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA .....	200	200
WALLACE LAKE, LA .....	222	222
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA .....	17	17
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA .....	66	66
<b>MAINE</b>		
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME .....	1,050	1,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, ME .....	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME .....	95	95
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME .....	1,100	1,100

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME .....	25	25
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD .....	22,083	22,083
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL) .....	325	325
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV .....	150	150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD .....	135	135
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV .....	1,913	1,913
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD .....	450	450
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD .....	62	62
WICOMICO RIVER, MD .....	1,500	1,500
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA .....	785	785
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA .....	788	788
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA .....	600	600
CAPE COD CANAL, MA .....	9,834	9,834
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA .....	301	301
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA .....	315	315
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA .....	549	549
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA .....	629	629
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, MA .....	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA .....	306	306
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA .....	673	673
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA .....	762	762
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, .....	434	434
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA .....	900	900
TULLY LAKE, MA .....	793	793
WEST HILL DAM, MA .....	700	700
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA .....	606	606
MICHIGAN		
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR, MI .....	173	173
DETROIT RIVER, MI .....	5,814	5,814
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI .....	658	658
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI .....	1,800	1,800
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI .....	230	230
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI .....	50	50
MONROE HARBOR, MI .....	1,000	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI .....	670	670
SAGINAW RIVER, MI .....	3,837	3,837
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI .....	25	25
ST. CLAIR RIVER, MI .....	649	649
ST. MARYS RIVER, MI .....	29,403	29,403
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI .....	2,653	2,653
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE—WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD .....	242	242
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI .....	5,987	5,987
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN .....	484	484
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN .....	622	622
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN .....	232	232
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION), MN .....	53,014	53,014
ORWELL LAKE, MN .....	441	441
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN .....	87	87
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN .....	149	149
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN .....	3,344	3,344
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN .....	462	462
MISSISSIPPI		
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS .....	1	1
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS .....	255	255

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

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS .....	3,082	3,082
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS .....	135	135
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS .....	34	34
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS .....	1,650	1,650
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS .....	7,294	7,294
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA .....	162	162
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS .....	154	154
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS .....	10	10
YAZOO RIVER, MS .....	23	23
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO .....	12	12
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO .....	6,501	6,501
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO .....	3,579	3,579
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO .....	9,165	9,165
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO .....	1,557	1,557
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO .....	927	927
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO .....	1,007	1,007
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO AND IL .....	40,303	40,303
NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MO .....	23	23
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO .....	2,297	2,297
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO .....	14	14
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO .....	205	205
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO .....	1,587	1,587
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO .....	1	1
STOCKTON LAKE, MO .....	4,609	4,609
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR .....	8,585	8,585
MONTANA		
FT. PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT .....	5,540	5,540
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT .....	177	177
LIBBY DAM, MT .....	1,812	1,812
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT .....	243	243
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD .....	9,352	9,352
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE .....	12,609	12,609
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE .....	449	449
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA .....	92	92
PAPILLION CREEK, NE .....	938	938
SALT CREEKS AND TRIBUTARIES, NE .....	1,075	1,075
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV .....	73	73
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA .....	1,061	1,061
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV .....	337	337
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH .....	733	733
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH .....	572	572
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH .....	863	863
HOPKINTON—EVERETT LAKES, NH .....	1,402	1,402
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH .....	61	61
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH .....	664	664
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH .....	250	250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH .....	663	663
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ .....	420	420
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ .....	375	375
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ .....	15	15

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA, AND DE .....	19,745	19,745
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NJ .....	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ .....	466	466
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ .....	315	315
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ .....	260	260
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ .....	5,000	5,000
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ .....	605	605
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ .....	1,797	1,797
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ .....	220	220
RARITAN RIVER, NJ .....	100	100
SHARK RIVER, NJ .....	500	500
SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ .....	20	20
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIJU DAM, NM .....	2,772	2,772
COCHITI LAKE, NM .....	3,241	3,241
CONCHAS LAKE, NM .....	2,143	2,143
GALISTEO DAM, NM .....	822	822
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NM .....	30	30
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM .....	676	676
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM .....	1,533	1,533
RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, NM .....	2,500	2,500
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM .....	1,280	1,280
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM .....	547	547
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM .....	735	735
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM .....	1,438	1,438
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY .....	576	576
ARKPORT DAM, NY .....	434	434
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY .....	300	300
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY .....	1,770	1,770
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY .....	1,420	1,420
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY .....	400	400
EAST RIVER, NY .....	100	100
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY .....	220	220
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY .....	682	682
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY .....	250	250
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT) .....	2,100	2,100
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O AND C) .....	2,100	2,100
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NY .....	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY .....	1,526	1,526
JAMAICA BAY, NY .....	100	100
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY .....	20	20
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY .....	4,014	4,014
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY .....	5,869	5,869
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ .....	100	100
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY .....	6,740	6,740
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY AND NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL) .....	9,300	9,300
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS) .....	1,100	1,100
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY .....	2,089	2,089
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY .....	20	20
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY .....	800	800
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY .....	590	590
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY .....	710	710
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC .....	1,600	1,600
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC .....	1,647	1,647
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC .....	485	485
FALLS LAKE, NC .....	1,767	1,767
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC .....	261	261

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC .....	1,200	1,200
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC .....	150	150
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC .....	5,357	5,357
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC .....	700	700
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC .....	300	300
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC .....	300	300
W. KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC .....	3,372	3,372
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC .....	17,803	17,803
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN HALEY, ND .....	224	224
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND .....	12,327	12,327
HOMME LAKE, ND .....	236	236
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND .....	384	384
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND .....	1,233	1,233
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND .....	1,186	1,186
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND .....	247	247
SOURIS RIVER, ND .....	344	344
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND .....	32	32
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH .....	1,508	1,508
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH .....	1,030	1,030
BERLIN LAKE, OH .....	1,925	1,925
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH .....	1,781	1,781
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM, OH .....	1,847	1,847
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH .....	7,345	7,345
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH .....	1,030	1,030
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH .....	1,696	1,696
DELAWARE LAKE, OH .....	1,693	1,693
DILLON LAKE, OH .....	1,513	1,513
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH .....	2,000	2,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH .....	694	694
LORAIN HARBOR, OH .....	1,350	1,350
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH .....	41	41
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH .....	1,127	1,127
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH .....	1,126	1,126
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH .....	8,639	8,639
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH .....	301	301
OHIO—MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH .....	1,849	1,849
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH .....	1,446	1,446
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH .....	305	305
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH .....	35	35
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH .....	1,440	1,440
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH .....	249	249
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH .....	5,871	5,871
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH .....	995	995
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH .....	939	939
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE, OH .....	1,226	1,226
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK .....	623	623
BIRCH LAKE, OK .....	725	725
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK .....	5,704	5,704
CANTON LAKE, OK .....	2,193	2,193
COPAN LAKE, OK .....	869	869
EUFULA LAKE, OK .....	6,496	6,496
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK .....	6,560	6,560
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK .....	883	883
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK .....	376	376
HEYBURN LAKE, OK .....	596	596
HUGO LAKE, OK .....	2,866	2,866

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
HULAH LAKE, OK .....	875	875
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK .....	180	180
KAW LAKE, OK .....	3,463	3,463
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK .....	4,890	4,890
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK .....	5,374	5,374
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK .....	4,946	4,946
OPTIMA LAKE, OK .....	44	44
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK .....	146	146
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK .....	1,279	1,279
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK .....	7,442	7,442
SARDIS LAKE, OK .....	1,412	1,412
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK .....	1,000	1,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK .....	1,866	1,866
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK .....	9,395	9,395
WAURIKA LAKE, OK .....	1,340	1,340
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK .....	5,026	5,026
WISTER LAKE, OK .....	1,800	1,800
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR .....	1,250	1,250
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR .....	571	571
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA .....	7,477	7,477
CHETCO RIVER, OR .....	21	21
COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLAND, OR .....	34,517	34,517
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA .....	18,217	18,217
COOS BAY, OR .....	6,069	6,069
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR .....	1,470	1,470
COUGAR LAKE, OR .....	2,002	2,002
DETROIT LAKE, OR .....	1,083	1,083
DORENA LAKE, OR .....	1,070	1,070
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR .....	2,259	2,259
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR .....	1,999	1,999
GREEN PETER—FOSTER LAKES, OR .....	2,392	2,392
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR .....	1,327	1,327
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, OR .....	20	20
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR .....	578	578
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA .....	4,502	4,502
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR .....	9,345	9,345
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR .....	3,156	3,156
MENARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA .....	6,909	6,909
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR .....	400	400
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR .....	104	104
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR .....	32	32
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR .....	5,794	5,794
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR .....	60	60
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR .....	81	81
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR .....	681	681
YAUQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR .....	2,000	2,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA .....	4,892	4,892
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA .....	699	699
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA .....	274	274
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA .....	1,250	1,250
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA .....	2,841	2,841
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA .....	1,393	1,393
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA .....	1,970	1,970
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA .....	1,352	1,352
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA .....	803	803
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ .....	4,735	4,735
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA .....	1,194	1,194

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA .....	814	814
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM, PA .....	954	954
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA .....	320	320
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, PA .....	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA .....	1,213	1,213
JOHNSTOWN, PA .....	64	64
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA .....	1,325	1,325
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA .....	2,723	2,723
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA .....	1,168	1,168
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA .....	11,035	11,035
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH AND WV .....	30,905	30,905
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH AND WV .....	359	359
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA .....	170	170
PROMPTON LAKE, PA .....	475	475
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA .....	34	34
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA .....	3,717	3,717
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA .....	45	45
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA .....	1,718	1,718
STILLWATER LAKE, PA .....	425	425
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA .....	103	103
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA .....	2,199	2,199
TIONESTA LAKE, PA .....	1,939	1,939
UNION CITY LAKE, PA .....	450	450
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA .....	1,102	1,102
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA .....	723	723
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD .....	2,147	2,147
RHODE ISLAND		
FOX POINT BARRIER, NARRANGANSETT BAY, RI .....	1,750	1,750
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, RI .....	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI .....	45	45
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI .....	350	350
WOONSOCKET, RI .....	759	759
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC .....	14,825	14,825
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC .....	5,600	5,600
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC .....	66	66
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC .....	875	875
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD .....	10,165	10,165
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD .....	377	377
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD .....	1,116	1,116
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD .....	10,405	10,405
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD .....	146	146
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN .....	554	554
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND .....	12,796	12,796
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN .....	7,285	7,285
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN .....	7,011	7,011
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN .....	6,992	6,992
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN .....	7,295	7,295
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN .....	96	96
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN .....	4,822	4,822
NORTHWEST TENNESSEE REGIONAL HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, TN .....	10	10
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN .....	9,845	9,845
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN .....	2	2
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN .....	22,675	22,675
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN .....	219	219

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX .....	1,285	1,285
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI .....	1,591	1,591
BARDWELL LAKE, TX .....	1,850	1,850
BELTON LAKE, TX .....	3,613	3,613
BENBROOK LAKE, TX .....	2,774	2,774
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX .....	3,200	3,200
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX .....	2,884	2,884
CANYON LAKE, TX .....	2,978	2,978
CEDAR BAYOU, TX .....	100	100
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX .....	400	400
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	7,250	7,250
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX .....	11,227	11,227
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX .....	43	43
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX .....	3,400	3,400
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX .....	8,300	8,300
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX .....	6,300	6,300
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX .....	3,200	3,200
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX .....	2,800	2,800
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX .....	2,133	2,133
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX .....	2,641	2,641
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX .....	28,885	28,885
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX .....	1,652	1,652
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	30,150	30,150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX .....	1,813	1,813
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX .....	1,758	1,758
JOE POOL LAKE, TX .....	1,008	1,008
LAKE KEMP, TX .....	285	285
LAVON LAKE, TX .....	3,114	3,114
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX .....	3,277	3,277
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	5,200	5,200
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX .....	3,153	3,153
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX .....	2,271	2,271
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX .....	957	957
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX .....	1,004	1,004
PROCTOR LAKE, TX .....	2,438	2,438
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX .....	325	325
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX .....	1,412	1,412
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX .....	16,050	16,050
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX .....	7,020	7,020
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX .....	224	224
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX .....	3,090	3,090
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX .....	2,013	2,013
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	4,300	4,300
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX .....	100	100
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX .....	3,093	3,093
WACO LAKE, TX .....	3,404	3,404
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX .....	2,306	2,306
WHITNEY LAKE, TX .....	8,557	8,557
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX .....	4,511	4,511
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT .....	52	52
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT .....	541	541
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN, VT .....	1,003	1,003
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT .....	220	220
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND NY .....	30	30
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT .....	895	895
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT .....	800	800

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT .....	804	804
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT .....	870	870
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA .....	2,160	2,160
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA .....	1,170	1,170
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA .....	710	710
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA .....	2,262	2,262
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR, VA (DRIF .....	1,458	1,458
HAMPTON ROADS, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS) .....	88	88
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, VA .....	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA .....	359	359
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA .....	3,801	3,801
JOHN H. KERR LAKE, VA AND NC .....	10,895	10,895
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA .....	2,128	2,128
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA .....	400	400
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA .....	12,426	12,426
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA .....	547	547
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA .....	5,190	5,190
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA .....	1,368	1,368
RUDEE INLET, VA .....	400	400
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, VA .....	130	130
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA .....	100	100
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA .....	637	637
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR .....	878	878
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR, AND ID .....	3,350	3,350
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA .....	1,749	1,749
GRAYS HARBOR, WA .....	9,965	9,965
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA .....	3,296	3,296
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA .....	4,574	4,574
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA .....	53	53
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA .....	1,093	1,093
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA .....	9,416	9,416
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA .....	2,710	2,710
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA .....	9,621	9,621
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA .....	2,480	2,480
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA .....	2,423	2,423
MOUNT SAINT HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA .....	260	260
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA .....	3,543	3,543
OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA .....	603	603
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA .....	606	606
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA .....	1,075	1,075
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA .....	500	500
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA .....	110	110
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA .....	280	280
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA .....	78	78
TACOMA HARBOR, WA .....	1,894	1,894
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA .....	148	148
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR .....	3,150	3,150
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV .....	1,472	1,472
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV .....	1,914	1,914
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV .....	2,564	2,564
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV .....	2,310	2,310
ELKINS, WV .....	56	56
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV .....	461	461
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV .....	11,528	11,528
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY, AND OH .....	32,046	32,046
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY, AND OH .....	3,113	3,113

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV .....	2,457	2,457
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV .....	1,184	1,184
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV .....	3,348	3,348
SUTTON LAKE, WV .....	2,328	2,328
TYGART LAKE, WV .....	1,839	1,839
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI .....	734	734
FOX RIVER, WI .....	2,005	2,005
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI .....	3,367	3,367
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI .....	61	61
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI .....	700	700
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI .....	288	288
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI .....	20	20
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI .....	540	540
WYOMING		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WY .....	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY .....	123	123
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY .....	2,374	2,374
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY .....	121	121
SUBTOTAL, .....	2,411,388	2,411,388
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:		
NAVIGATION MAINTENANCE .....		10,000
DEEP-DRAFT HARBOR AND CHANNEL .....		95,000
INLAND WATERWAYS .....		23,000
SMALL REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE NAVIGATION .....		30,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PURPOSES .....		5,000
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH .....	690	690
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT .....	4,750	4,750
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS PROGRAMS:		
STEWARDSHIP SUPPORT PROGRAM .....	1,000	1,000
PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM .....	4,000	4,000
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM .....	1,650	1,650
OPTIMIZATION TOOLS FOR NAVIGATION .....	392	392
COASTAL AND OCEAN DATA SYSTEM .....	3,000	5,000
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM .....	2,700	2,700
RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AT CORPS PROJECTS .....	5,000	5,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION) .....	4,500	4,500
DREDGE MCFARLAND READY RESERVE .....	11,840	11,840
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE .....	12,000	12,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM .....	1,150	1,150
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH [DOER] .....	6,450	6,450
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM [DOTS] .....	2,820	2,820
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM .....	270	270
FACILITY PROTECTION [CISP] .....	5,500	5,500
FERC HYDROPOWER COORDINATION .....	3,000	3,000
FISH & WILDLIFE OPERATING FISH HATCHERY REIMBURSEMENT .....	4,700	4,700
GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL .....	600	600
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS .....	3,000	3,000
INTERAGENCY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TASK FORCE/HURRICANE .....	8,125	8,125
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS .....	30,000	30,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS .....	6,920	6,920
NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY .....	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL (MULTIPLE PROJECT) NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT .....	8,673	8,673
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM .....	6,300	8,300
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM (PORTFOLIO RISK ASSESSMENT) .....	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM [NEPP] .....	6,750	6,750
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATIONS .....	571	571

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT .....	300	300
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS .....	50	50
REDUCING CIVIL WORKS VULNERABILITY .....	1,000	.....
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS .....	500	500
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS .....	4,771	4,771
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION .....	825	825
RECREATIONONESTOP (RIS) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION .....	215	215
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM .....	1,800	4,000
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB .....	300	300
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) .....	500	500
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS .....	176,612	344,812
REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE .....	.....	-56,200
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	2,588,000	2,700,000

*Perdido Pass, Alabama.*—The Committee encourages the Corps to conduct an updated survey of the need for maintenance dredging of Perdido Pass.

*Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana.*—The Calcasieu Ship Channel connects the city of Lake Charles, Louisiana, with the Gulf of Mexico. The Port of Lake Charles is the 11th largest seaport in the United States due to the tonnage handled for various industries via the Channel. The channel is highly important to the U.S. and local economy and is often busy with a variety of industrial and recreational traffic. The Committee recognizes that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has done a significant amount of work to dredge the channel, but more work still needs to be done to increase the width of the waterway to accommodate the size and number of vessels the channel can handle. The Committee urges the Corps to make dredging of the Calcasieu Ship Channel a priority in order to maintain its fine safety record and allow the importation/exportation of materials so valuable to the local and global economy.

*Beneficial Use of Dredge Material.*—The Secretary is urged to conduct a pilot disposal and sediment project to determine the cost-effectiveness of pump-out disposal operations for hopper dredges involving the transportation of material to established disposal sites. A non-Federal sponsor must fund the additional cost in excess of the least cost method of dredge material disposal. No more than 1 year after the date of the selection of this pilot project, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that provides a comparison of the cost effectiveness of operations described above compared to the least cost disposal method generally used when and where the pilot project is selected. The report must describe the resultant environmental benefits of the operations, including ecosystem enhancement, wave attenuation, sediment retention, and storm surge reduction. The report must also provide a comparison of operations described above and district-wide operation and maintenance dredging activities, including an analysis of means, methods, quantities, and costs both cumulatively and for beneficial use.

*Zebra and Quagga Mussels.*—The Committee understands the challenges posed by the invasion of quagga and zebra mussels in various places across the country, and that invasion has not yet occurred in the Pacific Northwest and Lake Tahoe. Given the significant Federal assets in the region, it would seem prudent to determine the vulnerabilities of the infrastructure. The Committee recognizes the work that is underway, but believes more can and should be done to prevent invasion. Portions of the country are already dealing with these invasive species and the lessons learned should be applied to developing a strategy of minimizing the impacts to vulnerable infrastructure in this region. The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers in partnership with the Bonneville Power Administration, to continue its efforts to develop invasive mussel vulnerability assessments for federally owned hydropower projects, in the Pacific Northwest, including an estimate of the annual cost of protection and maintenance of this infrastructure, if applicable. Further, the Committee urges the Corps, where appropriate, to assist the States in their efforts to prevent the spread of invasive mussels to Federal projects in the region.

*Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.*—The fiscal year 2014 budget request does not fund operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of our Nation's aging infrastructure sufficiently to ensure continued competitiveness in a global marketplace. Federal navigation channels maintained at only a fraction of authorized dimensions, and navigation locks and hydropower facilities well beyond their design life result in economic inefficiencies and risks infrastructure failure, which cause substantial economic losses. The Committee believes that investing in operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of infrastructure today will save taxpayers money in the future.

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

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

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

Within 45 days of enactment of this act, the Corps shall provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed. The plan should include: (1) the ratings system developed and used to evaluate projects; (2) a summary of the work to be accomplished with each allocation; and (3) a list and description of each discrepancy between the results of the project evaluations and the allocations made. No funds shall be obligated for any project in the work plan which has not been justified in such a report. The Committee directs that a listing should accompany the work plan showing all the ongoing projects that were considered eligible and could have used funding for fiscal year 2013 and the reasons why these items were considered as being less competitive for inclusion in the work plan.

*Reducing Civil Works Vulnerability.*—No funding is included for this new item. However, the Committee has combined the intent of this study within the Water Resources Priority Study funded in the General Investigations account and changed the name to the National Flood Risk Assessment Study.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$192,614,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	200,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	200,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

An appropriation of \$200,000,000 is recommended for the regulatory program of the Corps of Engineers.

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

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

The Committee believes compensatory mitigation is appropriate for a permitted activity when that activity damages or destroys the value of wetlands. However, the Committee is concerned about the rigid application of the Modified Charleston Method [MCM] in the Lower Mississippi River Valley and the associated adverse impacts it is having on essential public works projects along existing and established flood protection alignments. It is the Committee’s belief that the six factor categories which determine compensatory miti-

gation requirements under MCM provide the requisite flexibility to reduce mitigation requirements for vital levee and related flood control projects. However, the significant increase in mitigation costs resulting from MCM have dramatically and negatively affected property values and economic development initiatives in the Lower Mississippi River Valley. The Corps is directed to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment of this act the ways in which compensatory mitigation is calculated for critical infrastructure projects that have sought to avoid and minimize all impacts to adjacent wetlands. This report should also include proposals for alternative mitigation strategies and recommendations for increasing supply-side mitigation opportunities that would make compensatory mitigation activities more cost competitive.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$108,782,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	104,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	195,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$195,000,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] in fiscal year 2014.

