

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

110TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
2d Session } 110-

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS  
BILL, 2009

JUNE , 2008.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of  
the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. ]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in  
explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for en-  
ergy and water development for the fiscal year ending September  
30, 2009, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page number	
	Bill	Report
Introduction .....		3
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Introduction .....	2	7
Investigations .....	2	14
Construction .....	3	22
Mississippi River and Tributaries .....	4	34
Operation and Maintenance .....	5	36
Regulatory Program .....	6	52
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies .....	6	53
Expenses .....	7	53
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) .....	7	54
General Provisions .....	8	54
II. Department of the Interior:		
Central Utah Project Completion Account .....	8	54

	<i>Page number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Overview .....	9	55
Water and Related Resources .....	9	56
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund .....	11	63
California Bay-Delta Restoration .....	12	64
Policy and Administration .....	13	65
General Provisions .....	14	66
III. Department of Energy:		
Introduction .....		66
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy .....	15	76
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability .....	16	89
Nuclear Energy .....	16	91
Legacy Management .....		96
Clean Coal Technology .....	18	96
Fossil Energy Research and Development .....	18	96
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves .....	21	102
Strategic Petroleum Reserve .....	21	102
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve .....	21	103
Energy Information Administration .....	22	103
Non-Defense Environmental Management .....		103
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup .....	22	104
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund .....	23	108
Science .....	23	108
Nuclear Waste Disposal .....	24	119
Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program .....	27	119
Departmental Administration .....	29	120
Office of Inspector General .....	30	121
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:		
National Nuclear Security Administration .....	30	122
Weapons Activities .....	30	123
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation .....	31	131
Naval Reactors .....	31	138
Office of the Administrator .....	32	138
Defense Environmental Management .....		141
Defense Environmental Cleanup .....	32	144
Other Defense Activities .....	33	148
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal .....	34	149
Power Marketing Administrations:		
Bonneville Power Administration .....	34	149
Southeastern Power Administration .....	34	150
Southwestern Power Administration .....	35	150
Western Power Administration .....	36	151
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund .....	37	151
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission .....	37	152
Committee Recommendation .....		152
General Provisions .....	38	170
IV. Independent Agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	43	171
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	44	172
Delta Regional Commission .....	44	172
Denali Commission .....	44	173
Nuclear Regulatory Commission .....	44	173
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	46	176
Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects .....	46	176
Tennessee Valley Authority .....		177
V. General Provisions:		
House of Representatives Report Requirements .....	46	179

## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates, which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, 2009. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2008, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2009.

**[INSERT TABLE]**

## INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2009 totals \$33,265,000,000, \$2,078,300,000 above the President's budget request and \$2,377,000,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2008.

Title I of the bill provides \$5,332,900,000 for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, \$591,900,000 over the budget request and \$258,975,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level (excluding emergency spending). The fiscal year 2009 budget request for the Corps of Engineers totals \$4,741,000,000 which is composed entirely of new budget authority.

The budget request also included \$5,761,000,000 in emergency appropriations for the provision of 100-year storm protection for the greater New Orleans, Louisiana area. The Committee has included this funding in a fiscal year 2008 emergency supplemental appropriations Act.

Title II provides \$957,479,000 for the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, \$163,680,000 over the budget request, and \$193,434,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. The Committee recommends \$42,000,000 for the Central Utah Project, including \$987,000,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account, both the same as the budget request. The Committee recommends \$915,479,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$163,680,000 above the budget request and \$192,434,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. The Committee recommendation includes a rescission of \$120,000,000 in unobligated balances, rather than the \$175,000,000 rescission requested by the Administration.

Title III provides \$27,204,820,000 for the Department of Energy, \$1,286,932,000 over the budget request, and \$2,715,718,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level (excluding emergency spending). The Committee recommends funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency programs at \$2,518,552,000, an increase of \$1,263,159,000 above the request; electricity delivery and energy reliability programs at \$149,250,000, an increase of \$15,250,000 above the request; nuclear energy programs including the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility at \$1,238,852,000, a decrease of \$101,800,000 below the request; fossil energy research and development programs at \$853,578,000, an increase of \$99,548,000 above the request. The Committee recommends \$4,861,669,000 for the Office of Science an increase of \$139,700,000 above the budget request and \$843,958,000 above the current year.

Environmental management activities—non-defense environmental cleanup, uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning, legacy management, and defense environmental clean-

up are funded at \$972,273,000, an increase of \$12,887,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level and an increase of \$92,548,000 above the budget request.

The Committee recommends a total of \$494,742,000 for the Yucca Mountain repository. This includes \$247,371,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal, the same as the request, and \$247,371,000 for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the same as the request.

Funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which includes nuclear weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation, naval reactors, and the Office of the NNSA Administrator, is \$8,823,243,000, a decrease of \$274,019,000 below the request, and an increase of \$12,958,000 above fiscal year 2008. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,530,048,000 for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, an increase of \$194,052,000 above the current year and \$283,000,000 above the budget request. Funding for the Power Marketing Administration is provided at the requested levels.

Title IV provides \$305,701,000 for several Independent Agencies, an increase of \$37,688,000 above the budget request, and \$24,405,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. The requested funding is provided for the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Delta Regional Authority, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Inspector General, the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, the Denali Commission, and the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects. The request for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is increased by \$37,682,000 and no funds are provided for the Office of Inspector General for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

#### THE ENERGY CRISIS

Across the Nation, families already stung by an economic downturn have seen their energy bills skyrocket over the last year and their homes and lives endangered by floods, tornados, and hurricanes. With the price of gasoline now exceeding \$4.00 a gallon, and the potential costs of adverse consequences of global warming, such as an increase in frequency of severe weather, becoming painfully clear, the urgency to address energy and climate change has never been greater and the consequences of inaction more dire. Unfortunately, there are no easy or quick solutions to these problems. For example, from an economic perspective we cannot promise that we will lower the price of gasoline at the pump tomorrow, but we will do everything possible to help increase vehicle gas mileage. From a national security perspective we will work hard to enhance the use of biofuels to reduce our dependency on foreign sources of oil, but their use will not in and of themselves solve our global warming problem. Environmentally, we will work diligently to move our country away from a carbon based economy to reduce global warming, but our success will unfortunately not be measured in days and months.

Funding provided in this bill supports a substantial expansion of research, development, demonstration, and deployment programs focused on efficiently utilizing our domestic natural resources to fulfill our energy needs while addressing global climate change. The bill supports water infrastructure investments which represent

the Nation's front-line defenses for protecting our homes and families from some of the possible impacts of global climate change. In addition, the bill recommends funding to reduce fuel consumption through infrastructure investments which will increase the efficiency of our marine transportation system. These expanded activities alone cannot immediately reduce our energy bills or greenhouse gas emissions substantially, but they are a critical first step to addressing these issues sustainably in the long-term.

#### ADDRESSING HIGH GASOLINE PRICES

The Energy and Water Development appropriation includes \$888,938,000 for research, development, demonstration, and deployment of improved vehicle technology and production of biofuels, \$387,715,000 above the fiscal year enacted funding level and \$313,914,000 more than requested by the President. This substantial increase includes funding for many new initiatives to address the impacts of high gas prices authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, including new research and development programs for advancing battery technologies for electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles; Renewable Fuel Infrastructure grants to deploy more renewable fuel blends and make them more widely available; and Advanced Vehicles Manufacturing Facility grants as well as \$1,000,000,000 in direct loans for assistance for automakers and suppliers to more readily convert domestic manufacturing capabilities for the manufacture of new vehicles which are less dependent on fossil fuels. Over the next five to ten years, the results of these activities should address high gas prices by reducing demand for gasoline derived from oil and increasing supplies of alternative fuels.

#### ADVANCING ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For fiscal year 2009, the Energy and Water Development appropriation includes \$3,636,804,000 for research, development, and demonstration of advanced energy technologies, \$877,291,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted funding level and \$219,340,000 more than requested by the President. The Nation is engulfed in an energy crisis which, unlike the crisis of the 1970s, appears to be driven by fundamental, long-term economic, scientific, political and technological challenges. The steep increase in energy demand associated with the emergence of hundreds of millions of people from poverty internationally along with the significant barriers to increasing conventional energy supplies suggest the need for a fundamental transformation of our energy system. Such a radical transformation might be possible with the technologies we have today, but likely at significant cost. Investments in energy research, development and demonstration programs are designed to reduce these costs by expanding the range of options available to transform our energy system.

The energy technology research funded at the Department of Energy ranges from basic work to map the genomes of microorganisms that digest cellulose to applied work to increase the efficiency of turbines. The Department supports research and development of renewable energy generation technologies including advanced biofuels as well as solar, wind, geothermal, ocean, tidal, and hydropower. Work on conservation aims at development of zero en-

ergy houses by 2020, improved energy efficiency for U.S. industry, technology to further increase the fuel efficiency of vehicles, improved batteries for electric and plug-in hybrid cars, and hydrogen storage for future vehicles. Nuclear energy currently provides 20 percent of the electricity generation capacity of the United States. Sustaining this level of energy production is supported with research, subsidies for first applicants to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for new types of reactors, and demonstration of safer, gas-cooled next generation nuclear power plants. Fossil energy spending is devoted to carbon capture and sequestration so that coal can be used to generate energy without greenhouse gas emissions and to improving the energy efficiency of current coal-fired power plants. Long-term energy science research is focused on breakthrough ideas like fusion energy, which aims to harness the same source of power that enables the sun to shine to generate electricity here on earth.

The Department of Energy is encouraged to pursue all the technologies that can help abate the current energy crisis while reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other adverse environmental, economic, and security impacts, and to do so in creative and innovative ways. The Department must maintain a careful eye toward what can be used in the private and public sectors in the coming five to fifteen years while simultaneously funding the visionary research that will be needed to realize a sustainable energy system over the long-term.

#### FUNDING TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE

For fiscal year 2009, the Energy and Water Development appropriation includes \$6,009,524,000 to address climate change, \$1,326,777,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted funding level and \$1,929,674,000 more than requested by the President. This substantial increase includes \$500,000,000 to support new initiatives authorized by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140).

Funding is provided for research, development, demonstration, and deployment of energy technologies that increase energy conservation and production of energy without emission of greenhouse gases. Support for utilization of available conservation technology is provided through a major new energy efficiency block grant program, the weatherization grants, state energy grants, and federal energy management programs. In addition, an increase in budget authority is provided to cover the risk of providing an additional \$8,500,000,000 in loan guarantees to companies investing in innovative renewable and/or energy efficient technologies as well distributed energy generation, transmission, and distribution.

Increased renewable energy production is supported through major refurbishment by the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation of existing hydropower dams. Funding is also provided for research to understand and predict climate change, including climate modeling using DOE's state-of-the-art super computers, atmospheric radiation monitoring, and long-term experiments on the response of forests and other ecosystems to increased atmospheric carbon dioxide.

---

INTEGRATING CLIMATE CHANGE INTO LOCAL AND REGIONAL WATER  
RESOURCES PLANNING

Existing water resources projects were generally planned, designed, and built on the assumption that the future would look pretty much like the past. A review of the historical record revealed the water levels that have been reached in historical storms, and the agencies use that information to design projects that protect against a certain frequency event (e.g., the 100-year storm, the standard project flood, etc.). There are some exceptions, such as where upstream development is changing runoff or where subsidence is changing the ground elevation, but generally our water resources agencies have assumed a steady-state climate.

There is now increasing physical evidence, supported by increasing scientific consensus, that the global climate is warming, which will cause substantial changes to global sea level and to regional precipitation patterns. These changes will, in turn, affect key design parameters for water projects, such as levee heights, reservoir capacities, and channel depths. Global climate modeling is now sophisticated enough to be able to predict these changes on the regional scale, where they may have a significant impact over the typical project lifetime of Federal water resources projects. While not all climate models agree, especially at the regional scale, the Committee expects the water resources agencies under its jurisdiction, namely the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, to use the latest available climate models and forecasts to inform the planning and design of future water projects.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Act funds the Civil Works component of the Army Corps of Engineers, which encompasses approximately 23,000 civilians and 190 military personnel. Army involvement in works of civil nature dates back to the origins of the nation. Over the years, the Corps Civil Works mission has adapted to accommodate changing societal needs and values. A brief legislative history and the major mission areas of the Corps have been included in past Energy and Water Development reports.

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

The Administration's request constitutes an abject failure to meet the infrastructure needs of our country. Last year, this Committee characterized the budget request for the Corps as woefully inadequate; this year, the budget request borders on irresponsible. This Administration has clearly not learned the lessons of the Gulf Coast Hurricanes and the Minnesota highway bridge collapse. That lesson was a simple one—investment today can eliminate the need for costly emergency response tomorrow. More importantly, adequate investment today can save lives tomorrow. The budget re-

---

quest does nothing to meet the needs of tomorrow, is inadequate to meet existing requirements, and fails to provide sufficient funding to provide an economic stimulus through job creation, long term savings through operational efficiency of existing projects or transportation savings through optimal operation of the nation's harbors and channels. Beyond economic stimulus and transportation efficiency, infrastructure investment is necessary for the safety of our citizens. The consequences of under-investment in flood control and transportation projects are too significant to remain unaddressed.

In light of the need for increased investment in public infrastructure, the Committee recommends a significant increase to the Corps of Engineers budget for fiscal year 2009 to address additional priorities. While insufficient to meet all requirements, this funding will make progress toward adequate investment levels. The Committee remains adamant that the Corps of Engineers continue the reforms made in the last several years regarding project management and execution and out-year planning. The Committee's expectation, regardless of the amount of the annual appropriation, is that the Corps will ensure its funding is expended efficiently and in good faith to achieve the best interests of the public.

#### FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET OVERVIEW

The Committee recommends a total of \$5,332,900,000 for the Corps of Engineers, an increase of \$591,900,000 above the request and a decrease of \$258,975,000 from fiscal year 2008 enacted levels. In addition, the Committee recommends a rescission of \$1,900,000 from funds appropriated in the fiscal year 2008 Act.

The fiscal year 2009 budget request for the Corps of Engineers totals \$4,741,000,000, \$850,875,000 below the funding level enacted in fiscal year 2008. The bulk of this reduction was requested in the Construction account and would have significantly undermined the provision of new water resource infrastructure. Additionally, the budget request for the Operation and Maintenance account represents a reduction from the fiscal year 2008 enacted level, after adjusting for the proposal to move projects between the accounts, while the requirements to maintain aging existing infrastructure continue to increase.

The budget request for the Investigations account reflects a severe reduction from fiscal year 2008 levels. The Administration proposes only \$41,000,000 for studies to address water resource issues in cooperation with local sponsors, \$20,000,000 of that amount is for one study, leaving a small level of funding for the rest of the nation.

The requested fiscal year 2009 Construction program is \$1,477,807,000, including \$75,807,000 in the Mississippi Rivers and Tributaries account. The Construction request proposes six performance-based guidelines to guide the allocation of funding construction projects. Flood and storm damage reduction, navigation and hydropower projects are ranked by their Benefit-to-Cost Ratio (BCR). Aquatic ecosystem restoration projects are ranked based on how cost-effective they are in helping restore a regionally or nationally significant ecosystem that has become degraded as a result of a Civil Works project or a restoration effort that requires the Corps' unique expertise in modifying an aquatic regime. Two other key performance guidelines give priority to projects that address a

---



significant risk to human safety or provide dam safety assurance, seepage control, or static instability correction. Finally, the budget proposes funding to complete 12 projects, a new category seemingly designed to allow funding for one project to be included.

The 79 construction projects requested for funding consist of 50 Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction projects (five budgeted for completion), 19 Navigation projects (seven budgeted for completion), five Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration projects, and five Hydro-power replacement projects.

The budget request is based on an unrealistically optimistic assumption that a proposed change to the structure of the inland waterways system revenue stream is adopted and enacted. The Administration proposes to collect lockage-based user fees for commercial barges on the inland waterways to address the declining balance in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF), and to phase out the existing diesel fuel tax for these waterways. To date, the legislation is pending. Without enactment, the Inland Waterways Trust Fund will be depleted by the end of calendar year 2008. The Committee recommendation on this issue is discussed at length in the section titled Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

The fiscal year 2009 budget request is the first to present information for Operation and Maintenance activities by 54 areas based on United States Geological Survey sub-watersheds. This presentation is similar to that proposed in the preceding two fiscal years.

The Administration requests \$130,000,000 for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program, a reduction of \$10,000,000 from current year levels. The request for the remaining accounts, Regulatory, Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies, Expenses and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) is at fiscal year 2008 levels.

The budget request includes \$5,761,000,000 in a fiscal year 2009 emergency request for the additional federal funds needed for the following purposes: to reduce the risk to the Greater New Orleans, Louisiana, area from storm surges that have a one-percent annual chance of occurring; to improve internal drainage; to restore and complete construction of hurricane and storm damage reduction features in surrounding areas to previously authorized levels of protection; and to incorporate certain non-federal levees into the federal system. The Committee has included this funding in a fiscal year 2008 emergency supplemental appropriations bill. This amount brings the total cost of reconstruction and the provision of 100-year protection to the Greater New Orleans area to approximately \$14,000,000,000, roughly double the original cost estimate.

Pre-Katrina, storm damage reduction was provided through separately authorized projects, which were designed to different standards, subject to different requirements for non-federal cost sharing, and managed by different local entities. The budget request proposes to authorize the works in Greater New Orleans as a single project, to be constructed with the State of Louisiana as the cost-sharing partner, and subsequently maintained and operated by the State. The proposal is now obsolete, due to the consolidation of the levee boards in the greater New Orleans area at the urging of Congress. The Committee did accept the proposal to cost share the provision of 100-year protection 65 percent federal/35 percent non-federal and included it in the emergency supplemental bill. Addition-

---

ally, the budget request proposes to defer by one year the state's obligation to pay its \$1,500,000,000 cost share. This language is not included in the supplemental appropriations bill as it is simply a restatement of existing law.

A table summarizing the fiscal year 2008 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2009 budget request, and the Committee recommended levels is provided below.

[Dollars in 1,000s]

Account	FY 2008 enacted	FY 2009 request	Committee recommended
Investigations .....	\$167,161	\$91,000	\$142,900
Rescission .....	(-100)	—	(-1,900)
Construction .....	2,294,029	1,402,000	2,070,000
Rescission .....	(-4,688)	—	—
Emergency appropriations <sup>1</sup> .....	—	5,761,000	—
Mississippi River and tributaries .....	387,402	240,000	278,000
Operation and Maintenance .....	2,243,637	2,475,000	2,300,000
Regulatory program .....	180,000	180,000	180,000
FUSRAP .....	140,000	130,000	140,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies .....	—	40,000	40,000
Expenses .....	175,046	177,000	177,000
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) .....	4,500	6,000	5,000
<b>Total, Corps of Engineers .....</b>	<b>5,587,087</b>	<b>10,502,000</b>	<b>5,331,000</b>
Appropriations .....	5,591,875	(4,741,000)	(5,332,900)
Emergency appropriations <sup>1</sup> .....	—	(5,761,000)	(—)
Rescissions .....	(-4,788)	—	(-1,900)

<sup>1</sup>Emergency appropriations recommended in the FY 2008 Supplemental Appropriations Act.

#### INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND

The Committee's recommendation includes funding for projects cost-shared from Inland Waterways Trust Fund largely as requested. However, to achieve this level of funding the Committee has suspended withdrawal of funds from the Trust Fund for several major rehabilitation projects that have been funded out of the Trust Fund for decades but are not legally required to do so. This change in policy is necessary due to the Administration's failure to address declining revenues.

The Committee is disappointed with the Administration's lack of timely action on revising the structure of the revenues generated for this purpose. The Administration has been aware for years that the Trust Fund would become the limiting factor in appropriations for this purpose, yet little or no action has been taken. The Administration testified on March 13, 2007, in part that, "the Administration is developing and will propose legislation . . . [that] will address the decline in the balance in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund . . . The legislation will be offered this spring for consideration by Congress." The legislation was eventually submitted to Congress on April 4, 2008, more than a year after it was promised and years after the bankruptcy of this Trust Fund was projected. The Committee insists that the Administration work with the appropriate authorizing committees to reach agreement on restructuring the revenue stream. The Committee will oppose any proposal which includes a change to the non-federal cost share required for inland navigation projects.

The Committee's recommendation in no way changes its position that capital improvements to the inland waterway system must be cost shared from the Trust Fund. All investment decisions must be made in light of national priorities and all projects must compete against each other for the limited funding. The Committee expects that once the revenue stream to the Trust Fund is restored, the total cost of these major rehabilitation projects will once again be cost shared at fifty percent. Due to existing obligations which account for the vast majority of the current revenue stream, language is carried prohibiting the Corps from awarding any additional continuing contracts for projects funded from the Trust Fund.

#### FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET PRESENTATION

For the third year in a row, the Corps of Engineers has proposed several changes to the manner that the Civil Works program is presented and appropriated. The most significant change appears in the Operation and Maintenance account, into which four categories of projects are moved from Construction. These categories are: the rehabilitation of infrastructure; Endangered Species Act compliance; the construction of facilities, projects or features (including islands and wetlands) using materials dredged during Federal navigation operation and maintenance activities; and the mitigation of impacts on shorelines resulting from Federal navigation operation and maintenance activities. Additionally, the budget request aggregates operation and maintenance projects into geographical regions and provides a single appropriation for all projects contained within each of the 54 regions. The approach proposed by the Administration is simply a project-by-project budget which has been regionally aggregated to give the appearance of a regional or systems-level approach. The Committee supports a regional to systems approach to Operation and Maintenance budgeting, but it must be based on substantive regional analysis and decision-making, not merely aggregation for the sake of appearance.

The Congress offered to consider the regional approach in budgeting operation and maintenance projects once the Corps proved that it was budgeting on the basis of systems-level needs rather than by individual project needs; the Corps has not yet accomplished this task. The fiscal year 2008 appropriation included the conditions under which the Congress would consider a regional appropriation of the Operations and Maintenance account and the movement of projects from the Construction account. To reiterate, the Corps is directed to prepare four systemized, integrated budgets for four different areas of the nation, the Ohio River, the Great Lakes, the Texas coast, and the California coast, to demonstrate the value of system or watershed planning and budgeting. Further, the Corps is directed to develop a comprehensive capital expense policy to distinguish clearly between activities that should be considered routine maintenance and those that should be considered a capital expense consistent with industry practices. Capital improvements are properly budgeted in the Construction account; routine activities associated with the upkeep of existing projects are properly budgeted in Operations and Maintenance account.

The regionalization of the Operation and Maintenance account was initially proposed by the Administration to avoid congressional

---

reprogramming limitations. Regrettably the Office of Management and Budget has politicized this account by declaring each project in the fiscal year 2008 program a congressional earmark, despite the fact that the program was appropriated largely as requested by the Administration.

Additionally, the budget documents for the Corps of Engineers included no detailed information for this \$2,475,000,000 Operation and Maintenance account. The documents contained no information on how the Administration arrived at the final funding levels for the 54 regional systems or information that would allow comparison to past years. The Administration further directed the Corps of Engineers not to release this information beyond the executive branch; it required a letter from this Committee in order for Congress and the public to have access to the underlying data which supported the regional funding level. The Administration's problematic steps have been counterproductive.

The Committee recognizes the Operation and Maintenance account can require a higher degree of flexibility than the Construction or Investigations accounts. As the Corps has reformed its fiscal management, this Committee has supported higher levels of reprogramming authority for this account without the need to seek approval from the Congress. The Committee has also been willing to consider reprogrammings necessary for the greater good, even when these reprogrammings are politically unpopular. It is the Administration's own policies that have resulted in the Corps' inability to reprogram funds necessary to meet national or regional needs.

The Committee reiterates its support for a more systematic approach to funding the operation and maintenance of the nation's waterways and understands the dynamic nature of the project needs under this account. However, the Corps must first comply with the conditions necessary for the Committee to support the Administration's budget structure. The appropriation recommendations included herein reject the Administration's proposal and are consistent with the fiscal year 2008 structure.

The following table provides a comparison of the Operation and Maintenance and Construction accounts for fiscal years 2006–2009:

[Dollars in 1,000s]

Account	FY 2006 enacted	FY 2007 enacted	FY 2008 enacted	FY 2009 request	Committee recommended
Operations and Maintenance .....	\$1,969,000	\$1,973,347	\$2,243,637	\$2,475,000 [2,200,000]	2,300,000
Construction .....	2,348,000	2,336,368	2,294,029	1,402,000 [1,677,000]	2,070,000

<sup>1</sup> Bracketed figures reflect account totals following the structure used in fiscal year 2006–2008.

#### PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND EXECUTION

This Committee has repeatedly emphasized that sound infrastructure investment is not just a matter of money, but also requires continued improvements in project management and execution. The Committee recognizes and appreciates the Corps' efforts in this area, but more can be achieved.

*Five-year comprehensive budget planning.*—The Committee has not yet received the Corps' updated five-year plan, despite repeated assurances that its delivery was imminent. This lack of responsive-

ness is disappointing. This Committee has used the Corps as an example of an agency that has consistently improved with each submission of this critical planning tool. The Committee is left to conclude that, once again, the Administration is unwilling to provide transparency in its own budgeting even as it exhorts the Congress to do so.

*Emphasis on expenditures.*—Recent changes to the Corps' budgeting and contracting policies have resulted in the carryover of significant levels of funding from year to year. The Committee fully expected obligated balances to increase. However, the Corps is directed to minimize unobligated carryover to the extent practicable. This direction should not be viewed as an excuse to reprogram funds liberally between projects or activities, but rather an admonition to the Corps to estimate capabilities accurately and execute projects within baseline scope and schedules.

