AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

113TH CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
113–486

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2015

JUNE 20, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4923]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Number Bill	Page Number Report
Introduction	—	5
I. Department of Defense—Civil:	—	14
Corps of Engineers—Civil	2	14
Investigations	2	25
Construction	3	36
Mississippi River and Tributaries	4	43
Operation and Maintenance	4	46
Regulatory Program	6	70
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	6	71
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	6	72
Expenses	6	72
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	7	73
General Provisions	8	74
II. Department of the Interior:	11	74
Central Utah Project	11	74
Central Utah Project Completion Account	11	74
Bureau of Reclamation:	—	75

88–390

	Page Number Bill	Report
Water and Related Resources	12	77
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	13	86
California Bay-Delta Restoration	14	86
Policy and Administration	14	87
Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account	15	88
Administrative Provision	15	88
General Provisions	15	88
III. Department of Energy:	20	89
Introduction	—	89
Committee Recommendations	—	89
Energy Programs:	20	94
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	20	94
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	20	102
Nuclear Energy	21	104
Fossil Energy Research and Development	21	107
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	22	112
Elk Hills School Lands Fund	22	112
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	22	113
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve	23	115
Energy Information Administration	23	115
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup	23	115
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	24	116
Science	24	117
Nuclear Waste Disposal	25	124
Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy	25	124
Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	26	125
Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program	27	125
Clean Coal Technology	27	126
Departmental Administration	27	126
Office of the Inspector General	28	127
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:	29	128
National Nuclear Security Administration:	29	128
Weapons Activities	29	129
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	29	139
Naval Reactors	30	145
Office of the Administrator	31	147
Environmental and Other Defense Activities	31	148
Defense Environmental Cleanup	31	148
Other Defense Activities	32	152
Power Marketing Administrations:	—	153
Bonneville Power Administration Fund	32	153
Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	33	154
Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	34	154
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	35	155
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	37	155
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	38	156
Committee Recommendation	—	157
General Provisions	39	191
IV. Independent Agencies:	51	192
Appalachian Regional Commission	51	192
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	51	192
Delta Regional Authority	51	193
Denali Commission	52	193
Northern Border Regional Commission	52	193
Southeast Crescent Regional Commission	52	194

	Page Number	
	Bill	*Report*
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	52	194
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	54	197
General Provisions	55	197
V. General Provisions	56	198
House of Representatives Report Requirements	—	199
Additional Views	—	222

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates, which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2015. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2014, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2015.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted /1	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Title I, Department of Defense - Civil	5,467,499	4,533,000	5,492,499	+25,000	+959,499
Title II, Department of the Interior	1,113,098	1,042,995	1,013,569	-99,529	-29,426
Title III, Department of Energy	27,281,046	28,436,428	27,305,845	+24,799	-1,130,583
Title IV, Independent Agencies	265,144	248,715	312,367	+47,223	+63,652
Title V, General Provisions	---	---	---	---	---
Subtotal	34,126,787	34,261,138	34,124,280	-2,507	-136,858
Scorekeeping adjustments	-66,288	-578,000	-114,280	-47,992	+463,720
Grand total for the bill	34,060,499	33,683,138	34,010,000	-50,499	+326,862

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2015 totals $34,010,000,000, $50,499,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2014 and $326,862,000 above the President's budget request. Total defense funding is $17,150,000,000, $45,499,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2014 and $828,688,000 below the budget request. Total non-defense funding is $16,860,000,000, $5,000,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2014 and $1,155,550,000 above the budget request. After adjusting for the Department of Energy's $463,000,000 legislative proposal, which the Committee rejects, total defense funding is $365,688,000 below the budget request, and total non-defense funding is $692,550,000 above the budget request.

Title I of the bill provides $5,492,499,000 for the Civil Works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, $25,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $959,499,000 above the budget request. Total funding for activities eligible for reimbursement from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is estimated at more than $1,100,000,000, more than $185,000,000 above the budget request.

Title II provides $1,013,569,000 for the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, $99,529,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $29,426,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends $1,003,695,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, $100,678,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $32,000,000 below the budget request for accounts traditionally within the Bureau of Reclamation. The Committee recommends $9,874,000 for the Central Utah Project, $1,149,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $2,574,000 above the budget request.

Title III provides $27,305,845,000 for the Department of Energy, $24,799,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $1,130,583,000 below the budget request. After adjusting for the Department's $463,000,000 legislative proposal, which the Committee rejects, the funding for the Department of Energy is $667,583,000 below the budget 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 $11,361,570,000, $154,570,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $296,430,000 below the budget request.

Funding for energy programs within the Department of Energy, which includes basic science research and the applied energy programs, is $10,323,800,000, $112,996,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $269,090,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends $5,071,000,000 for the Office of Science; $1,789,000,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; $899,000,000 for Nuclear Energy; $593,000,000 for Fossil Energy; and $280,000,000 for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy.

Environmental management activities—non-defense environmental cleanup, uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning, and defense environmental cleanup—are funded at $5,628,430,000, $202,158,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $6,742,000 above the budget request.

Funding for the Power Marketing Administrations is provided at the requested levels.

Title IV provides $312,367,000 for several Independent Agencies, $47,223,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $63,652,000 above the budget request. Net funding for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is $172,278,000, $49,062,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $50,000,000 above the budget request.

OVERVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation continues the strong investments in American infrastructure contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 (Division D of Public Law 113–76). The recommendation rejects the Administration's ill-considered request to cut approximately $700 million from critical Army Corps of Engineers efforts to keep the nation's rivers and ports dredged and to protect farmland and cities from flooding. Such a drastic reduction would have a deleterious impact on the nation's economic competitiveness and flood defenses. The Committee strongly encourages the Administration to request a fiscal year 2016 budget that recognizes and supports these critical missions of the Corps of Engineers.

The recommendation also includes significant support to ensure the short- and long-term supply of affordable, clean energy and the stability of the nation's electrical infrastructure. This portfolio builds upon this country's significant fossil, nuclear, and renewable energy resources to strengthen American energy independence. The recommendation makes key investments in technologies to help our energy sector adjust to a challenging regulatory environment by supporting advances in efficiency and emissions reduction.