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

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

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

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

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

#### FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1 2</sup> .....	\$1,034,996,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	28,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	28,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

<sup>2</sup> Includes emergency funding of \$1,008,000,000 in the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–2).

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

#### GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1 2</sup> .....	\$194,630,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	182,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	182,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

<sup>2</sup> Includes emergency funding of \$10,000,000 in the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (division A of Public Law 113–2).

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommendation is \$182,000,000.

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

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

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

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

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

The Corps is reminded that General Expense funds are appropriated solely for the executive management and oversight of the Civil Works Program under the direction of the Director of Civil Works.

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

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$4,992,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	5,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

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

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

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The bill includes language concerning reprogramming guidelines.

Section 102. The bill includes language concerning continuing contracts and the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

Section 103. The bill includes a provision requested by the administration providing the Corps of Engineers authorization for

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

Section 104. The bill includes language concerning funding transfers requested by the administration related to fish hatcheries.

Section 105. The bill includes language concerning a project cost increase requested by the administration for the Olmsted Lock and Dam Project.

Section 106. The bill includes language concerning a project deauthorization in Massachusetts.

Section 107. The bill includes language concerning a project deauthorization in Illinois.

Section 108. The bill includes language concerning the deauthorization of a portion of a project in Rhode Island.

Section 109. The bill contains language concerning a project cost increase requested by the administration for the Little Calumet, Indiana, project.

Section 110. The bill contains language concerning the combining of two projects and the sharing of credits between two projects in Florida.

Section 111. The bill contains language concerning a technical fix for a project in Florida requested by the administration.

Section 112. The bill contains language concerning the Cape Arundel disposal site in Maine.

Section 113. The bill contains language concerning the Little Rock district of the Corps of Engineers.

Section 114. The bill contains language concerning the Chicago District of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee is concerned by recent proposals by the Corps of Engineers to relocate and consolidate administrative staff from the Chicago District of the Corps of Engineers to other Districts in the Great Lakes region. The Committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report detailing any proposals to relocate and consolidate administrative staff among Corps Districts, including plans impacting the Chicago District. This report should be submitted prior to relocating or consolidating administrative staff and include estimated cost savings derived from proposed relocations, consolidations, and transfers of functions, timelines for accomplishing proposals, impact on jobs in each affected city and plans to ensure that critical functions are not diminished by implementation of such proposals.

TITLE II  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION  
INTRODUCTION

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

While Reclamation only has projects in the 17 Western States, its programs impact the entire Nation. Reclamation is the largest wholesaler of water in the country, operating 348 reservoirs with a total storage capacity of 245 million acre-feet. Reclamation projects deliver 10 trillion gallons of water to more than 31 million people each year, and provide 1 out of 5 Western farmers (140,000) with irrigation water for 10 million acres of farmland that produce 60 percent of the Nation's vegetables and 25 percent of its fruits and nuts. Reclamation manages, with partners, 289 recreation sites that have 90 million visits annually.

OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The fiscal year 2014 budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation is composed of \$1,049,584,000 in new budget authority. The budget request is \$3,881,000 more than the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before sequester. Accounting for the Central Utah Project, the Department of the Interior's request for this bill is \$17,077,000 less than the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before sequester.

The budget request for Reclamation includes \$3,500,000 for the Central Utah Project that the administration has proposed to integrate under Reclamation's jurisdiction as a separate account. The Committee has accepted this proposal. The administration's request for Indian water rights settlements (\$78,661,000) and the San Joaquin River Restoration Fund (\$26,000,000) are requested as separate accounts.

The Committee believes that the budget request, particularly for the Water and Related Resources account, is inadequate to fund the water and power needs in the West. Aging infrastructure continues to be a major concern as to whether projects will continue to provide the benefits to the economy for which they were con-

structed. New stresses on water supplies from population growth to drought require innovative ways to wring every bit of efficiency that is possible out of the existing infrastructure. While rural water funding is increased over last year’s request, it is still inadequate to allow any of these projects to make substantial progress towards completion.

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund is proposed at \$53,288,000 for fiscal year 2014. This is an increase of \$247,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before sequester. This account is primarily funded from revenues collected from water and power customers. Levels of funding in this account are based on a 3-year rolling average of revenues collected.

The California Bay-Delta Restoration account is proposed at \$37,000,000 for fiscal year 2014. This is down \$2,572,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before sequester.

The Policy and Administration account is requested at \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2014. This is an increase of \$120,000 from the fiscal year 2013 enacted amount before sequester.

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$893,210,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	791,135,000
Committee recommendation .....	945,796,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

An appropriation of \$945,796,000 is recommended by the Committee for the Bureau of Reclamation. This includes the budget request for Water and Related Resources. Also included within this amount are the proposed funding levels for Indian Water Rights Settlements and the San Joaquin River Restoration under this account.

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

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

FEDERAL PREFERENCE POWER FOR RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Committee recognizes that in some areas, power prices have increased significantly, increasing costs to Reclamation projects that lack power supplies. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the Federal power marketing administrations, state utility regulators, and private utilities to find ways to supply Federal preference power for pumping project water at

authorized Reclamation irrigation projects that lack power supplies, and the Committee requests that the Bureau report to the Committee on the progress of such efforts within 180 days.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

The budget for the Bureau of Reclamation consists of individual line-items of projects. As presented by the President, the budget contains 195 specific line-item requests for directed spending by the administration. An additional 46 line-item requests for funding by the administration are for nationwide line-items. All of these line-items were specific requests by the administration to be funded in fiscal year 2014. The administration did not request these funds programmatically, but rather requested them for a specific project in a specific location for a specific purpose.

Congressionally directed spending has become synonymous with earmarks in recent debates, even for agencies such as the Bureau of Reclamation where the majority of the budget request is based on individual line-item studies and projects. Due to this ongoing debate, the Committee has voluntarily refused all congressionally directed spending requests for fiscal year 2014. Accordingly, the administration has total discretion as to how the funding that this Committee appropriates will be spent as it relates to individual studies and projects. The Committee has retained the traditional table for the Water and Related Resources account delineating the line-items requested by the President in the budget request. Due to inadequacies in the administration's budget request, the Committee has also inserted some additional line-item funding under the Regional Programs heading for specific categories of studies or projects that the Committee feels are underrepresented in the administration's budget request. Reclamation has discretion within the guidelines provided as to which line-items this additional funding will be applied to. The Committee has not included any congressionally directed spending as defined in section 5(a) of rule XLIV of the standing rules of the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT .....		12,375		12,375
COLORADO RIVER BASIN—CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT .....	8,602	436	8,602	436
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM .....	2,990		2,990	
SALT RIVER PROJECT .....	704	230	704	230
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT .....	52		52	
SIERRA VISTA SUBWATERSHED FEASIBILITY STUDY .....	10		10	
YUMA AREA PROJECTS .....	1,412	22,430	1,412	22,430
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT .....	672	674	672	674
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, FOLSOM DAM UNIT/MORMON ISLAND (SOD) .....	1,789	9,169	1,789	9,169
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT .....	35	2,285	35	2,285

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
DELTA DIVISION .....	6,468	5,511	6,468	5,511
EAST SIDE DIVISION .....	1,332	2,730	1,332	2,730
FRIANT DIVISION .....	2,292	3,426	2,292	3,426
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RESTORATION SETTLEMENT .....			26,000	
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS .....	9,246	454	9,246	454
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINTENANCE PROGRAM .....		17,351		17,351
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION .....	3,246	1,026	3,246	1,026
SAN FELIPE DIVISION .....	397	75	397	75
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION .....	52		52	
SHASTA DIVISION .....	430	8,195	430	8,195
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION .....	14,353	4,233	14,353	4,233
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS .....	4,359	7,423	4,359	7,423
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT .....	40,150	6,518	40,150	6,518
ORLAND PROJECT .....		910		910
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT .....	300		300	
SOLANO PROJECT .....	1,407	2,367	1,407	2,367
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT .....	338	33	338	33
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT .....	891	1,313	891	1,313
COLLBRAN PROJECT .....	262	1,691	262	1,691
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT .....	251	12,883	251	12,883
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT .....	122	117	122	117
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT .....	349	8,526	349	8,526
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT—ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT .....	1,000		1,000	
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II .....	638	1,362	638	1,362
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT .....		2,254		2,254
MANCOS PROJECT .....	110	124	110	124
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II .....	106	2,574	106	2,574
PINE RIVER PROJECT .....	204	288	204	288
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT .....	294	3,608	294	3,608
CONEJOS, CO .....	26	33	26	33
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT .....	770	185	770	185
UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM .....	270		270	
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS .....	3,019	3,269	3,019	3,269
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT .....	18,000		18,000	
LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS .....	664	30	664	30
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS .....	2,283	6,783	2,283	6,783
PRESTON BENCH PROJECT .....	4	8	4	8
KANSAS				
WICHITA PROJECT—CHENEY DIVISION .....	79	472	79	472
WICHITA PROJECT—EQUUS BEDS DIVISION .....	50		50	
MONTANA				
FORT PECK RESERVATION/DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM .....	4,300		4,300	
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT .....		795		795
HUNTLEY PROJECT .....	32	64	32	64
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT .....	364	22	364	22
MILK RIVER PROJECT .....	548	1,358	548	1,358
ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MT RURAL WATER SYSTEM .....	5,400		5,400	
SUN RIVER PROJECT .....	53	263	53	263
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT .....	15	132	15	132

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
NEVADA				
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY .....				
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT .....	5,759	4,042	5,759	4,042
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM .....	115		115	
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM .....	775		775	
NEW MEXICO				
CARLSBAD PROJECT .....	2,556	1,017	2,556	1,017
EASTERN NEW MEXICO RURAL WATER SUPPLY .....	649		649	
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT .....	13,252	12,682	13,252	12,682
RIO GRANDE PROJECT .....	885	3,871	885	3,871
RIO GRANDE PEUBLOS PROJECT .....	250		250	
TUCUMCARI PROJECT .....	14	20	14	20
NORTH DAKOTA				
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT .....	17,698	6,417	17,698	6,417
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT .....	67	186	67	186
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT .....	89	788	89	788
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT .....	25	576	25	576
NORMAN PROJECT .....	48	410	48	410
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT .....	129	1,300	129	1,300
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT .....	58	614	58	614
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT .....	253	514	253	514
DESCHUTES PROJECT .....	301	190	301	190
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS .....	639	232	639	232
KLAMATH PROJECT .....	15,975	2,025	15,975	2,025
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION .....	1,704	436	1,704	436
TUALATIN PROJECT .....	94	209	94	209
UMATILLA PROJECT .....	574	2,814	574	2,814
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM .....	3,200		3,200	
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT .....		15		15
MNI WICONI PROJECT .....		12,000		12,000
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT .....		92		92
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT .....	25	15	25	15
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT .....	82	86	82	86
LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION PROGRAM .....	50		50	
NUECES RIVER PROJECT .....	74	649	74	649
SAN ANGELO PROJECT .....	56	529	56	529
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT .....	289	160	289	160
MOON LAKE PROJECT .....	102	79	102	79
NEWTON PROJECT .....	32	89	32	89
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT .....	232	252	232	252
PROVO RIVER PROJECT .....	1,243	438	1,243	438
SANPETE PROJECT .....	60	11	60	11
SCOFIELD PROJECT .....	372	77	372	77
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT .....	708	83	708	83
WEBER BASIN PROJECT .....	1,130	1,075	1,130	1,075
WEBER RIVER PROJECT .....	79	79	79	79

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT .....	3,761	5,755	3,761	5,755
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS .....	436	70	436	70
YAKIMA PROJECT .....	804	6,616	804	6,616
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT .....	8,016	.....	8,016	.....
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT .....	108	7,293	108	7,293
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT .....	209	1,298	209	1,298
SHOSHONE PROJECT .....	76	776	76	776
SUBTOTAL, ITEMS UNDER STATES .....	223,793	231,885	249,793	231,885
REMAINING ITEMS				
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:				
RURAL WATER .....	.....	.....	25,000	.....
FISH PASSAGE AND FISH SCREENS .....	.....	.....	5,000	.....
WATER CONSERVATION AND DELIVERY .....	.....	.....	10,000	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND COMPLIANCE .....	.....	.....	5,000	.....
FACILITIES OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REHABILITATION .....	.....	.....	.....	9,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I .....	.....	12,158	.....	12,158
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I .....	6,100	.....	6,100	.....
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT [CRSP], SECTION 5 .....	3,360	5,283	3,360	5,283
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT [CRSP], SECTION 8 .....	3,923	.....	3,923	.....
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT .....	537	.....	537	.....
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM .....	.....	1,300	.....	1,300
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION .....	.....	66,500	.....	66,500
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS .....	.....	20,284	.....	20,284
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	500	.....
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM .....	.....	1,400	.....	1,400
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM .....	21,207	.....	21,207	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION .....	1,717	.....	1,717	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES .....	.....	9,491	.....	9,491
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES .....	2,000	.....	2,000	.....
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS:				
AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT ACT .....	.....	.....	4,664	.....
CROW TRIBE WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 2010 .....	.....	.....	7,500	.....
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT .....	.....	.....	60,497	.....
TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT .....	.....	.....	4,000	.....
WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010 .....	.....	.....	2,000	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM .....	10,684	.....	10,684	.....
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM .....	27,839	.....	27,839	.....
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS .....	.....	848	.....	848
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM .....	7,412	.....	7,412	.....
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING .....	2,376	.....	2,376	.....
OPERATION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....	768	1,446	768	1,446
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM—OTHER PICK SLOAN .....	3,320	37,647	3,320	37,647
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES .....	2,083	307	2,083	307
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM .....	662	206	662	206
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION .....	2,331	.....	2,331	.....
RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION .....	2,391	.....	2,391	.....
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:				
DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM .....	2,016	1,285	2,016	1,285
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM .....	13,265	.....	13,265	.....
SITE SECURITY ACTIVITIES .....	.....	27,800	.....	27,800

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
	Resources management	Facilities OM&R	Resources management	Facilities OM&R
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES—TECHNICAL SUPPORT .....	90	.....	90	.....
WATERSMART PROGRAM:				
WATERSMART GRANTS .....	12,000	.....	20,000	.....
WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICES PROGRAM .....	3,437	.....	3,437	.....
COOPERATIVE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT .....	250	.....	250	.....
SHARED INVESTMENT WATER INNOVATION PROGRAM .....	1,000	.....	1,000	.....
BASIN STUDIES .....	4,734	.....	4,734	.....
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE TITLE XVI .....	14,000	.....	22,000	.....
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS .....	149,502	185,955	289,663	194,955
UNDERFINANCING .....	.....	.....	-11,759	-8,741
TOTAL .....	373,295	417,840	527,697	418,099
GRAND TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES .....	.....	791,135	.....	945,796

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

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

fallowing, or dedication of water or water rights within the Rio Grande Basin in New Mexico, including water and water rights native Rio Grande and from the San Juan-Chama Project under its current Middle Rio Grande Supplemental Water Acquisition Program. Water and/or water rights acquired through the Middle Rio Grande Supplemental Water Acquisition Program will be acquired only from willing lessors or sellers and designed to benefit the Rio Grande, Bosque habitat and species protected under the Endangered Species Act.

*Middle Rio Grande, New Mexico, San Acacia Reach—Physical Habitat Restoration and Management.*—The Committee is aware of the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program's [Program] existing habitat restoration and improvement activities in the Albuquerque and Isleta reaches of the Middle Rio Grande including physical manipulations of the Rio Grande channel (riverine restoration) and adjacent bosque (riparian restoration). The Committee recognizes that the Program has completed habitat restoration projects with a focus on the aforementioned reaches to date, however, further recognizes that the improvement in the San Acacia reach of the Middle Rio Grande from San Acacia Dam to the delta of Elephant Butte Reservoir is a critical component for the recovery of the species. Because of the ecological importance of the San Acacia reach and likelihood of increased water shortfalls, the Committee urges the Program to conduct a comprehensive study of the infrastructure of the San Acacia reach including but not limited to the alternate configurations and/or altered management scenarios of the Low Flow Conveyance Channel, and conduct a feasibility analysis of a one-channel river system.

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

*Indian Water Rights Settlements Account.*—The Committee has chosen not to include a separate account for this work. The Committee recognizes that these are legal settlements with the affected tribes, however, believe it is prudent to keep these items within the Water and Related Resources account. Beyond the actual water rights settlement funding, many of these settlements included construction components very similar to rural water projects funded elsewhere in this account. The Committee understands that, due to the way the settlements were structured, some of the discretionary funding may not be obligated in fiscal year 2014 and will be carried over into later years. The Committee urges Reclamation to minimize this practice to the extent practicable and within the confines of these settlements. To maintain the visibility of these projects, the Committee has included the five projects under the Regional Programs heading with a subheading called Indian Water Rights Settlements.

*Buried Metallic Water Pipe.*—Reclamation is again reminded that the fiscal year 2012 conference report was very specific that Reclamation should not use Technical Memorandum 8140-CC-2004-1 ("Corrosion Considerations for Buried Metallic Water Pipe") as the sole basis to deny funding or approval of a project or to disqualify any material from use in highly corrosive soils. The Committee con-

tinues to be concerned about how Reclamation is following the guidance from the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water Conference Report, title II of division B of House Report 112-331. The concern stems from the Committee direction that Reclamation assemble data on pipeline reliability for all types of pipe specified in table 2 of Technical Memorandum 8140-CC-2004-1 along with the specified corrosion protection applied in the various soil types and to conduct an analysis of the performance of these types of pipe installed in the same or similar conditions. It has come to the Committee's attention that Reclamation may be requiring different reliability standards for different pipe materials. The Committee directs Reclamation to report to the Committee within 30 days of enactment of this Act as to the reliability standards that are being utilized for the analysis required in the fiscal year 2012 conference report. Reclamation should understand that the Committee intends for Reclamation to analyze the reliability standards in as near as possible to the exact same conditions so that there is no bias towards any particular pipe material. Before finalizing the analysis, Reclamation shall contract with the National Academies to review the draft analysis to ensure that the uniform reliability standard, in addition to the analysis of economics, cost-effectiveness, and life-cycle costs, is accurate and consistent across all referenced materials.

*Rural Water.*—The Committee understands that Reclamation is using the amount of non-Federal funds provided by a sponsor in excess of the authorized non-Federal cost share as a criteria to determine how a project will be budgeted. The Committee views this as improper pressuring of local sponsors in an attempt to get them to contribute more than the authorized cost share for a project. If a sponsor is willing to provide excess funds, Reclamation should obviously accept those excess funds, but they should not try to compel excess non-Federal funds as a means of prioritizing a sponsor's project for Federal funds. Therefore, the Committee directs that Reclamation should not use the level of excess non-Federal funding as a criteria for budgeting rural water projects.

*Zebra and Quagga Mussels.*—The Committee understands the challenges posed by the invasion of quagga and zebra mussels in various places across the country, and that invasion has not yet occurred in the Pacific Northwest and Lake Tahoe. Given the significant Federal assets in the region, it is prudent to determine the vulnerabilities of the infrastructure. The Committee recognizes the work that is underway, but believes more can and should be done to prevent invasion. Portions of the country are already dealing with these invasive species and the lessons learned should be applied to develop a strategy of minimizing the impacts to vulnerable infrastructure in this region. The Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation, in partnership with the Bonneville Power Administration, to continue its efforts to develop invasive mussel vulnerability assessments for federally owned hydropower projects, in the Pacific Northwest, including an estimate of the annual cost of protection and maintenance of this infrastructure, if applicable. Further, the Committee urges Reclamation to assist the States, where appropriate, in their efforts to prevent the spread of invasive mussels to Federal projects in the region.

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

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

The intent of these funds is for work that either were omitted from the budget request or were inadequately budgeted. Within 30 days of enactment, Reclamation shall provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a work plan delineating how these funds are to be distributed and in which phase the work is being accomplished.

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

Additionally, the Committee is concerned that constrained budgets impact the research and development initiatives vital to improvements in water recycling and desalination technologies development and applications. The Committee believes that only through enhanced Federal and non-Federal research partnerships can research and development vital to much needed improvements in water recycling and desalination technologies development and applications be accomplished. Within the amounts appropriated, the Committee has included the requested \$1,000,000 in funds for the Bureau of Reclamation's WaterSMART program to fund the Shared Investment Water Innovation Program to provide for extramural cost-shared research grants to fund high-priority research and development initiatives by non-governmental organizations, including not-for-profit organizations who often partner with the Bureau of Reclamation, to advance next-generation water management technologies, including water reuse, recycling, and desalination.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$53,041,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	53,288,000
Committee recommendation .....	53,288,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$53,288,000 for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.

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

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

Power users, in particular, are paying a much greater share than anyone anticipated. This has resulted in high CVP power costs, and unpredictable fee assessments on power agencies. The fees imposed on power users are unpredictable, since in low water years the water users pay very little and the power users make up the difference.

Since the fund was established in 1992 more than \$1,400,000,000 has been spent for restoration activities, but there has been little accountability on how effectively it has been used. There is very little assurance that the goals of the Restoration Fund will be met in the near future, such that the fees could be reduced under the statute. Therefore, the Committee urges the Commissioner to continue to work with power users to determine a more predictable payment stream for power users and to develop measures to provide more accountability and transparency to the restoration process. Further, a report covering the previous fiscal year activities should be submitted by March 1, 2014, and every year thereafter.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$39,572,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	37,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	37,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of \$37,000,000 for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

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

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$20,958,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	3,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,500,000

<sup>1</sup>The fiscal year 2013 funds were provided as a separate account under the Department of the Interior.

The fiscal year 2014 budget request recommended funding for the Central Utah Project Completion Act as a separate account under the Bureau of Reclamation so that the priority of the Central Utah Project can be evaluated in the context of other water programs. The Committee recommendation provides the budget request level of funding as a separate account with the same funding control points as when it was carried as a separate account under the Department of Interior.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2014 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals \$3,500,000. An appropriation of \$1,200,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; \$1,000,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation account for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation. The Committee recommendation provides \$1,300,000 for program administration and oversight.