*Continuing contracts.*—In recent years, Congress has placed restrictions on the Corps' use of continuing contracts, a unique authority which allows the Corps to obligate the federal government in advance of appropriations. In response to concerns surrounding the reforms made to the Corps' contracting, the fiscal year 2008 appropriation included direction to the Corps and to GAO to provide reports describing the overall effects, both positive and negative, of this new policy in relation to the Corps' ability to execute the Civil Works mission, including any recommendations for changes or improvements to this policy if necessary and appropriate.

Neither the Corps nor GAO have completed the requested reports. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation includes a provision that prohibits the use of funds to execute any new continuing contract, or modifications to an existing contract, that commits an amount for a project in excess of the amounts appropriated for such project or otherwise available through carryover.

While the Committee is willing in the future to revisit its position on continuing contracts, the Corps must be mindful to only use continuing contracts where justified. Once issued, these contracts should be managed to existing and realistically expected future year appropriations. Under no circumstance should the contractor be allowed to dictate the pace of expenditures; the Corps as the contracting agent holds this responsibility. The Committee restates its direction that the Corps develop criteria and standards for the use of continuing contracts as well as examine alternatives to this contracting.

*Reprogrammings.*—To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2009 is consistent with congressional direction, to minimize the movement of funds, and to improve overall budget execution, the bill incorporates by reference the projects identified in the report accompanying this Act into statute.

*Emergency Operation and Maintenance Reprogrammings.*—Fiscal year 2008 brought significant flooding to the Midwest, resulting in increased sedimentation that threatened to close the lower Mississippi River to deep draft navigation. The Corps initially informed the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations that there was no alternative to reprogramming funds from existing Operation and Maintenance projects, despite the fact the Corps had approximately \$10,000,000 in unobligated emergency funds that may be used to restore navigation projects to authorized depths

---

when the sediment accumulation is the result of natural disasters. The situation required both Committees to intervene in the reprogramming so as not to adversely impact projects appropriated through the regular appropriations process. Subsequent to the initial reprogramming, less than \$10,000,000 in additional funding was needed to maintain Mississippi River navigation. The Corps Headquarters requested assistance from all field offices, yet they were unable or unwilling to provide even minimal funding to assist. This response is unacceptable when the Operation and Maintenance account is \$2,300,000,000. Accordingly, the Committee has reduced the budget request for each Operation and Maintenance project and funded an emergency line item, which will be used to respond to unforeseen requirements in this account. The Corps Headquarters will manage the fund, with any allocation subject to the consultation and approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

*New Starts.*—The Committee recommendation includes a limited number of new start studies and construction projects. The Committee recommends no new start environmental infrastructure projects; all new starts are limited to the traditional missions of the Corps of Engineers.

*Projects.*—Congress has made significant reforms in the way it reviews funding for the Federal government; reforms which the Committee takes very seriously as it executes its constitutional authority. Earmarking or directed spending of Federal dollars does not begin with Congress. It begins with the Executive Branch. For example, the Construction, Investigations and Mississippi River and Tributaries accounts in the budget request are almost entirely made of individual earmarked projects. The Administration, in selecting these projects, goes through a process that is the functional equivalent of earmarking. When the Committee reviews the budget request, it goes through a process of rigorous review and may alter or modify this list to reflect additional priorities. The Administration has proposed the Operation and Maintenance account on a regional basis to avoid the appearance of an earmarked account; however, the regional requests are simply aggregated individual projects. The method used by the Administration simply obfuscates the details of the budget request so that it is difficult to compare the information to past requests and appropriations for the projects owned and operated by the Corps of Engineers.

#### INVESTIGATIONS

##### (INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$167,261,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	91,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	142,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	-24,361,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+51,900,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$142,900,000, a decrease of \$24,361,000 from the fiscal year 2008 enacted level and an increase of \$51,900,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes a rescission of \$1,900,000 appropriated in Public Law 110-161.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST INV.	PLNG	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALASKA			
ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK.....	---	---	550
ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK.....	100	---	100
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK.....	400	---	400
YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK.....	700	---	700
ARIZONA			
LITTLE COLORADO RIVER WATERSHED, AZ.....	---	---	250
PASCUA YAQUI, AZ.....	---	---	100
PIHA COUNTY, AZ.....	275	---	275
RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ.....	---	---	1,500
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ.....	---	658	658
ARKANSAS			
PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR.....	---	---	500
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR.....	---	---	250
CALIFORNIA			
ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA.....	---	---	390
ARROYO SECO WATERSHED, CA.....	---	---	200
BALDNA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA.....	---	---	500
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA.....	900	---	900
CITY OF NORWALK, CA.....	---	---	250
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA.....	---	950	1,600
DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA.....	---	---	500
ESTUDILLO CANAL, CA.....	---	---	200
GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA.....	---	---	600
HAMILTON CITY, CA.....	---	---	1,000
HUMBOLDT BAY LONG TERM SHOAL MGMT, CA.....	---	---	150
LAUNA CREEK WATERSHED, CA.....	---	---	500
LOS ANGELES RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA.....	---	---	500
LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE, HEADWORKS, CA.....	---	---	433
LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA.....	---	---	250
MIDDLE CREEK, CA.....	---	---	200
PAJARO RIVER, CA.....	---	---	800
RAYMOND BASIN, SIX, CHINO, & SAN GABRIEL BASINS, CA...	---	---	100
RIVERSIDE COUNTY SAMP, CA.....	---	---	365
SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN COMP, CA.....	---	---	750
SAC - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES, CA.....	468	---	469
SAN CLEMETE SHORELINE.....	---	---	400
SAN FRANCISCO CREEK, CA.....	---	---	700
SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA.....	---	---	750
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS, ORESTIMBA CR	---	---	380
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA..	---	---	400
SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA.....	---	---	280
SANTA CLARA RIVER WATERSHED, CA.....	---	---	500
SOLANA-ENCINITAS SHORELINE, CA.....	171	---	375
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE, CA.....	---	---	2,800
SUN VALLY WATERSHED, CA.....	---	---	200
SUTTER COUNTY, CA.....	339	---	1,000
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA.....	191	---	262
WESTMINSTER (EAST GARDEN GROVE) WATERSHED, CA.....	---	---	900
COLORADO			
CHATFIELD, CHERRY AND BEAR CREEK, RESERVOIRS, CO.....	---	---	54
CONNECTICUT			
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT,MA,NH & VT	---	---	450



CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST		HOUSE
	INV.	PLNG.	RECOMMENDED
DELAWARE			
DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, NY,NJ,PA & DE.....	---	---	5
MID ATLANTIC RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS, DE,DC,NY,MD,PA,V	---	---	2,365
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION.....	---	---	(715)
POTOMAC RIVER COMMISSION.....	---	---	(650)
SUSQUEHANNA RIVER COMMISSION.....	---	---	(1,000)
FLORIDA			
BISCAYNE BAY, FL.....	---	---	500
EGMONT KEY, FL.....	---	---	500
FLAGLER COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	300
LIDO KEY, SARASOTA, FL.....	---	---	157
MILE POINT, FL.....	50	---	200
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL.....	550	---	650
ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	300
ST. LUCIE COUNTY INLET, FL.....	---	---	500
GEORGIA			
AUGUSTA, GA.....	---	278	278
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA.....	150	---	150
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA.....	---	700	---
TYBEE ISLAND, GA.....	250	---	250
GUAM			
HAGATHA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GUAM.....	350	---	350
HAWAII			
ALA WAI CANAL, DAHU, HI.....	300	---	300
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI.....	---	200	200
WALILUPE STREAM, DAHU, HI.....	---	---	300
ILLINOIS			
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II).....	500	---	500
GRAYVILLE DAM, IL.....	---	---	100
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL.....	400	---	400
KEITH CREEK, ROCKFORD, IL.....	---	---	500
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL.....	---	---	50
PRAIRIE DUPONT LEVEE, IL.....	---	---	450
S. FORK, SOUTH BRANCH, CHICAGO RIVER, (BUBBLY CREEK)	---	---	500
UPPER MISS-ILLINOIS WM SYSTEM, IL,IA,MN,MO & WI.....	---	---	3,000
INDIANA			
CENTRAL WABASH RIVER, IN.....	---	---	100
INDIANA HARBOR, IN.....	300	---	800
IOWA			
CEDAR RIVER TIME CHECK AREA, IA.....	---	---	300
KANSAS			
TOPEKA, KS.....	---	100	100
KENTUCKY			
CITY OF PADUCAH, KY.....	---	---	388
GREENUP LOCK AND EXTENSION, KY.....	---	---	500
NORTH KENTUCKY RIVERFRONT COMMONS, KY.....	---	---	100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST INV.	PLNG.	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
LOUISIANA			
BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA.....	---	1,599	1,599
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA.....	53	---	600
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA.....	67	---	67
CROSS LAKE, LA.....	---	---	250
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM REST, LA (SCIENCE PRO	10,000	---	---
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.....	10,000	---	10,000
ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA.....	500	---	500
SOUTHWEST COASTAL LOUISIANA HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA..	---	---	500
MAINE			
SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME.....	---	---	157
MARYLAND			
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES COMP PLAN, MD.....	---	---	847
BALTIMORE METRO WATER RESOURCES - PATAPSCO URBAN RIVER	---	---	100
EASTERN SHORE, MID-CHESAPEAKE BAY ISLAND, MD.....	---	---	200
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST. MARY'S, MD.....	---	---	200
MIDDLE POTOMAC COMP PLAN, MD,VA,PA,WV,DC.....	---	---	200
MIDDLE POTOMAC WATERSHED, GREAT SENECA CREEK AND MUDDY	---	---	600
MASSACHUSETTS			
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI.....	---	---	307
BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA.....	---	2,300	2,300
PILGRIM LAKE, TRURO & PROVINCETOWN, MA.....	96	---	96
SALISBURY, PLAIN RIVER, BROCKTON, MA.....	---	---	100
MICHIGAN			
CLINTON RIVER, MI.....	---	---	100
GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA	200	---	200
GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS (RAP), MI.....	---	---	1,500
NIAGARA RIVER AREA OF CONCERN.....	---	---	(150)
MAUMEE RIVER AREA OF CONCERN.....	---	---	(80)
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI.....	---	---	200
MINNESOTA			
MINNEHANA CREEK WATERSHED, MN.....	---	---	500
TWIN VALLEY, WILD RICE, MN.....	---	---	300
WILD RICE RIVER, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN.....	271	---	271
MISSOURI			
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS.....	262	---	1,262
MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION, MO.....	88	---	88
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L45 & R480-471, MO.	---	---	600
RIVER DES PERES, MO.....	---	---	150
SPRINGFIELD, MO.....	---	---	500
SWOPE PARK, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	138	138
MONTANA			
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT.....	200	---	200
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
HERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA.....	200	---	200
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, HN & ME.....	---	---	82

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST INV.	PLNG.	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NEW JERSEY			
DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, NJ.....	290	---	290
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ..	204	---	204
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ.....	200	---	750
LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ.....	---	---	200
PECKMAN RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	---	---	750
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ.....	---	---	100
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ.....	---	---	25
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.....	---	---	150
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	---	---	200
NEW YORK			
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY.....	---	---	700
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY.....	100	---	100
DUTCHESS COUNTY WATERSHEDS, NY.....	---	---	250
ESOPUS - RONDOUT WATERSHED, NY.....	---	---	250
GOWANUS CANAL, HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, NY.....	---	---	500
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ.....	200	---	1,000
JAMAICA BAY, NY.....	---	---	300
NIAGARA RIVER WATERSHED, NY.....	---	---	100
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, ASHAROKEN, NY.....	---	---	300
NORTH SHORE LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY.....	---	---	300
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY.....	---	---	500
SAW MILL RIVER WATERSHED, NY.....	---	---	500
TEN MILE RIVER WATERSHED, DUTCHESS CTY, NY & LITCHFIELD	---	---	250
UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY.....	---	---	600
NEVADA			
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV.....	---	---	1,000
NORTH CAROLINA			
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC.....	150	---	150
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC.....	---	200	200
SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC.....	---	---	368
OHIO			
HOCKING RIVER BASIN, MONDAY CREEK, OH.....	---	---	400
OKLAHOMA			
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK.....	---	---	200
OREGON			
WILLANETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR.....	240	---	240
PENNSYLVANIA			
DELAWARE RIVER WATERFRONT, PA.....	---	---	100
UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA.....	---	---	2,000
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD STUDY.....	---	---	100
SOUTH CAROLINA			
EDISTO ISLAND, SC.....	218	---	218
SOUTH DAKOTA			
WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD.....	---	---	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST INV.	PLNG.	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
TENNESSEE			
LITTLE RIVER, TN .....	---	---	100
MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN .....	100	---	100
TEXAS			
ABILENE, TX .....	---	---	200
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX .....	400	---	600
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX .....	---	---	100
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX .....	---	---	100
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	---	150	150
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX .....	400	---	400
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER REALIGNMENTS, TX .....	200	---	200
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX .....	---	150	150
GIWW, PORT OCONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX .....	350	---	350
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX .....	223	---	523
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX .....	---	---	425
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, WHARTON/ONION, TX .....	---	---	1,322
NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX .....	250	---	250
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX .....	---	---	550
RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX .....	100	---	100
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX .....	---	---	500
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX .....	---	---	150
UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX .....	---	207	600
VIRGINIA			
ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA .....	---	97	97
FOUR MILE RUN, VA .....	---	---	400
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216) .....	300	---	300
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA .....	175	---	175
MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER, CAMERON RUN/HOLMES RUN, VA .....	---	---	400
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA .....	---	---	200
VICINITY AND WILLOUGHBY SPIT, VA .....	---	---	400
WASHINGTON			
CENTRALIA, WA .....	---	---	500
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA .....	---	---	250
ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL, WA .....	---	---	250
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA & OR .....	100	---	100
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA .....	400	---	600
PUYALLUP RIVER, WA .....	---	---	250
SKAGIT RIVER, WA .....	---	---	250
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA .....	---	---	766
WEST VIRGINIA			
UPPER GUYANDOTTE, WV .....	---	---	200
WELLS LOCK AND DAM, LITTLE KANAWHA RIVER, WV .....	---	---	300
WISCONSIN			
ST. CROIX RIVER BASIN, MN & WI .....	---	---	130
ST. CROIX RIVER RELOCATION OF ENDANGERED MUSSELS, MN & WI .....	---	---	350
SUBTOTAL FOR PROJECTS .....	33,356	7,727	91,631
NATIONAL PROGRAMS			
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD .....	350	---	350
ACTIONS FOR CHANGE TO IMPROVE INVESTIGATIONS .....	2,000	---	2,000
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION .....	1,400	---	2,400
Southern California Beach Processes Study, CA .....	---	---	(1,000)
COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS .....	100	---	100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST		HOUSE
	INV.	PLNG.	RECOMMENDED
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES.....	75	---	75
FEHA/MAP MOD COORDINATION.....	1,500	---	1,500
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA.....	220	---	220
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES.....	8,000	---	8,260
Leominster, MA.....	---	---	(100)
Sidney comprehensive flood reduction study, NY.....	---	---	(300)
Bucks County, PA.....	---	---	(250)
Belle View and New Alexandria, VA.....	---	---	(200)
Spring Valley, Krouts Creek, WV.....	---	---	(60)
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES.....	250	---	250
INDEPENDENT PEER REVIEW.....	1,000	---	1,000
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES.....	200	---	200
NATIONAL SHORELINE STUDY.....	375	---	375
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS.....	4,080	---	4,080
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	7,000	---	7,092
Molokai Water Resources, HI.....	---	---	(200)
State of Hawaii and Pacific Territories, HI.....	---	---	(200)
Humboldt, IA.....	---	---	(152)
Stafford County, IA.....	---	---	(150)
East Baton Rouge, LA.....	---	---	(400)
Bardstown, KY.....	---	---	(12)
Line Creek Watershed, MO.....	---	---	(100)
Asheville, NC.....	---	---	(50)
Gallatin, TX.....	---	---	(85)
Oklahoma comp water plan, OK.....	---	---	(100)
Harris Riverfront, WV.....	---	---	(75)
Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa, WI.....	---	---	(60)
Cedar Lake Water Quality, WI.....	---	---	(70)
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM.....	2,100	---	2,100
PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE).....	225	---	225
REMOTE SENSING / GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	150	---	150
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	16,892	---	16,892
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS.....	50	---	50
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY).....	600	---	600
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.....	350	---	350
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.....	1,000	---	1,000
WATER RESOURCES PRIORITIES STUDY.....	2,000	---	2,000
<hr/>			
SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL PROGRAMS.....	49,917	---	51,269
<hr/>			
TOTAL.....	83,273	7,727	142,900

*Los Angeles River Ecosystem Restoration, California.*—Funding is included to continue the existing study. This funding shall not be applied to the new authorization for the Los Angeles River which the Committee considers a new start.

## CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$2,289,341,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	<sup>1</sup> 1,402,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	2,070,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	- 224,029,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+668,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Excludes emergency supplemental appropriations request of \$5,761,000,000.

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,070,000,000, \$224,029,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted appropriation and \$668,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation does not include the proposal to move funding in the amount of \$275,000,000 for four categories of projects from the Construction account to the Operation and Maintenance account.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALABAMA		
MOBILE HARBOR TURNING BASIN, AL.....	---	15,300
PINHOOK CREEK, HUNTSVILLE, AL.....	---	500
ALASKA		
SITKA HARBOR BREAKWATER UPGRADE, AK.....	---	1,000
ARIZONA		
NOGALES WASH, AZ.....	---	2,000
RIO DE FLAG FLAGSTAFF, AZ.....	---	100
TRES RIOS, AZ.....	---	10,000
TUSCON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ.....	---	5,000
ARKANSAS		
FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR.....	---	2,300
MKARNS, 12-FT CHANNEL, AR.....	---	100
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB).....	17,300	17,300
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR & TX.....	---	2,000
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOW, AR.....	---	5,000
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA.....	13,000	15,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), C.....	9,000	9,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA.....	---	1,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (NEW BRIDGE BELOW FOLSOM DAM).....	---	1,000
CALFED LEVEE STABILITY PROGRAM, CA.....	---	5,000
CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CA.....	---	300
CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA.....	---	2,385
CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA.....	---	300
FARMINGTON RECHARGE, CA.....	---	1,000
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	---	500
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA.....	4,900	14,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT, CA.....	---	1,750
KAWEAH RIVER, CA.....	1,000	1,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	5,700	5,700
LOWER WALNUT CREEK, CA.....	---	300
MID VALLEY AREA LEVEE, CA.....	---	2,250
MURRIETA CREEK, CA.....	---	2,000
NAPA RIVER, CA.....	7,395	11,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50-FOOT PROJECT), CA.....	25,092	28,092
PETALUMA RIVER, CA.....	---	300
PLACER COUNTY, CA.....	---	1,000
PORT LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA.....	---	885
PIER 36 REMOVAL, CA.....	---	100
SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA.....	900	1,100
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA.....	23,968	23,968
SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION, CA.....	---	1,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA.....	---	1,800
SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA.....	---	400
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA.....	8,100	14,000
SEVEN OAKS WATER QUALITY STUDY.....	---	1,500
SANTA MARIA RIVER LEVEES, CA.....	---	8,500
SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA.....	---	4,000
SOUTH PERRIS, CA.....	---	989
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	12,000	14,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY).....	8,000	8,000
SURFSIDE - SUNSET NEWPORT BEACH, CA.....	---	800
UPPER NEWPORT BAY, CA.....	---	2,000
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA.....	---	4,250
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	---	6,000
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEACH.....	---	350

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY, FL.....	---	500
BROWARD COUNTY, FL (SEGMENT I).....	---	174
BROWARD COUNTY, FL (SEGMENT III).....	---	2,000
CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL.....	2,773	7,600
FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, FL.....	---	2,500
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL).....	77,400	77,400
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	---	9,000
LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL.....	---	500
LEE COUNTY, FL.....	---	250
MIAMI HARBOR, FL.....	---	2,700
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL.....	---	7,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	---	2,400
PORT EVERGLADES, FL.....	---	3,000
SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL.....	185,000	135,000
Central and Southern Florida, FL.....	(100,188)	(100,188)
Indian River Lagoon South, FL.....	(4,500)	(4,500)
Everglades and S. Florida Ecosystem Restoration...	(3,797)	(3,797)
Kissimmee River, FL.....	(31,015)	(31,015)
Modified Water Deliveries, FL.....	(50,000)	---
ST LUCIE INLET, FL.....	4,000	4,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL.....	---	600
GEORGIA		
ATLANTA, EI, GA.....	---	2,000
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC.....	1,450	1,450
SARANNAH HARBOR, GA.....	---	700
IDAHO		
RURAL IDAHO.....	---	5,000
ILLINOIS		
ALTON TO GALE LEVEE DISTRIC, IL & MO.....	---	300
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR).....	2,500	2,500
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL.....	5,750	5,750
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL, SECOND BARRIER, IL...	500	500
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL.....	1,000	1,000
COOK COUNTY, IL.....	---	250
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL.....	5,620	5,620
EAST ST LOUIS, IL.....	200	200
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT LOCK AND DAM, IL (REPLACEM	28,600	28,600
LOCK AND DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB)...	---	2,598
MADISON AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, IL.....	---	500
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL.....	34,000	30,000
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY.....	114,000	114,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO &	20,000	20,000
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL.....	884	1,984
INDIANA		
CALUMET REGION, IN.....	---	4,000
INDIANA HARBOR CONFIND DISPOSAL FACILITY, IN \1.....	---	8,400
INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN.....	---	1,600
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN.....	---	5,300
LAKE MICHIGAN WATERFRONT, IN.....	---	2,000
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN.....	8,000	14,000
MT ZION HILL POND DAM, FULTON COUNTY, IN.....	---	250
OHIO RIVER GREENWAY ACCESS, IN.....	---	2,100
IOWA		
DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA.....	---	4,000
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)...	---	2,750
MISSOURI RIVER FISH MITIGATION, IA,KS,MO,MT,NE \1.....	---	60,000



CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
KANSAS		
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO.....	10,000	10,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY).....	23,800	23,800
KENTUCKY		
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY.....	22,330	22,330
MARKLAND LOCKS AND DAM, KY, IL (MAJOR REHAB) \1.....	---	10,600
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN.....	6,270	6,270
SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY.....	---	2,000
WOLF CREEK, KY (SEEPAGE CONTROL).....	57,000	57,000
LOUISIANA		
COMITE RIVER DIVERSION CANAL, LA.....	---	10,000
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA.....	1,500	1,500
MARYLAND		
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC.....	---	30
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD \1.....	---	500
BALTIMORE METRO RESOURCES, GWYNNS FALLS, MD.....	---	500
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA.....	---	2,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD \1.....	---	9,185
SMITH ISLAND, SOMERSET COUNTY, MD.....	---	100
MASSASSACHUSETTS		
MUDDY RIVER, MA.....	4,000	6,000
MICHIGAN		
ECORSE CREEK, MI.....	---	100
GENESEE COUNTY, MI.....	---	700
GREAT LAKES FISHERY AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MI.....	---	2,145
HAMILTON DAM, FLINT RIVER, FLINT MICHIGAN, MI.....	---	100
MEGAUNEE, MI.....	---	500
SAULT STE MARIE, MI.....	---	17,000
MINNESOTA		
BRECKENRIDGE, MN.....	---	2,877
CROOKSTON, MN.....	300	300
MILLE LACS, MN.....	---	1,000
NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA, MN.....	---	2,000
ROSEAU RIVER, ROSEAU, MN.....	---	1,000
MISSOURI		
BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRIC, MO.....	---	2,130
BLUE RIER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	4,120
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	1,700	1,700
CAPE GIRARDEAU, MO.....	---	2,575
CHESTERFIELD, MO.....	---	4,500
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO (SEEPAGE CONTROL).....	25,000	25,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	5,011	5,011
ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO.....	2,000	2,690
STE. GENEVIEVE, MO.....	---	500
MONTANA		
FORT PECK CABIN CONVEYANCE, MT.....	---	1,500
NEBRASKA		
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE.....	4,828	4,828
SAND CREEK, SAUNDERS COUNTY, NE.....	---	2,400

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR, NJ (NJ SHORE PROT	11,700	11,700
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (ABSECON IS	---	400
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ \1	---	2,500
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET & PECK BEACH, NJ	---	3,500
JOSEPH G. MINISH WATERFRONT, NJ	---	1,000
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ \1	---	150
PASSAIC RIVER BASIN FLOOD MGHT, NJ	---	1,000
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, NJ	---	4,808
RAMAPO RIVER AT MAHWAH AND SUFFERN, NJ	---	500
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	---	191
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	10,000	10,000
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	---	1,100
ALAMOGORDO, NM	4,200	4,200
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE	800	800
NEW YORK		
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO MORTON POINT,	3,800	4,800
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET & JAMAICA BAY, NY	---	750
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY \1	---	500
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	2,150	2,150
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	90,000	90,000
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	---	2,000
ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NY	---	3,200
NORTH CAROLINA		
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	550
STANLY COUNTY, NC	---	400
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	---	2,075
NORTH DAKOTA		
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (REPLACEMENT)	3,500	3,500
GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	---	800
OHIO		
HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	---	2,800
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	4,000	4,000
OHIO RIVERFRONT, CINCINNATI, OH	---	6,000
OHIO EI, OH	---	21,000
Austinbury Township, OH	---	(1,000)
Brunswick, OH	---	(1,000)
Campbell Brownfield, OH	---	(700)
City of Hillisboro, OH	---	(1,000)
Clark State Community College, Springfield, OH	---	(1,000)
Culpepper, OH	---	(600)
Cuyahoga River, OH	---	(1,250)
Dayton, OH	---	(500)
East Banks, OH	---	(750)
Fairview Commons, Dayton, OH	---	(300)
Fremont, OH	---	(500)
Little Squaw Creek, OH	---	(675)
Marlboro, OH	---	(2,000)
Marysville, OH	---	(1,000)
McHackin Road, Madison, OH	---	(200)
Richmond Dale, OH	---	(400)
Route 41, Prime, OH	---	(1,000)
Springfield Hospital, OH	---	(2,000)
Steetsboro, Portage County, OH	---	(1,600)
Summit Road, City of Barberton, OH	---	(500)
Toledo, OH	---	(1,275)
Upper Hocking, OH	---	(500)
Village of St. Martin, OH	---	(200)
Willowcrest, OH	---	(500)