Due to the limitation on defense funding contained in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Division A of Public Law 113–67), the Committee is unable to provide adequate support for all priorities within the National Nuclear Security Administration and other security-related programs funded by this recommendation. The Committee therefore continues its strong emphasis on maintaining the nuclear deterrent, including the nuclear weapons and naval reactors programs. To provide additional support for nuclear nonproliferation programs above the budget request, the recommendation redirects prior-year funding from stalled programs to be used for current priorities.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS

As in previous years, the Committee considers the national defense programs run by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to be the Department of Energy's top priority. Even within the limited resources available for fiscal year 2015, the recommendation provides robust support for the President's proposals to modernize the nuclear weapons stockpile, increase investment in the NNSA's infrastructure, prevent the proliferation of nuclear materials, and support the naval nuclear propulsion program within funding for Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors.

The recommendation continues the Committee's strong support for the NNSA's Weapons Activities. The Administration has embarked on a multi-year plan to modernize the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and its supporting infrastructure. Early formula-

tions of the modernization plan tended to focus on stretch goals for warhead life extension programs and major construction projects that were based on overly optimistic timelines and invalid cost assumptions. The NNSA's failure to deliver on those promises has damaged the credibility of the organization. However, the fiscal year 2015 budget request is a positive development due to the increased emphasis on conservative strategies that are attainable, affordable, and ultimately more realistic. While there will continue to be debate on which specific programs should have higher priority and how those programs should be carried out, the NNSA must evolve to become more mission-oriented and focused on successfully carrying out its modernization plans to provide assurances that it will not fail in its stewardship of the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. With new leadership in place at the Department of Energy and the NNSA, there is an opportunity to accelerate this transformation. The Committee is encouraged by the engagement the Secretary has shown to date in reforming federal oversight at the Department. The Committee is hopeful that the new NNSA Administrator will continue to advance management reforms that have been set in motion. As the NNSA makes progress in resolving the inconsistencies between its goals for modernization and its ability to achieve those goals, the Committee will continue to hold the NNSA accountable for delivering its commitments on time and within budget.

The recommendation fully funds the Administration's budget request for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, while reprioritizing activities within the account to reinvigorate the nonproliferation research and development base of the national laboratories. The United States government has made great strides working with its global partners to limit the potential spread of fissile materials, but our national strategies must evolve with the changing geopolitical environment. There will be consequences to Russia's recent behavior in Ukraine with respect to how the United States government engages with the Russian Federation. The Secretary of Energy must reevaluate the Department's cooperative nuclear security activities to ensure those programs are effectively and measurably promoting our national security interests. At the same time, those programs must continue to make progress on preventing the spread of nuclear materials and technologies and adapt to meet the latest threats.

The Committee strongly supports the strategic protection afforded by our country's nuclear fleet, which is supported through the Naval Reactors account. The recommendation prioritizes strategic activities, such as the Ohio-class ballistic submarine replacement reactor program, while delaying infrastructure and technology development needs that, while also important, can be slightly deferred with no strategic repercussions. The Committee greatly appreciates the service of the members of our country's armed forces and will continue to place the highest priority on support for them and their work.

SUPPORTING AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS

The agencies and programs funded by the recommendation are critical engines for the prosperity of the nation. The Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for keeping our federal waterways open

for business. The Corps also has been instrumental in reducing the risk of flooding for much of this country's food-producing lands. The Bureau of Reclamation, in typical water years, supplies reliable water to approximately ten percent of this country's population and to much of its fertile agricultural lands. The Department of Energy has been at the forefront of developing intellectual property in energy sciences and other disciplines, the commercialization of new ideas, and improvements in energy supply and utilization. Working together, these agencies underpin the country's economic competitiveness and energy security.

As the agency responsible for our nation's federal waterways, the Army Corps of Engineers maintains 926 coastal, Great Lakes, and inland harbors and 25,000 miles of commercial channels serving 41 states. The maintenance of these commercial waterways is directly tied to the ability of this country to ship its manufactured and bulk products, as well as to compete with the ports of neighboring countries for the business of ships arriving from around the world. These waterways handled foreign commerce valued at more than $1,774,000,000,000 in 2012 alone. As a primary supporter of America's waterway infrastructure, the Corps is ensuring that the nation has the tools to maintain a competitive edge in the global market. This recommendation provides significant funding above the budget request to ensure that the Corps has the necessary tools to continue to support America's shipping infrastructure.

The flood protection infrastructure that the Corps builds or maintains reduces the risk of flooding to people, businesses, and other public infrastructure investments. In fact, the average annual damages prevented by Corps projects from 2003 to 2012 was $36,200,000,000. Between 1928 and 2012, each inflation-adjusted dollar invested in these projects prevented $7.90 in damages. The properties and investments protected by the Corps infrastructure would often be flooded without that infrastructure, destroying homes, businesses, and many valuable acres of cropland.

The Bureau of Reclamation's water infrastructure is a critical component of the agricultural productivity of this country. One of every five western farmers, representing approximately 10 million acres of irrigated land that produces 60 percent of the nation's vegetables and 25 percent of its fruits and nuts, relies on these facilities for water. Additionally, more than 31 million people rely on these facilities for municipal, rural, and industrial uses. Without these dams and water supply facilities, American agricultural producers in the West would not be able to access safe water for their families and their businesses and many municipal and industrial users would face critical water shortages.

The Department of Energy supports essential research that has helped keep America at the cutting-edge of science and technology innovation. Given the limited resources available this year, the recommendation places a higher priority on research that only the government is likely to do, research that advances our basic scientific understanding, and research that has commercialization possibilities only in the distant future.

Research and development for technologies that are closer to commercialization, and thus that the private sector has more incentive to take up, receive less funding than in fiscal year 2014. However, the recommendation does continue a long-standing commit-

ment by the Committee to the type of research that will improve American energy security and independence. The recommendations for Fossil Energy, Nuclear Energy, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, and the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy are balanced to improve the efficiency of existing forms of energy production, to develop new and innovative forms of energy for this nation's long-term security and prosperity, and to help American manufacturing compete in the global marketplace.

As noted in prior years, the Department has not been as successful ensuring that intellectual property developed with U.S. taxpayer funds benefits those same taxpayers. The Department still has no coherent and implementable strategy to track and improve domestic exploitation of Department-developed intellectual property. Without such a strategy, U.S. manufacturing will too frequently be forced to play "catch-up" with foreign competitors benefitting from ideas formed here in the U.S. The Committee strongly urges the Secretary to take more of a leadership role in improving U.S. manufacturing and domestic intellectual property retention.