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

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

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$59,880,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	60,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	60,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

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

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

#### INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS

Appropriations, 2013 .....	
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	\$78,661,000
Committee recommendation .....	

The Committee recommends no appropriation for the Indian Water Rights Settlements Account.

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

#### SAN JOAQUIN RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2013 .....	
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	\$26,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	

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

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

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

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

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

Section 203. The bill includes language concerning groundwater banking requested by the administration.

Section 204. The bill includes language concerning water transfers requested by the administration.

Section 205. The bill includes language extending the Drought Act requested by the administration and raising the appropriation ceiling.

Section 206. The bill includes language extending the CALFED Bay-Delta authorization requested by the administration.

Section 207. The bill includes language increasing the cost ceiling of the Secure Water Act requested by the administration.

Section 208. The bill includes language extending the Water Desalination Act requested by the administration.

Section 209. The bill includes language that allows Joint Powers Authorities to participate in water storage studies. The Secretary of the Interior shall complete and issue the Draft Environmental Impact Statement [DEIS] and draft feasibility study associated with any storage project authorized under Public Law 108-361, no later than July 15, 2014 and ensure the completion and issuance of the Final Environmental Impact Statement [FEIS] and final feasibility study associated with any such water storage project no later than September 30, 2015. Within 60 days of enactment of this act, the Secretary shall report to the Committee whether the Bureau of Reclamation will meet the DEIS, FEIS and feasibility deadlines independently or through cooperative agreements with local partners to ensure their completion.

Section 210. This provision concerns the Friant prepayment for the San Joaquin River Settlement currently authorized for disbursement starting in 2019. The provision advances disbursement of these prepaid funds to 2014 and limits expenditure of these authorized mandatory funds to \$40,000 per year. The section changes no other provisions of the San Joaquin River Settlement.

Section 211. The bill includes language concerning the Central Utah Project requested by the administration.

Section 212. The bill includes language concerning the Fort Peck/Dry Prairie, Montana project.

TITLE III  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
EXASCALE INITIATIVE

The Committee recommends \$150,000,000, which includes \$81,000,000 for the Office of Science and \$69,000,000 for the NNSA, to support the Department's initiative to deploy the first exascale system by 2022. The Committee continues to support this research, development, and engineering effort to develop a new generation of high performance computers that can accelerative scientific discoveries, improve U.S. economic competitiveness, and maintain confidence in the safety, security, and reliability of the country's nuclear weapons deterrent.

The Committee believes the United States must remain the world leader in high performance computing. To achieve this ambitious goal of deploying a computing system 1,000 times faster than today's supercomputers requires a coordinated effort between the Office of Science and NNSA. The Committee supports the shared responsibilities laid out in a Memorandum of Understanding between NNSA and the Office of Science which assigns primary responsibility for systems engineering to NNSA and long-lead research and development in advanced architectures and system software to the Office of Science.

The Committee recommends that the Secretary assign an advisor on exascale computing to coordinate efforts across the Department and would report directly to the Secretary on the status of efforts to implement the exascale strategic plan.

SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING

The Committee is concerned about the Department's plans to change the way it manages small business contracts to achieve the agency's small business prime contracting goal. The Department's plans would increase costs to the Federal Government without helping small businesses. For example, converting Management and Operating subcontracts to Department prime contracts would increase the Department's administrative costs by up to \$50,000,000 to hire 260 additional FTEs with contracting expertise. The Department's plans may also adversely disrupt existing subcontracts with small businesses and prevent the integration of critical safety and security functions at its sites and facilities. The Committee bill allows the Department to count subcontracts awarded by its Management and Operating contractors toward the agency and government-wide goals for procurement contracts awarded to small businesses.

## REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

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

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

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

## ENERGY PROGRAMS

## ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

## (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$1,810,463,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	2,775,700,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,280,985,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommendation is \$2,280,985,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

*Quadrennial Technology Review.*—Based on the results of the Department's Quadrennial Technology Review, and the Nation's many urgent energy challenges, the Committee recommends that the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy consider applying more funding toward near-term commercialization efforts in partnership with the private sector.

*Hydrogen Technology.*—The Committee continues to support fuel cell and hydrogen energy systems for stationary, vehicle, motive and portable power applications. The Committee recommends \$100,000,000 for the Fuel Cell Technologies program. Within this total funding, \$10,000,000 is for Technology Validation focused on passenger vehicle and hydrogen infrastructure applications where vehicles will be deployed, \$42,000,000 is for hydrogen fuels R&D, and \$10,000,000 is for Market Transformation for cost-shared advanced demonstration and deployment of early market stationary

power and motive applications including material handling equipment, ground support equipment, refrigerated trucks, auxiliary power units and the associated hydrogen infrastructure.

The Committee is encouraged by the collaborative approach reflected in the H2USA Letter of Agreement and sees it as an important step toward commercialization of fuel cell vehicles and the supply chain. With regard to infrastructure, DOE should analyze, research and make suitable investments in order to transform the size, cost, scalability, and interoperability of new stations, including modular stations, in order to meet the needs of the initial, commercial market beginning in 2015, while having the ability to increase the station capacity as commercialization develops. Additionally, DOE should continue to support efforts to finalize codes and standards to promote fuel cell and infrastructure commercialization, to establish a national template for emergency responder training programs, and to ensure metering and quality standards that can be met and verified by State and local measurement standards agencies.

*Bioenergy Technologies.*—The Committee recommends \$245,000,000 for biomass and biorefinery systems R&D. Within the available funds, the Department is encouraged to direct a total of \$30,000,000 for algae biofuels. The Committee is concerned the Department is interpreting biomass too narrowly and failing to consider promising noncellulosic forms of biomass energy technology projects. For purposes of allocating resources, the Department is directed to include biosolids derived from the municipal wastewater treatment process and other similar renewables within the definition of noncellulosic. In funding biomass and biofuels refinery systems, the Department is encouraged to provide funding to projects that utilize regionally available and appropriate wood and agricultural biomass feedstock for thermal heating applications. The Committee recognizes that quality and reliability of supplies will be key in acceptance of advanced drop-in biofuels into the supply chain once they are demonstrated at a convincing scale. To that end, the Committee is supportive of the collaboration between the Navy, Department of Agriculture and DOE to develop innovative technologies for jet and diesel fuels for military uses. With the Department of Defense as an early adopter of these alternative fuels, the wider marketplace will be more likely to follow. The Committee has provided the requested \$45,000,000 to support this effort. The Committee urges the Department to provide funds to projects that utilize regionally available and appropriate wood and agricultural biomass feedstock for thermal heating applications.

*Solar Energy.*—The Committee recommends \$310,000,000 for solar energy. The Committee supports the increase to \$61,081,000 for solar balance of system soft cost reduction and directs the Department to engage with State and local governments to reduce costs and timelines associated with permitting, interconnection, and inspection; to create technical and professional standards for solar installers to eliminate overlapping inspections; and to encourage innovative business models that reduce soft costs to consumers. Further, the Committee supports the grid integration activities proposed in the budget request.

*Wind Energy.*—The recommendation is \$110,000,000 for wind energy. The Committee directs use of offshore wind technologies funding to include freshwater, deepwater, shallow water, and transitional depth installations. The Committee understands that the Department is making resources available on a competitive basis for offshore wind advanced technology demonstration projects and expects that such funds continue to be awarded for new and innovative technologies.

*Geothermal Technology.*—The recommendation for geothermal technology is \$60,000,000. The funds made available by this section shall be disbursed to the full spectrum of geothermal technologies as authorized by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) and the Department of Energy shall continue its support of comprehensive programs that support academic and professional development initiatives. The Committee continues to have concerns about the level of funding devoted to low-temperature geothermal research and development and directs the Department to provide funding to this geothermal area of research and development. The U.S. Geological Survey has identified more than 120,000 MW of untapped potential at these temperatures.

*Water Power Energy R&D.*—The Committee recommends \$59,000,000 for water power, including \$43,500,000 for marine and hydrokinetic technology research, development and deployment, and \$15,500,000 for conventional hydropower. The Committee directs the Department to provide not less than \$20,000,000 for competitive demonstrations of marine and hydrokinetic technologies. The Committee recommends the Department review its university-based National Marine Renewable Energy Centers and determine if these activities should be consolidated into one existing Center. The Committee is concerned with the Department's proposal to construct a new deep-water wave tank testing facility in fiscal year 2014 and then to immediately turn to constructing an off-shore testing facility in fiscal year 2015. The Committee directs the Department to consult with industry to determine if the deep-wave tank testing facility is a priority for industry. The Department is directed to share the out-come of the industry consultation with Congress before taking any action. None of the funding may be used for the proposed advanced manufacturing initiative for MHK devices. The Committee recommends that the Department coordinate with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, other relevant agencies and industry to reduce the amount of time to permit MHK test and demonstration projects. The Committee also recommends that the Water Power Program, in coordination with the Fossil Energy Program, demonstrate the ability of marine and hydrokinetic technologies to reduce emissions and improve energy efficiencies related to offshore oil and gas production.

*Vehicle Technologies.*—The Committee recommends \$415,000,000 for vehicle technologies. The Committee acknowledges the progress toward the Super Truck program's goals, anticipates continued progress in fiscal year 2014 with the \$10,100,000 requested in the budget, and supports continued fulfillment of existing contracts to

support commercialization of truck technologies demonstrated by industry partners. The Committee further encourages the Department to identify additional measures to leverage the success of the current program toward additional fuel economy gains to incorporate alternatives to petroleum fuels in commercial vehicles. The Committee notes that class 8 heavy-duty trucks account for 25 percent of commercial trucks, yet consume 75 percent of the total amount of petroleum used for all commercial trucks. The Committee recommends that a portion of the funds appropriated to the Vehicle Technology Program be used to research, develop, and demonstrate the most promising class 8 heavy-duty long-haul truck technologies (such as alternative fuel or dual fuel technologies), capable of significantly reducing air pollution emissions and petroleum consumption in a cost effective manner. The Committee believes that such work will leverage existing Federal investments and help put our heavy-duty truck fleet on the path to reduced petroleum usage. The Committee supports the grid integration activities proposed in the budget request. Further, within available funds, \$10,000,000 is provided to continue funding of section 131 of the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act. Lastly, \$10,000,000 is provided for competitive demonstrations of electric vehicle deployment programs. Grants made available with this funding should focus on a limited number of awards in order to maximize large-scale deployment.

*Building Technologies.*—The Committee recommends \$224,000,000 for building technologies. The Committee supports the grid integration activities proposed in the budget request. These activities hold particular promise for the Building Technologies Program, where new control paradigms at the building/grid interface promise near-term efficiency gains, as well as additional operational flexibility and resilience for electric distribution systems. The Committee notes that television set-top boxes cost consumers \$3,000,000,000 in electricity charges in 2011, with \$2,000,000,000 wasted when televisions are not in use. The Committee commends industry for its commitments to utilize more efficient equipment. The Committee encourages the Department of Energy to work with industry and stakeholders to develop and deploy widely equipment that meets Energy Star 4 specifications and powers down or off when not in use as soon as feasible. Further, the Committee urges the Department to consider establishing a Geothermal Heat Pump Technology Office within the Buildings Technology Program to promote developing innovative geothermal heat pump technologies and enhancing their use in both residential and commercial buildings. The Department is to report back within 6 months of enactment of this act on the progress for the Geothermal Heat Pump Technology Office.

The Committee recommends no funding for the Energy Efficient Buildings Hub, and directs the Department to terminate the Hub. The Department may use the remainder of prior year balances provided to the Hub for research and development activities within the program. After \$80,000,000 in appropriations and spending \$55,000,000 over the last 4 years, the Committee has seen no measurable benefit from this investment. The purpose of the Hubs is to accelerate the discovery of transformational energy tech-

nologies within 5 years that are likely to be commercialized by the private sector. Unlike the other Hubs, which have clear goals and timeframes, the Energy Efficient Buildings Hub never established key deliverables within the 5 year award period. The Hub was more focused on the economic development of the Philadelphia area rather than developing a national program to improve the energy efficiency of commercial and residential buildings across the United States. In addition, most of the activities described in the Hub's program plan are already being addressed by core programs in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Last year, an independent review team found that this Hub was poorly managed and lacked measurable goals. Despite efforts by the Department to help improve management of the Hub and establish key deliverables within the 5 year award period, the Committee has seen no improvement. The Committee is frustrated that the Department did not exercise sufficient oversight of the Hub at its inception to avoid these mistakes and expects the Department to take faster action when programs are not meeting management or scientific goals. It appears that part of the Department's problem in exercising control of the Hub stems from the Hub's organizational structure, which involves several Federal agencies and other non-Federal partners which have changed since the Hub was created. In proposing future Hubs, the Department should incorporate the lessons learned from this Hub to provide the greatest opportunity for success. If the Department again seeks to propose a Hub jointly with any other Federal agency it will have to detail how the Department is going to exercise oversight and control in such a structure. The Department should work to minimize duplication and overlap between any Hub and the Department's program offices.

*Advanced Manufacturing.*—The Committee recognizes the importance of the manufacturing sector to the U.S. economy, directly generating 12 percent of U.S. GDP and employing nearly 12 million people. The Committee recommends \$215,985,000 for advanced manufacturing. Within this total funding, \$5,000,000 is for the joint additive manufacturing pilot institute with the Department of Defense, \$10,000,000 is for development of additive manufacturing processes, low cost carbon fiber, and other manufacturing technologies at the existing Manufacturing Demonstration Facility, \$25,000,000 is for the Critical Materials Hub aimed at improving critical material supply chains that are prone to disruption, \$56,000,000 is for the wide bandgap semiconductor institute. The Committee supports the President's vision to strengthen domestic manufacturing and improve U.S. competitiveness through a National Network for Manufacturing Innovation, however, the Committee would like to see analysis to identify and prioritize investments in clean energy manufacturing. The Committee encourages the Department to conduct this analysis to justify requests for more substantial increases for institutes in clean energy manufacturing.

*Federal Energy Management Program.*—The Committee recommends \$30,000,000 for the Federal Energy Management Program.

*Facilities and Infrastructure.*—The Committee recommends \$46,000,000 for facilities and infrastructure.

*Program Direction.*—The Committee recommends \$185,000,000 for program direction.

*Strategic Programs.*—The Committee recommends \$28,000,000 for strategic programs.

*Weatherization Assistance Program.*—The Committee provides \$190,000,000. The Committee notes that the Inspector General has found instances where weatherized homes have failed state inspections or fell short of minimum efficiency standards. The committee encourages the Weatherization Program to raise standards by (1) requiring crew laborers, crew leaders, contractors, energy auditors and QC inspectors to meet minimum training requirements and to meet or exceed current industry standards for home performance accreditation programs as determined by the Secretary; (2) ensuring that each retrofit for which weatherization assistance is provided meets or exceeds the standards in applicable building energy codes and quality of work standards after the work is completed; and (3) increasing third party inspection to ensure compliance with building energy codes and quality of work standards. The Committee notes, however, the important role that weatherization plays in permanently reducing energy costs for low-income families, lessening our dependence on foreign oil, and training a skilled workforce.

*Intergovernmental Activities.*—The Committee provides \$53,000,000 for State Energy Programs and \$10,000,000 for Tribal Energy Activities.

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$139,219,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	169,015,000
Committee recommendation .....	149,015,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$149,015,000 for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability. The Department should support or implement accelerated deployment of new renewable electricity generation by developing best practices and providing the necessary funds for States seeking to form interstate compacts for integrating large-scale renewable energy into their transmission system.

The Committee supports the Department’s proposed research on advanced modeling capabilities to improve electric planning and operations. Advances in big data analytic capabilities and modeling and visualization technologies offer potential for improving efficient operations of the electric grid particularly when incorporating power from variable renewable energy sources such as wind and solar energy. Within funds provided for the Clean Energy Transmission and Reliability Program, the Committee urges the department to consider applications beyond response to energy supply disruption, and to include university/industry teams. The Committee directs the Department to report on the need for workforce education as a necessary element for the successful and rapid transition of advanced modeling and simulation solutions developed under this program.

Because of recent natural disasters and other interruptions to power and energy sources, the Committee generally supports the Department’s desire to create new capabilities for emergency response and monitoring. The Committee, however, also has the responsibility to ensure that the limited taxpayer dollars that are available to the Department are allocated in the most cost-efficient manner possible. The Committee has evaluated the Department’s restructuring proposal and is concerned that instead of replacing lower priority activities with new, higher priority activities, the Department is simply adding work scope and not achieving the types of efficiencies that are expected in these tight budgets. The Committee is concerned that the Department would create significant out-year mortgages and an unsustainable new number of Federal jobs. The Committee understands, for example, that as part of the proposed Operational Energy and Resilience program, the Department is seeking to create 17 new Federal FTEs, and will, in future budget years, propose a total of 70 permanent FTEs to operate this program at its peak. This more than doubles the current number of FTEs currently in this office, and will have a significant effect on future funding decisions. The Department is directed, within 90 days after the enactment of this Act, to provide the Committee a report on the proposed Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration program, including funding requirements for future years, proposed staff levels, a detailed justification of the duties and responsibilities of Federal staff proposed to be located in each State, and any other detail that is relevant to the Committee’s consideration in evaluating the program.

The Committee does not include funding for the proposed Electricity Systems Hub. In proposing new hubs, the Department should model its approach after the successful hubs, each of which addresses a well-defined grand energy challenge and has a focused mission. An energy innovation hub should not be proposed for work that could otherwise be conducted within an office’s research and development programs if sufficient resources could be freed through prioritization. In this case, the Department has not made a strong argument that the proposed work warrants establishing a new hub.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$757,482,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	735,460,000
Committee recommendation .....	735,460,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$735,460,000 for Nuclear Energy, including \$94,000,000 for safeguards and security at Idaho National Laboratory. In addition, the Committee recommends use of prior year balances in the amount of \$5,000,000.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

*Small Modular Reactor Licensing Technical Support.*—The Committee recommends \$70,000,000 for Small Modular Reactor Licensing Technical Support. The Committee understands that due to the issuance of a second funding opportunity announcement for more

innovative designs, the program has been extended from five to six years but will remain subject to the original \$452,000,000 cap. Prior to making any additional awards, the Department should conduct an economic assessment to determine whether favorable market and other economic considerations justify supporting additional reactor designs. The Committee directs any new awardees to be selected only after a full competitive process.

*Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration.*—The Committee recommends \$62,500,000 for Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration. The Committee directs the Nuclear Energy Program to focus funding for Reactor Concepts Research, Development and Demonstration, which includes funding for Advanced SMRs and Advanced Reactor Concepts, on technologies that show clear potential to be safer, less waste producing, more cost competitive, and more proliferation-resistant than existing nuclear power technologies.

The Committee supports the termination of the Next Generation Nuclear Plant demonstration project, and accordingly recommends no funds for this activity. Although high temperature gas reactors may present significant potential benefits in the future, there is little to no likelihood of such reactors being built in the United States in the mid-term. The low price of natural gas will continue to undermine the economic case for using nuclear reactors for process heat.

The Committee recommends \$21,000,000 for Advanced Reactor Concepts. The Committee is encouraged by the Department's efforts to develop enhanced accident tolerant fuels which will significantly improve the ability of nuclear reactors to cope with beyond-design-basis accidents. The Committee supports a continued and strengthened program leveraging its significant applied materials science resources embodied in the national laboratory complex with the domestic commercial nuclear sector. The Committee supports focused development on concepts that target reduced heat and hydrogen production from reactions under loss of coolant conditions, and which provide additional barriers to fission product release, thus limiting the possibility of offsite contamination in the event of catastrophic accidents. Specific encouraging examples include accelerated development of advanced self-protecting steel cladding and the ceramic-based microencapsulated fuel. The Committee also directs the Department to engage in a rigorous analysis utilizing its recently integrated high-speed computing and modeling activities to underpin the benefit of these new enhanced accident tolerant fuels.

The Committee notes that significant developments in the nuclear energy field have occurred since the Department issued its Nuclear Energy Research and Development Roadmap [Roadmap] in 2010. These new developments, such as, lessons learned from Fukushima, advances in small modular reactor technologies, and DOE path forward on the BRC recommendations, should inform the Department's research and development priorities in the future. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to update the Roadmap to ensure that its research and development priorities reflect the most current and emerging needs of the nuclear energy field to allow the United States to maintain a strong world

leadership role in nuclear technologies. Further, the Committee directs the Department to identify how it will integrate the missions and expertise of our unique national laboratories to help meet these long-term goals. The Department is directed to submit the updated Roadmap to Congress no later than 180 days after the enactment of this act.

*Fuel Cycle Research and Development.*—The Committee recommends \$175,100,000 for Fuel Cycle Research and Development. The Committee recommends \$60,000,000 for used nuclear fuel disposition, consistent with the budget request.

The Committee notes that nearly 18 months have passed since the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future submitted its final recommendations to the Secretary of Energy. The Committee continues to strongly support these recommendations, and again provides funding for research and development activities which support efforts to move forward on a new nuclear waste management program, regardless of the location of storage or disposal facilities. The Committee again includes a general provision in section 309 of this bill which allows the Department of Energy to develop a pilot program for a consolidated storage facility, pending enactment of more comprehensive legislation.

The Committee recommends \$57,100,000 for the Advanced Fuels program. The Committee directs the Department to continue implementation of the accident tolerant fuels development program, the goal of which is development of meltdown-resistant nuclear fuels leading to in-reactor testing and utilization in 10 years. The Committee is concerned that the proposed reduction for the Advanced Fuels program does not support continued engagement of private industry and universities as the process of evaluating and selecting promising technologies for accident tolerant fuel for further development in the United States moves into reactor testing and fuel licensing work. In addition to continuation of the industry and university cost shared program initiated in fiscal year 2012, \$3,000,000 is recommended to advance promising and innovative research, including ceramic cladding and other technologies, emanating from qualified and competitively selected small business research task awards that complement the three major industry and university projects and are focused on the development and testing of accident tolerant fuels. Further, the Committee is concerned that the Department has not yet provided to the Committee the plan for development of meltdown-resistant fuels leading to in-reactor testing and utilization by 2020 as required in the Fiscal Year 2012 Consolidated Appropriations Act (Report 112–75). The Committee directs the Department to provide this report to the Committee no later than 30 days after enactment of this act.

*Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies.*—The Committee recommends \$62,300,000 for Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies. Within available funds, the Committee recommends \$12,563,000 for the National Scientific User Facility.

The Committee recommends \$24,300,000 for the Energy Innovation Hub for Modeling and Simulation, which represents the fifth fiscal year of funding for this Hub. The Committee recognizes the accomplishments of this Hub, whose centerpiece is a virtual model of an operating pressurized water reactor. Research and data from

this Hub has, and will continue, to provide a basis for improving the safety and economic cases for approximately two-thirds of the Nation’s operating commercial reactors. Allowing researchers and engineers to examine real-time operations in this virtual reactor provides opportunities to address issues in nuclear reactors that have not been possible until now. The Department is encouraged to apply lessons learned from this Hub to any new Hubs it proposes in the future.

*Radiological Facilities Management.*—The Committee provides \$20,000,000 for Radiological Facilities Management. Within this funding, the Committee recommends \$15,000,000 for hot cells at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 for Research Reactor Infrastructure.

*Idaho Facilities Management.*—The Committee recommends \$166,560,000 for Idaho Facilities Management.

*International Nuclear Energy Cooperation.*—The Committee provides \$2,500,000 for International Nuclear Energy Cooperation, the same as the request.

*Program Direction.*—The Committee recommends \$87,500,000 for Program Direction to be available until September 30, 2015.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT  
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$532,932,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	420,575,000
Committee recommendation .....	420,575,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$420,575,000 for Fossil Energy Research and Development.

*CCS and Power Systems.*—The Committee recommends \$268,631,000 for CCS and Power Systems. Within the available funding, Advanced Energy Systems is funded at \$40,000,000. Within Gasification Systems, a subprogram of Advanced Energy Systems, the recommendation includes \$8,000,000 to continue activities improving advanced air separation technologies.

Funds recommended for Carbon Capture and Storage, and Power Systems shall be available to continue to advance the full scope of technologies for the reduction of carbon emissions conducted at the Department of Energy’s National Carbon Capture Center, including direct carbon capture and technologies or methods to reduce the cost of or advance the efficiency or reliability of post-combustion capture technologies, pre-combustion capture technologies, and oxy-combustion systems.

The United States is experiencing a significant increase in natural gas production and use in the United States. The Committee is aware that some of the research and development work being conducted within the CCS and Power Systems programs for coal are also potentially applicable to natural gas. The Department is directed to use funds from this program for both coal and natural gas research and development as it determines to be merited.

*Program Direction.*—The Committee recommends \$115,753,000 for program direction.

*Other Programs.*—The Committee recommends \$13,294,000 for Plant and Capital Equipment; \$5,897,000 for Fossil Energy Environmental Restoration; and \$700,000 for Special Recruitment Programs. Within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to continue the Risk Based Data Management System.

The Committee recommends \$20,000,000 for natural gas technologies. Of this amount, \$12,000,000 is for interagency research and development initiatives and \$8,000,000 is for ongoing methane hydrates research and development.

#### NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$14,879,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	20,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	20,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$20,000,000 for Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, the same as the budget request.

#### STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$192,319,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	189,400,000
Committee recommendation .....	189,400,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$189,400,000 for the operation of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The Committee notes that the Department has continued to ignore the statutory directive in Public Law 111–8 to submit a report to Congress regarding the effects of expanding the Reserve on the domestic petroleum market by April 27, 2009. The Department has not yet submitted the report, and continues to fail to meet other congressionally mandated deadlines without explanation or cause. Although now nearly 4½ years delayed, the information requested in the report continues to be pertinent to policy decisions, and the Secretary is directed to submit the report as expeditiously as possible to the Committee. The Committee is concerned with the Department’s seeming unwillingness or inability to implement a law enacted in 2009.

#### NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$4,099,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	8,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	8,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$8,000,000 for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve as requested.

#### ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$104,790,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	117,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	117,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$117,000,000 for the Energy Information Administration.

#### NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$235,250,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	212,956,000
Committee recommendation .....	232,956,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee’s recommendation for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup is \$232,956,000.

*Reprogramming Control Levels.*—In fiscal year 2014, the Environmental Management program may transfer funding between operating expense funded projects within the controls listed below using guidance contained in the Department’s budget execution manual (DOE M 135.1–1A, chapter IV). All capital construction line item projects remain separate controls from the operating projects. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be formally notified in advance of all reprogrammings, except internal reprogrammings, and the Department is to take no financial action in anticipation of congressional response. The Committee recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2013:

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

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

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

*Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning.*—The Committee recommends \$2,545,000.

*Gaseous Diffusion Plants.*—The Committee recommends \$96,222,000.

*Small Sites.*—The Committee recommends \$70,189,000. In response to a lack of progress on addressing existing contamination and seismic deficiencies within buildings that are located in heavily used areas at some Department national laboratories, the Department is directed to use additional funding to improve health and safety by cleaning up existing contamination and improving seismic standards of buildings within Department laboratory grounds.

The Committee also encourages the Department to explore remediation efforts at small sites which can demonstrate new models for cleanup performed by private sector and third party organizations, such as laboratories and universities, which could save substantial

resources compared to the traditional agency-led cleanup model and result in faster cleanup without compromising public safety. The Committee urges the Department to budget for such cleanup models.

*West Valley Demonstration Project.*—The Committee recommends \$64,000,000.

#### URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$471,984,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	554,823,000
Committee recommendation .....	554,823,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$554,823,000 for Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning activities, the same as the budget request.

#### SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$4,866,248,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	5,152,752,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,152,752,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$5,152,752,000 as requested for the Office of Science. The Committee continues to support the three highest priorities for the Office of Science: (1) the discovery and design of new materials for the generation, storage, and use of energy, (2) better understanding of microorganisms and plants for improved biofuels production, and (3) the development and deployment of more powerful computing capabilities to take advantage of modeling and simulation to advance energy technologies and maintain U.S. economic competitiveness.

#### BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommends \$1,805,162,000, a decrease of \$57,249,000 below the request, for Basic Energy Sciences. Of these funds, the Committee recommends up to \$100,000,000 for Energy Frontier Research Centers and \$24,237,000 each for the Fuels from Sunlight and Batteries and Energy Storage Hubs.

Within these funds, the Committee also recommends \$20,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] program, which was created by Congress over concerns about the uneven distribution of Federal research and development grants. The Committee encourages the Department to continue funding to support research and development needs of graduate and post-graduate science programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

#### BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommends \$625,347,000 as requested for Biological and Environmental Research. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$321,066,000 for biological systems science and \$304,281,000 for climate and environmental sciences.

Within the funds for biological systems science, the Committee recommends \$5,000,000 for nuclear medicine research for human application. Within the funds provided for climate and environmental sciences, the Committee recommends \$46,700,000 as requested for the operation of the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. The Committee also recommends \$74,000,000 for climate and Earth systems modeling of which \$500,000 is to be used to engage universities more directly in climate analysis.

The Committee is aware that the program is engaged in a collaborative process focused on adaptation to climate change. Specifically, the program has engaged other Federal agencies, climate modelers, and end users in an evaluation of how best to advance model development in service of adaptation given a rapidly evolving climate. The Committee encourages a continuation of this effort and would urge that it focus on recommendations to “downscale” global models to a level of resolution which facilitates informed decisionmaking at the local, state and regional level. Given the significant computing power needs and massive volumes of statistical data associated with this effort the Committee would note the critical role that the national laboratories can play through their science expertise and computing resources. The Committee would urge further involvement by the national laboratories in development of climate models which can facilitate development of high resolution, regionally focused climate projections.

#### ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Committee recommends \$493,773,000, an increase of \$28,180,000 above the request, for Advanced Scientific Computing Research. The Committee believes its recommendation would allow the Department to develop and maintain world-class computing and network facilities for science and deliver the necessary research in applied mathematics, computer science, and advanced networking to support the Department’s missions.

Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$81,000,000, an increase of \$12,500,000 above the request, for the exascale initiative to spur U.S. innovation and increase the country’s ability to address critical national challenges. The Committee supports the Department’s plan to deploy the first exascale system by 2022 that is energy efficient with a peak power not to exceed 20 megawatts based on marketable technology and have real-world, mission-critical applications ready to use on exascale platforms with computationally efficient and reliable system software.

Since few companies have the resources or expertise to develop and maintain their own modeling, simulation, and analytics software, the Committee is concerned that it is becoming increasingly difficult for small, medium, and even large businesses to take advantage of powerful, new computing capabilities. The Committee directs the Office of Science to submit a plan to this Committee by May 1, 2014 that would (1) simplify access to computing resources at the labs, especially for small- and medium-sized businesses, (2) establish a few primary points-of-contact to help industry learn about advanced computing capabilities and resources available within the Department and national laboratories, and (3) engage

relevant and qualified independent software vendors to partner with the laboratories to help bridge the gap between the research capabilities at the labs and the commercial needs of companies by adapting and customizing lab-developed software for use by industry.

The Committee also recommends \$93,000,000 for the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility, \$67,000,000 for the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, and \$65,605,000 for the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center facility at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

The Committee recommends \$6,000,000 for the Computational Science Graduate Fellowship program to maintain a healthy pipeline of computational scientists equipped and trained to address the Department's mission needs, including advances in exascale computing.

#### HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The Committee recommends \$806,590,000, an increase of \$30,069,000 above the request, for High Energy Physics. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$35,000,000 as requested for construction of the Muon to Electron Conversion Experiment. The Committee also recommends \$30,000,000 for the Long Baseline Neutrino Experiment, which includes \$10,000,000 for research and development and \$20,000,000 for project engineering and design. Research in neutrinos represents the next frontier of particle physics and this experiment remains a top priority for the U.S. and international physics communities. The Committee restores funding for this project to mature the design, develop better cost estimates, and encourage international collaborators to make financial contributions. Within the funds for High Energy Physics, the Committee recommends \$15,000,000 to support minimal, sustaining operations at the Homestake Mine in South Dakota.

Within the funds for High Energy Physics, the Committee also recommends \$20,000,000 for Accelerator Stewardship. The Committee recognizes the critical role accelerator technology can play in addressing many of the economic and societal issues confronting the country. The Committee supports the Office of Science's efforts to make unique test facilities available to U.S. industry to accelerate applications of accelerator technology. Testing accelerator technology, such as at beam facilities, is the only, unambiguous way to demonstrate the operational efficacy of a new technology and represents the final step in validating a design concept.

#### NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Committee recommends \$569,938,000 as requested for Nuclear Physics. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$25,500,000 in construction funds for the upgrade to the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, which the Nuclear Science Advisory Committee reaffirmed was the highest priority for the nations' nuclear physics program. The Committee also recommends \$55,000,000 for the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams, \$17,255,000 for operations of the Argonne Tandem Linac Accelerator System, and \$165,200,000 for the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider for 22 weeks of operations.

## FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommends \$458,324,000 as requested for Fusion Energy Sciences. Within these funds, the Committee recommends no less than \$75,000,000 for the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory to maintain core expertise in plasma theory and simulation, general plasma science, and tokamak research. The Committee also recommends no less than \$77,000,000 for the DIII-D fusion reactor, which includes \$10,264,000 for upgrades to the reactor, \$16,000,000 to support critical scientific staff, and \$904,000 to support university students and post-docs. The Committee provides no funding for the Alcator C-Mod fusion reactor at MIT. The Committee commends the Office of Science for making a difficult choice to shut down the facility to fund higher priority activities within the fusion energy sciences program.

The Committee also recommends \$14,773,000 for High Energy Density Laboratory Plasmas, which includes \$6,575,000 as requested for experiments on the Matter in Extreme Conditions instrument at the Linac Coherent Light Source at SLAC and \$8,198,000 for academic grants to study the behavior of matter and radiation at extreme temperatures and pressures to match funding available at NNSA for this joint program. The Committee also recommends \$2,500,000 for heavy ion fusion science research at the Neutralized Drift Compression Experiment-II at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory to take advantage of an \$11,000,000 Recovery Act upgrade to the facility.

The Committee also recommends \$12,000,000 for the Fusion Simulation program to provide experimentally validated predictive simulation capabilities that are critical for ITER and other current and planned toroidal fusion devices. The Committee is concerned that the fusion energy program is not taking full advantage of high performance computing to address scientific and technical challenges on the path to fusion energy. Given current and future budget constraints, the Committee views this initiative as critical to maintain U.S. world leadership in fusion energy sciences in a cost-effective manner. The Committee directs the Office of Science to develop a plan on the use of these simulation capabilities based on the results of a 2-year planning effort recently funded by the Department.

The Committee is concerned by the lack of a strategic vision, which includes research and future facility needs, to advance the domestic fusion energy sciences program. The Committee directs the Secretary to submit a 10-year plan, not later than 12 months after enactment of this act, on the Department's proposed research and development activities in magnetic fusion. The report shall (1) identify specific areas of fusion energy research and enabling technology development in which the United States can and should establish or solidify a lead in the global fusion energy development effort and (2) identify priorities for facility construction and facility decommissioning.

The Committee recommends \$183,502,000 for the U.S. contribution to ITER. No funding shall be made available for the U.S. contribution until the Secretary submits to this Committee a baseline cost, schedule, and scope estimate consistent with project manage-

ment principles in DOE Order 413.3B of the U.S. contribution needed for completing all construction activities.

The Committee is concerned by the rising costs of the ITER project and the impact to the domestic program. The cost range for the U.S. contribution for construction activities was between \$1,450,000,000 and \$2,200,000,000. The most recent estimate is \$2,400,000,000 and this estimate only fulfills U.S. obligations for first plasma, rather than all construction activities. The Committee is further concerned that the latest cost estimate does not properly account for the technical risk of building the most complicated engineering facility in the world. The most recent cost range was developed when the design for ITER was less than 40 percent complete.

The Committee also directs the Office of Science to include a project data sheet with details of all project costs until the completion of the project for ITER in the fiscal year 2015 budget submission. The Committee understands that the Department provides funding for ITER as a Major Item of Equipment rather than a line item construction project, which would be consistent with DOE Order 413.3B. However, the Committee feels that a multi-billion dollar project, especially of this scale and complexity, should be treated as a construction project and follow DOE Order 413.3B guidance.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS AND SCIENTISTS

The Committee recommends \$16,500,000 as requested. The Committee directs the Office of Science to provide this Committee with a cost assessment and evaluation of the impact to existing workforce development activities of establishing the Distinguished Scientist program authorized in the America COMPETES bill. The Committee believes this program has merit and should be priority for workforce development.

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$264,470,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	379,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	379,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends \$379,000,000 as requested for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy [ARPA-E]. The Committee supports ARPA-E’s efforts to advance energy technologies in transportation and stationary power systems, including advanced vehicle designs and materials and stationary energy storage systems. The Committee is encouraged by ARPA-E’s early indicators of success. For example, 17 projects, which received \$70,000,000 in ARPA-E funding, have now secured more than \$450,000,000 in outside private capital investment to further develop these technologies. In addition, 12 new companies have been formed to bring new technologies to market.

With dozens of projects nearing the end of their 3-year grants, the Committee directs ARPA-E to submit a report to this Committee by March 1, 2014, that evaluates the success of the first set of projects. The report should include whether the projects achieved

their technical milestones, how many projects received follow on funding from the private sector or other government agencies, how many new companies have been formed, and whether any technologies have been deployed in the marketplace.

#### INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

##### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

##### GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$38,000,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	48,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	42,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

##### OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	-\$38,000,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	-22,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	-22,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

##### NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1,2</sup> .....	
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	\$26,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	20,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends \$42,000,000 in funding for the Loan Guarantee Program. This funding is offset by \$22,000,000 in receipts from loan guarantee applicants. The Committee does not recommend any additional loan authority in fiscal year 2014.

#### ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$5,988,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	6,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	6,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

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

#### DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

##### (GROSS)

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$237,370,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	226,580,000
Committee recommendation .....	234,637,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

##### (MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	-\$111,623,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	-108,188,000
Committee recommendation .....	-108,188,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

## NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$125,747,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	118,392,000
Committee recommendation .....	126,449,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends \$126,449,000 for Department Administration. The Committee notes that the Department has not yet satisfied its outstanding obligation under the Final Elk Hills Agreement, and urges the Secretary to act as soon as practicable to comply with the terms of this agreement. The Committee notes that the Secretary may reduce or eliminate the research and development match requirement established in section 988 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, where necessary and appropriate. The Committee encourages the Secretary to consider the use of this discretion if the research goals of the Department of Energy would be advanced by reducing or eliminating the match requirement for nonprofit organizations and institutions.

*Energy Policy and Systems Analysis.*—The Committee supports the consolidation of the Department’s energy policy analysis functions. Consistent with direction in the Energy and Water Development fiscal year 2010 conference report, consolidation will reduce redundancy across the Department and enable enterprise-wide orchestration of analytical capabilities across all areas relevant to the Nation’s energy sector. As part of this effort, the Committee shifts funding for policy functions from elsewhere in the Department into the Energy Policy and Systems Analysis office within Departmental Administration. This accounts for the \$5,852,000 increase in Department Administration funding.

The Office of the Secretary of Energy shall ensure that it is a full participant in the administration’s efforts to identify the best locations to site interstate transmission lines to maximize access to the Nation’s most significant renewable energy resources. Additionally, the Department is directed to collect, compile, and maintain data on the efforts of the tax code on meeting the Nation’s energy challenges, such as improving energy security, pollution reduction, and improving energy technology innovation and competitiveness, in a manner that will be useful during the tax reform debates.

The Committee is concerned that the Department has not made a concerted effort to reduce contractor international travel costs. According to a recent DOE Inspector General [IG] audit, while the Department implemented a mandatory 30 percent reduction in Federal employee travel, parallel actions have not been taken to manage or control foreign travel by contractors. According to the IG, a 30 percent reduction to international travel costs incurred by its 100,000 contractor workforce could save millions of dollars each year. Based on the IG’s findings, this Committee estimates, at minimum, \$7,000,000 in savings in fiscal year 2014 to offset the costs of appropriated non-security funding for the Department by avoiding unnecessary contractor travel costs and direct the total amount appropriated for these activities be reduced by that amount to address budget shortfalls for critical missions.

## OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$41,916,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	42,120,000
Committee recommendation .....	42,120,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends \$42,120,000 for the Office of the Inspector General.

## ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

## NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Committee recommends \$11,758,469,000, an increase of \$106,000,000 above the request, for the National Nuclear Security Administration. The Committee restores funding to critical non-proliferation activities that reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism—one of the Nation’s most important national security priorities. The Committee supports accelerated efforts to secure and permanently eliminate remaining stockpiles of nuclear and radiological materials overseas and in the United States that can be used for nuclear or radiological weapons. The Committee also continues to support efforts to modernize the nuclear weapons stockpile to sustain a safe, secure, and effective nuclear arsenal without testing. However, the Committee is concerned that NNSA will not be able to execute multiple, highly complex life extension projects and construction projects concurrently under ambitious schedules. NNSA’s inability to complete projects on time and on budget adds significant risk to its modernization plans.

*Report on Changes to Cost, Schedule, and Scope of Major Projects.*—The Committee is concerned that NNSA is not communicating changes in cost, schedule, and scope in a transparent and timely manner. The Committee directs NNSA to submit a report every 6 months on December 1 and June 1, with the first report due on December 1, 2013, on the status of major projects, such as construction projects and life extension programs, which are estimated to cost a minimum of \$750,000,000. The report shall include, among other things, the name of the project, a brief description of the mission need, a brief summary of project status, the baseline cost or expected cost range and contingencies, expected completion date, scope of work, and an explanation of changes, if any, to cost, schedule, scope, or contingencies.

*Improving the NNSA Budget Structure.*—NNSA was established in 2000, less than a decade after the cessation of nuclear testing. The budget structure that was developed to suit the mission at the time has mostly remained the same while NNSA’s mission has matured and evolved. The Committee believes the budget structure should change to improve transparency and flexibility and reflect NNSA’s new programmatic focus on life extension programs, infrastructure modernization, and a science, technology, and engineering capability to assess the stockpile without underground testing. The Committee directs NNSA to submit recommendations to this Committee for a new budget structure by March 1, 2014, that improves transparency and reflects new priorities and mission needs without unduly limiting the flexibility of the agency. The Com-

mittee plans to work with NNSA to develop a new budget structure for the fiscal year 2016 budget submission.

*Strengthening Assessments of Alternatives.*—The Committee is concerned about NNSA’s ability to assess alternatives, which may significantly reduce cost, at the preliminary planning stages of a project. Two major projects have recently been terminated or deferred after NNSA spent hundreds of millions of dollars on design and engineering work, including a plutonium facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory and a plutonium pit disposition facility at Savannah River National Laboratory. NNSA has since concluded existing facilities can meet mission needs. The Committee believes this wasteful spending could have been avoided had NNSA better assessed alternatives. The Committee also believes NNSA should more rigorously and thoroughly assess alternatives to construction projects with an estimated cost over \$100,000,000. The Committee directs NNSA to submit a plan to this Committee by March 1, 2014, on ways it will strengthen its ability to assess alternatives, including potential workforce needs and timescales to implement a more rigorous alternatives assessment capability.

*Academic Programs.*—The Committee recognizes that the foundation of NNSA’s ability to successfully execute its unique mission of ensuring a strong nuclear deterrent and preventing nuclear proliferation is the highly trained workforce at the national laboratories and production plants. The Committee acknowledges that developing the next generation of a specialized workforce is also NNSA’s responsibility. The Committee encourages NNSA to continue to support investments in academic programs in fields of research important to its unique mission, especially in focus areas that receive little funding from other government agencies or private entities

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$7,574,916,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	7,868,409,000
Committee recommendation .....	7,868,409,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$7,868,409,000 as requested for Weapons Activities. The Committee’s recommendation represents an increase of \$1,483,978,000, or 23 percent, compared to fiscal year 2010 to support nuclear modernization activities.