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
Youngstown, Wick District, OH.....	---	(550)
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY).....	21,200	21,200
OREGON		
COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA.....	38,000	36,000
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA...	2,455	2,455
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR.....	3,120	3,120
WILLAMETTE TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR \1.....	---	3,331
PENNSYLVANIA		
ASPINWALL BOROUGH, PA.....	---	1,000
ENSWORTH L&D, OHIO RIVER, PA (STATIC INSTABILITY CORRE	25,800	25,800
GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	600	600
LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA.....	---	4,782
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	40,806	40,806
NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA, PA.....	---	300
POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &	150	150
PRESQUE ISLE, PA.....	---	1,000
SAM MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA.....	---	800
SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, PA.....	---	12,500
SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	---	250
TACONY CREEK, PA.....	---	1,000
COBBS CREEK HABITAT, PA.....	---	500
PUERTO RICO		
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR.....	45,000	45,000
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR.....	12,000	12,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
FOLLY BEACH, SC \1.....	---	35
LAKES MARION AND MOULTRI, SC.....	---	10,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL DAM, TN (SEEPAGE CONTROL).....	53,400	53,400
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN.....	42,000	42,000
CUMBERLAND COUNTY, TN.....	---	650
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	5,382	5,382
CENTRAL CITY, FORT WORTH, UPPER TRINITY RIVER, TX.....	---	6,000
CLEAR CREEK, TX.....	---	1,000
COLONIAS - LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX.....	---	500
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX.....	---	6,000
HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX.....	21,700	21,700
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX \1.....	---	500
JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX.....	---	2,000
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK.....	---	3,240
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX.....	---	1,400
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	23,465	23,465
VIRGINIA		
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (REPLACEMENT)...	14,000	14,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA.....	---	500
RICHMOND CSD, VA.....	---	300
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA.....	1,075	1,500
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH GAS ABATEMENT, WA \1.....	---	6,500
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, OR & WA \1.....	---	88,000
DUMAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA.....	---	1,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
HOWARD HANSEN DAM, WA 11.....	---	15,000
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA...	1,500	1,500
LOWER MONUMENT LOCK & DAM, WA 11.....	---	3,123
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMP, WA,OR, ID 11.....	---	1,500
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA.....	1,410	1,410
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (FISH PASSAGE).....	1,000	1,000
PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WA.....	---	300
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE).....	12,000	12,000
CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV.....	---	3,000
GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV.....	---	1,500
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV,VA		
Kentucky.....	---	7,000
Virginia.....	---	2,000
MARRET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV.....	9,000	9,000
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH.....	1,000	1,000
SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV.....	---	1,500
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV.....	900	900
WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, PA & WV.....	---	2,000
WISCONSIN		
NORTHERN WISCONSIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, WI.....	---	5,560
ST. CROIX FALLS, WI.....	---	4,207
SUBTOTAL FOR PROJECTS.....	1,296,684	1,844,924
NATIONAL PROGRAMS		
ABANDONED MINE RESTORATION.....	---	455
Mt. Diablo.....	---	(400)
ACTIONS FOR CHANGE TO IMPROVE CONSTRUCTION.....	4,600	---
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM.....	3,500	3,500
CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206).....	10,295	30,000
Chattahoochee Fall Line Ecosystem, AL.....		
Brownsville Branch, AR.....		
St. Helena - Napa River Project, CA.....		
Upper York Creek Dam Removal, CA.....		
Goose Creek, CO.....		
Tamarisk Eradication, CO.....		
Mill River Restoration, Stamford, CT.....		
Rose Bay, Volusia Co, FL.....		
Jackson Creek, GA.....		
Emiquon Preserve, IL.....		
Eugene Field, IL.....		
Hofmann Dam, IL.....		
Orland Park, IL.....		
Ping Tom, IL.....		
Storm Lake, IA.....		
Ventura Marsh Habitat, Clear Lake, IA.....		
Arkansas River Fish Habitat, KS.....		
Malden River Ecosystem Restoration, MA.....		
Milford Pond Restoration, Milford, MA.....		
Mill Pond Restoration, Littleton, MA.....		
Franklin Point, MD.....		
North Beach, MD.....		
Northwest Branch, Anacostia River, MD.....		
Rancocas Creek Fish Passage, NJ.....		
Soundview Park, Bronx, NY.....		
Asheville, Buncombe County, NC.....		
Concord Streams Restoration, NC.....		
Western Cary Stream Restoration, Cary, NC.....		
Wilson Bay Restoration, NC.....		
Drayton Dam, ND.....		
Christine/Hickson Dams, ND.....		
Osgood Pond, Milford, NH.....		
Arrowhead Creek, OR.....		
Eugene Delta Ponds, OR.....		

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
Springfield Millrace, OR.....		
Canonsburg Lake Ecosystem Restoration, PA.....		
Dents Runs, PA.....		
Sweet Arrow Lake, PA.....		
Pocotaligo River & Swamp Restoration, SC.....		
Jonesborough Watershed, TN.....		
Pistol Creek, Maryville, TN.....		
Spring Lake, San Marcos, TX.....		
Meridan, WWT, TX.....		
Stephenville, WWT, TX.....		
Carpenter Creek, WA.....		
<b>BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)</b>	---	4,000
Isle Aux Herbes, AL.....		
Blackhawk Bottoms, IA.....		
Calc Rv, Hi 5-14 Ks, LA.....		
NJIW Beneficial Use, NJ.....		
Wanchese Marsh Creation, NC.....		
Maumee Bay Restoration, OH.....		
Wynn Road CDF, OH.....		
Restoration of Cat Islands, WI.....		
<b>EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC</b>	2,301	10,000
<b>FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)</b>	2,617	48,980
Wynne, AR.....		
Borrego Springs, CA.....		(100)
Las Gallinas Creek/Santa Venetia Levee, CA.....		
White Slough, CA.....		
Little Hill Creek, New Castle County, DE.....		
Turkey Creek, Ben Hill County, GA.....		
Keopu-Hienaloli Stream, HI.....		
Waialele Stream, Oahu, HI.....		
Meredosia, IL.....		
Mad Creek, Muscatine, IA.....		
Winnebago River, Mason City, IA.....		
Crosscreek, Rossville, KS.....		
Concordia, KS.....		
Hopkinsville Dry-Dam, KY.....		
Town of Carencro, Lafayette Parish, LA.....		
Northwest Branch Anacostia River, MD.....		
Blackwater River, Salisbury, MA.....		
Mill Pond Restoration, Littleton, MA.....		
North River, Peabody, MA.....		
Salisbury River, Brockton, MA.....	---	(100)
Granite Falls, MN.....		
Blacksnake Creek, St. Joseph, MO.....		
Festus Crystal City, MO.....		
Little River Diversion, Dutchtown, MO.....		
Platte River, Fremont, NE.....		
Platte River, Schuyler, NE.....		
Assunpink Creek, Hamilton Township, Mercer Cou		
Jackson Brook, NJ.....		
Poplar Brook, Deal and Ocean Township, NJ.....		
Upper Passaic River and Tributaries, Long Hill		
Limestone Creek, Fayetteville, NY.....		
Steel Creek, NY.....		
Wahpeton, ND.....		
Rio Descalabrado, PR.....		
Rio Guamaní-Guaya, PR.....		
Cuyahoga River, OH.....		
Duck Creek Flood Warning System, OH.....		
Findley, OH.....		
Ottawa, OH.....		
Beaver Creek & Tribs, Bristol, TN.....		
Beaver Creek Bristol TN, and Bristol, VA.....		
Farmers Branch, Tarrant County, TX.....		
Pecan Creek, Gainesville, TX.....		
Estate La Grange, VI.....		
WV Statewide Flood Warning System, WV.....		

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107).....	559	8,000
Savoonga Harbor, AK.....		
Kahoolawe Harbor, Kahoolawe, HI.....		
Bucks Harbor, ME.....		
Rhodes Point, Somerset County, MD.....		
St. Jerome's Creek, St. Mary County, MD.....		
Woods Hole, Great Harbor, Woods Hole, MA.....		
Mackinac Isle, Harbor Breakwall, MI.....		
Northwestern Michigan, Traverse City, MI.....		
Two Harbors, MN.....		
Hampton Harbor, NH.....		
Cooley Canal, OH.....		
Delaware River, Fairless Turning Basin, PA.....		
Charlestown Breachway and Inlet, RI.....		
Clarksville, TN.....	---	(100)
Northwest Tennessee Regional Harbor, TN.....		
Nassawadox, VA.....		
MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111) /1.....	---	8,000
Mobile Pass, AL.....		
Camp Ellis, Saco, ME.....		
Vermillion, OH.....		
Fairport Harbor, OH.....		
Mattituck Harbor, NY.....		
Tybee Island Channel Impacts, GA.....		
PROJECT MODS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (S	8,544	30,000
Lower Cache Restoration, AR.....		
Tujunga Wash Environmental Restoration, CA.....		
Lower Kingman Island, DC.....		
Kanaha Pond, Maui, HI.....		
Kaunakakai Str, Molokai, HI.....		
Rathbun Lake Habitat Restoration, IA.....		
Indian Ridge Marsh, Chicago, IL.....		
Spunky Bottoms, IL.....		
Green River Dam, Mod, KY.....		
Sand Hill River, MN.....		
Duck Creek, MO.....		
Bloomington State Park, MO.....		
Blue Valley Wetlands, Jackson, MO.....		
Prison Farm, ND.....		
Assunpink Creek, Trenton, NJ.....		
Route 66 Environmental Restoration, Albuquerque		
Aquatic Habitat Restoration, NM.....		
Gerritsen Creek, NY.....		
Spring Creek, NY.....		
Tappan Lake, OH.....		
Lower Columbia Slough, OR.....		
Eagleland Ecosystem, TX.....		
Lewisville Dam, TX.....		
Braided Reach, WA.....		
Shorty's Island, WA.....		
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103).....	---	2,000
Unalakleet Storm Damage Reduction, Unalakleet,		
Bay Farm Island, CA.....		
Marshfield, MA.....		
Nantasket Beach, MA.....		
Athol Springs, Lake Erie, NY.....		
Lasalle Park, Buffalo, NY.....		
Old Lakeshore Road, NY.....		
Lake Erie At Painesville, OH.....		
Philadelphia Shipyard, PA.....		
Ft San Gerontimo, PR.....		
Veteren's Drive Shoreline, St. Thomas, VI.....		
Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, VA.....		
Lincoln Park Beach Seattle, WA.....		
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM...	48,600	48,600
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM (DMDF)	---	8,241
Savannah Harbor, GA.....	---	(5,275)

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
Rogue River, MI.....	---	(160)
Charleston Harbor, SC.....	---	(2,580)
Green Bay Harbor, WI.....	---	(950)
EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION.....	21,000	21,000
ESTUARY RESTORATION PROGRAM (PL 106-457).....	5,000	4,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE.....	50	50
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE.....	250	250
SUBTOTAL FOR NATIONAL PROGRAMS.....	105,316	225,076
TOTAL.....	1,402,000	2,070,000

1/ ITEMS REQUESTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION IN  
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

*Kaweah River, California.*—Within the funds provided for the Terminus Dam, Kaweah River project, the Secretary is directed to reimburse the non-federal sponsor for a portion or all of the reimbursable work carried out on the project and to ensure that the non-federal sponsor is fully reimbursed not later than March 1, 2010.

*Everglades Restoration, Florida.*—The Committee recommendation includes no funding for the Modified Waters element of the Everglades Restoration within the Energy and Water Development Appropriation. The funding for this project is contained within the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

*Upper Mississippi River Restoration, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri & Wisconsin.*—The Committee directs the Corps to complete a plan to transition this project to the Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program (NESP) for the Upper Mississippi River System. The Committee has not provided funding for this new project and will consider the new start when an adequate plan to complete ongoing projects and transition future projects to the new authority is received by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. In order to facilitate this transition the Corps is directed not to initiate any new projects under this authority. Funding should be focused on completion of all existing work to facilitate the initiation of the new authority.

*Muddy River, Boston and Brookline, Massachusetts.*—Funding is included to continue project design and construction, including ecosystem restoration features.

*Columbia River Channel Improvements, Oregon and Washington.*—The Committee has recommended the full request for this project, despite the fact that the Corps of Engineers has failed to respond to repeated requests for information that verifies that this level of funding would complete the project as claimed by the Administration.

*Continuing Authorities Program.*—The fiscal year 2008 omnibus appropriation directed the Corps to reevaluate the management and backlog of the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP). The review recently provided to the Committees on Appropriations shows nearly \$1,000,000,000 is required to complete all existing, active projects. For a program that receives approximately \$120,000,000 annually, this review reaffirms the Committee's belief that the program is over subscribed. A summary of the review, by CAP authority section, is included in the table below.

CAP section	Project Federal cost (\$)	Project allocations thru FY 07 (\$)	FY 08 total allocations planned (\$)	Balance to complete (\$)
14 .....	69,548,012	38,328,057	9,707,357	21,512,598
103 .....	48,386,819	15,522,875	4,451,555	28,322,389
107 .....	118,598,140	38,181,184	7,232,400	73,184,556
111 .....	50,283,000	3,574,645	1,919,000	44,789,355
204 .....	35,317,018	7,398,318	1,373,000	26,545,700
205 .....	548,772,450	162,448,027	42,370,804	343,953,619
206 .....	457,038,102	120,987,115	29,149,778	306,901,210
208 .....	1,349,900	713,899	—	636,001
1135 .....	267,193,752	117,611,141	29,174,000	120,408,611
Totals .....	1,596,487,193	504,765,261	125,467,894	966,254,038



In fiscal year 2009 the Committee recommendation lists projects for CAP Sections 103, 107, 111, 204, 205, 206, 208 and 1135, but only specifies funding for two of the listed projects in recognition of the dynamic nature of the projects within the program. No projects, whether requested by the Administration or Members of Congress, are listed for the Section 14 program. This funding is only for emergency streambank protection of public facilities and, as such, shall be distributed on the basis of urgency.

The preceding table titled "Construction" includes the list of projects designated by Congress for fiscal year 2009 funding. The Corps may allocate funds to other, active projects after the funding for named projects is addressed. Under no circumstances shall the Corps initiate new projects in Section 205, 206 or 1135. New projects may be initiated in the remaining sections after an assessment is made that such projects can be funded over time based on historical averages of the appropriation for that section and approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. The Corps shall prioritize the projects based on the following criteria:

Priorities for Design and Implementation (D&I) Phase:

1. D&I work for continuing projects that have executed Project Cooperation Agreements (PCAs).
2. D&I funding for projects approved by Corps Headquarters to execute a PCA.
3. D&I work which does not require executed agreements (e.g. continuing or pre-PCA design) for ongoing projects.
4. D&I funding for projects with approved Feasibility Reports moving into D&I.

Priorities for Feasibility Phase:

1. Feasibility phase funding for projects with executed Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreements (FCSAs).
2. Feasibility phase funding for projects approved by Corps Headquarters to execute a FCSA.
3. Feasibility phase work which does not require a FCSA for ongoing projects.
4. Feasibility phase funding for initiations or restarts.

Within the last-funded priority level within the D&I and Feasibility phases, if the projects qualifying for funding exceed the available funding, funds shall be allocated based on project outputs and the non-federal sponsor's ability to meet local obligations.

Remaining funds, if any, may be allocated to additional projects in accordance with the aforementioned priorities, except that all funds for Section 14 projects shall be allocated to the most urgently needed projects.

The Corps is directed to maintain a split of approximately 80-20 percent between the Design and Implementation (D&I) phase and the Feasibility phase within each authority. This split should be considered a guideline only, as there may be specific circumstances that require a slightly different weighting.

## MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$387,402,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	240,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	278,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	-109,402,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+38,000,000

This appropriation funds planning, construction, and operation and maintenance activities associated with projects to reduce flood damage in the lower Mississippi River alluvial valley below Cape Girardeau, Missouri.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$278,000,000, a decrease of \$109,402,000 from the fiscal year 2008 enacted appropriation and an increase of \$38,000,000 over the budget request.

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

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
INVESTIGATIONS		
ALEXANDRIA TO THE GULF, LA.....	790	790
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM LAND STUDY, LA.....	100	100
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS.....	125	125
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, STORM WATER MGMT STUDY, TN & MS....	34	34
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA.....	400	400
CONSTRUCTION		
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR.....	---	2,800
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, DIKES, AR,IL,KY,LA,MS,MO & TN....	12,134	12,134
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, REVETMENT OPERATIONS, AR,IL,KY,LA	33,089	40,741
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR,IL,KY,LA,MS,MO & TN.....	20,000	35,000
NEW MADRID LEVEE CLOSURE & MO PED ACTIVITES.....	---	3,800
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR.....	---	3,300
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.....	2,025	2,025
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	6,300	6,300
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA.....	2,259	2,259
ST. JOHNS BAYOU & NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO.....	---	200
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN.....	---	500
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE		
DIKES, AR,IL,KY,LA,MS,MO & TN.....	1,290	1,290
DREDGING, AR,IL,KY,LA,MS,MO & TN.....	16,869	16,869
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR.....	128	128
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR.....	249	249
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR.....	256	256
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR.....	161	161
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR,IL,KY,LA,MS,MO & TN.....	15,873	15,873
REVTMENTS, AR,IL,KY,LA,MS,MO & TN.....	47,052	47,052
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR.....	1,039	1,039
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL.....	135	135
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY.....	93	93
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.....	2,117	2,117
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	8,619	8,619
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA.....	162	162
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA.....	42	42
BONNET CARRE, LA.....	2,346	2,346
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA.....	1,727	1,727
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA.....	578	578
OLD RIVER, LA.....	13,882	13,882
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA.....	53	53
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA.....	1,880	1,880
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.....	2,501	2,501
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS.....	436	436
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS.....	101	101
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS.....	424	424
YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS.....	6,228	6,228
YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS.....	171	171
YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS.....	6,388	6,388
YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS.....	1,650	1,650
YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS.....	8,201	6,201
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS.....	1,128	1,128
YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS.....	6,971	6,971
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS.....	694	694
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS.....	272	272
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS.....	393	393
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS.....	534	534
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO.....	185	185
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO.....	4,445	4,445
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.....	4,567	9,567
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN.....	81	81
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN.....	3,283	3,283
REMAINING ITEMS:		
MAPPING.....	1,488	1,488
TOTAL.....	240,000	278,000

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$2,243,637,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	2,475,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	2,300,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	+56,363,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	-175,000,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,300,000,000, \$56,363,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level and \$175,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee rejects the Administration's proposal to move \$275,000,000 for four categories of projects from the Construction account to the Operation and Maintenance account. After accounting for this change, the Committee's recommendation is \$100,000,000 over the budget request.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL.....	375	356
ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL.....	15,872	18,600
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL.....	22,191	21,081
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL.....	5,230	8,869
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL.....	60	57
MOBILE HARBOR, AL.....	21,562	20,484
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL.....	100	95
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL.....	94	89
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	2,350	2,233
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS.....	22,009	21,850
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA.....	8,417	8,550
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL.....	120	114
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK.....	17,601	16,721
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK.....	2,225	2,114
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK.....	840	798
HOMER HARBOR, AK.....	820	589
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK.....	1,058	1,005
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK.....	350	333
NOME HARBOR, AK.....	780	741
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK.....	550	523
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ.....	1,585	1,506
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ.....	98	93
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ.....	1,206	1,146
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ.....	39	37
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ.....	171	162
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR.....	5,270	5,007
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR.....	8,384	8,265
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR.....	1,427	1,356
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR.....	7,367	8,999
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	8,491	8,066
DEGRAY LAKE, AR.....	6,317	6,270
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR.....	1,286	1,222
DIERKS LAKE, AR.....	1,354	1,286
GILLHAM LAKE, AR.....	1,156	1,098
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR.....	6,861	6,518
HELENA HARBOR, AR.....	90	86
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR.....	508	483
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR...	28,395	28,875
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR.....	2,074	1,970
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR.....	4,591	4,646
NIMROD LAKE, AR.....	1,609	1,529
NORFORK LAKE, AR.....	3,920	3,724
OSCEDLA HARBOR, AR.....	14	1,796
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA.....	8,509	8,084
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	5,287	5,023
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR.....	8	8
WHITE RIVER, AR.....	52	49
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR.....	3	3
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA.....	1,954	1,856
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA.....	1,820	1,729
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA.....	5,360	5,082
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA.....	3,384	3,215
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA.....	---	1,663
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA.....	5,067	4,814
FARMINGTON DAM, CA.....	443	421
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA.....	1,786	1,897
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA.....	5,144	4,887

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
-----		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA.....	3,822	3,631
ISABELLA LAKE, CA.....	1,404	1,334
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	3,998	3,796
MARINA DEL REY, CA.....	2,499	2,374
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, CA & NV.....	737	700
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	239	227
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA.....	285	271
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.....	1,630	1,549
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA.....	---	713
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA.....	2,115	2,009
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA.....	1,730	1,644
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA.....	7,445	7,073
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA.....	1,620	1,539
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA.....	2,854	2,711
PORT HUENEME, CA.....	4,029	3,828
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA.....	2,422	2,301
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA.....	---	570
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA.....	6,950	6,603
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA.....	5,582	5,303
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.....	1,566	1,488
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA.....	175	166
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA.....	1,106	1,051
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, LTMS, CA.....	---	3,040
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL).....	2,805	3,848
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA.....	2,514	2,964
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA.....	5,411	5,140
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA.....	1,140	1,083
SAN RAFAEL CHANNEL, CA.....	---	3,088
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	3,148	2,991
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.....	2,090	1,986
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA.....	1,639	1,557
SUCCESS LAKE, CA.....	1,791	1,701
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA.....	2,982	2,833
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAMEAH, CA.....	1,912	1,816
VENTURA HARBOR, CA.....	3,095	2,940
YUBA RIVER, CA.....	129	123
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO.....	332	315
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO.....	1,176	1,117
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO.....	870	827
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO.....	457	434
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO.....	2,418	2,297
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO.....	720	684
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO.....	956	2,043
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT.....	416	395
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT.....	547	520
GREENWICH HARBOR, CT.....	---	48
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT.....	338	321
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT.....	919	873
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT.....	316	300
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT.....	---	---
LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT.....	1,000	4,275
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT.....	493	468
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT.....	385	366
NORWALK HARBOR, CT.....	---	3,040
PATCHOGUE RIVER, WESTBROOK, CT.....	---	1,425
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT.....	1,100	1,045
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT.....	374	355
THOMASTON DAM, CT.....	615	584
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT.....	568	540
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES V1... ..	350	---
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D.....	14,065	14,716
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D.....	40	38
MISPILLION RIVER, DE.....	30	29

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE.....	30	28
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE.....	147	140
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE.....	2,750	2,813
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC.....	62	59
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL).....	805	765
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC.....	28	27
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC.....	25	24
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL.....	4,404	5,700
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL.....	13,234	12,572
ESCAMBIA AND CONECH RIVERS, FL.....	25	24
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL.....	400	818
FERMANDINA HARBOR, FL.....	2,025	1,924
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL.....	300	285
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R., FL.....	---	3,325
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL.....	325	5,890
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	6,000	5,886
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.....	9,165	10,274
Hydrilla control.....	---	(855)
Woodruff Bridge Repairs.....	---	(713)
MANATEE HARBOR, FL.....	2,675	2,541
MIAMI RIVER, FL.....	10,820	10,279
NAPLES TO BIG MARCOS PASS, FL.....	---	1,235
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL.....	4,530	4,304
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL.....	55	1,952
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL.....	87	84
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL.....	2,385	2,266
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL.....	1,265	1,202
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL.....	4,420	4,199
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL.....	30	29
SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL.....	357	339
TAMPA HARBOR, FL.....	4,550	4,323
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL.....	405	385
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA.....	6,016	7,325
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL.....	3,418	3,247
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA.....	257	244
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	5,545	5,268
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA.....	7,946	7,549
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA.....	7,703	7,318
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC.....	12,188	11,579
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA.....	63	60
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA.....	142	135
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC.....	11,066	10,513
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA.....	162	154
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC.....	8,386	7,967
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA.....	19,170	13,200
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA.....	183	174
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL.....	7,446	7,074
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI.....	200	190
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI.....	659	626
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI.....	537	510
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID.....	1,539	1,462
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID.....	2,404	2,284
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID.....	354	317
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID.....	1,801	1,711
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID.....	469	446