PROGRAM AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Committee remains concerned about the Department of Energy's oversight and management of its programs and projects, despite several policy, process, and organizational improvements that have been implemented over the past few years. While the Department has demonstrated noted progress in its ability to deliver small projects on schedule and within budget, the Department continues to struggle to keep its major construction projects on track. The Department has no baseline against which it can monitor progress on the full scope of its major environmental cleanup projects, the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant and the Salt Waste Processing Facility. As a result, the Department is unable to provide to the Committee the anticipated cost and schedule for completing those projects. Of the ongoing major construction projects of the NNSA, the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility and the Uranium Processing Facility are both facing serious challenges, and it has become clear that the Department may not have sufficient funds to complete these facilities in a timely manner. Even as the Department analyzes potential alternatives, the Committee is concerned that it may be repeating the mistakes of the past by relying on poor cost estimates and rushing to commence construction activities before planning activities are sufficiently mature. Of significant concern is the Department's continued practice of avoiding enforcement of its own project management regulations. The Department's lack of enforcement of its own standards has been found to be a root cause of its continued presence on the Government Accountability Office's "high-risk list" for project management. The Department submitted a reprogramming request to the Committee to initiate a major recapitalization of its plutonium infrastructure at Los Alamos National Laboratory using operating funds, despite having formal requirements under DOE Order 413.3B which clearly applied to the acquisition of those capital assets. The Committee will not support requests for capital investments that do not provide sufficient accountability for delivering those investments within budget and on schedule. The Committee

expects the Department to not only monitor performance of its projects, but also ensure that its requirements are not being circumvented by simply redefining what scope of work is considered to be a "project." The Committee also notes that the Department is continuing to allow programs to make capital investments using site indirect funds over which the Department has little visibility.

While the Department is clearly struggling with how to consistently enforce its own regulations, the Committee notes that it has made some progress. The Secretary of Energy has proposed positive organizational changes that will enhance the authority of the Office of Management to oversee program and project performance and to enforce standards. The Committee supports this proposal and directs the Department to expedite measures to strengthen internal oversight while its organizational reforms are being carried out. The budget request also properly identifies capital projects carried out by the Office of Environmental Management to comply with statutory requirements.

The Committee remains concerned about the management of the Department's research and development activities, although it notes significant improvements from previous years. The Department has taken steps to ensure that taxpayer funding is only invested in programs with clear guidelines and expectations, and the Committee expects that the nascent reforms within the energy efficiency and renewable energy activities will help foster a culture in which projects are terminated when those expectations are not met.

The Committee recognizes the improvements made by most of the Department to reduce "mortgages," funding in any fiscal year promised to awards or agreements started in prior years. Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, once one of the greatest offenders, is now on par with Nuclear Energy and Fossil Energy, and the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 included statutory language requiring the Office of Science to fully fund its multi-year awards valued at less than $1,000,000. Minimal mortgages allow these offices to ensure that new resources in any fiscal year are allocated to the highest value projects, rather than to previous years' priorities. Program managers can actively manage their portfolios, ensuring that well-performing awardees are fully resourced without having to accommodate uncertainties about future-years' budgets.

The Committee's concerns regarding program and project management are not limited to the Department of Energy. The Corps of Engineers has suffered several significant failings in recent years that have resulted in cost increases for projects, such as the massive cost escalation associated with the Olmsted Locks and Dam project. In some cases, the Administration has not requested authorization increases in time for the Congress to act before projects experience delays. The Committee enacted new requirements in fiscal year 2014 intended to address these problems, but to date—five months after enactment—the Corps has not complied with the Committee's directions. In addition, the Committee notes that the Corps still has not submitted a complete work plan for fiscal year 2014, nor complied with several other oversight initiatives necessary to safeguard taxpayer dollars. As a result, the Committee provides additional direction regarding the Corps' management of its programs and projects under the heading "Title I—Corps of Engineers—Civil."

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Unfortunately, this budget request once again fails to reflect a coherent energy policy or plan for this country. The President continues to highlight an "all of the above" energy portfolio in his speeches, but fails to present such a balanced approach in his budget requests. The fiscal year 2015 budget request, like its predecessors, instead seems more ideological than practical. The request makes cuts to fossil energy research and, to a much lesser extent, nuclear energy research—this country's most important energy sources—in order to increase funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs by 22 percent. As attractive as renewable energy may be, it will supply only a mere fraction of this country's energy needs over the next 50 years, and it presents considerable challenges to the nation's existing electric power grid, given its increasing variability and uncertainty from supply and demand changes.

At the same time, the Administration is moving forward with several regulations that will have a significant impact on energy use in the coming years and that reveal the inconsistencies of the Administration's purported "all of the above" energy policy. The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) proposed rules to regulate carbon pollution from new fossil-fueled electric power plants, first proposed in September 2013, and from existing fossil-fueled electric power plants, first proposed in June 2014, will have a significant impact on energy production, consumption, and reliability. Fossil fuels currently provide 82 percent of the energy used by the nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide for a majority of our energy needs in the coming years, yet the Administration has proposed to reduce the fossil energy research and development program to its lowest programmatic level since fiscal year 2000. This program conducts the very research into carbon capture and storage technologies that will now be required for certain new fossil-fuel electric power plants given the EPA's proposed rules on carbon pollution. Further inconsistencies can be seen in the Administration's proposal to reduce core research funding for nuclear energy, which will continue to be a vital base load electricity source in future years, and the Administration's willful disregard of the federal government's legal responsibilities regarding Yucca Mountain, which has resulted in no disposition pathway for civilian spent nuclear fuel and defense waste resulting from the back end of the nuclear fuel cycle. Time and again this Administration has failed to put forward a strategic vision for a truly "all of the above" national energy policy that is sound both scientifically and economically.

The Committee continues its long-standing support for the investment of taxpayer dollars across the spectrum of all technologies, as reflected in this recommendation, and supports a clearly articulated, consensus-based national energy policy that achieves the long-term strategic goals of energy security, independence, and prosperity for the nation. Such a vision will emphasize a balanced approach for all energy sources and include a long-term strategic vision of the nation's fossil, nuclear, and renewable energy programs in the coming years, as well as the scientific and technical challenges to be overcome. The Committee encourages the new

leadership of the Department of Energy to develop a consensus energy policy which is sound both scientifically and economically. This policy should support the budget request for fiscal year 2016.

COMMITTEE OVERSIGHT INITIATIVES

The highest priority mission of any federal agency is to be an effective steward of taxpayer dollars. Any waste, fraud, or abuse of taxpayer dollars is unacceptable. The Committee uses hearings, reviews by the Government Accountability Office, the Committee on Appropriations' Surveys and Investigations staff, and its annual appropriations Act, including the accompanying report, to promote strong oversight of the agencies under its jurisdiction, with an emphasis on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Energy.