*Management Efficiencies and Workforce Restructuring.*—The Committee is concerned by NNSA’s decision to make the successful execution of complex nuclear projects, including life extension projects for five weapons systems and a multi-billion dollar construction project, contingent on unidentified and ambiguous management efficiency and workforce restructuring savings. In fiscal year 2014, the Weapons Activities budget assumes savings of \$320,000,000, but NNSA has not completed any assessments to determine the reasonableness, feasibility, or source of those savings. A failure to achieve those savings may impact critical programs. The Committee directs NNSA to submit to the Committee within 30 days of completion its Workforce Management and Governance Studies that identify the source of management efficiency and workforce restructuring savings.

*Assessment on Insensitive High Explosives.*—The Committee understands that the Nuclear Posture Review promotes exploring options for enhancing the safety of nuclear warheads. Nuclear weapon designs include fundamental safety features intended to prevent accidental weapon detonation or the scatter of radioactive material. One important safety feature NNSA is considering is the use of insensitive high explosives for all future weapons undergoing life extension activities, which would include repurposing plutonium pits that have traditionally used conventional high explosives. The Committee has not received sufficient information from NNSA and the Department of Defense on the need for insensitive high explosives in all nuclear weapons given the increased cost and risk of design changes required to use insensitive high explosives. NNSA has used conventional high explosives safely over the last 60 years and the W76 warhead which is currently being refurbished will use conventional high explosives for another 30 years. The Committee directs NNSA to submit a report to this Committee by March 1, 2014 that explains the benefits of using insensitive high explosives in all systems, the certification strategy for repurposing pits from conventional to insensitive high explosive systems, the costs associated with converting systems to insensitive high explosives, and changes in safety vulnerability assessments, if any, that would justify this approach.

*Plutonium Capability.*—With the deferral of a Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility, the Committee supports efforts to maintain pit manufacturing capabilities using existing facilities. NNSA assessments have concluded that existing infrastructure is sufficient to meet pit requirements for the stockpile until fiscal year 2030 and the Committee continues to provide sufficient funding to modify existing buildings to meet those pit requirements. The Committee recommends \$311,067,000 for plutonium sustainment and manufacturing capabilities, which includes \$143,685,000 for plutonium sustainment activities at Los Alamos, \$11,368,000 to purchase and install new manufacturing equipment to help achieve a pit production capacity of 30 pits a year by 2021, \$1,894,000 to begin pit certification testing to certify that newly manufactured pits can be used in the stockpile, \$30,679,000 to complete Phase 2 safety upgrades to the main plutonium manufacturing facility, known as PF-4, at Los Alamos, \$10,000,000 for additional seismic upgrades at PF-4, \$26,722,000 to continue construction of the Transuranic Waste Facility at Los Alamos, \$55,719,000 to begin construction of the Radioactive Liquid Waste Facility at Los Alamos, and \$31,000,000 to continue material stabilization, repackaging, and de-inventory of the PF-4 vault.

*JASON Study on Technical Hedge.*—The fiscal year 2014 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan proposes a strategy to consolidate the number of nuclear weapons variants from 12 to 5 over the next four decades. A stated advantage of the strategy is to ultimately reduce the size of the stockpile hedge—the portion of the stockpile that is maintained to mitigate against possible weapons and delivery platform reliability issues, transportation and surveillance logistics, and geopolitical changes. Since hedge weapons must be maintained in the same state of readiness as non-hedge weapons, significant costs are incurred to maintain the hedge. The Com-

mittee believes that potential reductions to the hedge made possible by the proposed strategy must be thoroughly evaluated up front since these strategies require billions of dollars of near- and medium-term investments in the name of reduced long-term costs. The Committee directs the JASON group of scientific advisers to submit to the Committee by April 1, 2014 an assessment of the requirement to maintain a significant hedge to address potential technical surprises and the extent to which NNSA uses quantifiable metrics associated with margins of uncertainties to determine the appropriate hedge size. The assessment should determine whether NNSA's requirements and methodology are mature enough to definitively inform the size of the technical hedge and, if not, provide recommendations on what steps should be taken to appropriately mature them.

#### DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

The Committee recommends \$2,258,468,000, a decrease of \$170,048,000 below the request, for Directed Stockpile Work.

*Life Extension Programs.*—The Committee recommends \$846,560,000, a decrease of \$168,044,000 below the request, for life extension programs.

*W76 Life Extension Program.*—The Committee recommends \$235,382,000 as requested for the W76 Life Extension Program. Completing the W76 Life Extension Program, which makes up the largest share of the country's nuclear weapon deterrent on the most survivable leg of the Triad, is this Committee's highest priority for life extension programs.

*B61 Life Extension Program.*—The Committee recommends \$369,000,000, a decrease of \$168,044,000 below the request, for the B61 Life Extension Program. The recommended funding will allow NNSA to continue design, engineering, and testing of critical non-nuclear components, such as the radar, neutron generator, power source, and gas transfer system, that are reaching the end of their lives and would affect the long-term reliability of this weapon system.

The Committee is concerned that NNSA's proposed scope of work for extending the life of the B61 bomb is not the lowest cost, lowest risk option that meets military requirements and replaces aging components before they affect weapon performance. NNSA's cost estimate for the B61 Life Extension Program has doubled in the past two years as work scope has increased—from \$4,500,000,000 to \$8,168,000,000. An independent cost review by the Department of Defense's Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office estimates that the actual cost will be \$10,100,000,000. With a projected scope of only several hundred bombs, NNSA would be paying tens of millions of dollars per bomb. In addition to cost increases, the schedule for manufacturing the first production unit, or the first refurbished bomb, has already slipped 2 years—from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2019. NNSA will face additional delays as it applies the sequester cuts to its major programs.

The Committee encourages NNSA to reconsider the option it selected for the B61 life extension program and develop a scope of work that can be successfully executed within known budget constraints and replaces critical non-nuclear components as soon as

possible to address end-of-life issues. The Committee also directs NNSA to submit to the Committee within 30 days of enactment of this Act its analysis of reduced life cycle costs for the proposed Option 3b for the B61 life extension program, including cost savings from consolidating the different B61 variants.

*W78/W88-1 Life Extension Study.*—The Committee recommends \$72,691,000 as requested to continue the W78 life extension study. The Committee is concerned about projected costs for an integrated warhead that would provide the same nuclear warhead for both the Minuteman III and Trident II delivery systems. The fiscal year 2014 stockpile stewardship and management plan projects the cost of an integrated warhead for the W78 and W88 systems at \$14,000,000,000. Given NNSA's poor cost estimating practices, the cost is likely to be much higher.

The Committee directs NNSA, in coordination with the Nuclear Weapons Council, to not preclude a separate W78 life extension program similar to the W76 life extension program, which did not require significant design changes. The Committee is concerned that an integrated warhead may be unnecessarily complex and expensive, increase uncertainty about certification and meeting the full range of military characteristics and stockpile-to-target sequences needed for submarine and intercontinental ballistic missile systems, and fail to address aging issues in a timely manner. When NNSA completes its study, the Committee expects a detailed assessment of the expected cost savings from an integrated warhead compared to separate life extension programs for the W78 and W88 and differences, if any, in reducing the hedge.

*W88 Alt 370.*—The Committee recommends \$169,487,000 as requested for the W88 Alt 370 arming, fuzing, and firing system. The Committee supports efforts to make the new W88 arming, fuzing, and firing system adaptable for use on other systems, such as the W78 and W87, to reduce design and engineering costs as those systems are upgraded. The Committee also encourages NNSA to meet the first production unit target date of December 2018 to match the limited life component exchange cycle for the W88 neutron generators and gas transfer systems to reduce transport and handling of this weapon.

*Stockpile Systems.*—The Committee recommends \$282,809,000 for stockpile systems. The Committee has removed congressional budgetary control points for each individual weapon system to provide NNSA greater flexibility in addressing unexpected technical issues. The Committee expects NNSA to continue to provide the same level of detail on each individual weapon system in yearly budget justifications. The Committee has moved funding requested for surveillance activities under stockpile systems to a new surveillance budget line.

*Surveillance.*—The Committee recommends \$234,647,000 for surveillance. The Committee consolidated requested funds for surveillance activities from Stockpile Systems and Stockpile Services into a new budget line. A new budget line will provide greater transparency into critical surveillance activities. The stockpile surveillance program provides information on the status of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. Through a variety of tests, the surveillance program ensures that weapon systems function as expected

and detects defects due to handling, aging, manufacturing, or design. The test results are used to help support NNSA's annual assessment of the reliability, safety, and security of the stockpile. The Committee wants to avoid budget shortfalls that hamper the ability of the nuclear weapons laboratory directors to complete all scheduled tests necessary to detect potential aging issues.

*Weapons Dismantlement.*—The Committee recommends \$56,000,000, an increase of \$6,736,000 above the request, for weapons dismantlement and disposition activities. The increased funding shall be used to reduce the backlog in dispositioning nuclear components from dismantled nuclear weapons. The Committee supports NNSA's goal of dismantling all weapons retired prior to fiscal year 2009 by the end of fiscal year 2022. The Committee directs NNSA to notify the Committee if it cannot meet this goal.

*Stockpile Services.*—The Committee recommends \$838,452,000 for stockpile services. Funding for Tritium Readiness in the Readiness Campaign has been moved to this account under a newly named Tritium Production program. Funding associated with component development under research and development certification and safety has been moved to a new Technology Maturation Campaign. Funding associated with surveillance activities has been moved to a new surveillance budget line.

The Committee is concerned about the Administration's lack of awareness of the vital role that the Tennessee Valley Authority plays in our Nation's nuclear weapons enterprise. TVA is the Department's only supplier of tritium, which is a vital component in weapons production. If TVA were to stop supplying the Department with tritium the Department would incur significant costs to initiate a production process due to private utilities unwillingness to assume tritium production responsibilities. That is why it is particularly troubling that the Administration chose to include a recommendation to privatize TVA in the President's budget request to Congress. The inclusion of the recommended sale of TVA caused a massive drop in value of TVA's bonds, did senseless damage to the financial holdings of TVA bond holders, and prevented TVA from being able to issue bonds in the 30 year bond market; all of which will result in higher electricity rates for TVA ratepayers. The Administration not only created massive turmoil with its ill advised recommendation to privatize TVA but the Administration also failed to address the fundamental question about how it would acquire tritium. The Committee directs the Department to submit a tritium acquisition plan to this Committee and the Office of Management and Budget, no later than May 1, 2014. The plan should detail the costs to the Department should TVA no longer be a viable tritium supplier.

#### CAMPAIGNS

The Committee recommends \$1,847,365,000, an increase of \$136,400,000 above the request, for NNSA Campaigns. The Committee supports efforts to improve models of weapon performance using experimental data, underground test data, and advanced computer simulations to better understand the effects of aging and provide solutions for potential stockpile issues. However, the Committee is concerned about the increased scope of work and planned

experiments to develop improved intrinsic safety and security options. The Committee believes planned experiments related to new safety and security options should be tied to military requirements and changes in risk assessments or weapon vulnerabilities that would justify exploring new surety features. Experiments related to new surety features should also be weighed against extrinsic features already available or being developed that may be less costly and more effective to prevent unauthorized access. The Committee also encourages NNSA to use the campaigns to reduce the complexity and costs of life extension programs.

*Science Campaign.*—The Committee recommends \$374,723,000, a decrease of \$23,179,000 below the request, for the Science Campaign. Within these funds, \$34,000,000 shall be used at Sandia's Z facility to continue critical plutonium and other physics experiments to support the stockpile stewardship program. The Committee encourages NNSA to prioritize fundamental and focused hydrodynamic and subcritical experiments over large-scale, integral experiments, as recommended by the JASON group of scientific advisors. The Committee supports strengthening predictive capabilities by obtaining critical data from focused and fundamental experiments that measure key dynamic properties of plutonium and other relevant materials and that study the interaction of radiation with matter. Given the cost of integral scaled subcritical experiments, the Committee encourages NNSA to prioritize scaled experiments that inform decisions for future life extension programs. The Committee also directs NNSA to provide a clear justification if it decides to increase the frequency of these experiments more than once every 18 months.

*Engineering Campaign.*—The Committee recommends \$90,043,000 for the engineering campaign. Funding for enhanced surety and funding associated with advanced diagnostics under Enhanced Surveillance has been moved to a new Technology Maturation Campaign.

*Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign.*—The Committee recommends \$528,376,000, an increase of \$127,333,000 above the request, for the inertial confinement fusion ignition and high-yield campaign. The increase reflects a movement of \$113,333,000 for the National Ignition Facility [NIF] operations in the Site Stewardship Site Operations account to the Facility Operations and Target Production account in this campaign to improve transparency of NIF operating costs. The Committee recommends that no funds within Site Operations and Maintenance shall be used for NIF. Within the funds for inertial confinement fusion, \$329,000,000, \$66,950,000, \$54,000,000, and \$6,000,000 shall be used for inertial confinement fusion activities at the NIF, the University of Rochester's Omega facility, Sandia National Laboratory's Z facility, and the Naval Research Laboratory, respectively. Within the \$329,000,000 available for NIF, \$30,000,000 is for the Advanced Radiographic Capability.

The Committee supports NNSA's approach as laid out in the December 2012 Path Forward Report to Congress on the use of the National Ignition Facility, which involves more focused experiments to understand fundamental physics and improve the predictability of simulation codes for indirect drive ignition while also sup-

porting polar drive and magnetically driven ignition experiments as alternative approaches to ignition. However, the Committee is concerned that NNSA has not developed clear metrics to measure NIF's progress in achieving ignition and supporting stockpile stewardship. This Committee's support for the National Ignition Facility will continue to be contingent on the unique contributions the facility makes to advance fundamental understanding of weapons physics. The Committee directs NNSA to provide the Committee within 60 days of enactment of this Act a 3-year plan that lays out significant milestones NIF plans to achieve on the path to ignition and critical experiments needed to support the stockpile stewardship program.

The Committee is also concerned by the operating costs of NIF, which is currently the most expensive experimental facility at the Department of Energy and NNSA. The Committee has seen little effort by NNSA to find operating efficiencies without significantly reducing the shot rate or laser energies. The Committee directs NNSA to submit to the Committee within 120 days of enactment of this Act a plan to increase the shot rate at NIF over the next 3 years with a budget of \$329,000,000 over the next 3 years.

Consistent with NNSA's other inertial confinement fusion facilities, the conferees direct that no less than 50 percent of the facility time on the NIF shall be dedicated to non-ignition stockpile stewardship experiments. The conferees further direct that Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory follow the advice of the High Energy Density Planning and Facility Coordination Council, which is made up of nuclear weapons physics experts from all three NNSA laboratories, to determine which non-ignition stockpile stewardship experiments shall be conducted on NIF that meet the highest priorities of the stockpile stewardship program.

*Advanced Simulation and Computing.*—The Committee recommends \$600,569,000, an increase of \$36,240,000 above the request, for advanced simulation and computing. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$69,000,000 for activities associated with the exascale initiative, such as advanced system architecture design contracts with vendors and codesign and advanced weapons code development to effectively use new high performance computing platforms.

*Technology Maturation.*—The Committee has replaced the Readiness Campaign with the Technology Maturation Campaign. The Committee recommends \$253,654,000 for the Technology Maturation Campaign, which includes funding from Stockpile Services and the Engineering and Readiness Campaigns. Funding for tritium activities has been moved to Stockpile Services. The Technology Maturation Campaign's goal will be to develop and deploy multi-system weapons component manufacturing capabilities needed to replace or upgrade technologies in nuclear weapons systems. The Committee supports efforts to modernize and increase the cost efficiency of manufacturing processes for the production of neutron generators, tritium reservoirs, detonators, and other critical technologies.

## NUCLEAR OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends \$688,031,000, a decrease of \$56,419,000 below the request, for Nuclear Operations and Capital Construction. The Committee supports NNSA's efforts to restructure the former Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities [RTBF] account. The Committee has renamed the two new accounts that encompass previous RTBF functions to provide greater clarity: (1) Nuclear Operations and Capital Construction and (2) Site Operations and Maintenance. The Committee provides no funds for a new plutonium metal processing activity. Without a plutonium strategy and a requirement to manufacture new pits, the Committee does not support efforts to stockpile refined metal.

*Corporate Project Management.*—The Committee recommends no funds for Corporate Project Management. The Committee supports efforts to improve NNSA's project management but the functions funded under this account should be funded under the Office of the Administrator.

*Pit Environmental Testing Capabilities.*—The Committee is concerned about the costs and security of shipping nuclear weapons primaries to Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. With the successful de-inventory of Superblock and the removal of all Category I and II special nuclear materials, the security designation at Livermore was reduced to Category III. To adjust to these less stringent security requirements, Livermore reduced the number of highly trained security personnel and removed some physical security equipment to save about \$40,000,000 a year. NNSA has proposed a surge in physical security when needed to protect primaries that are transported to Livermore for environmental testing on the unique diagnostics that reside at Superblock. The Committee directs NNSA to submit a report to this Committee by February 1, 2014 that explains whether this capability is needed to support stockpile stewardship. If this capability is still needed, the report shall include the results of a cost and benefit analysis of maintaining the capability at Livermore and surging physical security forces and defenses when the capability must be used as opposed to moving the capability to the Pantex site, which was the recommended option in a 2008 assessment that found moving the capability to Pantex was feasible and cost effective.

*Construction.*—The Committee recommends \$438,955,000 as requested for major capital construction projects.

*Project 06-D-141, PED, Uranium Processing Facility, Y-12, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.*—The Committee recommends \$325,835,000 as requested to continue design and engineering work as well as site readiness and site preparation projects. The Committee is concerned about project management and oversight of contractors for the UPF project. Most recently, a space fit issue that required raising the roof of the building by 13 feet to fit critical equipment resulted in more than \$500,000,000 in additional costs to U.S. taxpayers. The Committee is concerned that NNSA will not be able to complete the first phase of the project within the current cost range of \$4,200,000,000 to \$6,500,000,000. According to a recent GAO assessment, the space fit issue used approximately 45 percent of NNSA's contingency and NNSA contingency planning did not ac-

count for such a large sum of money being needed to address design risk. Several identified project risks, including all risks related to construction activities, remain but there is significantly less funding available to mitigate those risks. The Committee emphasizes the need for NNSA to improve project management of major projects and hold contractors accountable for increased costs and schedule delays.

#### NUCLEAR COUNTERTERRORISM INCIDENT RESPONSE

The Committee recommends \$260,181,000 for Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response. The Committee does not approve the transfer of this account to Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation and has restored funds in Nuclear Weapons Activities. Within these funds, \$190,181,000 shall be used for Nuclear Counterterrorism Incident Response and \$70,000,000 for Nuclear Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation. Within the funds available for Nuclear Counterterrorism Incident Response, the Committee recommends using the funds above the budget request to equip two additional cities under the joint NNSA and Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] Stabilization Program, which can help cities delay or impede threats from nuclear and radiological dispersal devices until specialized national teams can respond.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR SECURITY

The Committee recommends \$678,981,000 as requested for nuclear security activities at NNSA sites. The Committee recommends no funding for the Device Assembly Facility Argus Installation Project at the Nevada National Security Site unless NNSA provides the Committee a detailed explanation of the significant cost growth—from about \$5,000,000 to about \$25,000,000—for this project. The Committee understands that NNSA's contract structure for safeguards and security was a significant factor in the July 29, 2012 Y-12 security incident. NNSA had the Management and Operating contractor managing security systems and a separate prime contractor managing security personnel, which led to conflicting priorities and a lack of effective communication between the two contractors. However, the Committee is concerned that shifting protective force services at Y-12 away from a separate prime contractor to the Management and Operating contractor may not have been the most cost effective means of improving physical security at Y-12. All internal and independent reviews of the security breach at Y-12 conclude that the security failure was due to poor management and oversight, not a lack of protective forces, training, equipment, or funding. Despite these findings, the budget request includes an increase of \$57,255,000 for protective forces. The increase is primarily due to shifting protective force services to the Management and Operating contractor, which has higher overhead rates than the previous contractor. The Committee questions whether NNSA's decision to pay \$57,255,000 more for the same protective force services has resulted in any improvements in security. The Committee directs NNSA to submit a report to this Committee within 30 days of enactment of this act, with an explanation as to why the protective force contract was not competed, plans for future protective force services at Y-12 that offer the best protec-

tive services at the lowest cost, and why overhead rates are significantly higher than the previous contractor.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$2,433,524,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	2,140,142,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,180,142,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommends \$2,180,142,000, an increase of \$40,000,000 above the request, for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. The Committee commends NNSA for making significant progress in meeting the goal of securing all vulnerable nuclear materials within 4 years. Since April 2009, when President Obama announced the 4 year goal, NNSA has removed over 1,500 kilograms of highly enriched uranium and plutonium—enough material for approximately 60 nuclear weapons. As part of this effort, in less than 4 years, NNSA has removed all highly enriched uranium from 10 countries—for a cumulative total of 23 countries where a terrorist can no longer access dangerous nuclear materials. Further, NNSA has completed security upgrades at dozens of additional buildings in Russia and other countries to reduce the threat of theft of weapons usable nuclear material.

Despite the success of securing and permanently removing dangerous nuclear materials over the last 4 years that significantly reduces the threat of nuclear terrorism, the Committee is frustrated that the NNSA budget request does not make nonproliferation activities a top priority and fails to provide the necessary resources to complete critical nonproliferation efforts. Rather, the budget request would let critical milestones slip. For example, shutting down or converting 200 research reactors that use highly enriched uranium, which is a critical step in permanently removing highly enriched uranium from the remaining countries around the world, would take 8 years longer and would not be completed until 2030.

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

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

The Committee directs NNSA to submit by May 1, 2014 a new 4-year strategic plan with metrics, goals, and needed funds to secure and dispose of the remaining vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials that present the greatest terrorism risk to the United States. The plan should describe how and in what timeframe NNSA plans to remove all highly enriched uranium [HEU] and plutonium from the remaining countries around the world and

secure the highest risk nuclear and radiological materials at civilian sites by the end of the decade.

#### GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Committee recommends \$497,487,000, which is \$73,000,000 above the request. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$166,000,000 for the HEU reactor conversion program, \$160,000,000 for nuclear and radiological material removal, and \$171,487,000 for nuclear and radiological material protection.

Within the funds available for the HEU reactor conversion program, the Committee recommends \$52,000,000 as requested to continue supporting NNSA's efforts in developing a capability which does not currently exist in the U.S. to produce Moly-99—a medical isotope used in 16 million nuclear medicine procedures in the U.S. each year—with low enriched uranium by 2016.

The Committee is frustrated by NNSA's failure to provide sufficient funding in the preceding 3 fiscal years to meet the target goal of converting or shutting down 200 research reactors that use highly enriched uranium [HEU] around the world by 2022. HEU-fueled research reactors have some of the world's weakest security measures and a determined terrorist could use HEU reactor fuel for a nuclear device. The Committee believes permanently eliminating supplies of HEU as quickly as possible around the world significantly reduces the threat of nuclear terrorism. Because each reactor conversion takes approximately 2 to 5 years, depending on a variety of factors, such as time needed to modify facilities to accept low enriched uranium fuel, funding is needed in advance to prepare for these conversions. Because of insufficient planning and funding, the goal of converting or shutting down HEU-fueled research reactors has slipped by 8 years—to 2030. The Committee encourages NNSA to provide sufficient funding in the outyears to avoid any further delays in this program.

Within the funds available for nuclear and radiological material removal, the Committee recommends \$23,000,000, which is \$5,000,000 above the request, for domestic radiological material removal. The Committee recommends additional funds to eliminate the existing backlog of orphaned or unused radiological sources in the United States and dispose of the remaining orphaned or unused radiological sources that present the greatest risk of use in a radiological dispersal device by 2020.

Within the funds available for nuclear and radiological material protection, the Committee recommends \$100,000,000, which is \$49,000,000 above the request, for international material protection and \$71,487,000, which is \$15,000,000 above the request, for domestic material protection. The Committee is concerned by a lack of sufficient funding in the budget request to secure 8,500 buildings in the United States and overseas which legitimately use nuclear and radiological sources but, if stolen, could be used as effective improvised nuclear devices or radiological dispersal devices. Radiological materials in particular are used at hospitals and universities to treat diseases and for other medical purposes but they have little or no security. As the only government program that provides physical protection upgrades for civilian sites with nuclear and radiological materials, GTRI has only installed security up-

grades at 1,500 civilian buildings, or about 18 percent, that have high-priority, vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials. Instead of accelerating efforts to secure these facilities to address the known risk, the budget request would have abandoned the goal of securing 8,500 buildings by 2025 and would have delayed the completion of these activities by close to 20 years—to 2044. The Committee believes that leaving these nuclear and radiological materials unsecured for an additional 20 years does not serve the national security interests of the United States. For this reason, the Committee's recommendation would allow GTRI to meet its original goal of securing 8,500 buildings by 2025.

#### INTERNATIONAL MATERIAL PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The Committee recommends \$419,625,000, which is \$50,000,000 above the request. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$190,000,000 for Second Line of Defense [SLD]. The Committee supports NNSA's efforts to reassess and evaluate the effectiveness of its efforts to deter, detect, and interdict illicit trafficking in nuclear and radiological material across international borders and through the global maritime shipping system. The Committee encourages the SLD program to continue training foreign law enforcement and customs officials on the use, repair, and maintenance of portal monitors and other detection equipment to transition full operational responsibility and costs for the equipment to the host country as quickly as possible. The Committee also supports SLD efforts to complete installation of fixed detection equipment at vulnerable border crossings and expand the use of mobile radiation detection systems. The Committee recommends additional funding to accelerate efforts to install and deploy fixed and mobile radiation detection systems at border crossings, airports, and seaports.

The Committee is concerned about the effectiveness and long-term sustainability of the Megaports initiative. The Committee directs NNSA to provide this Committee a plan by March 1, 2014, on the Megaports initiative, which shall describe how NNSA will ensure the sustainability, including future upgrades, of Megaports operations after NNSA transfers radiation detection equipment to partner countries, the performance measures NNSA uses to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of this initiative, how many additional ports NNSA plans to install radiation detection equipment, and the extent to which NNSA will rely on industry to provide radiation detection equipment at key seaports.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends \$408,838,000, an increase of \$20,000,000, to support investments in developing advanced nuclear detection technologies. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$177,861,000 for nuclear detonation detection to meet production requirements of satellite sensors.

#### FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The Committee recommends \$669,191,000, which is \$166,634,000 above the request, to support plutonium and uranium disposition

activities and construction of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility [MFFF].

Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$113,000,000 for MO<sub>x</sub> Irradiation, Feedstock, and Transportation to resume testing for boiling and pressurized water reactor qualifications and other activities associated with MO<sub>x</sub> fuel packaging and transport. Within these funds, the Committee also recommends \$430,634,000, an increase of \$110,634,000 above the request, to continue construction of MFFF. The Committee is very concerned about the rising costs and schedule delays for building this facility. The cost estimate to complete construction has increased by \$2,800,000,000, or by 57 percent—from \$4,900,000,000 to \$7,700,000,000. The date for completing construction has also slipped by 3 years—from 2017 to 2020. Cost increases and schedule delays are attributable to poor project management by the prime contractor and weak oversight by Federal officials. For example, construction began before a baseline design for the facility was significantly complete, which is contrary to best practices, and the cost of equipment and supplies was higher than anticipated, even though the prime contractor and Federal officials should have anticipated the lack of expertise by suppliers and subcontractors to fabricate and install equipment than met stringent requirements for nuclear facilities.

Despite these cost increases, NNSA has not presented a better alternative to dispose of 34 metric tons of weapons grade plutonium in the United States and encourage Russia to dispose of an equivalent amount, which combined would be enough material for 17,000 nuclear weapons. The Committee generally supports efforts to find less expensive alternatives to meet nuclear modernization and nonproliferation goals, but NNSA's budget request only calls for slowing down the construction of MFFF while it conducts an assessment of alternative plutonium disposition strategies. NNSA has not provided this Committee with any information that would suggest a less expensive alternative may be available and the results of an alternatives assessment would not be completed in time to influence the fiscal year 2015 budget request. The Committee is concerned that a pause in construction for MFFF will only result in higher costs and further schedule delays. For these reasons, the Committee restores construction funds for MFFF.

#### NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The Committee recommends \$128,000,000, a decrease of \$13,675,000 below the request. The Committee provides no funds for the Global Security Through Science Partnerships because of a lack of measurable outcomes.

#### NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$1,079,654,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	1,246,134,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,312,134,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends \$1,312,134,000, an increase of \$66,000,000 above the request, for Naval Reactors. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$154,000,000, an increase of

\$9,600,000 above the request, and \$134,800,000, an increase of \$8,400,000 above the request, for the land-based prototype refueling overhaul and the development of a new reactor core for the Ohio-class replacement submarine, respectively. These additional funds will help Naval Reactors meet schedule and cost goals for these two critical projects. Within the funds for Naval Reactors, the Committee also recommends \$468,740,000, an increase of \$13,000,000 above the request, for Naval Reactors Operations and Infrastructure. The increased funding will help replace aging equipment needed for the land-based prototype refueling overhaul and provide additional high performance computing capabilities to avoid more expensive physical testing of components. Within funds for Naval Reactors, the Committee also recommends \$104,773,000, an increase of \$35,000,000 above the request, for construction projects. These additional funds will help mitigate delays to the construction of the radiological and prototype staff buildings needed to support the land-based prototype refueling overhaul and train sailors for nuclear operations. Additional funding will also accelerate efforts to upgrade aging security infrastructure at Naval Reactors sites.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$409,869,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	397,784,000
Committee recommendation .....	397,784,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends \$397,784,000 as requested. Within these funds, the Committee recommends \$67,373,000 to support nuclear nonproliferation activities and the expanded scope of work to secure and remove nuclear and radiological materials recommended by this Committee.

The Committee is concerned about the effectiveness of Federal site office staff in providing the necessary oversight of management and operating contractors. Recent studies, reviews, and audits have revealed weak Federal oversight at site offices that contributed to lapses in safety and security and completing construction projects on time and on budget at the national security labs and sites. The Committee believes the site offices, given their proximity and knowledge of the labs' and sites' operations, can be effective tools in managing contractors and identifying management issues early. However, the Committee is concerned that the site offices may not have the necessary skills or authority to conduct the appropriate level of oversight. The Committee directs NNSA to submit a report to this Committee by May 1, 2014 on ways it plans to strengthen site office oversight of safety, security, and project execution activities at the labs and sites, including strategies to hire staff with the necessary skills and changes, if needed, to roles, responsibilities, and authorities for site office staff to exercise better oversight.

The Committee is also concerned about increasing indirect costs, such as management, administrative, and facility costs, at the nuclear weapons laboratories. A recent GAO review found that management and operating contractors for the NNSA labs differ in how they classify and allocate indirect costs, which makes it difficult to compare indirect costs across the labs and even at each lab over

time. Without consistent and reliable information about indirect costs, NNSA cannot determine their reasonableness and whether there are opportunities to reduce costs so more dollars go toward mission critical activities. As a result, the Committee directs NNSA to submit a plan to this Committee by June 1, 2014 that would establish a standardized and consistent indirect cost reporting system for the NNSA labs to be able to compare indirect costs across the labs, assess the reasonableness of indirect costs, and establish incentives to reduce those costs.

Further, the Committee is concerned about award term extensions for NNSA sites that do not meet minimum threshold requirements for performance. The Committee believes award term extensions should be based on performance that exceeds expectations with goals and metrics set by NNSA and the management and operating contractor. Minimum threshold requirements create an incentive for the contractor to at a minimum meet, if not exceed, safety, security, programmatic, and operational requirements. Award term extensions create a long term financial liability for the Federal Government and should be awarded based on merit. The Committee believes NNSA must provide an explanation if at-risk award fees are adjusted and award term extensions granted that differ from field office recommendations. This Act includes a provision that requires a 30-day advance notification to this Committee with a detailed explanation of any waiver or adjustment made by NNSA’s fee determining official to at-risk award fees for management and operating contractors that result in award term extensions.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$5,012,954,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	4,853,909,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,146,536,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Committee recommendation for Defense Environmental Cleanup is \$5,146,536,000. Within the total provided, the Department is directed to fund the Hazardous Waste Worker Training Program.

*Reprogramming Control Levels.*—In fiscal year 2014, the Environmental Management program may transfer funding between operating expense funded projects within the controls listed below using guidance contained in the Department’s budget execution manual (DOE M 135.1–1A, chapter IV). All capital construction line item projects remain separate controls from the operating projects. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be formally notified in advance of all reprogrammings, except internal reprogrammings, and the Department is to take no financial action in anticipation of congressional response. The Committee recommends the following reprogramming control points for fiscal year 2014:

- Closure Sites;
- Hanford Site;
- Idaho National Laboratory;
- NNSA Sites;
- Oak Ridge Reservation;

- Office of River Protection;
- Savannah River Site;
- Waste Isolation Pilot Plant;
- Program Direction;
- Program Support;
- Technology Development and Deployment;
- Safeguards and Security; and
- All Capital Construction Line Items, regardless of site.

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

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

*Closure Sites.*—The Committee recommends \$4,702,000 for Closure Sites activities.

*Hanford Site.*—The Committee recommends \$961,785,000 for Richland Operations. Additional funding is provided for work related to the deconstruction of the Plutonium Finishing Plant, K basin sludge removal, and community and regulatory support. Within available funds in the River Corridor control point, the Department is directed to carry out maintenance and public safety efforts at the B Reactor, and the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response [HAMMER] facilities.

*Idaho National Laboratory.*—The Committee recommends \$380,010,000 for Idaho National Laboratory.

*NNSA Sites.*—The Committee recommends \$344,676,000 for NNSA sites, of which \$250,000,000 is for work at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

*Oak Ridge Reservation.*—The Committee recommends \$214,936,000 for Oak Ridge Reservation.

*Building 3019.*—The Committee recommends \$40,229,000 for the cleanup of Building 3019. This project will result in saving some \$6,000,000 in annual security costs at Oak Ridge National Laboratory once complete. The Committee directs the Department to provide an updated plan within 60 days of enactment of this act that keeps the project on a 5-year schedule.

*Oak Ridge Reservation Mercury Containment.*—Remediation of mercury contamination at the Oak Ridge Reservation from work performed at the Y-12 site is a high priority for the Environmental Management program. Full site remediation is a multiyear large scale cleanup endeavor that the Environmental Management program cannot afford to undertake at this time. However given the significant risk to public health the Committee urges the Department to continue to pursue efforts to prevent mercury from escap-

ing into the environment. The Committee recommends \$16,000,000 to continue planning, engineering and construction of the water treatment facility to be located at outfall 200 at the Y-12 site, which will reduce the mercury being released into the East Fork of Poplar Creek.

*Office of River Protection.*—The Committee recommends \$1,210,216,000 for the Office of River Protection.

*Savannah River Site.*—The Committee recommends \$1,194,261,000 for the Savannah River site. This includes an increase of \$106,000,000 for tank waste activities.

*Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.*—The Committee recommends \$222,390,000 for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. The increase in funding is to address the maintenance backlog which could threaten WIPP operations.

*Technology Development and Deployment.*—The Committee recommends \$24,091,000 for technology development and deployment.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$821,717,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	749,080,000
Committee recommendation .....	762,080,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends \$762,080,000, an increase of \$13,000,000 above the request, for Other Defense Activities. Within these funds, \$205,900,000 is for Specialized Security Activities. Within the funds for Other Defense Activities, the Committee recommends \$255,339,000, an increase of \$3,422,000 above the request, for the Office of Health, Safety, and Security. The increase is to support additional security reviews of Category I special nuclear material sites, which should include no notice and limited notice performance testing. A recent assessment of NNSA’s oversight of security operations after the Y-12 security incident found that the Office of Health, Safety, and Security, which is responsible for independent oversight, had been directed as part of governance reform to reduce the frequency and rigor of its security reviews of NNSA. As NNSA implements needed security reforms, the Committee encourages the Office of Health, Safety, and Security, through its independent reviews, to monitor and assess whether NNSA’s security reforms, including changes in organizational structure and Federal oversight of contractors’ security measures and performance assessments, has improved security of the labs and sites.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Department of Energy’s marketing agency for electric power in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides electricity to a 300,000-square-mile service area in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets the power from Federal hydropower projects in the Northwest, as well as power from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada

and California. The Committee recommends no new borrowing authority for BPA during fiscal year 2014.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER  
ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	
Committee recommendation .....	

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER  
ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$11,868,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	11,892,000
Committee recommendation .....	11,892,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

For the Southwestern Power Administration, the Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$11,892,000, the same as the budget request.

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

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$133,920,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	95,930,000
Committee recommendation .....	95,930,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

For the Western Area Power Administration, the Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$95,930,000, the same as the budget request. In cooperation with its customers, the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA] shall continue its efforts to build a more secure and sustainable electricity grid by leading the utility sector in efforts to maximize the use and integration of energy efficiency, renewable energy, distributed generation, and demand response, as well as improving transmission access between regions and interconnections, in a manner consistent with the core responsibility of WAPA to deliver power as inexpensively as possible to the preference customers.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$220,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	420,000
Committee recommendation .....	420,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

For the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, the Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$420,000.

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**  
**SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$304,600
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	304,600
Committee recommendation .....	304,600

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

**REVENUES APPLIED**

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	-\$304,600
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	- 304,600
Committee recommendation .....	- 304,600

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
<b>ENERGY PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY</b>			
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy RDD&D:			
Hydrogen and fuel cell technologies .....	100,000	100,000	.....
Bioenergy technologies .....	282,000	245,000	- 37,000
Solar energy .....	356,500	310,000	- 46,500
Wind energy .....	144,000	110,000	- 34,000
Geothermal technologies .....	60,000	60,000	.....
Water power .....	55,000	59,000	+ 4,000
Vehicle technologies .....	575,000	415,000	- 160,000
Building technologies .....	300,000	224,000	- 70,000
Advanced manufacturing .....	365,000	215,985	- 149,015
Federal energy management program .....	36,000	30,000	- 6,000
Facilities and infrastructure:			
National Renewable Energy Laboratory [NREL] .....	46,000	46,000	.....
Subtotal, Facilities and infrastructure .....	46,000	46,000	.....
Program direction .....	185,000	185,000	.....
Strategic programs .....	36,000	28,000	- 8,000
Subtotal, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy RDD&D .....	2,540,500	2,033,985	- 506,515
Weatherization and intragovernmental:			
Weatherization:			
Weatherization assistance .....	181,000	187,000	.....
Training and technical assistance .....	3,000	3,000	.....
Subtotal .....	184,000	190,000	.....
Other:			
State energy program grants .....	57,000	53,000	- 4,000
Tribal energy activities .....	7,000	10,000	+ 3,000
Subtotal .....	64,000	63,000	- 1,000
Subtotal, Weatherization and intragovernmental .....	248,000	247,000	- 1,000
Subtotal, Energy efficiency and renewable energy .....	2,788,500	2,280,985	- 507,515
Rescission .....	- 12,800	.....	+ 12,800
<b>TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY .....</b>	<b>2,775,700</b>	<b>2,280,985</b>	<b>- 494,715</b>

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
<b>ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY</b>			
Research and development:			
Electricity systems hub .....	20,000	.....	– 20,000
Clean energy transmission and reliability .....	32,000	32,000	.....
Smart grid research and development .....	14,400	14,400	.....
Energy storage .....	15,000	15,000	.....
Cyber security for energy delivery systems .....	38,000	38,000	.....
Subtotal .....	119,400	99,400	– 20,000
National electricity delivery .....	6,000	6,000	.....
Infrastructure security and energy restoration .....	16,000	16,000	.....
Program direction .....	27,615	27,615	.....
Subtotal, Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability .....	169,015	149,015	– 20,000
<b>TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY ....</b>	<b>169,015</b>	<b>149,015</b>	<b>– 20,000</b>
<b>NUCLEAR ENERGY</b>			
Research and development:			
Nuclear energy enabling technologies .....	62,300	62,300	.....
Small modular reactor licensing technical support .....	70,000	70,000	.....
Reactor concepts RD&D .....	72,500	62,500	– 10,000
Fuel cycle research and development .....	165,100	175,100	+ 10,000
International nuclear energy cooperation .....	2,500	2,500	.....
Subtotal .....	372,400	372,400	.....
Infrastructure:			
Radiological facilities management:			
Space and defense infrastructure .....	.....	15,000	+ 15,000
Research reactor infrastructure .....	5,000	5,000	.....
Subtotal .....	5,000	20,000	+ 15,000
INL facilities management:			
INL operations and infrastructure .....	165,162	150,162	– 15,000
Construction:			
13–D–905 RHLLW disposal project .....	16,398	16,398	.....
Subtotal, Construction .....	16,398	16,398	.....
Subtotal, INL facilities management .....	181,560	166,560	– 15,000
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security .....	94,000	94,000	.....
Subtotal, Infrastructure .....	280,560	280,560	.....
Program direction .....	87,500	87,500	.....
Use of prior year balances .....	– 5,000	– 5,000	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear Energy .....	735,460	735,460	.....
<b>TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY .....</b>	<b>735,460</b>	<b>735,460</b>	<b>.....</b>
Race to the top for energy efficiency and grid modernization .....	200,000	.....	– 200,000
<b>FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
CCS and power systems:			
Carbon capture .....	112,000	112,000	.....
Carbon storage .....	61,095	61,095	.....
Advanced energy systems .....	48,000	40,000	– 8,000

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
Cross-cutting research .....	20,525	20,525	.....
NETL coal research and development .....	35,011	35,011	.....
Subtotal, CCS and power systems .....	276,631	268,631	– 8,000
Natural gas technologies .....	17,000	20,000	+ 3,000
Unconventional fossil energy technologies from petroleum—oil technologies .....	.....	5,000	+ 5,000
Program direction .....	115,753	115,753	.....
Plant and capital equipment .....	13,294	13,294	.....
Fossil energy environmental restoration .....	5,897	5,897	.....
Special recruitment programs .....	700	700	.....
Use of prior year balances .....	– 8,700	– 8,700	.....
Subtotal, Fossil Energy Research and Development .....	420,575	420,575	.....
TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....	420,575	420,575	.....
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES .....	20,000	20,000	.....
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE .....	189,400	189,400	.....
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE			
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve .....	8,000	8,000	.....
TOTAL, NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE .....	8,000	8,000	.....
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION .....	117,000	117,000	.....
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP			
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA) .....	2,545	2,545	.....
Gaseous diffusion plants .....	96,222	96,222	.....
Small sites .....	50,189	70,189	+ 20,000
West Valley demonstration project .....	64,000	64,000	.....
Subtotal, Non-defense environmental cleanup .....	212,956	232,956	+ 20,000
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP .....	212,956	232,956	+ 20,000
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Oak Ridge .....	177,064	177,064	.....
Paducah .....	262,057	262,057	.....
Portsmouth .....	91,818	91,818	.....
Pension and community and regulatory support .....	23,884	23,884	.....
Subtotal, UED&D Fund .....	554,823	554,823	.....
TOTAL, UED&D FUND .....	554,823	554,823	.....
SCIENCE			
Advanced scientific computing research .....	465,593	493,773	+ 28,180
Basic energy sciences:			
Research .....	1,741,111	1,683,862	– 57,249
Construction:			
07–SC–06 Project engineering and design [PED] National Synchrotron light source II [NLSL–II] .....	26,300	26,300	.....
13–SC–10 LINAC coherent light source, II [SLAC] .....	95,000	95,000	.....
Subtotal .....	121,300	121,300	.....