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
ILLINOIS		
ANDALUSIA HARBOR, IL.....	---	143
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL.....	2,015	2,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL.....	44	42
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN.....	4,780	4,541
CARLYLE LAKE, IL.....	4,155	3,947
CHICAGO RIVER, IL.....	475	451
FARN CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL.....	203	193
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN.....	38,121	36,215
GRAFTON, IL TO LAGRANGE LOCK & DAM.....	(1,834)	(2,438)
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL.....	65	62
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL.....	2,298	2,183
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL.....	1,903	1,808
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL.....	860	817
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL.....	4,761	4,523
LOCK AND DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RVR, IL (MAJOR REHAB) \1.	2,598	---
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	63,207	60,047
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL.....	111	105
REND LAKE, IL.....	4,570	4,342
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL.....	565	537
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL.....	1,099	1,044
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	20,004	19,954
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN.....	1,849	1,567
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN.....	160	2,404
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN.....	---	950
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN.....	2,053	1,950
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN.....	1,226	1,165
INDIANA HARBOR, CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY, IN \1.....	8,385	---
INDIANA HARBOR, IN.....	3,138	2,981
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN.....	635	603
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN.....	2,842	2,700
MISSISSINAWA LAKE, IN.....	1,051	998
MONROE LAKE, IN.....	1,326	1,260
PATOKA LAKE, IN.....	1,150	1,093
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN.....	185	176
ROUSH RIVER MAJOR REHAB PROJECT, IN.....	300	285
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN.....	1,226	1,165
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN.....	91	86
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA.....	2,887	2,743
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA.....	466	443
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA.....	717	681
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RVR, IA (MAJOR REHAB) \1.	2,750	---
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA.....	166	158
MISSOURI RIVER - RULO TO MOUTH, IA, KS, MO & NE.....	5,108	5,700
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO&NE.	2,580	2,432
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO \1	85,000	---
RATHBUN LAKE, IA.....	2,214	2,163
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA.....	3,278	3,114
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA.....	3,908	3,713
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS.....	1,975	1,940
COUNCIL GRAVE LAKE, KS.....	1,328	1,262
EL DORADO LAKE, KS.....	569	607
ELK CITY LAKE, KS.....	734	897
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS.....	1,284	1,220
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS.....	722	726
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS.....	177	168
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS.....	1,042	2,481
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS.....	1,330	1,347
MARION LAKE, KS.....	1,504	1,429
MELVERN LAKE, KS.....	2,035	2,005
MILFORD LAKE, KS.....	2,076	2,026



CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS.....	1,048	996
PERRY LAKE, KS.....	2,452	2,390
POMONA LAKE, KS.....	1,914	1,871
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS.....	30	29
TORONTO LAKE, KS.....	535	508
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS.....	2,060	2,028
WILSON LAKE, KS.....	1,577	1,537
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN.....	10,255	9,742
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY.....	3,969	3,771
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY.....	1,250	1,188
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY.....	2,433	2,311
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY.....	1,797	1,707
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY.....	1,098	1,043
DENEY LAKE, KY.....	1,768	1,660
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY.....	25	24
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY.....	1,830	1,739
GRAYSON LAKE, KY.....	1,445	1,373
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY.....	2,698	2,563
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY.....	4,942	4,685
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY.....	554	526
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY.....	10	10
LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY.....	---	314
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,748	1,661
MARKLAND LOCKS AND DAM, KY & IN (MAJOR REHAB) 11.....	10,600	---
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY.....	1,062	1,009
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY.....	102	97
NOLIN LAKE, KY.....	3,337	3,170
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH.....	39,419	37,448
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH.....	4,485	4,261
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY.....	954	906
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY.....	7	7
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY.....	2,832	2,690
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY.....	1,312	1,246
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY.....	7,834	7,442
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY.....	1,180	1,121
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	8,993	8,543
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA.....	926	880
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA.....	809	769
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA.....	724	688
BAYOU PIERRE, LA.....	18	17
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA.....	321	296
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA.....	14	13
BAYOU TECHE, LA.....	209	199
CADDO LAKE, LA.....	181	172
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA.....	14,968	14,220
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA.....	1,848	1,756
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA.....	17,769	16,881
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA.....	662	1,425
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA.....	1,814	1,723
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA.....	10,555	10,027
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA.....	17	808
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA.....	5	81
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA.....	1,969	1,871
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA.....	3,136	2,979
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO..	55,325	52,559
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA.....	1,500	1,425
WALLACE LAKE, LA.....	200	190
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA.....	32	30
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	239	227
MAINE		
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME.....	1,200	1,140
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME.....	29	28
PORTLAND HARBOR, ME.....	100	95

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME.....	750	713
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME.....	17	16
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE, MD \1.....	500	---
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD.....	16,193	17,283
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL).....	338	321
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV.....	98	93
HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD.....	---	475
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD.....	89	85
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV.....	1,713	1,627
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD.....	450	428
PARISH CREEK, MD.....	---	950
POPLAR ISLAND, MD \1.....	9,185	---
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD.....	376	357
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD.....	64	61
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD.....	135	128
WICOMICO RIVER, MD.....	1,400	1,330
MASSACHUSETTS		
AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, MA.....	---	380
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA.....	580	551
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA.....	574	545
BOSTON HARBOR, MA.....	6,000	5,700
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA.....	515	489
CAPE COD CANAL, MA.....	11,546	10,989
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA.....	291	276
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA.....	232	220
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA.....	398	378
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA.....	503	478
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA.....	381	362
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA.....	526	500
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA.....	489	465
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER..	272	258
NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA.....	---	475
NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA.....	---	855
SOUTH JETTY.....	---	(95)
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA.....	1,200	1,140
TULLY LAKE, MA.....	543	516
WEST HILL DAM, MA.....	674	640
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA.....	497	472
MICHIGAN		
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI.....	---	156
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI.....	156	148
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI.....	197	187
CLINTON RIVER, MI.....	---	950
DETROIT RIVER, MI.....	5,327	5,061
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI.....	---	570
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI.....	1,312	1,246
GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI.....	180	171
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI.....	588	559
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI.....	230	219
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI.....	86	82
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI.....	442	420
MONROE HARBOR, MI.....	1,018	967
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI.....	350	333
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI.....	655	1,185
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI.....	---	169
PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI.....	---	433
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI.....	312	296
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI.....	276	262
ROUGH RIVER, MI \1.....	1,321	1,103
SAGINAW RIVER, MI.....	3,798	3,808
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI.....	75	71
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI.....	1,791	1,701
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI.....	585	1,064
ST MARYS RIVER, MI.....	18,836	29,465

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI.....	2,444	2,322
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD.....	172	183
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI.....	4,929	4,683
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN.....	623	592
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN.....	431	409
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN.....	200	190
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (HVP PORTION)	44,904	43,609
ORWELL LAKE, MN.....	256	243
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN.....	95	90
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN.....	84	80
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN.....	3,170	3,012
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN.....	323	307
TWO HARBORS, MN.....	300	285
MISSISSIPPI		
CLAIRBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS.....	1	1
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS.....	135	128
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS.....	---	414
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS.....	3,715	3,529
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS.....	223	212
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS.....	30	29
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS.....	1,517	1,441
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	4,130	3,924
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA.....	193	183
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS.....	82	78
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS.....	11	562
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS.....	30	29
YAZOO RIVER, MS.....	26	25
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO.....	10	10
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO.....	6,449	6,127
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO.....	2,825	2,684
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO.....	8,528	9,275
Complete stilling basin repairs.....	---	(1,900)
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO.....	1,688	1,604
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO.....	885	888
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO.....	1,057	1,045
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	25,359	24,091
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO.....	152	144
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO.....	2,056	2,003
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO.....	14	13
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO.....	327	311
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO.....	1,162	1,143
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO.....	8	8
STOCKTON LAKE, MO.....	3,320	5,089
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR.....	6,667	6,334
UNION LAKE, MO.....	10	10
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT.....	4,170	4,222
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT.....	54	51
LIBBY DAM, MT.....	1,712	1,828
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT.....	88	84
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD.....	5,935	6,192
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE.....	1,721	1,697
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE.....	508	483
PAPILLION CREEK, NE.....	531	504
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE.....	702	667

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV.....	127	121
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV.....	204	194
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH.....	567	539
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH.....	514	488
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH.....	619	588
HAMPTON HARBOR, NH.....	---	124
HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH.....	1,081	1,027
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH.....	37	35
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH.....	598	568
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH.....	300	285
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH.....	596	566
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	225	665
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ \1.....	2,500	---
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ.....	243	231
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ.....	15	14
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE..	18,778	17,839
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ.....	750	713
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ.....	253	240
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ \1.....	150	---
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ.....	160	542
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ.....	250	1,596
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ.....	300	2,375
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEM, NJ.....	254	241
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ.....	1,363	1,295
RARITAN AND SANDY HOOKS BAYS, LEONARD, NJ.....	40	38
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ.....	200	190
RARITAN RIVER, NJ.....	220	209
SALEM RIVER, NJ.....	70	67
SHARK RIVER, NJ.....	775	736
SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ.....	300	285
SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ.....	120	114
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM.....	2,220	2,109
COCHITI LAKE, NM.....	2,392	2,272
CONCHAS LAKE, NM.....	1,121	1,150
GALISTEO DAM, NM.....	423	402
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM.....	811	770
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM.....	684	650
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM.....	940	893
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM.....	502	477
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM.....	452	429
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM.....	1,201	1,141
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY.....	424	403
ARKPORT DAM, NY.....	225	214
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY.....	1,235	1,173
BRONX RIVER, NY.....	250	238
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY.....	50	48
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY.....	220	209
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY.....	---	779
EAST RIVER, NY.....	500	475
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY.....	4,220	4,009
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY.....	473	449
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY.....	180	171
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY \1.....	500	---
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY.....	380	504
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY.....	80	76
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY.....	500	475
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT).....	1,125	1,089

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
-----		
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C).....	1,525	1,449
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY.....	1,031	979
JAMAICA BAY, NY.....	250	238
JONES INLET, NY.....	350	333
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY.....	700	665
LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY.....	10	627
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY.....	200	190
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY.....	20	19
MORICHES INLET, NY.....	2,050	1
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY.....	4,839	4,597
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY.....	6,750	6,413
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY.....	4,000	3,800
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL).....	6,300	5,985
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSIT)	950	903
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY.....	220	209
PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY.....	150	143
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY.....	1,830	1,830
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY.....	1,805	1,525
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY.....	200	6,460
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY.....	839	797
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY.....	551	523
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY.....	250	238
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY.....	553	525
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC.....	900	855
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC.....	1,633	1,561
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC.....	718	682
FALLS LAKE, NC.....	1,883	1,599
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC.....	250	238
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC.....	---	1,302
MANTED (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	4,100	5,700
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC.....	365	347
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC.....	5,000	4,750
NEW RIVER INLET, NC.....	800	760
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC.....	675	641
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC.....	150	143
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC.....	400	380
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC.....	2,977	2,828
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC.....	13,000	12,350
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND.....	153	145
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND.....	9,435	9,015
HOMME LAKE, ND.....	151	143
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND.....	360	342
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND.....	1,017	966
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND.....	572	543
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND.....	119	113
SOURIS RIVER, ND.....	280	266
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATER, ND.....	24	23
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,439	1,367
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH.....	1,850	1,758
BERLIN LAKE, OH.....	4,867	4,624
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH.....	2,149	2,042
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH.....	2,520	2,394
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH.....	6,710	6,375
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH.....	350	333
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,359	1,291
DELAWARE LAKE, OH.....	1,445	1,373
DILLON LAKE, OH.....	1,454	1,381
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH.....	2,028	1,925
HURON HARBOR, OH.....	1,530	1,454
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH.....	452	429
LORAIN HARBOR, OH.....	2,423	2,302
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH.....	24	23

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH.....	2,023	1,922
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,383	1,314
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH.....	8,275	7,861
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH.....	593	563
OHIO-MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH.....	1,089	1,035
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,307	1,242
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH.....	285	280
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH.....	35	33
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH.....	223	212
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH.....	4,701	5,700
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH.....	791	751
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH.....	865	822
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH.....	1,837	1,745
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK.....	472	448
BIRCH LAKE, OK.....	648	616
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK.....	1,903	1,808
CANTON LAKE, OK.....	1,707	1,622
COPAN LAKE, OK.....	937	890
EUFULA LAKE, OK.....	5,348	5,081
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK.....	10,218	9,707
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK.....	742	705
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK.....	256	243
HEYBURN LAKE, OK.....	555	527
HUGO LAKE, OK.....	1,493	1,418
HULAH LAKE, OK.....	476	452
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK.....	177	168
KAW LAKE, OK.....	2,574	2,445
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK.....	6,073	5,789
MCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK.....	5,819	5,528
OLOGAH LAKE, OK.....	1,923	1,827
OPTIMA LAKE, OK.....	164	156
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK.....	119	113
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK.....	1,099	1,044
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK.....	6,599	6,269
SARDIS LAKE, OK.....	912	866
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK.....	520	494
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK.....	1,318	1,252
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK.....	3,794	3,604
WAURIKA LAKE, OK.....	1,093	1,038
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK.....	4,695	4,460
WISTER LAKE, OK.....	678	644
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR.....	904	859
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR.....	427	406
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	11,701	9,206
CHETCO RIVER, OR.....	574	545
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA WESTPORT SLOUGH.....	24,973	23,164
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA.....	15,125	14,369
BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGE MATERIAL AT MCR.....	---	380
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	840	608
COOS BAY, OR.....	4,769	4,939
COQUILLE RIVER, OR.....	307	292
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR.....	991	941
COUGAR LAKE, OR.....	1,549	1,472
DEPOE BAY, OR.....	3	3
DETROIT LAKE, OR.....	2,084	1,011
DORENA LAKE, OR.....	831	789
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR.....	918	872
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR.....	1,433	1,381
GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR.....	1,823	1,732
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR.....	792	752
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, OR.....	33	31
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR.....	413	382
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	7,049	6,697
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR.....	2,261	2,623

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
-----		
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR.....	3,560	3,382
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	5,183	4,924
PORT ORFORD, OR.....	7	795
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR.....	220	209
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR.....	587	558
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR.....	82	78
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR.....	583	658
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR.....	5	5
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA.....	10,400	9,880
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR.....	35	33
UMPOUA RIVER, OR.....	635	1,723
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR.....	210	200
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR.....	62	59
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR \1.....	3,331	---
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR.....	810	580
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR.....	1,482	1,408
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA.....	6,578	6,249
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA.....	591	561
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA.....	215	204
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA.....	1,311	1,245
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA.....	2,736	2,599
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA.....	1,734	1,647
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA.....	1,847	1,997
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA.....	2,530	2,404
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA.....	625	594
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA.....	2,179	2,165
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA.....	633	601
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA.....	774	735
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA.....	228	217
HERRING BAY & ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD.....	---	475
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA.....	592	562
JOHNSTOWN, PA.....	2,255	2,142
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA.....	2,493	2,368
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA.....	2,880	2,736
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA.....	1,823	1,732
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	12,392	10,522
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV.....	24,796	23,556
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV.....	509	484
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA.....	70	87
PROMPTON LAKE, PA.....	505	480
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA.....	20	19
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA.....	3,312	3,146
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA.....	46	44
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA.....	2,000	1,900
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA.....	2,366	2,248
STILLWATER LAKE, PA.....	331	314
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA.....	93	88
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA.....	2,213	2,340
TIONESTA LAKE, PA.....	3,115	3,240
UNION CITY LAKE, PA.....	1,017	966
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA.....	1,033	981
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA.....	471	447
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD.....	2,908	2,763
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO HARBOR, PR.....	100	95
RHODE ISLAND		
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR, RI.....	360	342
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI.....	43	41
POINT JUDITH HARBOR OF REUGE, RI.....	1,250	1,188
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI.....	400	380
PROVIDENCE HARBOR SHIPPING CHANNEL, RI.....	---	285

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC.....	724	688
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC \1.....	12,527	9,450
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	4,885	4,451
FOLLY RIVER, SC \1.....	35	---
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC.....	690	2,660
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC.....	65	62
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC.....	824	593
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD.....	6,799	6,691
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD.....	303	288
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD.....	223	212
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD.....	7,328	8,224
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD.....	49	47
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN.....	403	383
DAHE DAM, LAKE OAKE, SD & ND.....	8,977	8,902
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD.....	52	49
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN.....	7,021	6,670
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN.....	6,829	6,488
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN.....	1,200	1,140
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.....	6,386	6,067
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN.....	6,262	5,949
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN.....	85	81
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.....	4,602	4,372
J PERCY PRIEST GREENWAY, TN.....	---	95
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN.....	9,845	9,353
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN.....	9	9
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN.....	20,219	19,208
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN.....	107	722
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX.....	1,354	1,286
ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,415	1,344
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX.....	1,417	1,346
BAROWELL LAKE, TX.....	2,162	2,054
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	3,122	2,966
BELTON LAKE, TX.....	3,567	3,389
BENBROOK LAKE, TX.....	2,302	2,187
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX.....	3,259	8,075
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX.....	1,723	1,637
CANYON LAKE, TX.....	3,686	3,502
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX.....	348	331
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	3,398	3,228
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX.....	6,393	6,073
SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	---	475
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX.....	38	36
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX.....	4,179	3,970
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX.....	7,020	6,669
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX.....	6,022	5,721
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	2,706	2,571
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX.....	2,928	2,780
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	2,225	2,114
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX.....	2,900	2,755
GREENS BAYOU, TX.....	850	808
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX.....	31,874	30,280
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX.....	1,479	1,405
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	15,354	14,111
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX.....	1,936	1,839
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX.....	2,001	1,901
JOE POOL LAKE, TX.....	1,771	1,682
LAKE KEMP, TX.....	214	203
LAVON LAKE, TX.....	3,065	2,912
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX.....	4,110	3,905
LOWER TRINITY RIVER, TX.....	---	2,057



CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
<hr/>		
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	6,173	5,864
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX.....	3,542	3,385
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX.....	2,086	1,983
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	907	862
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX.....	1,005	955
PROCTOR LAKE, TX.....	2,155	2,047
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX.....	304	299
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX.....	1,456	1,383
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX.....	8,822	8,381
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX.....	5,820	5,529
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX.....	101	96
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX.....	3,157	2,999
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX.....	2,210	2,550
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	1,482	1,408
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX.....	100	95
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX.....	2,735	2,598
WACO LAKE, TX.....	3,090	4,551
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX.....	1,747	1,860
WHITNEY LAKE, TX.....	8,559	9,271
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	4,532	4,305
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT.....	75	71
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT.....	598	588
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT.....	719	683
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT.....	70	67
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY.....	80	76
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT.....	635	603
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT.....	747	710
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT.....	681	647
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT.....	578	549
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA.....	---	605
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA.....	1,823	1,732
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA.....	987	919
CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA.....	266	253
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA.....	207	197
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA.....	2,022	1,921
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM)	1,108	1,053
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA.....	226	215
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA.....	3,667	3,484
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC.....	11,571	10,992
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA.....	1,938	1,841
LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA.....	---	855
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA.....	1,058	1,005
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA.....	10,072	10,518
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA.....	656	623
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA.....	6,961	6,613
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA.....	870	827
RUDEE INLET, VA.....	370	352
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, VA.....	54	51
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA.....	260	247
YORK RIVER, VA.....	250	238
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM GAS ABATEMENT, WA \1.....	6,500	---
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA.....	785	785
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR.....	3	3
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA.....	6	6
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID \1.....	95,700	---
EDIZ HOOK, WA.....	83	60
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA.....	1,293	1,228
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA.....	9,180	8,721
LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	---	356

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
HOWARD HANSON DAM ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA \1.....	15,000	---
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA.....	2,627	2,498
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	4,982	4,733
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA.....	70	87
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA.....	823	582
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA.....	7,554	7,176
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	2,380	2,242
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	8,874	5,580
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	7,787	4,431
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, \1..	1,500	---
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA.....	2,437	2,315
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA.....	257	244
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA.....	3,271	3,107
NEAH BAY, WA.....	308	2,185
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA.....	338	321
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA.....	997	947
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA.....	1,572	1,493
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA.....	506	481
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA.....	913	867
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA.....	248	236
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA.....	53	50
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA.....	---	380
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA.....	120	114
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR.....	7,696	7,311
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA.....	34	32
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV.....	1,473	1,399
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV.....	1,508	1,433
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV.....	1,973	1,874
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV.....	2,044	1,942
ELKINS, WV.....	14	13
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV.....	255	242
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV.....	9,380	8,911
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH.....	30,292	28,777
PARKERSBURG/VIENNA, WV.....	---	1,425
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH.....	2,700	2,565
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV.....	2,836	2,694
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV.....	1,039	987
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV.....	2,044	1,942
SUTTON LAKE, WV.....	2,210	2,100
TYGART LAKE, WV.....	1,521	1,445
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI.....	811	580
FOX RIVER, WI.....	1,775	1,686
FOX RIVER LOCKS, WI.....	---	475
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODEL, CORNUCOPIA HARBO	---	95
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI \1.....	4,344	3,998
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI.....	125	119
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI.....	650	618
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI.....	160	152
SAXON HARBOR, WI.....	---	295
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI..	16	15
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI.....	498	473
TWO RIVER HARBOR, WI.....	---	760
WYOMING		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY.....	34	32
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY.....	326	310
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY.....	87	83
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES.....	2,348,593	2,117,571
REMAINING ITEMS		
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH.....	690	656
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE..	4,750	4,513

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS LINES.....	5,865	5,572
ACTIONS FOR CHANGE TO IMPROVE OPERATION AND MAINTENANC	7,737	4,000
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	2,475	2,351
CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROJECTS NOT REQUIRING SPECIFIC L		
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204/2	2,278	---
NATIONAL MITIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 111).....	5,325	---
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION).....	1,500	1,425
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE.....	12,000	11,400
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM..	1,062	1,009
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION (DOE	6,080	5,776
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)..	1,391	1,321
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM.....	270	257
EMERGENCY REPROGRAMMING.....	---	71,979
FACILITY PROTECTION.....	12,000	11,400
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODEL.....	900	855
INDEPENDENT (PART) ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENT-STEWARDSH	500	475
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS.....	3,708	3,523
INLAND NAVIGATION SAFETY INITIATIVE.....	3,000	2,850
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.....	1,780	1,681
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS.....	1,575	1,496
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM.....	7,000	6,650
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	15,000	14,250
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (NEPP).....	6,000	5,700
NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY.....	10,000	9,500
NATIONAL NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.....	3,328	3,160
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATION.....	300	285
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT (ABS-P2.WINABS).	300	285
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION:		
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS.....	500	475
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SEC 3)....	50	48
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS.....	4,271	4,057
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION.....	725	689
RECREATION ONE STOP (R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVAT	1,130	1,074
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM....	1,391	1,321
Chesapeake Bay, Newport Comfort, Mathews County,	---	238
Long Island Coastal Planning, NY.....	---	950
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB.....	808	578
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS).....	653	620
SUBTOTAL FOR ITEMS NOT LISTED UNDER STATES.....	126,140	182,429
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....	2,475,000	2,300,000

11 ITEMS FUNDED IN CONSTRUCTION

*Arkansas Lakes (Blakely Mountain Dam, Lake Ouachita, Degray Lake, Narrows Dam, Lake Greason), Arkansas.*—In addition to budgeted activities at these Corps facilities, \$964,600 is included to provide adequate levels of service at public facilities.

*Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana.*—The Committee has recommended \$2,530,000 for this project. Dredging activities should place priority on the Bailly intake pipe area.

*Moriches Inlet, New York.*—It is the Committee's understanding that the dredging of this project will be completed in conjunction with a FEMA effort to place sand at Smith Point Park and Cupsogue Beaches. The Committee will revisit this project to ensure adequate funding is in place in the event that the project is not completed in this manner.

*Regional Sediment Management.*—Using funds previously appropriated for Southwest Washington Littoral Drift Restoration (Benson Beach) Washington Regional Sediment Management, the Secretary shall conduct a test project by placing dredged material in the surf zone located on or near Benson Beach at the mouth of the Columbia River and monitor sediment movement and environmental impacts. This project shall be designed in concurrence with the existing recommendation of the bi-state working group of local, state, and federal entities. Additional costs beyond the previously appropriated funds shall be borne by non-Federal interests.

#### REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$180,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	180,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	180,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	—
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	—

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$180,000,000, which is the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

#### FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (FUSRAP)

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$140,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	130,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	140,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	—
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+10,000,000

This appropriation funds the cleanup of certain low-level radioactive materials and mixed wastes, located mostly at sites contaminated as a result of the Nation's early efforts to develop atomic weapons.

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$140,000,000, the same as the fiscal year 2008 enacted level and \$10,000,000 above budget request. The Committee reaffirms report language carried in previous years directing the prioritization of sites, especially those that are nearing completion.

#### FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$—
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	40,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	40,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	+40,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	—

This appropriation funds the planning, training, exercises, and other measures that ensure the readiness of the Corps to respond to floods, hurricanes, and other natural disasters, and to support emergency operations in response to such natural disasters, including advance measures, flood fighting, emergency operations, the provision of potable water on an emergency basis, and the repair of certain flood and storm damage reduction projects. The requested amount is the base funding necessary for preparedness activities.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$40,000,000, the same level as the budget request and \$40,000,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

#### EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$175,046,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	177,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	177,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	+1,954,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	—

This appropriation funds the executive direction and management of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$177,000,000, \$1,954,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the Corps is not filling open senior positions in a timely manner. The Corps of Engineers is receiving increasing appropriations on both the military and civil sides of its program. In addition, the Corps has a program nearly three times that of its annual national appropriation in the New

Orleans area and is providing assistance for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan. It is critical for the success of these important missions that leadership positions are recruited for and filled in a timely manner.