The recommendation continues the Committee's responsibility to conduct in-depth oversight into all activities funded in this bill. Each agency shall designate a specific point of contact to track each report required in the bill and ensure its timely production and delivery.

A summary of the major oversight efforts in the bill is provided below:

Agency/Account	Requirement
Army Corps of Engineers	Report on 3x3x3 waiver process
Army Corps of Engineers	Direction on Principles and Guidelines
Army Corps of Engineers	Report on impacts of revised Principles and Requirements
Army Corps of Engineers	Direction to prioritize ongoing studies and projects
Army Corps of Engineers	Comprehensive estimate for completing ongoing projects
Army Corps of Engineers	Guidance on ratings systems for allocating additional funds
Army Corps of Engineers	Guidance on 2015 Work Plan submission
Army Corps of Engineers/Investigations	Direction on the Passaic River Main Stem Study
Army Corps of Engineers/Construction	Guidance and reporting requirements on the Savannah Harbor Expansion project
Army Corps of Engineers/Construction	Report on distribution of Continuing Authorities Program
Army Corps of Engineers/Operation and Maintenance	Report on status of Corps lands in the Lower Snake River
Army Corps of Engineers/Regulatory Program	Guidance on Congressional interpretation of Clean Water Act
Army Corps of Engineers/FUSRAP	Guidance on investigation and study at former Sylvania site
Army Corps of Engineers/Expenses	Plan and status updates on funding 2014 Authorizing legislation provisions
Army Corps of Engineers/Expenses	Report on complying with ability to pay rule
Army Corps of Engineers/General Provisions	Reprogramming requirements
Army Corps of Engineers/General Provisions	Restriction on use of continuing contracts
Army Corps of Engineers/General Provisions	Restriction on committing funds beyond appropriated amounts
Army Corps of Engineers/General Provisions	Restriction on changing certain Clean Water Act definitions
Army Corps of Engineers/General Provisions	Restriction on revising federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act
Bureau of Reclamation/Water and Related Resources	Direction on Scoggins Dam, Tualatin Project
Bureau of Reclamation/Policy and Administration	Guidance on new scope of information for budget justifications
Bureau of Reclamation/Policy and Administration	Report on five year comprehensive spending plan
Bureau of Reclamation/General Provisions	Reprogramming requirements
Department of Energy	Requirement for monthly financial balances report
Department of Energy	Report on Department's Program Direction accounts
Department of Energy	Guidance on prior-year balances greater than five years old
Department of Energy	Guidance on Administration's Yucca Mountain policy
Department of Energy	Guidance on inclusion of centers in future budget justifications

Agency/Account	Requirement
Department of Energy	Direction on funding fellowship and scholarship programs
Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Report on national lab capabilities for expanding battery performance
Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Direction on recycled paper segregated from municipal solid waste
Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Direction on supporting supply chain technology efforts for solar cells
Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Report on benefits of mechanical insulation maintenance and upgrade programs in federal facilities
Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Guidance on including CEMI Institutes in future budget justifications
Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Direction on building energy codes
Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Guidance on engagement for housing energy standards
Department of Energy/Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	Report on resiliency and reliability of national power grid
Department of Energy/Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	Report on workforce plan of future OER program
Department of Energy/Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	Report on physical and cyber security of the grid
Department of Energy/Nuclear	Direction to support an SMR design award
Department of Energy/Nuclear	Guidance on dry cask storage research and development
Department of Energy/Nuclear	Guidance on cost-share of advanced supercritical carbon dioxide demonstration projects funding
Department of Energy/Fossil	Report on liquefied natural gas export applications
Department of Energy/Fossil	Guidance on full-time equivalent information
Department of Energy/Fossil	Guidance on efficiency of natural gas research
Department of Energy/Fossil	Direction on interagency plan regarding hydraulic fracturing
Department of Energy/Fossil	Report on unconventional fossil energy technologies
Department of Energy/Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup	Report on spent nuclear fuel storage costs
Department of Energy/UED&D	Report on commencing decommissioning activities at Paducah
Department of Energy/UED&D	Guidance on funding for thorium/uranium reimbursements
Department of Energy/Science	Guidance on cash contributions to ITER
Department of Energy/Title 17	Report on portfolio monitoring and risk management
Department of Energy/Weapons	Prohibition on funding defined benefit pensions above requirements
Department of Energy/Weapons	Report on improvements to future life extension programs
Department of Energy/Weapons	Guidance on dedicated funding for stockpile certification
Department of Energy/Weapons	Prohibition on funding for new reactor fueling agreements for reactors not producing tritium
Department of Energy/Weapons	Consolidation of production-related technology development under Advanced Manufacturing Campaign
Department of Energy/Weapons	Guidance on prioritization and reporting for NNSA infrastructure projects
Department of Energy/Weapons	Analysis of alternatives for Albuquerque Complex
Department of Energy/Weapons	Report on acquisition plan for secure transportation asset
Department of Energy/Weapons	Guidance on domestic nuclear emergency response
Department of Energy/Weapons	Guidance on future domestic enriched uranium funds
Department of Energy/Weapons	Analysis of alternatives for providing enriched uranium for national security purposes
Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	Guidance on new nonproliferation projects in Russia
Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	Guidance on reinvestment in nonproliferation-related R&D
Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	Prohibition on placing MOX plant in cold standby
Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	Guidance on continued study of limited MOX alternatives
Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	Requirement for independent verification of lifecycle cost estimate for MOX alternatives
Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	Review of cost sharing agreement between EM and NNSA
Department of Energy/Naval Reactors	Multi-year budget review of programmatic requirements
Department of Energy/Defense Environmental Cleanup	Report on Hanford tank maintenance and upgrade requirements
Department of Energy/Defense Environmental Cleanup	Guidance on progress at SPRU
Department of Energy/Defense Environmental Cleanup	Review of cost sharing agreement between EM and NNSA
Department of Energy/Defense Environmental Cleanup	Direction on developing a formal WIPP Recovery Plan
Department of Energy/Defense Environmental Cleanup	Analysis of DOE spent fuel storage infrastructure
Department of Energy/Other Defense Activities	Report on oversight activities
Department of Energy/Other Defense Activities	Guidance on updating Graded Security Posture
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	Report on increased electricity costs and impacts
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	Report on plan to complete consideration of liquefied natural gas export applications