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences .....	1,862,411	1,805,162	− 57,249
Biological and environmental research .....	625,347	625,347	.....
Fusion energy sciences .....	458,324	458,324	.....
High-energy physics:			
Research .....	741,521	751,590	+ 10,069
Construction:			
11-SC-40 Project engineering and design [PED] long baseline neutrino experiment, FNAL .....		20,000	+ 20,000
11-SC-41 Project engineering and design [PED] muon to electron conversion experiment, FNAL .....	35,000	35,000	.....
Subtotal .....	35,000	55,000	+ 20,000
Subtotal, High-energy physics .....	776,521	806,590	+ 30,069
Nuclear physics:			
Operations and maintenance .....	544,438	544,438	.....
Construction:			
06-SC-01 Project engineering and design [PED] 12 GeV continuous electron beam accelerator facility upgrade, Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator facility (was project 07-SC-001), Newport News, VA .....	25,500	25,500	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear physics .....	569,938	569,938	.....
Workforce development for teachers and scientists .....	16,500	16,500	.....
Science laboratories infrastructure:			
Infrastructure support:			
Payment in lieu of taxes .....	1,385	1,385	.....
Facilities and infrastructure .....	900	900	.....
Oak Ridge landlord .....	5,951	5,951	.....
Subtotal .....	8,236	8,236	.....
Construction:			
13-SC-70 Utilities upgrade, FNAL .....	34,900	34,900	.....
13-SC-71 Utility infrastructure modernization at TJNAF .....	29,200	29,200	.....
12-SC-70 Science and user support building, SLAC .....	25,482	25,482	.....
Subtotal .....	89,582	89,582	.....
Subtotal, Science laboratories infrastructure .....	97,818	97,818	.....
Safeguards and security .....	87,000	87,000	.....
Science program direction .....	193,300	192,300	− 1,000
Subtotal, Science .....	5,152,752	5,152,752	.....
TOTAL, SCIENCE .....	5,152,752	5,152,752	.....
ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY			
ARPA-E projects .....	344,890	344,890	.....
Program direction .....	34,110	34,110	.....
TOTAL, ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY .....	379,000	379,000	.....
TITLE 17—INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM			
Administrative expenses .....	48,000	42,000	− 6,000

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
Offsetting collection .....	- 22,000	- 22,000	.....
TOTAL, TITLE 17—INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM .....	26,000	20,000	- 6,000
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM			
Administrative expenses .....	6,000	6,000	.....
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM .....	6,000	6,000	.....
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Office of the Secretary:			
Program direction .....	5,008	5,008	.....
Chief Financial Officer .....	51,204	47,825	- 3,379
Management .....	55,699	57,599	+ 1,900
Human capital management .....	24,488	24,488	.....
Chief Information Officer .....	35,401	35,401	.....
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs:			
Program direction .....	4,700	4,700	.....
Economic impact and diversity .....	7,047	6,197	- 850
General counsel .....	33,053	33,053	.....
Policy and international affairs .....	20,518	.....	- 20,518
Energy policy and systems analysis .....	.....	16,181	+ 16,181
International affairs .....	.....	12,518	+ 12,518
Public affairs .....	3,597	3,597	.....
Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs .....	2,506	2,506	.....
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses .....	243,221	249,073	+ 5,852
Program support:			
Economic impact and diversity .....	2,759	2,759	.....
Policy analysis and system studies .....	441	441	.....
Environmental policy studies .....	520	520	.....
Climate change technology program (program support) ..	5,482	5,482	.....
Cybersecurity and secure communications .....	30,795	30,795	.....
Corporate IT program support (CIO) .....	15,866	15,866	.....
Subtotal, Program support .....	55,863	55,863	.....
Subtotal, Administrative operations .....	299,084	304,936	+ 5,852
Cost of work for others .....	48,537	48,537	.....
Subtotal, Departmental administration .....	347,621	353,473	+ 5,852
Funding from other defense activities .....	- 118,836	- 118,836	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross) .....	228,785	234,637	+ 5,852
Miscellaneous revenues .....	- 108,188	- 108,188	.....
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net) .....	120,597	126,449	+ 5,852
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL .....	42,120	42,120	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY PROGRAMS .....	11,129,398	10,434,535	- 694,863

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Directed stockpile work:			
B61 Life extension program .....	537,044	369,000	– 168,044
W76 Life extension program .....	235,382	235,382	.....
W78 Life extension study .....	72,691	72,691	.....
W88 Alt 370 .....	169,487	169,487	.....
Subtotal .....	1,014,604	846,560	– 168,044
Stockpile systems .....			
B61 Stockpile systems .....	83,536	.....	– 83,536
W76 Stockpile systems .....	47,187	.....	– 47,187
W78 Stockpile systems .....	54,381	.....	– 54,381
W80 Stockpile systems .....	50,330	.....	– 50,330
B83 Stockpile systems .....	54,948	.....	– 54,948
W87 Stockpile systems .....	101,506	.....	– 101,506
W88 Stockpile systems .....	62,600	.....	– 62,600
Subtotal .....	454,488	282,809	– 171,679
Surveillance .....	.....	234,647	+ 234,647
Weapons dismantlement and disposition:			
Operations and maintenance .....	49,264	56,000	+ 6,736
Stockpile services:			
Production support .....	321,416	321,416	.....
Research and development support .....	26,349	24,928	– 1,421
R&D certification and safety .....	191,259	80,824	– 110,435
Management, technology, and production .....	214,187	162,640	– 51,547
Plutonium infrastructure sustainment .....	156,949	156,949	.....
Tritium production .....	.....	91,695	+ 91,695
Subtotal .....	910,160	838,452	– 71,708
Subtotal, Directed stockpile work .....	2,428,516	2,258,468	– 170,048
Campaigns:			
Science campaign:			
Advanced certification .....	54,730	59,747	+ 5,017
Primary assessment technologies .....	109,231	93,000	– 16,231
Dynamic materials properties .....	116,965	105,000	– 11,965
Advanced radiography .....	30,509	30,509	.....
Secondary assessment technologies .....	86,467	86,467	.....
Subtotal .....	397,902	374,723	– 23,179
Engineering campaign:			
Enhanced surety .....	51,771	.....	– 51,771
Weapons system engineering assessment technology .....	23,727	23,727	.....
Nuclear survivability .....	19,504	19,504	.....
Enhanced surveillance .....	54,909	46,812	– 8,097
Subtotal .....	149,911	90,043	– 59,868
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high-yield campaign:			
Ignition .....	80,245	80,245	.....
Support of other stockpile programs .....	15,001	15,001	.....
Diagnostics, cryogenics, and experimental support .....	59,897	59,897	.....
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion .....	5,024	5,024	.....
Joint program in high-energy density laboratory plasmas .....	8,198	8,198	.....

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
Facility operations and target production .....	232,678	360,011	+ 127,333
Subtotal .....	401,043	528,376	+ 127,333
Advanced simulation and computing .....	564,329	600,569	+ 36,240
Technology maturation campaign .....	.....	253,654	+ 253,654
Readiness campaign:			
Component manufacturing development .....	106,085	.....	– 106,085
Tritium readiness .....	91,695	.....	– 91,695
Subtotal .....	197,780	.....	– 197,780
Subtotal, Campaigns .....	1,710,965	1,847,365	+ 136,400
Nuclear programs:			
Nuclear operations capability .....	265,937	.....	– 265,937
Capabilities based investments .....	39,558	.....	– 39,558
Nuclear operations and capital construction:			
Nuclear operations .....	.....	209,518	+ 209,518
Nuclear facility upgrades .....	.....	39,558	+ 39,558
Construction:			
12–D–301 TRU waste facilities, LANL .....	26,722	26,722	.....
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL .....	30,679	30,679	.....
07–D–220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL .....	55,719	55,719	.....
06–D–141 PED/Construction, Uranium capabilities replacement project, Y–12 .....	325,835	325,835	.....
Subtotal .....	744,450	688,031	– 56,419
Secure transportation asset:			
Operations and equipment .....	122,072	122,072	.....
Program direction .....	97,118	97,118	.....
Subtotal .....	219,190	219,190	.....
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response .....	.....	260,181	+ 260,181
Site stewardship .....	1,706,007	.....	– 1,706,007
Site operations and maintained .....	.....	1,535,893	+ 1,535,893
Defense nuclear security .....	664,981	664,981	.....
Construction:			
08–D–701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Alamos National Laboratory .....	14,000	14,000	.....
Subtotal, Defense nuclear security .....	678,981	678,981	.....
Information technology and cyber security .....	148,441	148,441	.....
Legacy contractor pensions .....	279,597	279,597	.....
Use of prior year balances .....	– 47,738	– 47,738	.....
Subtotal, Weapons activities .....	7,868,409	7,868,409	.....
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES .....	7,868,409	7,868,409	.....
<b>DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION</b>			
Defense nuclear nonproliferation R&D .....	388,838	408,838	+ 20,000
Domestic uranium enrichment research, development, nonproliferation, and international security .....	141,675	128,000	– 13,675
International materials protection and cooperation .....	369,625	419,625	+ 50,000
Fissile materials disposition:			
U.S. plutonium disposition .....	157,557	213,557	+ 56,000

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
U.S. uranium disposition .....	25,000	25,000	.....
Construction:			
MO <sub>x</sub> fuel fabrication facilities:			
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC .....	320,000	430,634	+ 110,634
Subtotal, Construction .....	320,000	430,634	+ 110,634
Total, Fissile materials disposition .....	502,557	669,191	+ 166,634
Global threat reduction initiative .....	424,487	497,487	+ 73,000
Legacy contractor pensions .....	93,703	93,703	.....
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response system .....	181,293	.....	– 181,293
Counterterrorism and counterproliferation programs .....	74,666	.....	– 74,666
Use of prior year balances .....	– 36,702	– 36,702	.....
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation .....	2,140,142	2,180,142	+ 40,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION .....	2,140,142	2,180,142	+ 40,000
NAVAL REACTORS			
Naval reactors development .....	419,400	419,400	.....
OHIO replacement reactor systems development .....	126,400	134,800	+ 8,400
S8G Prototype refueling .....	144,400	154,000	+ 9,600
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure .....	455,740	468,740	+ 13,000
Construction:			
14–D–902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL .....	1,000	1,000	.....
14–D–901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF ...	45,400	45,400	.....
13–D–905 Remote-handled low-level waste facility, INL .....	21,073	21,073	.....
13–D–904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO ....	600	2,600	+ 2,000
08–D–190, Project engineering and design, Expended Core Facility M–290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID .....	1,700	1,700	.....
Other construction costs .....	.....	33,000	+ 33,000
Subtotal, Construction .....	69,773	104,773	+ 35,000
Program direction .....	44,404	44,404	.....
Use of prior year balances .....	– 13,983	– 13,983	.....
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS .....	1,246,134	1,312,134	+ 66,000
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR .....	397,784	397,784	.....
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION .....	11,652,469	11,758,469	+ 106,000
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP			
Closure sites .....	4,702	4,702	.....
Hanford site:			
Central plateau remediation .....	513,450	533,450	+ 20,000
River corridor and other cleanup operations .....	393,634	408,634	+ 15,000
Richland community and regulatory support .....	14,701	19,701	+ 5,000
Total, Hanford site .....	921,785	961,785	+ 40,000
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition .....	362,100	377,100	+ 15,000
Idaho community and regulatory support .....	2,910	2,910	.....

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
Total, Idaho National Laboratory .....	365,010	380,010	+ 15,000
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites .....	309,676	344,676	+ 35,000
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
OR Nuclear facility D&D .....	73,716	89,716	+ 16,000
OR cleanup and disposition .....	115,855	120,855	+ 5,000
OR reservation community and regulatory support .....	4,365	4,365	.....
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation .....	193,936	214,936	+ 21,000
Office of River Protection:			
Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant:			
01-D-416 A-E/ORP-0060/Major construction .....	690,000	690,000	.....
Subtotal, Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant ..	690,000	690,000	.....
Tank Farm activities:			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition .....	520,216	520,216	.....
Total, Office of River Protection .....	1,210,216	1,210,216	.....
Savannah River site:			
Savannah River community and regulatory support .....	11,210	11,210	.....
SR site risk management operations .....	432,491	432,491	.....
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition ....	552,560	658,560	+ 106,000
Construction:			
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River .....	92,000	92,000	.....
Subtotal .....	92,000	92,000	.....
Total, Savannah River site .....	1,088,261	1,194,261	+ 106,000
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant .....	203,390	222,390	+ 19,000
Program direction .....	280,784	320,784	+ 40,000
Program support .....	17,979	17,979	.....
Safeguards and security .....	234,079	250,706	+ 16,627
Technology development .....	24,091	24,091	.....
Subtotal, Defense environmental clean up .....	4,853,909	5,146,536	+ 292,627
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP .....	4,853,909	5,146,536	+ 292,627
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP (LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL) .....	463,000	.....	- 463,000
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Health, safety, and security:			
Health, safety, and security .....	143,616	147,038	+ 3,422
Program direction .....	108,301	108,301	.....
Total, Health, safety and security .....	251,917	255,339	+ 3,422
Specialized security activities .....	196,322	205,900	+ 9,578
Office of Legacy Management:			
Legacy management .....	163,271	163,271	.....
Program direction .....	13,712	13,712	.....
Total, Office of Legacy Management .....	176,983	176,983	.....
Defense related administrative support .....	118,836	118,836	.....
Office of hearings and appeals .....	5,022	5,022	.....

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES .....	749,080	762,080	+ 13,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES .....	17,718,458	17,667,085	- 51,373
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS <sup>1</sup>			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Purchase power and wheeling .....	93,284	93,284	.....
Program direction .....	7,750	7,750	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	101,034	101,034	.....
Less alternative financing [PPW] .....	- 15,203	- 15,203	.....
Offsetting collections .....	- 85,831	- 85,831	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION .....			
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operating expenses .....	13,598	13,598	.....
Purchase power and wheeling .....	52,000	52,000	.....
Program direction .....	29,939	29,939	.....
Construction .....	6,227	6,227	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	101,764	101,764	.....
Less alternative financing .....	- 14,308	- 14,308	.....
Offsetting collections .....	- 75,564	- 75,564	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION .....	11,892	11,892	.....
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Construction and rehabilitation .....	122,437	122,437	.....
Operation and maintenance .....	82,843	82,843	.....
Purchase power and wheeling .....	407,109	407,109	.....
Program direction .....	217,709	217,709	.....
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	830,098	830,098	.....
Less alternative financing .....	- 293,349	- 293,349	.....
Offsetting collections (Public Law 108-477, Public Law 109-103) .....	- 230,738	- 230,738	.....
Offsetting collections (Public Law 98-381) .....	- 6,092	- 6,092	.....
Offsetting collections (for program direction) .....	- 168,193	- 168,193	.....
Offsetting collections (for O&M) .....	- 35,796	- 35,796	.....
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION .....	95,930	95,930	.....
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance .....	6,196	6,196	.....
Offsetting collections .....	- 4,911	- 4,911	.....
Less alternative financing .....	- 865	- 865	.....
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD O&M FUND .....	420	420	.....
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS .....	108,242	108,242	.....

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Committee recommendation compared to budget estimate
<b>FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION</b>			
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission .....	304,600	304,600	.....
FERC revenues .....	– 304,600	– 304,600	.....
<b>GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b> .....	<b>28,956,098</b>	<b>28,209,862</b>	<b>– 746,236</b>
(Total amount appropriated) .....	(28,968,898)	(28,209,862)	(– 759,036)
(Rescissions) .....	(– 12,800)	.....	(+ 12,800)
<b>SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS</b>			
Energy efficiency and renewable energy .....	2,775,700	2,280,985	– 494,715
Electricity delivery and energy reliability .....	169,015	149,015	– 20,000
Nuclear energy .....	735,460	735,460	.....
Fossil Energy Research and Development .....	420,575	420,575	.....
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves .....	20,000	20,000	.....
Strategic petroleum reserves .....	189,400	189,400	.....
Northeast home heating oil reserve .....	8,000	8,000	.....
Energy Information Administration .....	117,000	117,000	.....
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup .....	212,956	232,956	+ 20,000
Uranium enrichment D&D fund .....	554,823	554,823	.....
Science .....	5,152,752	5,152,752	.....
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy .....	379,000	379,000	.....
Title 17 Innovative technology loan guarantee program .....	26,000	20,000	– 6,000
Advanced technology vehicles manufacturing loan program .....	6,000	6,000	.....
Departmental administration .....	120,597	126,449	+ 5,852
Office of the Inspector General .....	42,120	42,120	.....
Atomic energy defense activities:			
National Nuclear Security Administration:			
Weapons activities .....	7,868,409	7,868,409	.....
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	2,140,142	2,180,142	+ 40,000
Naval reactors .....	1,246,134	1,312,134	+ 66,000
Office of the Administrator .....	397,784	397,784	.....
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration ....	11,652,469	11,758,469	+ 106,000
Defense environmental cleanup .....	4,853,909	5,146,536	+ 292,627
Defense environmental cleanup (legislative proposal) .....	463,000	.....	– 463,000
Other defense activities .....	749,080	762,080	+ 13,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities .....	17,718,458	17,667,085	– 51,373
Power marketing administrations: <sup>1</sup>			
Southwestern Power Administration .....	11,892	11,892	.....
Western Area Power Administration .....	95,930	95,930	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund .....	420	420	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations .....	108,242	108,242	.....
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:			
Salaries and expenses .....	304,600	304,600	.....
Revenues .....	– 304,600	– 304,600	.....
Travel efficiencies .....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Total Summary of Accounts, Department of Energy</b> .....	<b>28,756,098</b>	<b>28,209,862</b>	<b>– 546,236</b>

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

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

Section 301. Language is included on unexpended balances.

Section 302. Language is included specifically authorizing intelligence activities pending enactment of the fiscal year 2014 Intelligence Authorization Act.

Section 303. Language is included related to transfer authority.

Section 304. The Committee has included a provision related to nuclear safety requirements.

Section 305. The Committee has included language related to independent cost estimates.

Section 306. Language is included related to the provision of uranium.

Section 307. The Committee has included a provision modifying an annual review.

Section 308. The Committee has included a provision on appointments.

Section 309. The Committee has included a provision on a pilot program related to consolidated storage of spent nuclear fuel.

Section 310. The Committee has included a provision to repeal a reporting requirement.

Section 311. The Committee has included a provision amending a reporting requirement.

Section 312. The Committee has included language regarding New Brunswick Laboratory.

Section 313. The Committee has included language reducing contractor foreign travel.

Section 314. The Committee has included language on first tier subcontracts.

Section 315. The Committee has included language on a laboratory commission.

Section 316. The Committee has included language on waiver or adjustment notification.

## TITLE IV

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

### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

#### APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$68,126,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	64,618,000
Committee recommendation .....	68,200,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

Established in 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] is an economic development agency composed of 13 Appalachian States and a Federal co-chair appointed by the President. For fiscal year 2014, the Committee recommends \$68,200,000 for the ARC.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$29,072,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	29,915,000
Committee recommendation .....	29,915,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends \$29,915,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

#### DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$11,654,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	11,319,000
Committee recommendation .....	12,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

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

## DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$10,658,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	7,396,000
Committee recommendation .....	10,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Denali Commission is a Federal-State partnership responsible for promoting infrastructure development, job training, and other economic development services in rural areas throughout Alaska. For fiscal year 2014, the Committee recommends \$10,000,000.

## NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$1,494,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	1,355,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

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

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$1,025,186,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	1,043,937,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,043,937,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

## REVENUES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	-\$899,726,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	-920,721,000
Committee recommendation .....	-920,721,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

## NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1 2</sup> .....	\$125,460,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	123,216,000
Committee recommendation .....	123,216,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 2014 is \$1,043,937,000. This amount is offset by estimated revenues of \$920,721,000 resulting in a net appropriation of \$123,216,000.

The Committee is concerned about the security of high-risk radiological sources at hospitals and other medical facilities. Radiological materials are commonly found in equipment used by U.S. medical facilities to treat, among other things, cancer patients, but could also be used to construct a dirty bomb. A dirty bomb attack in the United States would have serious economic and psychological consequences. It is therefore in the interest of the Federal Government to ensure that all high-risk radiological materials in U.S. hospitals and medical facilities are secured as quickly as possible from potential theft or sabotage.

A September 2012 GAO report found that the NRC's requirements for medical facilities to secure radiological sources are not adequate. NRC's security controls do not prescribe specific measures that licensees should take to secure their sources, such as specific direction on the use of cameras, alarms, and other physical security measures. GAO visited medical facilities that implemented NRC's security controls and found that radiological sources were vulnerable to possible theft or sabotage. The Committee is encouraged by NRC's recent efforts to strengthen security training of inspectors and develop a best practices guide by November 1, 2013, that would help licensees determine how best to adequately secure equipment containing high-risk radiological sources and conduct trustworthiness and reliability determinations. However, the Committee does not believe these efforts are sufficient to secure these radiological materials and meet the intent of GAO's recommendations. The Committee therefore directs NRC to submit a plan to this Committee by March 1, 2014, that would strengthen NRC's security requirements, including new rulemaking if necessary, to provide hospitals and medical facilities with specific measures they must take to develop and sustain a more effective security program, including specific direction on the use of cameras, alarms, and other relevant security measures. The Committee believes the new requirements should be more prescriptive and establish minimum security measures each facility must take to address the risk posed by radiological sources.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

##### GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$10,838,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	11,105,000
Committee recommendation .....	11,105,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

##### REVENUES

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1,2</sup> .....	-\$9,754,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	-9,994,000
Committee recommendation .....	-9,994,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

##### NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$1,084,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	1,111,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,111,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of \$1,111,000.

#### NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$3,393,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	3,400,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,400,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112-25.

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board was established to evaluate the scientific and technical validity of the Department of

Energy’s nuclear waste disposal program. The Board reports its findings no fewer than two times a year to Congress and to the Secretary of Energy. For fiscal year 2014, the Committee recommends \$3,400,000.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS  
TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Appropriations, 2013 <sup>1</sup> .....	\$998,000
Budget estimate, 2014 .....	1,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect the March 1, 2013, sequester of funds under Public Law 112–25.

The Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects was established as an independent agency in the executive branch on December 13, 2006. The Committee recommends \$1,000,000. The Committee notes that the Office of the Federal Coordinator is legally allowed to receive funding from the companies for its work. The Committee urges the agency to take advantage of this potential funding source as the work of the agency directly benefits the companies.

GENERAL PROVISION

Section 401. The Committee has included a provision related to the Denali Commission.

## TITLE V

### GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

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

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

Section 503. The provision relates to conferences by any agency funded in the bill.

### PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

In fiscal year 2014, for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended, the following information provides the definition of the term “program, project or activity” for departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation bill. The term “program, project or activity” shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, 2014 and the report accompanying the bill.

If a sequestration order is necessary, in implementing the Presidential order, departments and agencies shall apply any percentage reduction required for fiscal year 2014 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–177 to all items specified in the report accompanying the bill by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in support of the fiscal year 2014 budget estimates as modified by congressional action.

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

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

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

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2014:

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

Department of Energy: Energy Conservation and Supply Activities;

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

Health, Safety and Security;

Non-Defense Environmental Management;

Office of Science;

Department of Administration;

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

Defense Environmental Management, Defense Site Acceleration Completion;

Other Defense Activities;

Defense Nuclear Waste Fund;

Office of Security and Performance Assurance;

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;

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

Energy Information Administration.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on June 27, 2013, the Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill (S. 1245) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, provided, that the bill be subject to amendment

and that the bill be consistent with its spending allocations, by a recorded vote of 24–6, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairwoman Mikulski	Mr. Shelby
Mr. Leahy	Mr. McConnell
Mr. Harkin	Mr. Coats
Mrs. Murray	Mr. Blunt
Mrs. Feinstein	Mr. Johanns
Mr. Durbin	Mr. Boozman
Mr. Johnson	
Ms. Landrieu	
Mr. Reed	
Mr. Pryor	
Mr. Tester	
Mr. Udall	
Mrs. Shaheen	
Mr. Merkley	
Mr. Begich	
Mr. Coons	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Alexander	
Ms. Collins	
Ms. Murkowski	
Mr. Graham	
Mr. Kirk	
Mr. Moran	
Mr. Hoeven	

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

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

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

**TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE**

**CHAPTER 84—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

**SUBCHAPTER II—ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT**

**§ 7135. Energy Information Administration.**

**(a) Establishment; appointment of Administrator; compensation; qualifications; duties**

\* \* \* \* \*

**(i) Manufacturers energy consumption survey**

(1) The Administrator shall conduct and publish the results of a survey of energy consumption in the manufacturing industries in the United States at least **[once every two years]** *once every four years* and in a manner designed to protect the confidentiality of individual responses. In conducting the survey, the Administrator shall collect information, including—

\* \* \* \* \*

**(k) Survey procedure**

\* \* \* \* \*

(1) conduct surveys of residential and commercial energy use at least **[once every 3 years]** *once every four years*, and make such information available to the public;

\* \* \* \* \*

**CHAPTER 109B—SECURE WATER**

**§ 10361. Findings**

\* \* \* \* \*

**§ 10364. Water management improvement**

**(a) Authorization of grants and cooperative agreements**

\* \* \* \* \*

**(e) Authorization of appropriations**

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section **[\$200,000,000]** *250,000,000*, to remain available until expended.

**TITLE 43—PUBLIC LANDS**

**CHAPTER 40—RECLAMATION STATES**

**SUBCHAPTER I—DROUGHT PROGRAM**

**§ 2214. Applicable period of drought program**

**(a) In general**

\* \* \* \* \*

**(c) Termination of authority**

The authorities established under this subchapter shall terminate on September 30, [2012] 2017.

\* \* \* \* \*

SUBCHAPTER III—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

§ 2241. Authorization of appropriations

Except as otherwise provided in section 2243 of this title (relating to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more than [\$90,000,000] \$100,000,000 in total for the period of fiscal years 2006 through [2012] 2017.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1988, PUBLIC LAW 100-676

SEC. 3. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION.— \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(1) LOWER MISSION CREEK, SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA.— \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(6) LOWER OHIO RIVER, ILLINOIS AND KENTUCKY.—The project for navigation, Lower Ohio River, Locks and Dams 52 and 53, Illinois and Kentucky: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated August 20, 1986, at a total cost of [\$775,000,000] \$2,918,000,000, with a first Federal cost of [\$775,000,000] \$2,918,000,000, and with the costs of construction of the project to be paid one-half from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and one-half from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1992, PUBLIC LAW 102-575

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT.

(a) INCREASE IN CRSP AUTHORIZATION.— \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—The Secretary is responsible for carrying out the responsibilities as specifically identified in this title and the Act of April 11, 1956 (Chapter 203; 70 Stat. 110 et seq.), popularly known as the Colorado River Storage Project Act, relating to the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project including oversight for all phases of the Bonneville Unit, the administration of all prior and future contracts, operation and maintenance of previously constructed facilities [and may not delegate such responsibilities to the Bureau of Reclamation except through the pilot management program hereby authorized. The pilot management program will exist for a period not to exceed 5 years and shall pro-

vide a mechanism for the Secretary and the District to create a mutually acceptable organization within the Bureau of Reclamation to assist the Secretary in his responsibilities for the long-term management of the Bonneville Unit. Such pilot management program may be extended indefinitely by mutual agreement between the Secretary and the District. The District at its sole option may use the technical services of the Bureau of Reclamation for engineering and construction work on any project features. These provisions shall not affect the responsibilities of the Bureau of Reclamation and Western Area Power Administration regarding all matters relating to all Colorado River Storage Project power functions, including all matter affecting the use of power revenues, power rates and ratemaking].

—————

**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1992, PUBLIC LAW 102-580**

**SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(1) SOUTHEAST ALASKA HARBORS OF REFUGE, ALASKA.—

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(8) KISSIMMEE RIVER RESTORATION, FLORIDA.—The project for the ecosystem restoration of the Kissimmee River, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated March 17, 1992, [at a total cost of \$426,885,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$139,943,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$286,942,000. The Secretary is further authorized to construct] and the Kissimmee River headwaters revitalization project in accordance with the report prepared under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4251-4252) for such headwaters project and any modifications as are recommended by the Secretary based on the benefits derived for the environmental restoration of the Kissimmee River basin[, at a total cost of \$92,210,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$46,105,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$46,105,000.]. *The total cost of the ecosystem restoration and headwaters revitalization projects is \$519,095,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$186,048,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$333,047,000.* The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that implementation of the project to restore the Kissimmee River will maintain the same level of flood protection as is provided by the current flood control project.

—————

**WATER DESALINATION ACT, 1996, PUBLIC LAW 104-298**

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**SECTION 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) SECTION 3.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 3 of this Act \$5,000,000 per year for fiscal years

1997 through [2013] 2018. Of these amounts, up to \$1,000,000 in each fiscal year may be awarded to institutions of higher education, including United States-Mexico binational research foundations and interuniversity research programs established by the two countries, for research grants without any cost-sharing requirement.

(b) SECTION 4.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 4 of this Act \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years [2012 through 2013] 2014 through 2018.

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

**TITLE I—CALIFORNIA WATER SECURITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT**

**SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**SEC. 103. BAY DELTA PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

\* \* \* \* \*

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

(1) IN GENERAL.—The heads of the Federal agencies described in this subsection are authorized to carry out the activities described in subsection (f) during each of fiscal years 2005 through [2014] 2018, in coordination with the Governor.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

(1) CONVEYANCE.— \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(3) LEVEE STABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.— \* \* \*

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that describes the levee stability reconstruction projects and priorities that will be carried out under this title during each of fiscal years 2005 through [2014] 2018.

\* \* \* \* \*

**SEC. 107. FEDERAL SHARE OF COSTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of implementing the Calfed Bay-Delta Program for fiscal years 2005 through [2014] 2018 in the aggregate, as set forth in the Record of Decision, shall not exceed 33.3 percent.

\* \* \* \* \*

**SEC. 109. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary and the heads of the Federal agencies to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out the new and expanded authorities described in subsections (e) and (f) of section 103 \$389,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2005 through ~~2014~~ 2018, to remain available until expended.

---

**FORT PECK RESERVATION RURAL WATER SYSTEM ACT,  
2000, PUBLIC LAW 106-382**

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) ASSINIBOINE AND SIOUX RURAL WATER SYSTEM.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(1) to the Bureau of Reclamation through fiscal year ~~2015~~ 2020, \$124,000,000 for the planning, design, and construction of the Assiniboine and Sioux Rural Water System; and

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM.—There is authorized to be appropriated, through fiscal year ~~2015~~ 2020, \$51,000,000 for the planning, design, and construction of the Dry Prairie Rural Water System.

---

**REVISED CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION,  
2007, PUBLIC LAW 110-5**

“DIVISION B—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION,  
2007

“TITLE II—ELIMINATION OF EARMARKS, ADJUSTMENTS IN  
FUNDING, AND OTHER PROVISIONS

**“CHAPTER 3—ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT**

“SEC. 20320. (a) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

“(c) The Secretary of Energy shall enter into an arrangement with an independent auditor for annual evaluations of the program under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. In addition to the independent audit, the Comptroller General shall conduct ~~an annual review~~ a review every three years of the Department’s execution of the program under title XVII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The results of the independent audit and the Comptroller General’s review shall be provided directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT, 2007, PUBLIC  
LAW 110-114**

**TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES  
PROJECTS**

**SEC. 1001. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.**

Except as otherwise provided in this section, the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this section:

(1) HAINES, ALASKA.— \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(17) MIAMI HARBOR, MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Miami Harbor, Miami-Dade County, Florida: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 25, 2005, at a total cost of ~~[\$125,270,000]~~ *\$152,510,000*, with an estimated Federal cost of ~~[\$75,140,000]~~ *\$92,007,000* and an estimated non-Federal cost of ~~[\$50,130,000]~~ *\$60,503,000*.

**ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT, 2007,  
PUBLIC LAW 110-140**

**TITLE VIII—IMPROVED MANAGEMENT  
OF ENERGY POLICY**

**Subtitle A—Management Improvements**

**[SEC. 804. COORDINATION OF PLANNED REFINERY OUTAGES.**

**[(a) DEFINITIONS.—**In this section:

**[(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—**The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration.

**[(2) PLANNED REFINERY OUTAGE.—**

**[(A) IN GENERAL.—**The term “planned refinery outage” means a removal, scheduled before the date on which the removal occurs, of a refinery, or any unit of a refinery, from service for maintenance, repair, or modification.

**[(B) EXCLUSION.—**The term “planned refinery outage” does not include any necessary and unplanned removal of a refinery, or any unit of a refinery, from service as a result of a component failure, safety hazard, emergency, or action reasonably anticipated to be necessary to prevent such events.

**[(3) REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCT.—**The term “refined petroleum product” means any gasoline, diesel fuel, fuel oil, lubricating oil, liquid petroleum gas, or other petroleum distillate

that is produced through the refining or processing of crude oil or an oil derived from tar sands, shale, or coal.

[(4) REFINERY.—The term “refinery” means a facility used in the production of a refined petroleum product through distillation, cracking, or any other process.

[(b) REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE INFORMATION.—The Administrator shall, on an ongoing basis—

[(1) review information on refinery outages that is available from commercial reporting services;

[(2) analyze that information to determine whether the scheduling of a refinery outage may nationally or regionally substantially affect the price or supply of any refined petroleum product by—

[(A) decreasing the production of the refined petroleum product; and

[(B) causing or contributing to a retail or wholesale supply shortage or disruption;

[(3) not less frequently than twice each year, submit to the Secretary a report describing the results of the review and analysis under paragraphs (1) and (2); and

[(4) specifically alert the Secretary of any refinery outage that the Administrator determines may nationally or regionally substantially affect the price or supply of a refined petroleum product.

[(c) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—On a determination by the Secretary, based on a report or alert under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (b), that a refinery outage may affect the price or supply of a refined petroleum product, the Secretary shall make available to refinery operators information on planned refinery outages to encourage reductions of the quantity of refinery capacity that is out of service at any time.

[(d) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall alter any existing legal obligation or responsibility of a refinery operator, or create any legal right of action, nor shall this section authorize the Secretary—

[(1) to prohibit a refinery operator from conducting a planned refinery outage; or

[(2) to require a refinery operator to continue to operate a refinery.]

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

**TITLE X—WATER SETTLEMENTS**

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

**PART I—SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RESTORATION  
SETTLEMENT ACT**

**SEC. 10009. APPROPRIATIONS; SETTLEMENT FUND.**

(a) IMPLEMENTATION COSTS.—

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.— \* \* \*

(2) AVAILABILITY.—All funds deposited into the Fund pursuant to subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) are authorized for appropriation to implement the Settlement and this part, in addition to the authorization provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 10203, except that \$88,000,000 of such funds are available for expenditure without further appropriation; provided that after **October 1, 2019**, all funds in the Fund shall be available for expenditure without further appropriation. *October 1, 2014, all funds in the Fund shall be available for expenditure on an annual basis in an amount not to exceed \$40,000,000 without further appropriation.*

**SMALL BUSINESS JOBS ACT, 2010, PUBLIC LAW 111-240**

**TITLE I—SMALL BUSINESSES**

**Subtitle C—Small Business Contracting**

**PART III—ACQUISITION PROCESS**

**SEC. 1335. REPEAL OF SMALL BUSINESS COMPETITIVENESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Business Opportunity Development Reform Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-656) is amended by striking title VII (15 U.S.C. 644 note).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this section—

(1) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) \* \* \*

(3) *First tier subcontracts that are awarded by Management and Operating contractors sponsored by the Department of Energy to small business concerns, small businesses concerns owned and controlled by service disabled veterans, qualified*

*HUBZone small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women, shall be considered toward the annually established agency and Governmentwide goals for procurement contracts awarded.*

### BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee guidance <sup>1</sup>	Amount of bill	Committee guidance	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee guidance to its subcommittees of amounts in the Budget Resolution for 2014: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Mandatory .....	NA	.....	NA	.....
Discretionary .....	34,773	34,773	NA	<sup>2</sup> 39,996
Security .....	18,012	18,012	NA	NA
Nonsecurity .....	16,761	16,761	NA	NA
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2014 .....	.....	.....	.....	<sup>3</sup> 20,504
2015 .....	.....	.....	.....	9,684
2016 .....	.....	.....	.....	3,111
2017 .....	.....	.....	.....	683
2018 and future years .....	.....	.....	.....	652
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2014 .....	NA	83	NA	18

<sup>1</sup> There is no section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2013 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2013 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
Investigations	124,750	90,000	120,000	-4,750	+30,000
Supplemental (Public Law 113-2) (emergency)	50,000			-50,000	
Subtotal	174,750	90,000	120,000	-54,750	+30,000
Construction	1,670,652	1,350,000	1,542,000	-128,652	+192,000
Supplemental (Public Law 113-2)	3,461,000			-3,461,000	
Subtotal	5,131,652	1,350,000	1,542,000	-3,589,652	+192,000
Mississippi River and Tributaries	251,496	279,000	300,000	+48,504	+21,000
Operations and Maintenance	2,407,176	2,588,000	2,700,000	+292,824	+112,000
Supplemental (Public Law 113-2) (emergency)	821,000			-821,000	
Subtotal	3,228,176	2,588,000	2,700,000	-528,176	+112,000
Regulatory Program	192,614	200,000	200,000	+7,386	
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP]	108,782	104,000	195,000	+86,218	+91,000
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	26,946	28,000	28,000	+1,054	
Supplemental (Public Law 113-2) (emergency)	1,008,000			-1,008,000	
Subtotal	1,034,946	28,000	28,000	-1,006,946	
Expenses	184,630	182,000	182,000	-2,630	
Supplemental (Public Law 113-2) (emergency)	10,000			-10,000	
Subtotal	194,630	182,000	182,000	-12,630	
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	4,992	5,000	5,000	+8	



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2013 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2013 appropriation	Budget estimate
Nuclear energy .....	757,482	635,460	635,460	- 122,022	.....
Defense function .....	.....	100,000	100,000	+ 100,000	.....
Subtotal .....	757,482	735,460	735,460	- 22,022	.....
Fossil Energy Research and Development .....	532,932	420,575	420,575	- 112,357	.....
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves .....	14,879	20,000	20,000	+ 5,121	.....
Strategic Petroleum Reserve .....	192,319	189,400	189,400	- 2,919	.....
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve .....	10,099	8,000	8,000	- 2,099	.....
Rescission .....	- 6,000	.....	.....	+ 6,000	.....
Subtotal .....	4,099	8,000	8,000	+ 3,901	.....
Energy Information Administration .....	104,790	117,000	117,000	+ 12,210	.....
Non-defense environmental cleanup .....	235,250	212,956	232,956	- 2,294	.....
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund .....	471,984	554,823	554,823	+ 82,839	.....
Science .....	4,866,248	5,152,752	5,152,752	+ 286,504	.....
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy .....	264,470	379,000	379,000	+ 114,530	.....
Race to the Top for Energy Efficiency and Grid Modernization .....	.....	200,000	.....	.....	- 200,000
Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee program .....	38,000	48,000	42,000	+ 4,000	- 6,000
Offsetting collection .....	- 38,000	- 22,000	- 22,000	+ 16,000	.....
Subtotal .....	.....	26,000	20,000	+ 20,000	- 6,000
Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loans program .....	5,988	6,000	6,000	+ 12	.....
Departmental administration .....	237,370	226,580	234,637	- 2,733	+ 8,057
Miscellaneous revenues .....	- 111,623	- 108,188	- 108,188	+ 3,435	.....
Net appropriation .....	125,747	118,392	126,449	+ 702	+ 8,057
Office of the Inspector General .....	41,916	42,120	42,120	+ 204	.....

Total, Energy programs .....	9,567,786	11,127,193	10,434,535	+ 866,749	- 692,658
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration					
Weapons activities .....	7,574,916	7,868,409	7,868,409	+ 293,493	.....
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	2,433,524	2,140,142	2,180,142	- 253,382	+ 40,000
Subtotal .....	2,433,524	2,140,142	2,180,142	- 253,382	+ 40,000
Naval reactors .....	1,079,654	1,246,134	1,312,134	+ 232,480	+ 66,000
Office of the Administrator .....	409,869	397,784	397,784	- 12,085	.....
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration .....	11,497,963	11,652,469	11,758,469	+ 260,506	+ 106,000
Environmental and Other Defense Activities					
Defense environmental cleanup .....	5,012,954	4,853,909	5,146,536	+ 133,582	+ 292,627
Defense environmental cleanup (legislative proposal) .....	.....	463,000	.....	.....	- 463,000
Other Defense activities .....	821,717	749,080	762,080	- 59,637	+ 13,000
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities .....	5,834,671	6,065,989	5,908,616	+ 73,945	- 157,373
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities .....	17,332,634	17,718,458	17,667,085	+ 334,451	- 51,373
Power Marketing Administrations <sup>1</sup>					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration .....	8,428	7,750	7,750	- 678	.....
Offsetting collections .....	- 8,428	- 7,750	- 7,750	+ 678	.....
Subtotal .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration .....	44,986	45,456	45,456	+ 470	.....
Offsetting collections .....	- 33,118	- 33,564	- 33,564	- 446	.....
Subtotal .....	11,868	11,892	11,892	+ 24	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration .....	290,529	299,919	299,919	+ 9,390	.....
Offsetting collections .....	- 156,609	- 203,989	- 203,989	- 47,380	.....
Subtotal .....	133,920	95,930	95,930	- 37,990	.....
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund .....	4,169	5,331	5,331	+ 1,162	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL  
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—Continued  
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2013 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				2013 appropriation	Budget estimate
Offsetting collections .....	-3,949	-4,911	-4,911	-962	
Subtotal .....	220	420	420	+200	
Total, Power Marketing Administrations .....	146,008	108,242	108,242	-37,766	
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses .....	304,000	304,600	304,600	+600	
Revenues applied .....	-304,000	-304,600	-304,600	-600	
Total, title III, Department of Energy .....	27,046,428	28,953,893	28,209,862	+1,163,434	-744,031
Appropriations .....	(27,052,428)	(28,953,893)	(28,209,862)	(+1,157,434)	(-744,031)
Rescissions .....	(-6,000)			(+6,000)	
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	68,126	64,618	68,200	+74	+3,582
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	29,072	29,915	29,915	+843	
Delta Regional Authority .....	11,654	11,319	12,000	+346	+681
Denali Commission .....	10,658	7,396	10,000	-658	+2,604
Northern Border Regional Commission .....	1,494	1,355	5,000	+3,506	+3,645
Southeast Crescent Regional Commission .....	250			-250	
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses .....	1,025,186	1,043,937	1,043,937	+18,751	
Revenues .....	-899,726	-920,721	-920,721	-20,995	
Subtotal .....	125,460	123,216	123,216	-2,244	
Office of Inspector General .....	10,838	11,105	11,105	+267	
Revenues .....	-9,754	-9,994	-9,994	-240	

Subtotal .....	1,084	1,111	1,111	+27	.....
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission .....	126,544	124,327	124,327	-2,217	.....
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	3,393	3,400	3,400	+7	.....
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects .....	998	1,000	1,000	+2	.....
Total, title IV, Independent agencies .....	252,189	243,330	253,842	+1,653	+ 10,512
Appropriations .....	(252,189)	(243,330)	(253,842)	(+ 1,653)	(+ 10,512)
Grand total .....	38,687,316	34,972,807	34,835,288	-3,852,028	- 137,519
Appropriations .....	(36,804,316)	(35,072,807)	(34,835,288)	(- 1,969,028)	(- 237,519)
Emergency appropriations .....	(1,889,000)	.....	.....	(- 1,889,000)	.....
Rescissions .....	(- 6,000)	(- 100,000)	.....	(+ 6,000)	(+ 100,000)

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