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

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$4,500,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	6,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	5,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	+500,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	-1,000,000

The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) oversees Civil Works budget and policy whereas the Corps' executive direction and management of the Civil Works program are funded from the Expenses account.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000, \$500,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level and \$1,000,000 below the budget request.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The bill includes an administrative provision limiting representational expenses and allowing for the purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

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

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the award of continuing contracts for any project for which funds are derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the use of funds for any A-76 or HPO study.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$43,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	42,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	42,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	-1,000,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	—

The Central Utah Project Completion Act (Titles II–VI of Public Law 102–575) provides for the completion of the Central Utah Project by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. The Act also authorizes the appropriation of funds for fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation; establishes an account in

the Treasury for the deposit of these funds and of other contributions for mitigation and conservation activities; and establishes a Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to administer funds in that account. The Act further assigns responsibilities for carrying out the Act to the Secretary of the Interior and prohibits delegation of those responsibilities to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2009 to carry out the Central Utah Project is \$42,000,000, the same as the budget request, and \$1,000,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. Within the \$42,000,000 provided by the Committee, the following amounts are provided for the Central Utah Valley Water Conservation District by activity, as recommended in the budget request:

Utah Lake drainage basin delivery system .....	\$28,900,000
Water conservation measures .....	4,000,000
Uinta Basin replacement project .....	3,400,000
Other Title II programs .....	2,000,000
<b>Total, Central Utah water conservation district .....</b>	<b>38,300,000</b>

The Committee recommendation includes the requested amount of \$987,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission. These funds, as proposed in the budget request, are to be used to implement the fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation projects authorized in Title III of Public Law 102-575; and to complete mitigation measures committed to in pre-1992 Bureau of Reclamation planning documents, as follows:

Provo River/Utah Lake fish and wildlife .....	\$300,000
Diamond Fork Fish and Wildlife .....	5,000
Duchesne/Strawberry Rivers fish and wildlife .....	30,000
CRSP/Statewide fish, wildlife and recreation .....	152,000
Section 201(a)(1) mitigation measures .....	500,000
<b>Total, Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission .....</b>	<b>987,000</b>

For program oversight and administration, the Committee has provided \$1,640,000, the same level as the budget request and \$20,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. For fish and wildlife conservation programs, the Committee has provided \$1,073,000, the same level as the budget request and \$284,000 above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

#### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

#### FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET OVERVIEW

The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public. Since its establishment by the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, the Bureau of Reclamation has developed water supply facilities that have contributed to sustained economic growth and an enhanced quality of life in the western states. Lands and communities served by Reclamation projects have been developed to meet agricultural, tribal, urban, and industrial needs. The Bureau con-

tinues to develop authorized facilities to store and convey new water supplies and is the largest supplier and manager of water in the 17 western states. The Bureau maintains 472 dams and 348 reservoirs with the capacity to store 245 million acre-feet of water. These facilities deliver water to one of every five western farmers for about 10 million acres of irrigated land, and to over 31 million people for municipal, rural, and industrial uses. The Bureau is also the Nation's second largest producer of hydroelectric power, generating 42 billion kilowatt hours of energy each year from 58 power plants. In addition, its facilities provide substantial flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

Despite the significant achievements of the past, the Committee is concerned that Bureau of Reclamation has become a caretaker agency and is no longer exerting a leadership role in the provision of water supply or maintenance of the West's existing water supply infrastructure. Current projections of increasing needs and changing hydrology necessitate a Bureau that is a leader in the provision of water supply in the West. The investments made in the past are reaching their design life; municipal needs are growing and agriculture production must be protected. Balancing these competing priorities will be challenging and requires active participation and leadership on the part of the Bureau and its technical staff. To meet this challenge the Secretary of Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation must reinvigorate the structure and culture of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The fiscal year 2009 budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation totals \$751,799,000. The Committee recommendation totals \$915,479,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$163,680,000 above the budget request and \$192,434,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

A table summarizing the fiscal year 2008 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2009 budget request, and the Committee recommendation is provided below.

(Dollars in 1,000s)

Account	Fiscal year 2008 enacted	Fiscal year 2009 request	Committee recommendation
Water and related resources .....	\$949,882	\$779,320	\$888,000
Rescission .....	0	-175,000	-120,000
Central Valley project restoration fund .....	59,122	56,079	56,079
California Bay-Delta restoration .....	40,098	32,000	37,000
Policy and administration .....	58,811	59,400	54,400
<b>Total, Bureau of Reclamation .....</b>	<b>1,107,913</b>	<b>751,799</b>	<b>915,479</b>

#### WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$949,882,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	779,320,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	888,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	-61,882,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+108,680,000

The Water and Related Resources account supports the development, management, and restoration of water and related natural resources in the 17 western states. The account includes funds for



operating and maintaining existing facilities to obtain the greatest overall levels of benefits, to protect public safety, and to conduct studies on ways to improve the use of water and related natural resources.

For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends \$888,000,000, \$108,680,000 above the budget request and \$61,882,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. The recommendation includes a rescission of \$120,000,000, reallocating funds to higher priority projects.

*Reprogramming.*—To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2009 is consistent with congressional direction, to minimize the movement of funds, and to improve overall budget execution, the bill incorporates by reference the projects identified in the accompanying report.

*Rural Water.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$71,000,000 for Rural Water, an increase of \$47,000,000 from the budget request. Due to competing priorities the Committee was only able to restore half of the cuts from fiscal year 2008 enacted levels. This does not lessen the importance of the program but once again illustrates the critical need for infrastructure investment.

*Title XVI, Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.*—The Committee provides \$50,000,000 for Title XVI, an increase of \$43,000,000 over the budget request. The program supports the construction of facilities to develop and expand the use of recycled water to augment surface water supplies, helping to preserve overdrawn river and groundwater supplies, protect the environment, and improve the overall security and reliability of water supplies.

*Projects.*—Congress has made significant reforms in the way it reviews funding for the Federal government; reforms which the Committee takes very seriously as it executes its constitutional authority. Earmarking or directed spending of Federal dollars does not begin with Congress. It begins with the Executive Branch. For example, the Water and Related Resources accounts in the budget request are almost entirely made of individual earmarked projects. The Administration, in selecting these projects, goes through a process that is the functional equivalent of earmarking. When the Committee reviews the budget request, it goes through a process of rigorous review and may alter or modify this list to reflect additional priorities.

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	----- REQUEST -----		--- RECOMMENDED ---	
	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R
ARIZONA				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA.....	---	---	1,500	---
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT.....	---	9,900	---	9,900
COLORADO RIVER BASIN, CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT.....	28,528	322	26,528	322
PIHA-MARICOPA IRRIGATION PROJECT.....	---	---	(11,698)	---
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM.....	2,350	---	2,350	---
ALL AMERICAN CANAL DROP 2 STORAGE RESERVOIR.....	(619)	---	(619)	---
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	320	---	320	---
PHOENIX METROPOLITAN WATER REUSE PROJECT.....	200	---	250	---
SALT RIVER PROJECT.....	469	131	469	131
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT.....	325	---	325	---
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	718	---	718	---
CASA GRANDE WATER RECYCLING PROJECT, AZ.....	---	---	125	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT..	2,969	---	2,969	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS.....	1,858	20,205	1,658	20,205
YUMA EAST WETLANDS.....	---	---	1,500	---
CALIFORNIA				
BAY AREA REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING PROGRAM.....	---	---	9,000	---
CACHUMA PROJECT.....	1,016	702	1,016	702
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	352	---	352	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PLANT....	800	---	1,200	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECTS:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION.....	1,708	7,772	1,708	7,772
EL DORADO TEMPERATURE CONTROL DEVICE.....	---	---	1,600	---
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	2,088	---	2,088	---
DELTA DIVISION.....	15,138	5,599	15,138	5,599
EAST SIDE DIVISION.....	1,591	2,943	1,591	2,943
FRIANT DIVISION.....	1,988	3,733	1,988	3,733
SEMITROPIC PHASE II GROUNDWATER BANKING.....	---	---	1,000	---
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	12,006	1,145	12,006	1,145
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT..	---	24,091	---	24,091
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	931	1,497	1,433	1,497
HAMILTON CIY PUMPING PLANT, GELL-COLUSA IRRIGA	(30)	---	(58)	---
RED BLUFF DIVERSION DAM FISH PASSAGE IMPROVEME	---	---	(1,000)	---
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	875	100	675	100
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION.....	391	---	391	---
SHASTA DIVISION.....	150	7,764	150	7,764
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION.....	7,215	3,102	7,215	3,102
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS.....	1,117	8,334	1,117	8,334
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT.....	3,497	5,422	3,497	5,422
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION.....	303	---	303	---
HI-DESERT WASTEWATER COLLECTION & REUSE.....	---	---	1,000	---
INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.....	---	---	5,000	---
IRVINE BASIN GROUND AND SURFACE WATER.....	---	---	1,000	---
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS.....	100	---	100	---
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROJECT...	692	---	692	---
LONG BEACH DESALINATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJ	---	---	1,325	---
MOKELUMNE RIVER REGIONAL WATER STORAGE & CONJUNCTIVE U	---	---	500	---
NORTH BAY WATER REUSE PROJECT.....	---	---	500	---
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT, PHAS	558	---	558	---
ORLAND PROJECT.....	---	703	---	703
RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT.....	---	---	50	---
RIVERSIDE CORONA FEEDER.....	---	---	100	---
SACRAMENTO VALLEY INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT	---	---	500	---
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT.....	700	---	700	---
NEW AND ALAMO RIVERS.....	---	---	1,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM....	3,000	---	7,000	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT.....	700	---	700	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION FUND.....	---	---	4,000	---
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM.....	250	---	8,000	---
SANTA MARGARITA RIVER CONJUNCTIVE USE.....	---	---	500	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST		RECOMMENDED	
	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R
SOLANO PROJECT.....	1,626	2,863	1,626	2,863
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	260	---	260	---
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT.....	389	31	389	31
WATSONVILLE AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.....	---	---	4,000	---
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT, CRSP.....	49,743	257	49,743	257
COLLBRAN PROJECT.....	166	1,390	166	1,390
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT.....	450	12,842	450	12,842
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	204	---	204	---
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT.....	75	154	75	154
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT.....	172	8,123	172	8,123
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II.....	164	1,281	164	1,281
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY.....	36	3,059	36	3,059
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	243	---	243	---
MANCOS PROJECT.....	42	104	42	104
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II.....	50	2,388	50	2,388
PINE RIVER PROJECT.....	184	151	184	151
SALT CEDAR AND RUSSIAN OLIVE CONTROL, ARKASSAS RIVER..	---	---	500	---
SAN JUAN BASIN WOOD INVASIVE INITIATIVE.....	---	---	250	---
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT.....	292	4,345	292	4,345
UNCOMPAGRE PROJECT.....	128	136	128	136
UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS.....	250	---	250	---
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS.....	2,769	2,515	2,769	2,515
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT.....	18,000	---	18,000	---
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	179	---	179	---
LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS.....	548	30	548	30
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS.....	2,768	2,790	2,768	2,790
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	73	---	73	---
WICHITA-CHENEY PROJECT.....	10	375	10	375
WICHITA PROJECT - EQUUS BEDS DIVISION.....	50	---	2,000	---
MONTANA				
FORT PECK RESERVATION/ DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM.	---	---	4,000	---
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT.....	---	653	---	653
HUNTLEY PROJECT.....	52	108	52	108
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT.....	31	15	31	15
MILK RIVER PROJECT.....	308	1,340	308	1,340
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS.....	134	---	134	---
ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MONTANA REGIONAL WATER.....	---	---	5,000	---
ST. MARY, GLACIER COUNTY, MT.....	---	---	500	---
SUN RIVER PROJECT.....	75	275	75	275
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT.....	12	158	12	158
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	64	---	64	---
NEVADA				
CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS.....	---	---	3,000	---
HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY.....	200	---	200	---
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT.....	5,021	2,684	5,021	2,684
LAKE MEAD /LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM.....	900	---	900	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST		RECOMMENDED	
	RES. NGHT.	FAC. OM&R	RES. NGHT.	FAC. OM&R
NEW MEXICO				
CARLSBAD PROJECT.....	2,657	1,127	2,657	1,127
ESPAÑOLA VALLEY REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.....	---	---	1,000	---
JICARILLA APACHE RESERVATION RURAL WATER SYSTEM.....	---	---	3,000	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT.....	13,047	9,653	13,047	9,653
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY, NM, UT, CO.....	---	---	500	---
NAVAJO NATION INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	77	---	77	---
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT.....	---	203	---	203
RIO GRANDE PROJECT.....	590	3,752	590	3,752
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	59	---	59	---
SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	57	---	57	---
TUCUMCARI PROJECT.....	23	35	23	35
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS.....	29	---	29	---
NORTH DAKOTA				
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN - GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT...	16,495	5,611	16,495	5,611
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT.....	48	241	48	241
MC GEE CREEK PROJECT.....	25	651	25	651
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT.....	---	523	---	523
NORMAN PROJECT.....	26	447	26	447
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	128	---	278	---
OKLAHOMA COMPREHNSIVE WATER PLAN.....	---	---	(150)	---
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT.....	30	1,396	30	1,396
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT.....	65	416	65	416
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT.....	407	444	407	444
DESCUTES PROJECT.....	238	178	238	178
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS.....	542	286	542	286
KLAMATH PROJECT.....	23,388	1,612	23,388	1,612
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	294	---	294	---
UMATILLA BASIN WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	(100)	---	(100)	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION.....	577	325	577	325
SAVAGE RAPIDS DAM REMOVAL.....	3,000	---	3,000	---
TUALATIN PROJECT.....	111	270	111	270
TUALATIN PROJECT TITLE TRANSFER.....	---	---	106	---
UMATILLA PROJECT.....	954	2,978	954	2,978
SOUTH DAKOTA				
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX RESERVATION, PERKINS & MEADE COUN.....	---	---	100	---
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM.....	---	---	25,000	---
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT.....	---	15	---	15
MNI WICONI PROJECT.....	16,240	10,000	16,240	10,000
PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER SYSTEM.....	---	---	3,000	---
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM.....	---	86	---	86
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT.....	41	17	41	17
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT.....	59	86	59	86
IRRIGATION CANAL INFRASTRUCTURE RESTORATION AND WATER.....	---	---	251	---
LOWER RIO GRANDE VALLEY WATER RESOURCES.....	50	---	1,000	---
NUECES RIVER PROJECT.....	25	533	25	533
RIVERSIDE CANAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.....	---	---	1,250	---
SAN ANGELO PROJECT.....	35	367	35	367
TWIN BUTTES RESTORATION PROJECT.....	---	---	500	---
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	146	---	146	---
WILLIAMSON COUNTY WATER RECYCLING PROJECT.....	---	---	1,000	---

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	REQUEST		RECOMMENDED	
	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT.....	146	32	146	32
MOON LAKE PROJECT.....	3	73	3	73
NEWTON PROJECT.....	4	38	4	38
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	156	---	156	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT.....	196	172	196	172
PROVO RIVER PROJECT.....	951	415	951	415
SCOFIELD PROJECT.....	55	78	55	78
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT.....	203	20	203	20
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	121	---	121	---
SUMMIT COUNTY WATER IMPORTATION PROJECT.....	---	---	500	---
WEBER BASIN PROJECT.....	1,028	720	1,028	720
WEBER RIVER PROJECT.....	30	107	30	107
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT.....	3,737	8,811	3,737	8,811
ODESSA SUBAREA SPECIAL STUDY.....	600	---	1,000	---
POTHLES RESERVOIR SUPPLEMENTAL FEED ROUTE.....	---	---	1,000	---
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS.....	85	10	85	10
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	57	---	57	---
YAKIMA PROJECT.....	1,201	6,565	1,201	6,565
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.....	8,503	---	8,503	---
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER STORAGE.....	---	---	500	---
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT.....	91	3,242	91	3,242
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT.....	302	1,578	302	1,578
SHOSHONE PROJECT.....	84	665	84	665
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS.....	26	---	26	---
SUBTOTAL FOR PROJECTS.....	275,213	213,288	380,522	213,288
REGIONAL PROGRAMS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I.....	---	9,444	---	9,444
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II.....	5,850	---	5,850	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 5.....	1,918	3,995	1,918	3,995
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 8.....	710	---	710	---
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	265	---	265	---
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	---	1,250	---	1,250
INITIATE SDD CORRECTIVE ACTION.....	---	71,500	---	71,500
SAFETY OF EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS.....	---	18,500	---	18,500
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.....	500	---	500	---
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM.....	---	1,422	---	1,422
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION.....	21,939	---	21,939	---
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES.....	1,739	---	1,739	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.....	973	---	973	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES.....	---	6,254	---	6,254
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM.....	---	1,384	---	1,384
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	2,183	---	1,899	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	7,481	---	7,481	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM.....	16,400	---	16,400	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS.....	---	714	---	714
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM.....	7,020	---	7,020	---
SID YATES SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.....	---	---	210	---
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING.....	1,658	---	1,658	---
OPERATIONS AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	684	522	684	522
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN - OTHER PICK-SLOAN.....	3,687	37,053	3,687	37,053
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES.....	847	250	847	250
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM.....	641	155	641	155

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES  
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	----- REQUEST -----		--- RECOMMENDED ---	
	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R	RES. MGMT.	FAC. OM&R
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION.....	2,132	---	2,132	---
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION..	951	---	951	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:				
DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM.....	375	1,600	375	1,600
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.....	9,000	---	9,000	---
RURAL WATER LEGISLATION, TITLE I.....	1,000	---	1,000	---
SITE SECURITY.....	---	28,950	---	28,950
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM.....	800	---	4,225	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES - TECHNICAL SUPPORT	93	---	93	---
WATER FOR AMERICA INITIATIVE.....	19,000	---	19,000	---
SUBTOTAL, REGIONAL PROGRAMS.....	107,826	182,993	111,197	182,993
TOTAL WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES.....	383,039	396,281	491,719	396,281

*Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Projects, California.*—The Committee commends the regional willingness to work together in pursuing needed water recycling projects, and has recommended \$5,000,000 for the effort.

*St. Mary's Project, Glacier County, Montana.*—The Committee has included \$500,000 for the St. Mary's Project, Glacier County, MT, in Water and Related Resources. Although funding for this project was authorized for the Corps of Engineers in section 5103 of the 2007 Water Resources Development Act, this project was originally constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation and its rehabilitation should take place under the Bureau's auspices. The Committee strongly encourages the Project's sponsors to pursue the necessary authority for the Bureau to undertake this work.

*Jicarilla Apache Reservation Rural Water System, New Mexico.*—Within funds provided, the Bureau is directed to proceed with construction of the project in a manner that comports and complements the existing work performed by the Tribe. The funds may also be used to reimburse the Tribe for work performed on authorized components of the project.

#### CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$59,122,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	56,079,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	56,079,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	—3,043,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	—

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

For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends \$56,079,000, the same level as the budget request and \$3,043,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. Authorizing legislation for the San Joaquin River Restoration Fund has not been enacted by Congress; therefore, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to expend the \$7,500,000 in assumed transferred receipts within the anadromous fish screen program.

*Reprogramming.*—To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2009 is consistent with Congressional direction, to minimize the movement of funds, and to improve overall budget execution, the bill incorporates by reference the projects identified in the accompanying report.

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

Anadromous fish restoration program .....	\$5,436,000
Instream flow .....	300,000
Other Central Valley project impacts .....	1,500,000
Dedicated project yield .....	800,000
Flow fluctuation study .....	50,000
Restoration of riparian habitat and spawning gravel .....	1,000,000

Central Valley comprehensive assessment/monitoring program .....	500,000
Anadromous fish screen program .....	6,000,000
Sacramento fish screens .....	4,000,000
Refugee wheeling conveyance .....	8,900,000
Refuge water supply, facility construction .....	4,694,000
Ecosystem/water systems operations model .....	7,709,000
Water acquisition program .....	9,990,000
San Joaquin Basin action plan .....	1,000,000
Land retirement program .....	500,000
Clear Creek restoration .....	700,000
Trinity River restoration program .....	1,000,000
San Joaquin River Basin resource management initiative .....	2,000,000
Total, Central Valley project restoration fund .....	56,079,000

### CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$40,098,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	32,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	37,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	- 3,098,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+5,000,000

The California Bay-Delta Restoration account funds the Federal share of water supply and reliability improvements, ecosystem improvements and other activities being developed for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and associated watersheds by a State and Federal partnership (CALFED). Federal participation in this program was initially authorized in the California Bay-Delta Environmental and Water Security Act enacted in 1996.

For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends \$37,000,000, \$5,000,000 above the budget request and \$3,098,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

*Reprogramming.*—To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2009 is consistent with congressional direction, to minimize the movement of funds, and to improve overall budget execution, the bill incorporates by reference the projects identified in the accompanying report.

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

Environmental water account .....	\$7,000,000
Water quality .....	6,000,000
San Joaquin River salinity management .....	(5,000,000)
Storage .....	6,450,000
Shasta enlargement study .....	(2,750,000)
Los Vaqueros Expansion .....	(200,000)
Sites Reservoir .....	(200,000)
San Joaquin River Basin Study .....	(3,300,000)
Conveyance .....	9,050,000
DMC Intertie w/California Aqueduct .....	(2,000,000)
San Luis lowpoint feasibility .....	(1,400,000)
Frank's tract feasibility study .....	(2,700,000)
DMC recirculation feasibility study .....	(750,000)
South Delta improvements program .....	(200,000)
Ecosystem restoration .....	3,500,000
Sacramento River small diversion fish screens .....	(2,000,000)
Bay Delta conservation plan .....	(1,500,000)
Science .....	3,000,000
Planning and management activities .....	2,000,000
Total, California Bay-Delta .....	37,000,000



POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$58,811,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	59,400,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	54,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	-4,411,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	-5,000,000

The Policy and Administration account provides for the executive direction and management of all Reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, and Denver, Colorado, and in five regional offices. The Denver and regional offices charge individual projects or activities for direct beneficial services and related administrative and technical costs. These charges are covered under other appropriations. For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends \$54,400,000, \$5,000,000 below the budget request and \$4,411,000 below the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

The Bureau is well aware of the Committee's intent for a five-year plan—a rational, reality-based assessment of investment needs, by project, outlining the expected and necessary expenses associated with the inventory of the existing projects and the new investments necessary to meet Reclamation's mission for a planning horizon of five years. The original direction for the Bureau's five-year plan was contained in the Committee's fiscal year 2006 report, adequate time for a meaningful plan to be assembled.

The Bureau's five-year plan as submitted in 2008 was inadequate to meet the Committee's needs. The Bureau provided a plan which contained only a list of projects along with, in the Administration's words, "mechanistic, computer generated account data" for out-year costs. It seems that the Administration's plan ignores actual programmatic needs and is instead built on an arbitrary funding level. This five-year plan is useless as a planning document and appears simply to be an effort to avoid the transfer of \$10,000,000 from the Policy and Administration account to the Water and Related Resources Account. The Bureau is aware of the Committee's dissatisfaction with the product provided and has taken no action to remedy the situation. Therefore, in addition to the transfer provision that was included in the fiscal year 2008 appropriation due to the Committee's frustration with the Bureau's inaction on this critical planning tool, the Committee recommendation includes a reduction to the Policy and Administration account.

The Committee's expectation for the fiscal year 2010 budget submission is as follows: (1) the five-year plan shall include two funding scenarios: one which reflects the Administration's expenditure ceilings and a second which reflects an expenditure level consistent with the fiscal year 2008 appropriation, including inflation for the out-years; (2) a list of active projects, as defined by a project receiving funding in the previous three years, for which funding is not proposed in the plan; (3) a full accounting of all rural water and title XVI projects which are currently authorized, the total authorization, the balance to complete, and total appropriations to date; and (4) an explanation of the methodology used in determining the project allocations, together with the direction provided to field offices in the preparation of the five-year plan.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The bill includes an administrative provision allowing for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

## DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

The bill includes a provision regarding the San Luis Unit and Kesterson Reservoir in California.

## TITLE III

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## INTRODUCTION

Funds recommended in Title III provide for all Department of Energy (DOE) programs, including Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Nuclear Energy, Fossil Energy Research and Development, Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, the Energy Information Administration, Non-Defense Environmental Management, Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, Science, Nuclear Waste Disposal, Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program, Departmental Administration, Office of the Inspector General, the National Nuclear Security Administration (Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and the Office of the Administrator), Defense Environmental Management, Other Defense Activities, Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Energy (DOE) has requested a total budget of \$25,917,888,000 in fiscal year 2009 to fund programs in its five primary mission areas: science, energy, environment, nuclear nonproliferation and national security. The overall DOE budget request is increased 5.8 percent compared to the fiscal year 2008 enacted level, but the five mission areas fare quite differently under the Department's budget proposal. Science research would increase by over 17.5 percent while the budget for Nuclear Nonproliferation decreases by 6.7 percent. The total environmental management budget request proposes a reduction of 8.3 percent compared to fiscal year 2008.

Compared to fiscal year 2008, the fiscal year 2009 budget request for energy conservation and renewable energy is actually down by 27.1 percent in the midst of an on-going energy crisis with increased, volatile costs for petroleum and natural gas, over-reliance on imported oil, and growing emissions of greenhouse gases. The complexity and importance of these interwoven issues suggests that a robust national strategy to tackle them will require significantly increased support of a broad range of energy technology options. However, the Administration has chosen to focus largely on expanding its energy technology efforts relevant to just one such technology, with a proposed 39.4 percent increase for nuclear energy.