Agency/Account	Requirement
Department of Energy/General Provision	Reprogramming requirements
Department of Energy/General Provision	Transfer authority specifications
Department of Energy/General Provision	Prohibit funds for high hazard nuclear facilities construction unless cost estimates have been developed
Department of Energy/General Provision	Prohibit funds approving CD-2 and CD-3 without separate cost estimates
Department of Energy/General Provision	Notification requirements for uranium transfers
Department of Energy/General Provision	Prohibit certain multi-year funding agreements in Office of Science
Department of Energy/General Provision	Requirement for cost reporting for major warhead refurbishment programs
Department of Energy/General Provision	Restriction of certain activities in the Russian Federation
Department of Energy/General Provision	Restriction of Strategic Petroleum Reserve activities and notification requirements
Department of Energy/General Provision	Limitation on LDRD activities
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Requirement on reporting unobligated funds allocations
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Requirement for joint management of salaries and expenses
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Prohibition on terminating programs without Commissioner approval
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Notification requirement for use of emergency functions
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Direction on Yucca Mountain license application and funding needs
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Semi-annual report on licensing and regulatory activities
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Report on workforce review and strategic plan
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Report on input and regulatory analysis of 10 CFR Part 50 or 52
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Report on National Framework recommendations
Independent Agencies/General Provision	Reporting requirement on use of emergency authority
Independent Agencies/General Provision	Requirement for NRC to comply with Congressional requests
General Provision	Prohibition on the use of funds to influence congressional action
General Provision	Limitation and reporting requirement on funds that support a corporation convicted of a felony
General Provision	Limitation and reporting requirement on funds that support a corporation with unpaid tax liabilities
General Provision	Consolidation of transfer authorities
General Provision	Prohibition of funds in contravention of Executive Order 12898
General Provision	Prohibition on use of funds to close Yucca Mountain application process

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act funds the Civil Works missions of the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). This program is responsible for activities in support of coastal and inland navigation, flood and coastal storm damage reduction, environmental protection and restoration, hydropower, recreation, water supply and disaster preparedness and response. The Corps also performs regulatory oversight of navigable waters. Approximately 23,000 civilians and almost 300 military personnel located in eight Division offices and 38 District offices work to carry out the Civil Works program.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET REQUEST OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS

The fiscal year 2015 budget request for the Civil Works program of the Corps of Engineers is $4,533,000,000, a decrease of $934,499,000 from fiscal year 2014. After adjusting for a proposed rescission of $28,000,000 of prior-year appropriations, the budget request represents a reduction from fiscal year 2014 of $906,499,000 (17%). Each of the four main project-based accounts would see a sharp decrease under the budget request. As in previous years, the largest dollar reduction is in the Construction account ($531,000,000), although the Investigations account sees the largest percentage reduction (36%). The Mississippi River and Tributaries and Operation and Maintenance accounts are reduced by 20 percent and 9 percent, respectively. The budget request proposes to reduce funding for activities eligible for reimbursement from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund by more than $160,000,000 from fiscal year 2014.

Although the Administration, on occasion, talks about the importance of infrastructure investment, the fiscal year 2015 budget request represents a different story entirely. Under the budget request, funding for both navigation and flood and storm damage reduction—the Committee's two highest priorities for the Corps' Civil Works program—is decreased significantly (20% and 16%, respectively). Investments in both of these mission areas not only provide short-term economic benefits by directly creating jobs, but also provide the foundation necessary for long-term economic growth. Further, in the case of flood and storm damage reduction, investment can prevent or reduce the costs of recovery from flood events.

The Committee rejects the low priority placed on infrastructure in the budget request. Instead, the Committee allocates $868,832,000 above the budget request for additional investments in navigation and flood and storm damage reduction improvements.

Budget Criteria.—According to the Administration, the Corps budget request is a performance-based budget developed using objective performance criteria. Besides that assertion, though, the budget development process remains considerably less than transparent. The request lists the general factors considered for allocating funds within each account, but does not detail how any of these factors were ranked or weighted during development of the budget.

Perhaps most concerning is the fact that the budget metrics were not applied consistently to all previously funded projects. In other words, numerous ongoing studies and projects, previously funded by congressional direction, were not even eligible to compete for inclusion in the President's budget with the only explanation the vague characterization of not being consistent with Administration policy. While this exclusion is not new this year, or even with this Administration, it nevertheless casts doubt on the true objectivity of the budget development process.

Project Completions and Initiations.—The budget request for the Investigations account includes funding to complete a total of 34 studies and project designs. Funding is requested for 10 new studies. The budget request for the Construction account includes funding to complete nine projects and to initiate one new project. It should be noted that the sizable number of budgeted completions

is only possible due to the additional funding provided in previous fiscal years by the Congress.

DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION

The Committee remains mindful of the evolving infrastructure needs of the nation's ports. Meeting these needs—including deeper drafts to accommodate the move towards larger ships—will be essential if the nation is to remain competitive in international markets and to continue advancing economic development and job creation domestically.

Investigations and construction of port projects, including the deepening of existing projects, are cost-shared between the federal government and non-federal sponsors, often local or regional port authorities. The operation and maintenance of these projects are federal responsibilities and are funded as reimbursements from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), which is supported by an *ad valorem* tax on the value of imported and domestic cargo. Expenditures from the trust fund are subject to annual appropriations. The balance in the HMTF by the beginning of fiscal year 2015 is estimated to be approximately $8,500,000,000.

Congress historically has appropriated more funding for HMTF-related activities each year than is included in that year's budget request. For fiscal year 2015, the Committee provides more than $1,100,000,000 for HMTF-related activities, an increase of more than $185,000,000 above the budget request. This substantial increase should allow the Corps to make progress on the backlog of dredging needs.

The recently enacted Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA) included provisions setting target annual appropriations levels for use of HMTF receipts and setting percentages of HMTF funding to be provided to various activities. The Committee remains committed to providing the maximum practicable amount of funding for HMTF-reimbursable activities consistent with annual allocations and after evaluating funding requirements for other priority activities within the Civil Works program. In fact, the Committee increased the amount appropriated for HMTF-reimbursable activities by more than $300,000,000 from fiscal year 2011 to this recommendation, even without statutory target levels. The Committee is in the process of evaluating how the prioritization provisions may be implemented and the expected results. Therefore, this recommendation continues the approach used in previous fiscal years, although changes may be necessary at a later date.

INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM

The nation's inland waterways system—consisting of approximately 12,000 miles of commercially navigable channels and 236 lock chambers—also is essential to supporting the national economy. Freight transported on the inland waterways system includes a significant portion of the nation's grain exports, domestic petroleum and petroleum products, and coal used in electricity generation. Much of the physical infrastructure of the system is aging, however, and in need of improvements. For example, commercial navigation locks typically have a design life of 50 years, yet nearly

60 percent of these locks in the United States are more than 50 years old, with the average age at almost 60 years old.

Capital improvements to the inland waterways system generally are funded 50 percent from the General Treasury and 50 percent from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF), while operation and maintenance costs are funded 100 percent from the General Treasury. The IWTF is supported by a $0.20 per gallon tax on barge fuel. In recent years, the increasing rehabilitation and reconstruction needs and the escalating costs of those projects have far outstripped available revenues in the IWTF. In fact, over the past several years, the majority of available revenues have been allocated to just one project—the Olmsted Locks and Dam project.

The recently enacted WRRDA reduced the portion of the costs of the Olmsted Locks and Dam project to be derived from the IWTF to 15 percent. This change means there will be revenues available for the required cost-share for some additional work on the inland waterways system. Funds from both the General Treasury and the IWTF are counted under overall discretionary spending limits, however, so the available revenues should not be considered free money or automatic allocations in any sense. The WRRDA provision does allow the Committee to consider the needs of the inland system along with the needs of other components of the Civil Works program; in previous years, the Committee was unable to even consider additional work on the inland system due to the lack of revenues available from the IWTF.

For fiscal year 2015, the Committee provides the budget request of $169,032,000 for construction of the Olmsted Locks and Dam project and the Locks 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River project, as well as $112,000,000 above the budget request for additional capital improvements to the inland waterways system. The Committee also allocates $45,000,000 above the budget request for additional operation and maintenance activities on the inland waterways.

PLANNING MODERNIZATION

The Committee strongly supports efforts to reduce the length of time and the funding required to complete studies while maintaining quality analysis and an appropriate level of information for congressional authorization and funding decisions. The Corps is working to make these improvements through its SMART Planning process (commonly referred to as "3x3x3"), which sets the goal of completing most feasibility studies within three years, for no more than $3,000,000, and with the decision document coordinated by three levels of the organization (headquarters, division, and district offices).

The Committee is aware, however, that not all studies will fit within the 3x3x3 model and that the Corps has established a waiver process for such studies. The Corps shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act on the details of the waiver process. This information shall include how the waiver process is managed across the three levels of the organization, how many waivers have been approved to date, the timeline from district request to approval for such waivers, ways the Corps is streamlining the waiver process so as not to delay unnecessarily studies that do not fit the 3x3x3 model, and any additional steps

necessary to comply with related provisions in the recently enacted WRRDA.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Committee is pleased that the Corps included performance measures in the fiscal year 2015 budget justifications. The Committee is concerned, however, that these performance measures were not results-oriented; did not clearly demonstrate the extent to which performance reporting under 31 U.S.C. 1116 demonstrates that prior-year investments in programs, projects, and activities are tied to progress toward achieving performance and priority goals; and did not include estimates for how proposed investments will contribute to additional progress. The Committee encourages the Corps to continue improving its performance measures, including efforts to clarify the connections between individual performance measures and strategic goals and objectives, demonstrate how the funding requested is expected to affect performance measures, and avoid overly technical language or jargon.

COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The fiscal year 2014 Act included several reporting requirements for the Corps of Engineers. Unfortunately, to date, the Corps has not complied with many of these directives. The Committee does not issue directives frivolously. The information sought through these reporting requirements is necessary to the Committee fulfilling its oversight responsibilities and to developing the fiscal year 2015 and future year recommendations. The Committee continues to expect the Corps to submit all required reports.

The following reports required in fiscal year 2014 have not been submitted as of the writing of this report or have been incomplete:

(1) Work plan for additional funding—incomplete;
—ratings system—incomplete;
—summary of work to be completed with funding—not submitted;
—list of and information on eligible but unfunded projects—not submitted;

(2) New construction starts affordability analysis—incomplete;

(3) Report on compensatory mitigation for critical infrastructure projects—not submitted;

(4) Report on metrics suitable for use in evaluating aquatic ecosystem restoration projects—not submitted;

(5) Comprehensive estimate related to ongoing construction projects—not submitted;

(6) Plan for the oversight and management of 902 limit project modifications—not submitted;

(7) List of projects with the potential to exceed 902 limits—not submitted;

(8) Report on policy regarding coastal storm damage reduction projects—not submitted; and

(9) Report on plan for allowing firearms on Corps lands—not submitted.

To demonstrate clearly the extent of the Committee's dissatisfaction with the Administration's disregard of congressional direction,

the recommendation reduces funding for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).

SECTION 902 AUTHORIZATION LIMITS

As noted above, the Administration has not yet submitted the required plan for the oversight and management of section 902 authorized cost project modifications or the list of projects with the potential to exceed the 902 limit. The Committee is aware that the WRRDA included a few such project modifications and that the Corps currently is working on completing necessary reports for other projects expected to exceed the 902 limit. The Committee is prepared to consider additional project modifications as the Corps completes the reports and submits recommendations to the Congress.

PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS

Concerns persist that the effort to update the Water Resources Principles and Guidelines is not proceeding consistent with the language or intent of section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. No funds provided to the Corps of Engineers shall be used to develop or implement rules or guidance to support implementation of the final Principles and Requirements for Federal Investments in Water Resources released in March 2013. The Corps shall continue to use the document dated March 10, 1983, and entitled "Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies" during the fiscal year period covered by the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for 2015. If Interagency Guidelines for implementing the March 2013 Principles and Requirements are finalized, the Corps shall be ready to report to the appropriate committees of the Congress not later than 120 days after finalization on the impacts of the revised Principles and Requirements and Interagency Guidelines. The Corps shall be prepared to explain the intent of each revision, how each revision is or is not consistent with section 2031 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, and the probable impact of each revision on water resources projects carried out by the Secretary including specific examples of application to at least one project from each main mission area of the Corps.