---

Moreover, this increase is primarily driven by the proposed funding for studies of potential nuclear fuel recycling facilities and fast reactors that comprise most of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership proposal.

The Committee recommends a number of significant changes to the fiscal year 2009 budget request to reflect specific Congressional priorities that better address our national interests. The Committee recommendation provides additional funds over the request for the Office of Science and supports the projected doubling of this area of research and development funding over the decade from 2006 to 2016. Significant adjustments to funding for nuclear non-proliferation, environmental cleanup, and weapons programs are recommended. With the passage of the Energy Independence Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140), many new programs were authorized that expand alternative energy research and development, and deploy renewable energy technologies to communities, states and industry. Including funding for some of these programs, the Committee provides over one billion dollars in new spending authority over the request for applied renewable energy and energy conservation research, development, demonstration, and deployment. The total funding recommended for the Department of Energy is \$27,204,820,000, an increase of \$2,715,718,000 over fiscal year 2008 and \$1,286,932,000 over the budget request.

#### COMMITTEE INITIATIVES

##### ENERGY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND DEPLOYMENT

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA) mandated new fuel efficiency standards for automobiles, increasing them for the first time since 1978. Along with these new vehicle efficiency standards, Congress also authorized new research, development and deployment programs for renewable energy and energy conservation measures. The Congressional commitment to wean the U.S. economy off fossil fuels is also evident in the provision of additional funds for these newly authorized programs. The Committee recommends over one billion dollars in new spending authority to fund many of the new initiatives in EISA, including Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants to help deploy renewable energy initiatives and conservation measures in states and local communities; Renewable Fuel Infrastructure grants to deploy more renewable fuel blends and make them more available for the public; and Advanced Vehicles Manufacturing Facility grants and loans for assistance for automakers and suppliers to convert U.S. manufacturing capabilities for the manufacture of new vehicles less-dependent on fossil fuels. These incentives for the deployment of new technologies are important, but the U.S. must also maintain its research base to ensure that a broad array of technology options is pursued to displace fossil fuel consumption. As such, the Committee recommends significant increases in applied energy research technologies, such as solar, wind, biomass, geothermal, and water power, to continue the work necessary to refine their power generation capability, making it more affordable and cost competitive with fossil fuels. The U.S. must maintain a robust research effort in alternative energy, balanced with effective deployment strategies.

---

## RESEARCH PRIORITIES AND COORDINATION

Starting from the time of the Manhattan Project and the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Energy and its predecessors have a long history of excellence in supporting innovative basic and applied research. One of the important legacies of this storied history is the Department's strength in the physical sciences, where it remains the largest source of research funding in the federal government. The major increase in funding for the Office of Science authorized by the America COMPETES Act (Public Law 110-69) is intended to begin to remedy years of neglect in support for these research areas and to address the recommendations in the report by the National Academies, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future*. The Committee substantially supports this increase, which will directly fund an additional 2,600 individuals engaged in research sponsored by DOE's Science account.

In general, the Department performs its basic science research and applied energy research missions quite well for the level of support provided. The Committee notes that the Department sponsors energy research and development through the Office of Science as well as the four applied energy programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Fossil Energy, Nuclear Energy, and Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability. One of the issues that this Committee raised repeatedly in recent years is the lack of coordination among these programs to ensure that mission-critical science needs and opportunities that span multiple programs are being appropriately addressed. The Committee is pleased to note that the Department has taken some encouraging steps in this direction, including the completion of twenty planning workshops arranged by the Office of Science in consultation with the applied technology programs in order to address the scientific barriers to progress in applied technology missions; integrated budget documentation for six key research and development areas of significant interest to the missions of multiple programs; and the proposal to fund over two dozen Energy Frontier Research Centers (EFRC) to tackle many of the of these critical science needs. The Committee directs the Department to continue to support and expand these efforts and take the steps needed to ensure that R&D integration is implemented at all levels across the Department in planning, budgeting, and execution. The Department is directed to provide the Committee with a report detailing progress on these efforts no later than March 1, 2009.

However, successful research integration requires strong programs across the Department spanning both the basic and applied sciences. Unfortunately, the budget request woefully underfunds many critical applied energy research and development activities in the applied energy technology programs, particularly Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. This Committee strongly rejects this unbalanced approach by providing robust funding for applied research and development to complement increases in basic science. Even with this increased funding, the Committee still remains concerned by the lack of support in the Department for long-term applied research focused on advancing innovative ideas which fall between basic science research and the short-term technology devel-

---

opment and demonstration efforts which are the focus of the applied technology programs. The Committee directs the Office of Science to work with the energy technology programs to identify priority, long-term applied science efforts that should be considered for enhanced investment by the applied technology programs, jointly with the Office of Science as appropriate. The Department is directed to provide the Committee with a report detailing progress on these efforts no later than March 1, 2009.

#### MAJOR COMMITTEE CONCERNS

##### CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

Article I, Section 9 of the U.S. Constitution states "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law". The Committee has reminded the Department of this Constitutional provision during budget hearings because of the repeated disregard of Congressional direction in the execution of appropriations law by the Department. The Department on several occasions has circumvented the clear intent of Congress, seeking to satisfy Administration desires rather than Congressional mandates. In the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008, Congress appropriated funds for the construction and management of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility in the Nuclear Energy appropriations account. Subsequent to this Act being signed into law by the President, the Department determined that its preference is to manage the project as DOE always has, within the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, disregarding the most recently passed Congressional statutory language. The Committee has provided additional statutory direction in fiscal year 2009 to reinforce the Committee's intent. The Department should execute this project as it is appropriated under the Office of Nuclear Energy.

The report accompanying the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill also directed the Office of Nuclear Energy to compete 50 percent of the research funds provided for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP). The Department did not agree with this direction and so it continued to obligate funds in a non-competitive manner, until it became impossible to comply with the Congressional direction. The Committee has eliminated all funding for the Administration's GNEP initiative for fiscal year 2009 and redirected a smaller amount to the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.

##### CONTRACT AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Project management is the Committee's number one organizational concern at the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy is the largest civilian contracting agency in the federal government and spends over 90 percent of its annual budget on contracts to operate its laboratories, production facilities, and environmental restoration sites. In 1990, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) began an annual assessment resulting in a list of programs that are at high risk for fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. DOE project management, as well as its contract management, have been on this list since its inception. The Office of Engineering and Construction Management (OECM) has been helpful in instilling project management discipline within the De-

partment. The Committee supports the work of this Office, and in particular supports the "root-cause analysis" that OECM has initiated to identify and correct the reasons why the Department repeatedly remains on the GAO high-risk list. The Committee looks forward to the corrective action plan that OECM is preparing based on the root-cause analysis.

In the fiscal year 2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act, the Congress provided funds for the Department to contract with the National Academy of Public Administration for a review of procurement and contracting processes at the Department, among other administrative functions. While the legislation was signed in December 2007, the Department was not able to award the contract until May of 2008, five months later. The Committee looks forward to the recommendations of the Academy and hopes the next Administration will consider the Academy's recommendations as it fills its senior management positions and establishes priorities for DOE. With the passage of eighteen years on the GAO high risk list, the DOE should have a sense of urgency to improve.

#### SPENT FUEL MANAGEMENT

The Committee continues to be frustrated and disappointed in the lack of an integrated approach from the Department to managing spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. Responsibilities for spent fuel and radioactive waste are divided among multiple program offices, primarily the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (for the Yucca Mountain repository), the Office of Environmental Management (for site cleanup and stewardship of the Department's spent fuel and high level waste), the Office of Naval Reactors (for Navy spent fuel), and the Office of Nuclear Energy (for researching options to recycle spent fuel).

Each of those program offices is making varying degrees of progress on its respective spent fuel and high-level waste responsibilities. In particular, the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management has done an exceptional job submitting the license application for Yucca Mountain in early June 2008. However, what is commendable focus from the perspective of individual program offices can in fact become tunnel vision when viewed from a broader outlook. The Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management has been lukewarm about interim storage or beginning work on the second repository, in that it views these alternatives as "distractions" from its primary focus on Yucca Mountain. The Office of Environmental Management is focused on cleaning up radioactive waste at sites such as Hanford and Savannah River. Unfortunately, that focus on making progress at the site level ignores the fact that Yucca Mountain, as presently authorized, does not have the capacity to handle all of the high-level waste and spent fuel from the entire DOE complex. The cleanup schedules assume, somewhat naively, that an expanded Yucca Mountain repository will be available to dispose of all high-level waste beginning around 2020.

The Office of Nuclear Energy has become so enamored of advanced recycling technologies, and proselytizing its GNEP vision around the world, that it has lost sight of its responsibilities to address the domestic spent fuel backlog. The long-range recycling vision, which would not touch domestic spent fuel in any significant

---

quantities until approximately two decades from now, might make sense if the Department has any near-term solution to spent fuel, such as interim storage. But it does not.

Meanwhile, the financial liability against the Federal government, which may well exceed \$7,000,000,000, mounts daily. This liability might be a strong motivator for the Administration and Congress to move aggressively to address spent fuel disposition. However, when DOE fails to reflect that liability anywhere in its budget, or show that liability elsewhere in the federal budget, it loses the leverage that this liability might provide. As DOE indicates a willingness to enter into modified standard contracts for new reactors, it only compounds the liability facing the federal government.

Yucca Mountain is the linchpin for the Department's entire spent fuel strategy. If Yucca does not open on schedule, if its capacity cannot be expanded, or if a reliable source of financing is not secured, then the other elements of DOE's spent fuel strategy will collapse. While advanced recycling might, in theory, reduce the need for additional Yucca Mountain-sized repositories in the distant future, there is still a need for that first repository to accommodate spent fuel that cannot be recycled, the very substantial high-level waste products from any recycling process, and the high-level waste from DOE cleanup sites. Again, without Yucca, the Department has no spent fuel strategy.

The Department lacks a robust, integrated strategy that will deal with our existing and projected quantities of spent fuel and high-level waste over the next several decades, in a manner that is financially responsible, technically sound, and politically feasible. The Department hinges all of its planning on Yucca Mountain and the hope that the repository will be operational by the end of the next decade. It also hopes that it will succeed in removing the statutory cap on the capacity of the repository, and will succeed in creating an off-budget financing mechanism for the repository program. These are nothing more than wishful thinking at this point; no rational observer would conclude that DOE has a chance of enacting these legislative changes in the near future.

The Committee is hopeful that the next Administration will take a more comprehensive and responsible approach to the management of spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

The Committee directs the Department to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, not later than March 1, 2009, a comprehensive report detailing all current and anticipated spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste, the current locations, quantities, and types of these materials, the destination for permanent disposal, and the planned shipment date to the disposal site. This comprehensive report should include all spent reactor fuel from any source (i.e., commercial power reactors, Navy reactors, domestic research reactors, and U.S.-origin fuel for foreign research reactors) and all domestic high-level radioactive waste that will require permanent disposal in the U.S. by the year 2050. These requirements may stem from statutory requirements, contractual requirements, agreements with regulators and affected States, court-ordered agreements, or agreements with foreign governments. The estimated amounts and shipment dates of spent fuel and high-level waste must be consistent with current DOE cleanup

---

plans and existing regulatory and court-ordered agreements. The forecast of anticipated spent fuel from future reactors should be consistent with current forecasts for U.S. nuclear energy by the Energy Information Administration. If the forecasts exceed the presently-authorized capacity at Yucca Mountain, then the Department must identify, with specificity, its plans for disposing of 100% of these materials.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Of all the programs within the Department of Energy, the Environmental Management (EM) program is most vulnerable to a complete breakdown in operations. A combination of factors—lack of transparency in operations, inability to communicate the progress or disruption of programs, poor contract management, severe cost overruns on projects, poor contractor oversight, and commitment to legal milestones knowing they will never be met—contributes to this state of affairs in the EM organization. Recent GAO findings documenting many of these factors have only strengthened the Committee's conviction that EM project management is dangerously flawed.

The fiscal year 2009 budget was submitted by the Administration with the full acknowledgment that all legal milestones were not being met. With GAO documentation of unreliable cost estimates and lack of project management rigor in mind, this acknowledgment is likely one of the few Departmental claims that the Committee can believe. Some compliance milestones will surely be missed, though it is doubtful whether the EM program is best utilizing all its resources—over six billion dollars annually—to the greatest effect. The underlying data necessary for integrity of information are absent in the EM program. The tragedy of the situation is that the stakes are so high at several of the EM sites. For example, millions of gallons of high-level liquid radioactive waste from five decades ago remain in single shell tanks at Hanford, threatening the Columbia River Valley and its downstream population. A forthcoming GAO report notes little has been achieved in the last 15 years to remedy the situation, while billions of dollars have been expended. The EM program needs to present a credible and coherent system for planning, budgeting, and executing its program as well as tracking its progress and reporting that progress to Congress. It may be that operations are working well at many of the smaller EM sites, but unfortunately the high-profile failures at sites like Hanford and Savannah River call the entire EM program into question.

#### NUCLEAR WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The Committee is concerned that NNSA's nuclear weapons programs have lost their direction. The United States has the most destructive nuclear arsenal in the world, far more effective than those of all other nations combined. However, U.S. nuclear weapons, and the complex that supports them, were built to Cold War legacy requirements. Nuclear yields are too high while margins and surety are too low. The weapons complex is far larger and more costly than present or future needs require. Yet the Departments of Energy and Defense have not produced a strategy specifying the purpose of the nuclear stockpile in the post Cold War world. In the ab-

---



sence of a strategy, it is impossible to make rational decisions on the size and composition of the stockpile and the complex that supports it.

The Committee commends NNSA for its excellent and innovative work on Stockpile Stewardship which has, without nuclear testing, produced a far more secure basis for confidence in the nuclear stockpile than could ever be attained by nuclear testing alone. The Committee also commends NNSA for its progress in safely dismantling excess nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, the Committee is highly averse to spending the taxpayers' money when no long-term strategy underlies the expenditure. Accordingly, the Committee has made numerous reductions to the Nuclear Weapons Activities requests, and in most cases has refused to fund new starts.

The Committee recognizes that the national weapons laboratories—Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore, and Sandia—have highly trained personnel and specialized facilities which have potential applications in addition to national security missions. With steady or decreasing funding in the weapons accounts, these laboratories are searching for a broader mandate, with a multiplicity of on-site agency clients and programs. Like the non-weapons laboratories, the weapons labs must compete on the basis of cost and performance, and on a level playing field. No lab is entitled to any portion of non-NNSA programs at the Department.

At the same time, the weapons laboratories enjoy protections and authorities derived from the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (NNSA Act) which other laboratories do not. Often, these authorities lead to illogical conclusions which erode accountability of taxpayer funds. Without top-level planning and guidance, the activities of our weapons laboratories are likely to continue to diversify, perhaps even to the detriment of the DOE mission. The Committee strongly encourages the Department to work with the laboratories to develop 10-year plans which ensure that any work occurring on weapons laboratories using non-NNSA funding has a clear, accountable, legally-enforceable line of authority to the appropriate program office outside of NNSA. This probably will necessitate amending the NNSA Act, which prohibits the accountability of the weapons laboratories to non-NNSA officials in DOE. The plans should also ensure that all laboratories competing for non-NNSA funding do so on a level playing field. The Administration should prepare and submit a legislative proposal if necessary to achieve these objectives.

#### NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

The Committee regards nuclear nonproliferation to be of highest priority. If nuclear nonproliferation fails, the adverse impact on human civilization could be immense. Nuclear nonproliferation presents a massive challenge, both because it requires overcoming a combination of technical and political hurdles and because it is required to undo past misjudgments. These misjudgments were made when the world was less complex and nuclear nonproliferation needs seemed largely confined to gaining national ratifications of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. At that time, nuclear weapons appeared clearly and securely confined to a small number of states which understood that their national safety lay in avoiding the use of such weapons. Today, civilization faces the prospect that

nuclear weapons or materials may fall into the wrong hands and be used not for national purposes which can be negotiated or deterred, but to cause death and destruction for its own sake. An additional challenge is the fact that while the technical requirements for making a nuclear device are not becoming more difficult, the technical knowledge needed to make the device is becoming more readily obtainable. DOE Nuclear Nonproliferation programs seek to counter these adverse trends by reducing the amount of nuclear material in the world, bringing it under better control and concentrating it in fewer and more secure locations, gaining the support of more governments in this effort of mutual self-interest, and improving civilization's ability to detect and/or counter potential terrorist nuclear devices. While much progress has been made, much remains to be done. The Committee regards DOE's requests, with the exception of the counterproductive Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP), to be generally well conceived and well executed, but insufficient. The Committee has added unrequested funding in several key areas, but the Committee encourages NNSA to take a more farsighted and comprehensive view of its nuclear non-proliferation responsibilities in the future.

#### FEDERAL STAFFING

Like many other Federal agencies, the Department of Energy is facing a human resources challenge as a large fraction of its federal workforce approaches retirement age. Recruiting and retaining talented younger individuals is critical to the future success of the Department. The Department of Energy is uniquely dependent on its contractors for executing almost the entirety of its energy, science, environmental and national security missions. Many of these DOE contractors offer better compensation packages than the Federal government, and promising young Federal employees are often lured away. While many technical tasks can be delegated to contractors, essential program management and other inherently governmental functions (e.g., budget formulation, contract administration, etc.) cannot. Fortunately, there are a number of intangible satisfactions that continue to make service in the public sector appealing and rewarding.

For DOE to be effective in the future, and for DOE to stay in control of its contractors, it is essential that DOE maintain a skilled, motivated, and well-compensated Federal workforce to execute governmental functions. The Committee fully supports efforts to strengthen and revitalize the Federal workforce at DOE.

#### REIMBURSABLE WORK

It has come to the attention of the Committee that almost one in six dollars spent by the Department is for work for others. Some of this work is complementary to the Department's work, and some of it is judicious use of assets through the Economy Act to avoid costs to other agencies. However, the fact that such a large portion of the Department's workforce and assets are employed in the service of others leaves the Department potentially vulnerable to unanticipated shifts in funding over which it has little or no control. Unfortunately, the current system of accounting does not make it transparent where those vulnerabilities might exist, and deprives the Department's management, the Administration, and the Con-

---

gress of valuable information that might help plan for and manage reimbursable work. In an effort to promote additional transparency and oversight, language is provided that requires DOE to account for its reimbursable activities in the accounts that are most closely related in mission to the work being carried out. In the event that the activity is not related to DOE's mission, the Department must report these activities in the account that would normally fund the resources being used in reimbursable work, or owns the assets being used in reimbursable work.

*Reporting Requirement.*—It has also come to the attention of the Committee that some enormous carryover balances exist in the national laboratories in the work for others reimbursable accounts. This leads the Committee to believe that more work scope is being accepted than can reasonably be executed. The Committee directs the Department to report to the Committees on Appropriations on a quarterly basis on the status of work for others activities in each of the national laboratories and DOE programs.

#### FINANCIAL REPORT

The Committee renews the direction provided in previous fiscal years requiring the Secretary to submit to the Committees on Appropriations a quarterly report on the status of all projects, reports, fund transfers, and other actions directed in this House bill and report. Any reports, transfers, or other actions directed in prior fiscal years that have not been completed as of the date of enactment of this Act should also be included in this quarterly report.

#### REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee requires the Department to inform the Committee promptly and fully when a change in program execution and funding is required during the fiscal year. To assist the Department in this effort, the following guidance is provided for programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. The Committee directs the Department to follow this guidance for all programs and activities unless specific reprogramming guidance is provided below 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, or activity described in the agency's budget justification as presented to and approved by Congress. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another project or a significant change in the scope of an approved project.

*Criteria for reprogramming.*—A reprogramming should be requested only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if delay of the project or the activity until the next appropriations year would result in a detrimental impact to an agency program or priority. Reprogrammings may also be considered if the Department can show that significant cost savings can accrue by increasing funding for an activity. Mere convenience or preference should not be factors for consideration. Reprogrammings should not be employed to initiate new programs, or to change program, project, or activity allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. In cases where unforeseen events or con-

ditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee and be fully explained and justified.

*Reporting and approval procedures.*—The Committee has not provided statutory language to define reprogramming guidelines, but expects the Department to follow the spirit and the letter of the guidance provided in this report. Consistent with prior years, the Committee has not provided the Department with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 2009, unless specifically identified in the House report for particular programs, projects, or activities. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

#### CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED PROJECTS

To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2009 is consistent with Congressional direction, the bill incorporates by reference the Congressionally directed projects identified in the report accompanying this Act into statute.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations for Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 2009 are described in the following sections. A detailed funding table is included at the end of this title.

#### ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$1,722,407,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	1,255,393,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	2,518,552,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	+796,145,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+1,263,159,000

Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy programs include renewable energy and energy conservation research, development, demonstration and deployment activities (RDD&D), and federal energy assistance programs. Renewable energy research, development, demonstration, and deployment activities include biomass and biorefinery systems, geothermal technology, hydrogen technology, water power, solar energy, and wind energy technologies. Energy conservation activities include improving the efficiency of vehicle, building, fuel cell, and industrial technologies, and the Federal Energy Management Program. Federal energy assistance programs include weatherization assistance, state energy programs, international renewable energy program, tribal energy activities, and the renewable energy production incentive. The Committee recommendation includes funding for new federal assistance programs authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, including energy efficiency block grants, advanced technology vehicles manufacturing incentives, domestic manufacturing conversion grants, and renewable fuel infrastructure grants.

The total Committee recommendation for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) programs is \$2,518,552,000, an increase of \$1,263,159,000 over the budget request, and an increase of \$796,145,000 over fiscal year 2008 enacted levels. The Committee

recommendation provides an increase of \$368,989,000 for renewable energy and conservation research and development activities; an increase of \$259,500,000 for existing federal energy assistance programs, including \$250,000,000 for Weatherization Assistance funding; and \$500,000,000 for new federal assistance programs authorized in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 over the budget request.

*Reporting Requirements.*—The Committee directs the Department to quantify and track the progress and impact of the substantial investments the Committee has made in the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy portfolio. The Department shall report to the Committee on an annual basis on the return on investment for each of the accounts.

*Cross-Technology Projects.*—As local governments implement renewable energy and energy conservation measures in their communities, some approaches may involve a variety of technologies at once. Therefore the Department needs to provide appropriate flexibility in its funding opportunities for grants and deployment efforts that can accommodate multiple technologies (e.g. geothermal and solar). In accordance with the Energy Independence and Security Act 2007, the Department is directed to make available up to \$20,000,000 of EERE research, development, demonstration and deployment funds for projects at the local level capable of reducing electricity demand with multiple technologies and involving public and private partnerships. The Department shall give priority to projects with substantial local cost-share match, that are replicable in the future under market conditions after demonstration of cost/benefit advantages, and that meet goals of greenhouse gas and water use reductions.

*Minority outreach programs.*—The Committee directs DOE to implement an aggressive program to take advantage of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic Serving Institutions across the country in order to deepen the recruiting pool of diverse scientific and technical staff available to support the growing renewable energy marketplace.

RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY CONSERVATION RESEARCH,  
DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND DEPLOYMENT

The Committee recommends \$1,566,620,000 for renewable energy and energy conservation research, development, demonstration, and deployment programs, an increase of \$368,989,000 over the budget request.

*Hydrogen Technology.*—The Hydrogen Technology program seeks to research, develop and evaluate hydrogen fuel cell, delivery, and storage technologies. This program supports the use of hydrogen from diverse domestic resources in a clean, safe, reliable, and affordable manner in fuel cell vehicles and stationary power applications. The Committee recommendation is \$170,000,000, an increase of \$23,787,000 over the budget request, of which \$15,787,000 is to establish a Market Transformation program to assist other agencies in purchasing portable, stationary, and transportation fuel cell systems, \$3,000,000 is to restore funding for fuel processor R&D and \$5,000,000 is to restore manufacturing R&D funding to prior year levels. The Committee does not provide funding for hydrogen production in the EERE account, as proposed in the budget re-

quest. Instead, the Committee recommends \$15,000,000 in the Office of Science for basic research on renewable energy hydrogen production. The Committee recommendation of \$170,000,000 in EERE includes \$59,200,000 for hydrogen storage R&D, the same as the budget request and an increase of \$15,699,000 over fiscal year 2008 enacted levels; \$62,700,000 for fuel cell stack and component R&D, the same as the budget request and an increase of \$19,100,000 over fiscal year 2008 enacted levels; and \$6,600,000 for transportation fuel cell systems, \$10,000,000 for distributed energy fuel cell systems, and \$7,713,000 for systems analysis, each the same as the budget request. These efforts are complemented by \$75,400,000 provided for basic research relevant to hydrogen production, storage, and utilization in the Office of Science for a total of \$245,400,000 for hydrogen RDD&D. The Committee supports the budget request to transfer technology validation, education and safety, codes and standards activities to the vehicle technology program beginning in fiscal year 2009.

*Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D.*—Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D conducts research, development and technology validation on advanced technologies that will enable future biorefineries to convert cellulosic biomass to fuels, chemicals, heat and power. The program focuses on reducing processing energy requirements and production costs in biomass processing plants and future integrated industrial biorefineries. The Committee supports efforts to develop cellulosic feedstocks that are not used as food sources.

The Committee recommendation for integrated research and development on biomass and biorefinery systems is \$250,000,000, an increase of \$25,000,000 over the budget request, of which no less than \$25,000,000 is for grants for the production of advanced biofuels as authorized under Section 207 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140). This funding is complemented by \$95,000,000 provided for bioenergy basic research in the Office of Science for a total of \$345,000,000 for bioenergy RDD&D.

*Solar Energy.*—The Solar Energy program develops solar energy technologies, such as photovoltaics and concentrating solar power, that are reliable, affordable and environmentally sound. The Committee recommends \$220,000,000 for solar energy programs, an increase of \$63,880,000 over the budget request. The increase is for research and development activities as authorized under Sections 602, 603, 604, 605, and 606 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140), which support thermal energy storage, concentrating solar power, workforce training, daylight systems, and solar air conditioning. These efforts are complemented by \$69,089,000 provided for basic research relevant to solar energy utilization in the Office of Science for a total of \$289,089,000 for solar energy RDD&D. The Committee directs the Department to provide an implementation plan within 90 days of enactment describing how they intend to spend the funds provided, including coordination with work in the Office of Science.

*Wind Energy.*—The Wind Energy program focuses on the development of wind turbines that can operate economically in areas with low wind speeds, small wind turbines that can serve a range of distributed power applications, and system technology in support

---

of offshore wind systems further from shore, particularly beyond the viewshed of coastal communities. The Committee recommends \$53,000,000 for wind energy systems, an increase of \$500,000 over the budget request, for wind turbine technology.

*Geothermal Technology.*—The Geothermal Technology program works in partnership with U.S. industry to establish geothermal energy as an economically competitive contributor to the U.S. energy supply. The Committee recommendation provides \$50,000,000, an increase of \$20,000,000 over the budget request for technology development and application strategies for enhanced geothermal systems, to be competitively awarded to industry, universities and national laboratories for exploration, drilling and conversion technologies.

*Water Power R&D.*—The Committee recommends \$40,000,000 for water power research and development, an increase of \$37,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee directs \$30,000,000 for basic and applied technology research and development for ocean/marine renewable technologies, including demonstration programs, and \$10,000,000 for conventional hydropower research, development and deployment.

*Vehicle Technologies.*—The Vehicle Technologies program seeks technology breakthroughs that will greatly reduce petroleum use by automobiles and trucks of all sizes, these technologies include R&D on lightweight materials, electronic power control, high power storage, and hybrid electric drive motors. The Committee recommends \$305,000,000, an increase of \$83,914,000 over the budget request.

The fiscal year 2009 budget request for vehicle technologies includes funding for programs historically requested and appropriated in the hydrogen technology account. The Committee supports the transfer of technology validation, safety codes and standards, and education activities to the Vehicles Technologies account.

The Committee recommends \$172,974,000 for Hybrid Electric Systems, an increase of \$69,613,000 over the budget request, to include \$30,000,000 for technology validation, an increase of \$15,211,000 over the budget request to restore funding to fiscal year 2008 levels; and \$76,663,000 for energy storage R&D as authorized under Section 641(g) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA, Public Law 110-140), an increase of \$27,206,000 over the budget request, of which \$5,000,000 is for secondary applications and disposal of electric drive vehicle batteries authorized under Section 641(k) of EISA. When combined with \$33,938,000 provided to the Office of Science for basic science relevant to electrical energy storage and \$13,403,000 for energy storage for utility scale applications, the recommendation includes \$124,004,000 for electrical energy storage RDD&D, one of six integrated areas highlighted in the budget request. The Committee recommends \$28,322,000 for Vehicle and Systems Simulation and Testing, an increase of \$7,196,000 over the budget request to restore funding to fiscal year 2008 levels. The Committee recommends \$20,000,000, not included in the budget request, for demonstrations of light-duty and heavy-duty plug-in vehicles as authorized in EISA section 131(b).

The Committee recommends \$38,600,000 for Advanced Combustion Engine R&D, to include \$8,500,000 for heavy truck engine

projects, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the request for new heavy truck engine initiatives to achieve greater systems thermal efficiency. The Committee recommends \$40,903,000 for Materials Technology to include \$23,458,000 for light weight materials technology an increase of \$4,000,000 over the request for research activities authorized in EISA Section 651. The Committee supports the lightweight materials research and development on advanced high-strength steels to reduce the weight of commercial and passenger vehicles. The Committee recommends \$16,122,000 for Fuels Technology, the same as the budget request.

The Committee recommends \$36,401,000 for Technology Integration, an increase of \$5,301,000 over the request to include \$12,500,000 for Clean Cities, an increase of \$2,404,000 over the budget request; \$15,000,000 for safety codes and standards, an increase of \$2,762,000 over the budget request; and \$4,000,000 for education, an increase of \$135,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation for these activities supports the funding levels and activities provided in fiscal year 2008.

*Building Technologies.*—In partnership with the buildings industry, this program develops, promotes, and integrates energy technologies and practices to make buildings more efficient and affordable. The Committee recommends \$168,000,000, an increase of \$44,235,000 over the budget request, for Building Technologies. The Committee recommends \$26,900,000 for Residential Buildings Integration, the same as the budget request, and \$33,000,000 for Commercial Buildings Integration, an increase of \$20,000,000 over the budget request for the Zero Net Energy Commercial Buildings Initiative as authorized in Section 422 of EISA. This initiative is designed to develop and disseminate technologies, practices, and policies that will facilitate establishment of zero net energy commercial buildings by 2030.

The Committee recommends \$45,352,000 for Emerging Technologies, to include \$25,000,000 for solid state lighting, an increase of \$5,887,000 over the budget request to maintain the current level of funding for research, development and deployment activities. The Committee recommends \$37,748,000 for Technology Validation and Market Introduction, an increase of \$13,343,000 over the request, to include \$10,000,000 for Energy Star, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the request and \$19,348,000 for building energy codes, an increase of \$11,348,000 over the budget request for DOE assistance to states to implement compliance plans and training. The Committee recommends \$25,000,000, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request for Equipment Standards and Analysis, for DOE to address accelerate the backlog of standards that are lagging behind schedule.

*Industrial Technologies.*—The Industrial Technologies program funds cost shared research in critical technology areas identified in partnership with industry in order to realize significant energy benefits. The Committee recommends \$100,000,000, an increase of \$37,881,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommends \$18,521,000 for Industries of the Future, (Specific), an increase of \$7,129,000 over the budget request to include \$5,000,000 for the steel industry for improvements in production, an increase of \$2,744,000 over the request; \$1,200,000 for the glass industry for the next generation melting system, an increase of \$1,200,000 over

---



the request; and \$2,973,000 for the metal casting industry, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the budget request for energy efficiency improvements. The budget request significantly reduced funding for these industry programs below fiscal year 2008 enacted levels. The Committee recommends \$1,185,000 over the budget request to restore funding for the Inventions and Innovations program.

The Committee recommends \$81,479,000 for Industries of the Future, (Cross-cutting), an increase of \$30,752,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommends \$4,783,000, an increase of \$4,200,000 for Combustion activities to continue research and development of the natural gas steam boiler, and \$17,896,000 for Energy-Intensive Process program, an increase of \$3,050,000 for high temperature heat recovery. The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for Distributed Energy, an increase of \$23,502,000 over the request for distributed generation and combined-heat and power activities, and the advanced reciprocating engines system program, restoring the program to fiscal year 2007 levels.

*Federal Energy Management Program.*—The Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) reduces the cost and environmental impact of the Federal government by advancing energy efficiency and water conservation, promoting the use of renewable energy, and managing utility costs in Federal facilities and operations. The Committee recommendation for the Federal Energy Management Program is \$30,000,000, an increase of \$8,000,000 over the budget request to support additional investment in more projects.

*Facilities and Infrastructure.*—The Committee recommendation for renewable energy Facilities and Infrastructure is \$33,000,000, an increase of \$19,018,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides \$23,000,000 to accelerate the design and construction of the Energy Systems Integration Facility at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), an increase of \$19,000,000 over the budget request.

*Program Support.*—Program Support activities for the EERE program include planning, analysis and evaluation, and information, communications and outreach. The Committee recommendation for Program Support is \$20,000,000 the same as the budget request.

*Program Direction.*—Program Direction funds for the Federal staffing resources and associated costs for the management and oversight of EERE programs. The Committee recommendation for Program Direction is \$127,620,000, an increase of \$5,774,000 over the budget request, to provide additional federal support in the management and oversight of added program resources provided by the Committee.

#### FEDERAL ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends a total of \$318,000,000 for federal energy assistance programs, an increase of \$259,500,000 over the budget request. These programs are described in detail in the following sections.

*Weatherization Assistance.*—The Committee recommends \$250,000,000 for weatherization assistance program grants, an increase of \$250,000,000 over the budget request, to include \$5,000,000 for training and technical assistance. The Committee recommendation is an increase of \$22,778,000 over fiscal year 2008

enacted levels. The Committee is concerned that the Department has not requested funding for this program, which almost immediately results in significant and immediate energy savings in American homes.

*State Energy Program.*—The Committee recommends \$50,000,000 for the State Energy Program, the same as the budget request, to include \$25,000,000 for competitive projects.

*International Renewable Energy Program.*—The Committee recommends \$7,000,000 for the International Renewable Energy Program, an increase of \$7,000,000 over the budget request, of which \$2,000,000 is to fund the U.S.-Israel cooperative agreement on renewable and sustainable energy, \$2,000,000 is to fund the Western Hemisphere Energy Cooperation initiative, as authorized in Section 985 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and \$3,000,000 is to fund other international renewable energy activities. The recommendation provides no funds for the Administration's Asia Pacific initiative, a reduction of \$7,500,000 below the budget request.

*Tribal Energy Activities.*—The Committee recommends \$6,000,000, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request, for tribal energy projects.

*Renewable Energy Production Incentive.*—The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 for the Renewable Energy Production Incentive, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007 (EISA) FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140) authorizes several new grant, loan and aid programs to stimulate the transformation of local communities, states, and industries adopting and adapting to renewable energy and energy conservation programs. For fiscal year 2009, the Committee supports several of these programs with new funding. However, recognizing that many of these programs involve thousands of recipients, time is necessary to ensure the programs are formulated and executed in a responsible and efficient manner. As such, the Committee recognizes that some initial implementation time will be required to fulfill the program mandates, and has adjusted the funding levels to reflect an initial program investment. The Committee recommends \$500,000,000 in new spending authority for these newly authorized programs in EISA, \$500,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee directs the Department to provide the Committees on Appropriations a detailed implementation plan for these assistance programs within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

*Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program.*—The Committee recommends \$295,000,000 to implement Subtitle E of EISA for the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program, an increase of \$295,000,000 over the budget request.

*Renewable Fuel Infrastructure Grants.*—The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 to implement Section 244 of EISA, for Renewable Fuel Infrastructure Grants, an increase of \$25,000,000 over the budget request.

*Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Grants.*—The Committee recommends \$30,000,000 to implement Section 136(b) of EISA, the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Grant program, \$30,000,000 over the budget request.

*Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Incentive Program.*—The Committee provides language recommending \$1,000,000,000 in direct loan obligational authority to be made available under Section 136 of EISA, the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Incentive program. The Committee recommends \$150,000,000 in budget authority to cover the loan subsidy costs as charged to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office. Direct loan authority for this program was not included in the budget request.

*Congressionally Directed Projects.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$134,670,000 for the following House-directed projects and activities. The Department should remind recipients that statutory cost-sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

---

**CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE  
ENERGY PROJECTS**

PROJECT	
ADAPTIVE LIQUID CRYSTAL WINDOWS (OH)	\$1,000,000
ADVANCED ENGINEERED RAPIDLY DEPLOYABLE MANUFACTURING METHODS AND MATERIALS FOR ENVIRONMENTALLY-BENIGN AND ENERGY EFFICIENT HOUSING (VA)	\$500,000
ADVANCED POWER BATTERIES FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY APPLICATIONS (PA)	\$369,000
ALTERNATIVE CROPS AND BIOFUEL PRODUCTION (OK)	\$300,000
ALTERNATIVE ENERGIES WORKFORCE APPLICATIONS EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM (OH)	\$1,000,000
ALTERNATIVE ENERGY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY (VA)	\$100,000
ANAEROBIC DIGESTER AND COMBINED HEAT POWER PROJECT (MD)	\$600,000
ANCHORAGE REGIONAL LANDFILL (AK)	\$750,000
ANN ARBOR WIND GENERATOR FOR WATER TREATMENT PLANT (MI)	\$1,000,000
ANTI-IDLING LITHIUM ION BATTERY PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA (CA)	\$1,000,000
ATLANTA INTERNATIONAL TERMINAL LEED CERTIFICATION (GA)	\$500,000
AUBURN UNIVERSITY BIOENERGY AND BIOPRODUCTS LABORATORY (AL)	\$1,000,000
BEXAR COUNTY PHOTOVOLTAIC PANELS (TX)	\$500,000
BIO-DIESEL CELLULOSE ETHANOL RESEARCH FACILITY (FL)	\$1,000,000
REDIRECTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2008 FUNDING FOR BIODIESEL INJECTION BLENDING FACILITIES (PA)	-\$738,000
BIOECONOMY INITIATIVE AT MBI INTERNATIONAL (MI)	\$250,000
BIOFUELS DEVELOPMENT AT TEXAS A&M (TX)	\$1,000,000
BIOFUELS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (WA)	\$500,000
BIOMASS ENERGY GENERATION PROJECT (IA)	\$300,000
BIOMASS FUEL CELL SYSTEMS (CO)	\$1,750,000
BIOREFINERY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, UGA, ATHENS (GA)	\$1,250,000
BIOREFINING FOR ENERGY SECURITY PROJECT, OU-LANCASTER (OH)	\$1,000,000
BIPOLAR WAFER-CELL PLUG-IN HYBRID ELECTRIC VEHICLE BATTERIES (CT)	\$1,000,000
BOISE CITY GEOTHERMAL SYSTEM EXPANSION (ID)	\$1,250,000
CARBON NEUTRAL GREEN CAMPUS (NV)	\$400,000
CAYUGA COUNTY REGIONAL DIGESTER FACILITY (NY)	\$500,000
CENTER FOR CLEAN FUELS AND POWER GENERATION AT THE UNIV OF HOUSTON (TX)	\$500,000
CENTER FOR EFFICIENCY IN RENEWABLE ENERGY SYSTEMS (CERES) (OH)	\$2,000,000
CENTER FOR INTEGRATED BIOMASS RESEARCH (NC)	\$1,270,000
CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH (TX)	\$550,000
CENTER FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (TX)	\$2,250,000
CENTER OF EXCELLENCE IN OCEAN ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY (FL)	\$1,250,000
CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS BUILDING GREEN ROOF DEMONSTRATION (MI)	\$150,000
CITY OF LAS VEGAS PLUG-IN HYBRID VEHICLE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM (NV)	\$150,000
CITY OF LOUISVILLE ENERGY CONSERVATION INITIATIVE (KY)	\$150,000
CITY OF MARKHAM COMMUNITY CENTER (IL)	\$250,000
CITY OF TALLAHASSEE INNOVATIVE ENERGY INITIATIVES (FL)	\$600,000
CLEAN AND EFFICIENT DIESEL ENGINE (PA)	\$1,250,000
CLEAN TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION PROGRAM (MA)	\$500,000
CLEAR UNIVERSITY GEOTHERMAL ENERGY RETROFIT (MI)	\$500,000

**CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE  
ENERGY PROJECTS**

PROJECT	
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY CELLULOSIC BIOFUEL PILOT PLANT IN CHARLESTON (SC)	\$1,500,000
CLOSED LOOP WOODY BIOMASS PROJECT (NY)	\$250,000
COASTAL WIND OHIO (OH)	\$500,000
COLUMBIA GORGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE WIND ENERGY WORKFORCE TRAINING NACELLE (OR)	\$250,000
CONSORTIUM FOR PLANT BIOTECHNOLOGY RESEARCH (NC, GA, KY, NY, MI, HI, SD, FL)	\$4,000,000
CONTROLLED ENVIRONMENTAL AGRICULTURE AND ENERGY PROJECT (NY)	\$500,000
DEVELOPING NEW ALTERNATIVE ENERGY IN VIRGINIA: BIO-DIESEL FROM ALGAE (VA)	\$750,000
DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH YIELD FEEDSTOCK AND BIOMASS CONVERSION TECHNOLOGY FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY PRODUCTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (HI)	\$400,000
DOWNTOWN DETROIT ENERGY EFFICIENCY STREET LIGHTING (MI)	\$1,000,000
ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE CAMPUS - NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE (NH)	\$315,000
ENERGY EFFICIENCY/SUSTAINABLE ENERGY PROJECT (NC)	\$1,000,000
ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS, SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH (UT)	\$650,000
ENERGY EFFICIENT ELECTRONICS COOLING PROJECT (IN)	\$1,000,000
ENERGY EFFICIENT LIGHTING PROJECT (KY)	\$200,000
ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEM CENTER AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY (NY)	\$750,000
ETHANOL FROM AGRICULTURE FOR ARKANSAS AND AMERICA (AR)	\$750,000
ETHANOL PILOT PLANT (MA, CT)	\$2,800,000
FLEXIBLE THIN-FILM SILICON SOLAR CELLS (OH)	\$1,000,000
FLORIDA RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM (FL)	\$750,000
FROSTBURG STATE UNIVERSITY SUSTAINABLE ENERGY RESEARCH FACILITY EQUIPMENT AND STAFFING (MD)	\$750,000
FUEL CELL OPTIMIZATION AND SCALE-UP (PA)	\$369,000
GEOHERMAL ENERGY PROJECT AT ROBERTS WESLEYAN COLLEGE (NY)	\$500,000
GEOHERMAL POWER GENERATION PLANT, OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (OR)	\$1,000,000
GREAT LAKES INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY INNOVATION (OH)	\$1,000,000
GREAT PLAINS WIND POWER TEST FACILITY (TX)	\$1,000,000
GREEN BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES - LAKEVIEW MUSEUM (IL)	\$250,000
GREEN BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES - BRADLEY UNIVERSITY (IL)	\$500,000
GREEN COLLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY TRAINING PROGRAM, AB TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE (NC)	\$650,000
GREEN ENERGY JOB TRAINING INITIATIVE (CA)	\$250,000
GREEN POWER INITIATIVE (IA)	\$1,000,000
GREEN ROOF PROJECT - GREENE COUNTY (MO)	\$500,000
GREEN VEHICLE DEPOT (NY)	\$300,000
HARLEM UNITED SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FUND WIND POWER PROJECT (NY)	\$50,000
HIDALGO COUNTY WASTE TO ENERGY PROJECT (TX)	\$125,000
HIGH CARBON FLY ASH USE FOR THE US CEMENT INDUSTRY (UT)	\$1,000,000
HIGH PERFORMANCE, LOW COST HYDROGEN GENERATION FROM RENEWABLE ENERGY (CT)	\$1,000,000
HULL MUNICIPAL LIGHT PLANT OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT (MA)	\$1,000,000
HYDROGEN OPTICAL FIBER SENSORS (CA)	\$1,000,000

**CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE  
ENERGY PROJECTS**

<b>PROJECT</b>	
HYDROGEN STORAGE SYSTEM FOR VEHICULAR PROPULSION (DE)	\$250,000
HYDROPOWER FROM WASTEWATER ADVANCED ENERGY PROJECT (NY)	\$500,000
HYPERCAST R&D FUNDING FOR VEHICLE ENERGY EFFICIENCY THROUGH CAST METAL AUTO-COMBUSTION SYNTHESIS (MA)	\$1,500,000
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY - BIOMASS RESEARCH PROJECT (IL)	\$500,000
INDIAN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOR THE RENEWABLE ENERGIES CENTER (FL)	\$950,000
INTEGRATED POWER FOR MICROSYSTEMS AT ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (NY)	\$1,400,000
INTELLIGENT CONTROLS FOR NET-ZERO ENERGY BUILDINGS (NE)	\$500,000
INTELLIGENT FACADES FOR HIGH PERFORMANCE "GREEN BUILDINGS" (NY)	\$750,000
IOWA CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE RENEWABLE FUELS LAB (IA)	\$500,000
IOWA LAKES COMMUNITY COLLEGE SUSTAINABLE ENERGY EDU. CENTER (IA)	\$500,000
ISLES, INC., SOLAR AND GREEN RETROFITS (NJ)	\$250,000
JUNIATA HYBRID LOCOMOTIVE (PA)	\$750,000
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY (KS)	\$750,000
KANSAS WIND ENERGY CONSORTIUM (KS)	\$750,000
KINGSPORT WORKFORCE AND HIGHER EDUCATION CENTER (TN)	\$400,000
LAKE LAND COLLEGE ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDINGS (IL)	\$1,400,000
LEHIGH VALLEY HOSPITAL PHOTOVOLTAIC PANEL INSTALLATION (PA)	\$1,000,000
LOW COST THIN FILMED SILICON BASED PHOTOVOLTAICS (NY)	\$500,000
MACOMB COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSPORTATION AND ENERGY TECHNOLOGY (MI)	\$500,000
MAINE TIDAL POWER INITIATIVE (ME)	\$1,000,000
MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR THE HYDROGEN ECONOMY (MI)	\$800,000
MARET CENTER (MO)	\$1,000,000
MARINE RENEWABLE ENERGY CENTER (MA)	\$1,000,000
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY ANAEROBIC BIOTECHNOLOGY (WI)	\$500,000
MARTIN COUNTY HYDROGEN FUEL CELL PROJECT (NC)	\$1,500,000
MIAMI SCIENCE MUSEUM RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH PROJECT (FL)	\$750,000
MICHIGAN ALTERNATIVE AND RENEWABLE ENERGY CENTER OFFSHORE WIND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (MI)	\$1,500,000
MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S GEOTHERMAL PROJECT (MA)	\$250,000
MIDSOUTH/SOUTHEAST BIOENERGY CONSORTIUM (AR, GA)	\$2,000,000
MINNESOTA CENTER FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY (MN)	\$500,000
MODULAR ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM FOR HYDROGEN FUEL CELL (MI)	\$1,250,000
MUNSTER--WASTE TO ENERGY COGENERATION PROJECT (IN)	\$1,000,000
NANOSTRUCTURED MATERIALS FOR ENERGY (NC)	\$1,000,000
NANOSTRUCTURED SOLAR CELLS FOR INCREASED EFFICIENCY AND LOWER COST (AR)	\$1,250,000
NASI AND NA-SG POWDER HYDROGEN FUEL CELLS (NY, NJ)	\$1,000,000
NATIONAL CENTER FOR MANUFACTURING SCIENCES LIGHTWEIGHT VEHICLE MATERIALS (MI)	\$2,000,000
NATIONAL WIND ENERGY CENTER (TX)	\$2,500,000
NIAGARA RIVER HYDROPOWER (NY)	\$100,000
NOTRE DAME/NISOURCE GEOTHERMAL IONIC LIQUIDS RESEARCH COLLABORATIVE (IN)	\$1,000,000

**CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE  
ENERGY PROJECTS**

<b>PROJECT</b>	
OMEGA OPTICAL SOLAR POWER GENERATION DEVELOPMENT (VT)	\$1,500,000
ONE KILOWATT BIOGAS FUELED SOLID OXIDE FUEL CELL STACK (NY)	\$1,000,000
OU CENTER FOR BIOFUELS REFINING ENGINEERING (OK)	\$250,000
PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEM AT TOWN LANDFILL IN ISLIP (NY)	\$500,000
PINELLAS COUNTY REGIONAL URBAN SUSTAINABILITY DEMONSTRATION AND EDUCATION FACILITY (FL)	\$500,000
PLACER COUNTY BIOMASS UTILIZATION PILOT PROJECT (CA)	\$250,000
PLUG-IN HYBRID AND ETHANOL RESEARCH PLATFORMS (NC)	\$850,000
PURDUE HYDROGEN TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM (IN)	\$1,000,000
RECAP (MN)	\$1,000,000
RENEWABLE ENERGY CENTER (NV)	\$500,000
RENEWABLE/ALTERNATIVE ENERGY CENTER (FL)	\$1,000,000
RHODE ISLAND OCEAN SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN (RI)	\$300,000
SAN FRANCISCO BIOFUELS PROGRAM (CA)	\$1,000,000
SAPPHIRE ALGAE TO FUEL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, PORTALES (NM)	\$1,000,000
SENIOR HOUSING PROJECT GREEN BUILDING, CERRITOS (CA)	\$400,000
SNOHOMISH COUNTY PUD NO. 1 GEOTHERMAL ENERGY STUDY (WA)	\$500,000
SOLAR DEMONSTRATION AND RESEARCH FACILITY (FL)	\$250,000
SOLAR ELECTRIC POWER SYSTEM (NY)	\$70,000
SOLAR ENERGY WINDOWS AND SMART IR SWITCHABLE BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES (PA)	\$1,250,000
SOLAR LIGHTING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (NV)	\$800,000
SOLAR PANELS FOR THE HAVERHILL CITIZENS ENERGY EFFICIENCY (MA)	\$250,000
SPRINGFIELD HOSPITAL GREEN BUILDING (OH)	\$4,000,000
ST. CLAIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE (MI)	\$200,000
ST. PETERSBURG SOLAR PILOT PROJECT (FL)	\$1,500,000
STAMFORD WASTE TO ENERGY PROJECT (CT)	\$2,000,000
STORAGE TANKS AND DISPENSERS FOR E85 AND BIO-DIESEL (IL)	\$220,000
SUSTAINABLE ENERGY RESEARCH CENTER (MS)	\$1,000,000
SUSTAINABLE HYDROGEN FUELING STATION, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LOS ANGELES (CA)	\$500,000
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY - OHIO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER (OH)	\$400,000
TOWN OF MEXICO GEOTHERMAL PROJECT (NY)	\$150,000
TRANSPO BUS OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE CENTER, SOUTH BEND (IN)	\$1,000,000
TRENTON FUEL WORKS CELLULOSIC DIESEL BIOREFINERY (NJ)	\$500,000
TSEC PHOTOVOLTAIC INNOVATION (NY)	\$2,000,000
UNALASKA GEOTHERMAL ENERGY (AK)	\$1,000,000
UNICOI COUNTY SCHOOL GEOTHERMAL HEATING (TN)	\$400,000
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY BIO-FUELS RESEARCH LABORATORY (KY)	\$450,000
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA GREEN CAMPUS INITIATIVE (AL)	\$500,000
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA ADVANCED MANUFACTURING AND ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT PROJECT (IN)	\$1,000,000
URBAN WOOD-BASED BIO-ENERGY SYSTEM IN SEATTLE (WA)	\$500,000

**CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE  
ENERGY PROJECTS**

---

<b>PROJECT</b>	
WATER-TO-WATER HEAT PUMP CHILLERS, PHOENIX CHILDREN (AZ)	\$2,000,000
WAVE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION CENTER (OR)	\$2,450,000
WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS COLLABORATIVE WIND PROJECT (MA)	\$1,250,000
WIND TURBINE ELECTRIC HIGH-SPEED SHAFT BRAKE PROJECT (OH)	\$500,000
WINOOSKI COMMUNITY GREENING PROJECT (VT)	\$120,000
WISDOM WAY SOLAR VILLAGE (MA)	\$600,000
WOODY BIOMASS PROJECT AT SUNY-ESF (NY)	\$650,000

---



## ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$138,556,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	134,000,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	149,250,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	+10,694,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+15,250,000

The mission of the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability is to lead national efforts to modernize the electric grid, enhance security and reliability of the energy infrastructure, and facilitate recovery from disruptions to the energy supply. The Committee recommendation for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability is \$149,250,000, an increase of \$15,250,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommends \$38,306,000 for Renewable and Distributed Systems Integration, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request for additional research and development to improve the ability to integrate renewable energy technologies into distribution and transmission systems. The Committee recommends \$19,122,000 for Operations and Analysis, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request for implementation of EISA Section 1305, Smart Grid Interoperability Framework, for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to develop a framework for information management to achieve interoperability of smart grid devices and systems. The Committee provides \$13,403,000 for Energy Storage and Power Electronics, utility scale activities relevant to Electrical Energy Systems, one of six integrated research and development areas highlighted in the request. The Committee continues to support the research and development activities for distributed energy power generation within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, and sees the research role of the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability as ensuring the connectivity of renewable energy sources to distribution and transmission systems, such as the national grid system.