NEW STARTS

Fiscal Year 2014 Implementation.—The Committee considers very carefully the decision of whether to provide funding for new starts each fiscal year. After three consecutive fiscal years with no new starts, the fiscal year 2014 Act allowed the Corps to initiate a limited number of new studies and new construction projects. Unfortunately, the Administration's mismanagement of the fiscal year 2014 authority leaves this Committee hesitant to provide similar authority in fiscal year 2015. Specifically, the fiscal year 2014 Act allowed for up to three new study starts where the benefits were primarily for environmental restoration. The Administration chose to combine two studies that had been proposed in the fiscal year 2014 budget request into one reconnaissance study and select two additional studies to initiate. The Administration's gaming of the

statutory limit on new starts was made very clear with the submission of the fiscal year 2015 budget request, which split the combined reconnaissance study into two studies once again. A substantive argument for combining the two studies may have been persuasive had the studies remained combined or if the Administration had chosen only one other study to initiate. As circumstances stand, however, the Committee has no choice but to believe the Administration's actions were nothing more than an effort to contravene clear congressional intent. Additionally, the fiscal year 2014 Act required the Corps to submit an out-year funding scenario to demonstrate the affordability of the new construction starts selected and the impact these selections would have on other ongoing construction projects. Ten weeks after announcing the new starts selected, the Administration submitted an analysis that fell far short of what was required.

Fiscal Year 2015.—The budget request includes funding for ten new study starts, even as the Investigations account is reduced by 36 percent from fiscal year 2014. The request also includes one new construction start, even as the Construction account is reduced by 32 percent from fiscal year 2014. This proposed project has an estimated federal cost in excess of $2,200,000,000, yet the Administration provided no analysis to demonstrate its affordability, especially in context of a Construction program proposed at only $1,125,000,000 for work across the entire country. In light of the Administration's mismanagement of the fiscal year 2014 new start authority and the lack of information to support the proposed new starts, the Committee recommends no new starts in any account in fiscal year 2015. The Corps is directed to prioritize ongoing studies and projects in an effort to complete them. The Administration should be aware that the Committee will remain disinclined to fund any new construction starts in the future without a clear understanding of the affordability of the proposed projects and the impacts to the schedule and cost of other projects in the construction program. This information will be necessary prior to allowing new starts, rather than after as in fiscal year 2014.

FIVE-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Comprehensive planning provides important information for more than just the evaluation of new starts. Historically, the Committee has encouraged the Administration to provide five-year investment plans for all the agencies within the Energy and Water Development jurisdiction. The five-year plan should be based on realistic assumptions of project funding needs. It is the Committee's expectation that once projects have been initiated, the Administration will request responsible annual funding levels for them through completion.

The executive branch has traditionally been unwilling to project five-year horizons for projects it has not previously supported through the budget process. Comprehensive planning is important for understanding future requirements of projects that have been supported through the budget process, as well. While this unwillingness to have a dialogue regarding additional investment might be reasonable under circumstances where there is no likelihood of additional investment, the Congress consistently has supported additional investment in the nation's water resource infrastructure.

The uncertainty caused by year-to-year federal planning leaves too many non-federal sponsors unable to make informed decisions regarding local funding.

It would be beneficial for the Congress, the Administration, and project partners to have a comprehensive plan to outline requirements for all projects that have received an appropriation to date or are proposed to begin receiving funding this year. The Committee continues to welcome a dialogue to reach a mutually-agreeable way to comprehensively plan for all initiated projects.

The Committee notes that last year the Corps was directed to prepare a comprehensive estimate of the optimum timeline and funding requirements to complete each of the ongoing projects that received construction funding in any of fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013, but were not slated by the Administration for construction funding in the fiscal year 2014 budget request. This report was to have been submitted not later than 90 days after enactment of the fiscal year 2014 Act. As of the writing of this report, the Committee still has not received this information.

FORMAT OF FUNDING PRIORITIES

Traditionally, the President requested and the Congress appropriated funds for the Civil Works program on a project-level basis. Taken together, however, these funding decisions indicated programmatic priorities and policy preferences. As with non-project-based programs, the Congress at times disagreed with the priorities stated in the President's budget request and made its priorities known in appropriations bills. Final federal government priorities were established in Acts passed by both chambers of the Congress and signed by the President.

On January 5, 2011, the House of Representatives voted to prohibit congressional earmarks, as defined in House rule XXI. That definition encompasses project-level funding not requested by the President. Following that vote, the Committee reviewed the historical format of appropriations for the Corps to see if there was a more transparent way to highlight programmatic priorities without abandoning congressional oversight responsibilities. The fiscal year 2012 Act included a modification to the format used in previous years, and that format is continued for fiscal year 2015. As in previous years, the Committee lists in report tables the studies, projects, and activities within each account requested by the President along with the Committee-recommended funding level. To advance its programmatic priorities, the Committee has included additional funding for certain categories of projects. Project-specific allocations within these categories will be determined by the Corps based on further direction provided in this report.

The Committee notes that one argument frequently made against congressional earmarks is that these activities are political decisions that divert funding to parochial concerns and away from national priorities. This argument assumes that funding decisions made within the executive branch are inherently objective and devoid of political influence. This argument and underlying assumption once again are proven false by the budget request for the Corps of Engineers. The fiscal year 2015 budget request includes projects previously funded only through congressional earmarks that the executive branch had determined were inconsistent with

policy in the past. No identification or explanation of policy changes accompanies the budget request for these projects.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK

As mentioned above, the budget request is woefully inadequate for meeting the critical water resources infrastructure needs of this nation. Numerous continuing studies and construction projects will be suspended or slowed, leaving many communities vulnerable to floods and coastal storms longer than necessary and hindering economic growth and international competitiveness. Underfunding operation and maintenance of existing assets results in economic inefficiencies and risks infrastructure failure, which can cause substantial economic losses. For these reasons, the Committee provides a total of $916,599,000 above the budget request within the Investigations, Construction, Mississippi River and Tributaries, and Operation and Maintenance accounts for additional work that either was not included in the Administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. The executive branch retains complete discretion over project-specific allocation decisions within the additional funds provided.

A project or study shall be eligible for additional funding within the Investigations, Construction, and Mississippi River and Tributaries accounts if: (1) it has received funding, other than through a reprogramming, in at least one of the previous three fiscal years; or (2) it was previously funded and could reach a significant milestone or produce significant outputs in fiscal year 2015. None of the additional funding in any account may be used for any item where funding was specifically denied; to initiate new studies, projects, programs, or activities; to alter any existing cost-share requirement; or for projects in the Continuing Authorities Program.

Funding associated with each category may be allocated to any eligible study or project, as appropriate, within that category; funding associated with each subcategory may be allocated only to eligible studies or projects, as appropriate, within that subcategory. The list of subcategories is not meant to be exhaustive.