*Congressionally Directed Projects.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$5,250,000 for the following House-directed projects and activities. The Department should remind recipients that statutory cost-sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

**CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY  
RELIABILITY PROJECTS**

---

<b>PROJECT</b>	
DEVELOPMENT OF TOROIDAL CORE TRANSFORMERS (NY)	\$1,000,000
ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES RESEARCH AND EDUCATION INITIATIVE (NM)	\$1,000,000
FEASIBILITY STUDY OF CONNECTING THE ST. THOMAS-ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX ELECTRICITY GRIDS (VI)	\$500,000
HIGH VOLTAGE TRANSMISSION LINES - PHASE II (TN)	\$500,000
LONG ISLAND SMART METERING PILOT PROJECT (NY)	\$750,000
MICROGRIDS FOR COLONIAS (TX)	\$500,000
NATIONAL CENTER FOR RELIABLE ELECTRIC POWER TRANSMISSION (NCREPT) (AR)	\$500,000
POWER GRID RELIABILITY AND SECURITY (WA)	\$500,000

---

## NUCLEAR ENERGY

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$961,665,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	<sup>1</sup> 1,340,652,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	1,238,852,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	+277,187,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	<sup>1</sup> -101,800,000

<sup>1</sup>The budget request for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility was included in the request for Other Defense Activities at \$487,008,000, and is appropriated in the Nuclear Energy account by the Committee.

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Energy appropriation is \$1,238,852,000, a decrease of \$101,800,000 below the budget request. This net decrease reflects the Committee's recommendation to provide no funds for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) program and instead fund the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative at \$90,000,000, \$211,500,000 below the budget request for GNEP; the Nuclear Power 2010 program at \$157,300,000, the same as the Nuclear Energy projected program planning level as proposed in their fiscal year 2008 request and \$84,300,000 less than the budget request; and the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility at \$487,008,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of \$208,219,000 over fiscal year 2008 enacted levels. In fiscal year 2008, the Committee transferred the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility program from the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation to the Office of Nuclear Energy and in fiscal year 2009 continues to fund the MOX program in the Nuclear Energy account. The Committee recommends increased funding for nuclear energy facility infrastructure, and for the deployment of a reactor from the Generation IV nuclear energy systems initiative. The Committee recommends no funds for the university education assistance program at DOE, the same as the budget request. However, the Committee has provided additional funding for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to implement an education assistance program, and continues to fund DOE support for university research reactors.

Of the total funding of \$1,317,663,000 provided for Nuclear Energy programs and facilities, \$78,811,000 represents costs allocated to the 050 budget function, (i.e. defense activities) for Idaho Site-wide and Security activities.

## NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

*Generation IV nuclear energy systems.*—The Committee supports the Department's collaborative efforts on the research and development of a Generation IV (Gen IV) reactor design that will be safer, more cost effective, and more proliferation resistant than current designs. The Committee recommends a total of \$200,000,000 for Generation IV nuclear energy systems, an increase of \$130,000,000 over the budget request. Of this amount, \$4,000,000 is provided to support Generation IV research and development activities for advanced reactor concepts, a decrease of \$5,750,000 below the budget request, and an increase of \$4,000,000 over fiscal year 2008 enacted levels, and \$196,000,000 to accelerate work on the Next Generation Nuclear Plant (NGNP), an increase of \$133,500,000 over the budget request. The NGNP Project will provide the basis for the commercialization of a new generation of advanced nuclear plants that use high temperature gas-cooled reactor technology. The Committee directs NGNP funds for continued research and de-

velopment on fuel and graphite testing and qualification, high temperature materials development, methods and high temperature instrumentation development and reactor conceptual design, licensing preparations, and design of the component test facility at INL. Of the \$196,000,000 provided for NGNP, \$9,000,000 is included to continue work with Russia on gas reactors and \$8,500,000 is included for deep burn research.

*Nuclear Hydrogen Initiative.*—The Committee recommends \$16,600,000 for the nuclear hydrogen initiative, the same as the budget.

#### NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE

The Nuclear Fuel Cycle activities include the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative (AFCI) and the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, requested in Other Defense Activities Appropriation in the Administration's budget.

*Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative.*—The Committee recommends \$90,000,000 for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative, \$211,500,000 below the Administration's request of \$301,500,000 for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP). The Committee supports continued research on advanced fuel cycles, including the development of technologies for recycling spent nuclear fuel. Combined with \$30,000,000 of research funds provided by the Committee in the Science appropriation, the Committee recommends a total of \$120,000,000 for nuclear fuel recycling research. No funds are provided for "grid-appropriate reactors" or small reactor program. No funds are provided for the design or construction of spent fuel recycling facilities or spent fuel research facilities, including fast neutron test capability, advanced fuel cycle facility, consolidated fuel treatment center and advanced burner reactors. No funds are provided for any continued work on GNEP, including the Department's efforts to solicit developing partner countries in the GNEP program. The Department should continue to coordinate its Advanced Fuel Cycle research with those countries having advanced fuel cycle capabilities (e.g., United Kingdom, France, and Japan), but the Committee does not support efforts to involve countries aspiring to have nuclear capabilities in the GNEP effort.

The Department should focus its limited AFCI resources in fiscal year 2009 on research activities at the Idaho National Laboratory, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and the Argonne National Laboratory, with support from university and private sector researchers as appropriate. The success of AFCI will be judged on the quality of the research it produces, not on the number of national laboratories that it supports.

The Committee does not support the Department's rushed, poorly-defined, expansive, and expensive Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) proposal. The Department has squandered funds provided by the Committee and followed little of the Committee's direction regarding the use of these funds, including the requirement to "make available 50 percent of the AFCI funds for research and development in an agency-wide solicitation for universities, national laboratories and commercial entities", as directed in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008. Instead, the Department distributed funds among 10 national laboratories, under the direction of a former national laboratory employee. The Department has also

failed to seek input from industry on building engineering-scale facilities. The April 2008 Government Accountability Office report on GNEP notes that "DOE's approach to building engineering-scale facilities lacked industry participation, potentially reducing the prospects for eventual commercialization of the technologies." Also, the report found "DOE's schedule called for building one of the recycling facilities (i.e., a reprocessing plant) before conducting R&D on recycled fuel that would help determine the plant's design requirements. This schedule unnecessarily increased the risk that the spent fuel would be separated in a form that cannot be recycled."

The GNEP program directors made claims they could not fulfill, and did not listen to the guidance of Congress and industry along the way. As such, the Committee does not support the GNEP program, and instead directs the AFCI research funds to be focused on the reduction of waste streams generated by reprocessing spent fuel, the design of safeguard measures for reprocessing facilities, and research on reducing the proliferation risk of reprocessing spent nuclear fuel. The Committee believes that these goals may be best accomplished via an integrated program of basic and applied research coordinated with the Office of Science consistent with the activities outlined in two of the six integrated research and development areas highlighted in the request, Characterization of Radioactive Waste and Advanced Mathematics for Optimization of Complex Systems, Control Theory, and Risk Management. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee within three months of enactment of this Act, which details the research activities and corresponding funding for the Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative program as well as the integration of these activities with relevant activities in the Office of Science.

*Fuel Fabrication Facilities.*—The Committee recommends \$487,008,000 for Fuel Fabrication Facilities, which includes \$467,808,000 for construction of the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility at the Savannah River Site, and \$19,200,000 for other project costs related to the MOX facility, the same as the budget request. The MOX project was transferred from the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account in fiscal year 2008 because the project ceased to be a nonproliferation project once it was de-linked from the companion Russian fissile material disposition project. The Administration's fiscal year 2009 budget requested funding for the MOX facility in the Other Defense Activities appropriation. The Committee, again, recommends funding for the MOX facility in the Nuclear Energy account.

The control point is at the Nuclear Fuel Cycle level, so that funds may be reprogrammed within and between the AFCI and Fuel Fabrication Facilities accounts without the need for prior Congressional approval.

*MOX Federal Management.*—Statutory language has been provided that directs the Office of Nuclear Energy to manage the MOX project. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008 transferred the MOX prior year balances and current year project funding from the National Nuclear Security Administration to the Nuclear Energy program account. The intent of Congress was for the Assistant Secretary of Nuclear Energy to be the lead DOE Program Secretarial Officer (PSO) for the management of the MOX facility. The DOE Office of General Counsel subsequently provided a draft legal

opinion interpreting the law and Congressional intent to justify the Department's retention of the management of MOX within the NNSA. As such, the Committee provides additional language in fiscal year 2009 to clarify for the Department the Committee's direction to manage the MOX project in the Office of Nuclear Energy.

*Project management.*—The Committee is very concerned about the past and present management of the MOX fuel fabrication facility. The Congress directed the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008 to monitor the construction and management of the MOX facility and report to the Committee on a quarterly basis on the progress of the fuel fabrication facility, regarding scope, cost and schedule changes and performance. Preliminary observations by the GAO in June 2008 indicate that DOE is not following its own construction project guidance, Order 413.3, as mandated in law by Congress in the fiscal year 2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act. Since December 2008, when the law was passed, DOE has received a notice of violation on accepting delivery of over 3,000 tons of reinforcement bar that did not meet industry standards for nuclear facilities. This infraction indicates problems with DOE's implementation of an adequate quality assurance program, a key component of the Department's project management guidance. In March 2005, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission issued a construction authorization for the MOX facility, even though concerns about the potential for an explosive reaction between chemicals used to purify plutonium oxide in the MOX facility, also known as a "red oil runaway reaction," were identified as far back as 2003 in the construction authorization review and had not been fully resolved. Between 2005 and 2007, NRC tasked its Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards and an Ad Hoc Panel to review red oil safety risks, and contracted for an independent assessment by the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses. In 2007, NRC concluded that "significant technical questions remain unanswered." While the NRC will not issue an operating license until these chemical safety concerns have been resolved, it is a concern of the Committee that DOE continues with the construction of the MOX facility while this design issue has not been resolved with the NRC, and that the Department is not following its own construction management guidance by proceeding with construction prior to resolving significant safety issues. Finally, an external independent review of the MOX cost and schedule baseline produced savings of over \$100 million and several months. While the Committee commends the Office of Engineering and Construction Management, these findings raise questions about NNSA's management of the project baseline. These findings convince the Committee more than ever that NNSA is not equipped to manage the MOX project, and the Committee has provided additional statutory language that directs the oversight and accountability of the MOX project reside in the Office of Nuclear Energy.

#### RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

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

---

tivities on a reimbursable basis. The Committee provides \$62,400,000, an increase of \$23,700,000 over the budget request.

*Space and defense infrastructure.*—The Committee recommendation is \$40,000,000, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request. This includes the requested amounts to operate radioisotope power systems at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL), and an increase of \$5,000,000 to reconstitute a program for Pu-238 production capability at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee directs that DOE, along with NASA, shall support the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) in the development of a plan for restarting and sustaining U.S. domestic production of radioisotope thermoelectric generator material for NASA's future science and exploration missions and the nation's space and defense needs. This plan shall be transmitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Commerce, Justice and Science, and Energy and Water Development. A funding request for DOE restart of production, and for NASA for marginal costs of production, should be included with the President's budget request for fiscal year 2010.

The Committee recommends the requested amounts to maintain iridium capabilities at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and the base Pu-238 mission at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

*Medical isotopes infrastructure.*—The Committee recommends no funding for medical isotope infrastructure, the same as the budget request. The funding for this activity is requested and provided in the Office of Science account beginning in fiscal year 2009.

*Research reactor infrastructure.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$6,000,000, an increase of \$2,300,000 over the budget request, for fresh reactor fuel and disposal of spent fuel for university reactors.

*Oak Ridge nuclear infrastructure.*—The Committee recommends \$16,400,000 for Oak Ridge radiological facilities management, an increase of \$16,400,000 over the budget request, for hot cells at the Radiochemical Engineering Development Center.

#### IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

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

*INL operations and infrastructure.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$150,000,000, an increase of \$45,300,000 over the budget request, for INL operations and infrastructure. The Committee recommends \$140,000,000 for Idaho facility management operations, maintenance and repair, Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) operations and life-extension program, environmental compliance, facility and infrastructure revitalization, and capital equipment. The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for ATR safety margin improvement and remote-handled low-level waste. The Next Generation Nuclear Plant is a high priority program for the Committee, and significant infrastructure investment is necessary to support this effort. The National Research Council's 2008 review of DOE's Nuclear Energy Research and Development Program emphasizes that "the high level of deferred maintenance at INL would seem to require significant investments to achieve parity with other DOE assets". The Committee recognizes the need to fund the

backlog of maintenance necessary at INL, especially now in anticipation of the NGNP mission. The Committee recognizes the good work of the INL in preparing a credible 10-year infrastructure plan.

*Idaho Site-Wide Safeguards and Security.*— Consistent with the budget request, this activity is funded at the requested level of \$78,811,000 as a 050 Defense Activity under the Other Defense Activities account.

*Program Direction.*— The Committee recommends a total funding level for program direction of \$80,544,000, the same as the budget request.

*Report on Uranium Tails.*—With the rising price of uranium, the Committee recognizes that there now may be economic value in re-enriching uranium tails inventoried as waste at DOE. The Committee directs DOE to submit, not later than 60 days after enactment, an analysis on the economic feasibility of re-enriching domestic uranium tails.

*Funding Adjustments.*—The Committee directs the use of \$5,000,000 of unused prior year balances of funds of which \$984,000 is to be taken from the fiscal year 2008 Congressionally directed project “CVD Single Crystal Diamond Optical Switch.”

#### OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$33,872,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	—
Recommended, 2009 .....	—
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	— 33,872,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	—

The Office of Legacy Management (non-defense) manages the Department's post-closure responsibilities, including long-term surveillance and maintenance, pension and benefit continuity for former contractor retirees, and archives management for non-defense sites. Beginning in fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends funding these activities in the Other Defense Activities appropriation, the same as the budget request.

#### CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-161), deferred \$149,000,000 in unobligated Clean Coal Technology balances to fiscal year 2009. The Committee recommends the transfer of this balance to the Carbon Capture Demonstration Initiative program, rather than to the FutureGen Program as requested.

#### FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2008 .....	\$742,838,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	754,030,000
Recommended, 2009 .....	853,578,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2008 .....	+110,740,000
Budget estimate, 2009 .....	+99,548,000



Funds provided for fossil energy research and development are intended for research, development, and demonstration programs that help protect the environment by reducing carbon dioxide and pollutant emissions into the atmosphere, increase efficiency for power generation, and improve compliance and stewardship operations of fossil energy activities. The threat of global warming poses substantial challenges to the continued utilization of coal and other fossil fuels for power generation, and will require the development of low-cost carbon capture and sequestration technologies as well as significant further improvements in plant efficiency. The research funded under this account has the difficult goal of developing virtually pollution-free power plants, while increasing plant efficiency in order to compete with other forms of electricity generation.

The Committee recommendation is \$853,578,000, an increase of \$99,548,000 over the budget request and an increase of \$110,740,000 from fiscal year 2008 enacted levels.

*Carbon Capture Demonstration Initiative (CCDI).*—Given the direction provided by Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161) regarding the requirement that Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI) projects must feature a carbon capture and sequestration component, and the subsequent cancellation of the FutureGen project, and program restructuring announced by the Department in January 2008, the distinction between these programs has largely disappeared. The Committee directs the Department to merge these programs, combining the proposed solicitations for Round III of the Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI), and the restructured FutureGen program, into a single solicitation for a Carbon Capture Demonstration Initiative (CCDI) focused on capture and storage of carbon dioxide emissions from coal power plants. Merging these programs will maximize funding available to accelerate the demonstration and widespread deployment of carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) at the earliest possible date. Language is provided that creates the Carbon Capture Demonstration Initiative as a new appropriations control level, pursuant to Title VII of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, combining the activities of the FutureGen and CCPI programs.

The Committee recommends \$241,000,000 for CCDI, the same as the sum of the budget requests for the CCPI, \$85,000,000 and the restructured FutureGen program, \$156,000,000. The Committee further directs the Department to combine all unobligated balances available in the CCPI and FutureGen accounts with the CCDI appropriation, totaling approximately \$513,800,000, and make these funds available for a CCDI solicitation with initial awards by no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act. The Committee believes that, in the interest of proceeding as rapidly as possible, the Department should encourage applicants to consider utilizing the sites proposed as part of the Regional Carbon Sequestration Partnerships program as well as those that were previously considered for the FutureGen project. The aggregate dollar contribution by the Department to the selected project(s) will be limited to the maximum funds available at the time of selection—which, as indicated above, is expected to be approximately \$513,800,000 for awards made in fiscal year 2009—and the total contribution to the

selected project(s) shall be fully appropriated at the time of selection. The Committee directs the Department to adopt emissions requirements for the CCDI solicitation at least as rigorous as those proposed for its restructured FutureGen project. If the power plant has multiple trains, the Department is instructed to only share the cost of one train equipped with CCS.

The Department is instructed to require at least 50 percent non-Federal cost-sharing in each budget period of a carbon capture demonstration project. The Department is further instructed to consider the proposed cost share agreement and the leverage of the Government's contribution thereby achieved as an important criterion in evaluating potential projects. In particular, the Committee recommends that the Department limit its share of the project cost so that it will not exceed the lower of: (1) the incremental cost of implementing a facility with CCS as compared to a state of the art facility without such technology, or (2) 50% of the total allowable costs for each project. The Committee instructs the Department not to enter into any agreement which entails an obligation to share any cost overruns (i.e., costs incurred during the demonstration project that are more than those estimated at the date of award), and the Department is instructed not to plan to set aside funds for overruns.

*Carbon Sequestration.*—The Committee recommends \$220,000,000 for a carbon sequestration research, development, and demonstration program, an increase of \$70,868,000 above the request, and establishes it as a stand-alone line item, outside of the Fuels and Power Systems subaccount, as funded in previous years. These funds, along with \$31,265,000 provided in the Office of Science for a total of \$251,265,000, are for fundamental science and engineering research, geologic sequestration tests, and large-scale sequestration tests for geologic containment of carbon dioxide as authorized by Section 702 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140). Together, these funds constitute an increase of \$72,368,000 over the request for an integrated Carbon Capture and Storage research and development program, one of six integrated research areas highlighted in the request. The Committee believes that carbon sequestration, and in particular, the underground storage of carbon dioxide, is critical to the future of coal power and may be more generally important as a climate change mitigation technology. Carbon sequestration may be utilized to store carbon dioxide emissions not only from coal power plants, but also from natural gas power plants as well as other industrial sources such as ethanol and cement plants.

In order to reflect the importance and broad scope of the carbon sequestration research program and ensure that management of this program is given the priority and leadership in the Department that will be required to meet the challenge of large-scale deployment of this critical technology, the Committee directs the Department to establish a new Office of Carbon Sequestration within the Office of Fossil Energy under the leadership of a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Carbon Sequestration. The Committee directs the Department to manage all carbon sequestration activities funded under this account and provided through previous appropriations through the Office of Carbon Sequestration, and to ensure that all sequestration activities undertaken by the Office of Fossil Energy,

---

including the sequestration part of the CCDI, are coordinated with the Office of Carbon Sequestration. The Committee directs the Office of Carbon Sequestration to utilize existing expertise in the Office of Oil and Natural Gas and coordinate closely with the Office of Coal to ensure that any opportunities to utilize a large-scale sequestration test by a CCDI demonstration are pursued. Further, the Committee directs the Office of Carbon Sequestration to coordinate with the Office of Science to address the basic science needs for carbon sequestration, and with the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to address opportunities for sequestration arising from ethanol, biomass, and industrial processes and waste.

The Committee believes that the research, development, and demonstration program needed to enable the safe storage of carbon dioxide emissions underground in geological formations would benefit from Federal management as a climate change mitigation technology rather than primarily as an enabling technology for clean coal power. At present, the Department's management of this program has not satisfied this Committee. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee within six months of enactment of this legislation describing the progress it has made in addressing the management issues outlined above along with an integrated strategy and program plan for its research, development, and demonstration efforts relevant to the management of greenhouse gas emissions.

*Fuels and power systems.*—The Committee recommends a total of \$220,600,000 for fuels and power systems, a decrease of \$13,000,000 below the budget request excluding carbon sequestration. The Committee provides \$40,000,000 for innovations at existing plants, the same as the budget request. The Committee is pleased that the Department is following Congressional leadership in this area and investing in a rigorous research program on the potential for retrofitting existing coal plants for carbon dioxide capture and sequestration. The Committee directs the Department to continue to focus these R&D efforts on carbon dioxide capture technology for existing pulverized coal (PC) combustion plants, to include efforts on high-strength materials for heat intensive operations, plant efficiency, and oxy-fuel combustion PC retrofit technology. The recommendation provides \$60,000,000 for advanced Integrated Gas Combined Cycle (IGCC), \$9,000,000 below the request, and \$24,000,000 for advanced turbines, a decrease of \$4,000,000 below the request. The Committee believes that the key barriers to the adoption of these technologies are not at the laboratory scale but at the commercial plant scale. The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for fuels and \$60,000,000 for fuel cells, the same as the budget request. The Committee provides \$26,600,000 for advanced research, above the same as the budget request.

*Petroleum-oil technologies.*—The Committee recommends \$3,000,000 for petroleum-oil programs, an increase of \$3,000,000 over the budget request, to include \$1,000,000 for the stripper well consortium and \$2,000,000 for the Risk Based Data Management System. The Committee views this database as an integral component to the progress of carbon sequestration demonstrations, and urges the Administration to include funding for this activity in future requests.

---

*Natural gas technologies.*—The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for methane gas hydrates research and development, an increase of \$25,000,000 over the budget request and a \$5,182,000 increase over fiscal year 2008 enacted levels. The study of methane hydrates contributes to understanding of our global climate change processes, and provides information on the potential use of methane hydrates as an energy source while minimizing environmental impacts. The Committee appreciates the valuable reporting contained in *Fire in the Ice*.

*Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Report.*—To ensure that the technical issues raised by the Government Accountability Office regarding the consequences of a terrorist attack on a liquefied natural gas (LNG) tanker are properly assessed, the Office of Fossil Energy is directed to convene peer review panels with appropriate expertise and a diversity of views and perspectives to review the adequacy and effectiveness of DOE's test plans, including those which evaluate cascading failures and heat effects from large pool fires.

*Program direction.*—The Committee recommends \$126,252,000 for program direction, the same as the budget request.

*Other.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$656,000 for special recruitment programs, \$5,000,000 for plant and capital equipment, and \$9,700,000 for fossil energy environmental restoration, the same as the budget request.

*Use of prior-year balances.*—The Committee supports the use of prior year balances in the amount of \$11,310,000 from completed or cancelled construction projects, the same as the budget request.

*Congressionally Directed Projects.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$13,680,000 for the following House directed projects and activities for the purposes of research, development, and demonstration of coal and other fossil energy related technologies or programs. The Department should remind recipients that statutory cost-sharing requirements may apply to these projects.

---