Transparency in the Work Plan Development Process.—The Administration's compliance—or more accurately, lack of compliance—with congressional direction regarding work plans in previous fiscal years is troubling. Specifically, in fiscal year 2014, the only component of the work plan the Administration submitted on time was the list of projects with funding allocations. Three weeks later, the Administration submitted a list of general factors and management controls considered when making allocation decisions, but this list clearly was not responsive to congressional direction to develop ratings systems for use in allocating additional funding to specific projects. As of the writing of this report, the Committee is still waiting for the remaining components of the fiscal year 2014 work plan, including a summary of the work to be accomplished with each funding allocation and the information on eligible projects that were not funded. The order in which information has been submitted suggests that the Administration made project-specific funding decisions and only then half-heartedly attempted to justify those decisions. Under a truly transparent and performance-based process, the order of events would be reversed—the necessary analytical tools would be developed first and then projects

would be evaluated using those tools in order to arrive at project-specific funding allocations.

The Committee expects considerable improvement in the quality and detail of information provided in fiscal year 2015 regarding the allocation of these additional funds. To assist the Administration in improving the transparency of the process, the Committee reiterates its direction to the Corps to develop ratings systems for use in evaluating projects for allocation of the additional funding provided in this Act. These evaluation systems may be, but are not required to be, individualized for each account or for each category of projects to be funded. The Corps retains complete control over the methodology of these ratings systems, but shall consider giving priority to the factors discussed under the heading "Additional Funding for Ongoing Work" within each relevant account. Each study or project eligible to receive additional funds shall be evaluated under the applicable ratings system; a study or project may not be excluded from evaluation under these ratings systems for being "inconsistent with Administration policy."

Work Plan.—The fiscal year 2015 work plan shall be submitted in two phases. First, not later than 21 days after enactment of this Act, the Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed description of the ratings system(s) developed and used to evaluate studies and projects within each account, including the weighting given to each factor or criterion if multiple factors or criteria are used. This phase shall not include any results of project-specific evaluations, but only information on the methodology of the ratings system(s). To ensure compliance with this directive in fiscal year 2015, the Corps shall not allocate additional funds to any study or project nor issue a work allowance for any study or project receiving funding under this Act until the Committees provide written acknowledgement of the Corps' compliance with this directive. To be clear, the Committee shall not attempt to reject, approve, or modify the ratings system(s) submitted, but rather simply shall indicate that the Corps has provided a sufficiently-detailed description to represent a transparent allocation process.

Second, not earlier than 21 days and not later than 60 days after the Committees provide written acknowledgement of receipt of phase one of the work plan, the Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate phase two of the work plan, including the following information:

(1) Delineation of how these funds are to be allocated;

(2) A summary of the work to be accomplished with each allocation, including phase of work, as appropriate;

(3) The results of each project-specific evaluation under the rating system(s); and

(4) A list of all studies and projects that were considered eligible for funding but did not receive funding, including:

a. an explanation of whether each study or project could have used funds in fiscal year 2015,

b. whether the study or project was rated as highly or more highly than other studies or projects that did receive funding, and

c. the specific reasons each study or project was considered as being less competitive for an allocation of funds.

For any study or project excluded from funding for being "inconsistent with administration policy," the work plan shall include a detailed explanation of why such study or project is inconsistent with administration policy.

Full Allocation of Funds.—The Committee has provided additional funding in amounts consistent with estimates of additional capability for fiscal year 2015 that were provided by the Corps. As such, the Committee expects the Corps to allocate in the work plan all additional funds provided. If during development of the work plan, however, the Corps determines that capability estimates have changed such that not all funding can be obligated within the fiscal year, the Corps is directed to review capability estimates at least every other month and to allocate funds to studies and projects in accordance with the same general process as the initial work plan. The Corps shall not hold back funds for later allocation if there are any studies or projects that, during development of the initial work plan, are expected to be able to obligate the funds within the fiscal year.

ASIAN CARP

The Committee remains concerned by the threat of aquatic nuisance species to the nation's water bodies and recognizes the critical role of the Army Corps of Engineers in preventing, controlling, and managing the threat of Asian carp. The Committee notes that the Corps cooperates with other federal, state, and local government agencies through the Asian Carp Regional Coordinating Committee to execute a comprehensive strategy to deal with Asian carp. The Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 included permanent authority for the Corps to implement certain actions to prevent aquatic nuisance species from dispersing into the Great Lakes by way of any hydrologic connection between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River Basin. Therefore, the recommendation does not include the annual provision included in previous years.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION AND REPROGRAMMING

To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2015 is consistent with congressional direction, to minimize the movement of funds, and to improve overall budget execution, the bill carries a legislative provision outlining the circumstances under which the Corps of Engineers may reprogram funds.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $5,492,499,000 for the Corps of Engineers, $25,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $959,499,000 above the budget request. The recommendation does not include the rescission of $28,000,000 of prior-year appropriations proposed in the budget request.

A table summarizing the fiscal year 2014 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2015 budget request, and the Committee-recommended levels is provided below:

(Dollars in thousands)

Account	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 request	Cmte. rec.
Investigations	$125,000	$80,000	$115,000
Construction	1,656,000	1,125,000	1,704,499
Mississippi River and tributaries	307,000	245,000	260,000
Operation and maintenance	2,861,000	2,600,000	2,905,000
Regulatory program	200,000	200,000	200,000
FUSRAP	103,499	100,000	100,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	28,000	28,000	28,000
Expenses	182,000	178,000	178,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works	5,000	5,000	2,000
TOTAL, Program Level	5,467,499	4,561,000	5,492,499
Rescission	– – –	−28,000	– – –
NET APPROPRIATION, Corps of Engineers—Civil	5,467,499	4,533,000	5,492,499

INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 2014	$125,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	80,000,000
Recommended, 2015	115,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+35,000,000

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; preconstruction engineering and design; data collection; interagency coordination; and research.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $115,000,000, $10,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $35,000,000 above the budget request.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
ALASKA						
ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK	---	50	---	---	50	---
CRAIG HARBOR, AK	---	300	---	---	300	---
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	---	---	300	---	---	300
ARIZONA						
LITTLE COLORADO RIVER (WINSLOW), AZ	---	751	---	---	751	---
LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	---	200	---	---	200	---
ARKANSAS						
WHITE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE - LOWER CACHE, AR	---	150	---	---	150	---
CALIFORNIA						
ALISO CREEK, CA	---	717	---	---	717	---
ARROYO SECO, CA	---	450	---	---	450	---
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA	---	---	675	---	---	675
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	---	449	---	---	449	---
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	---	---	230	---	---	230
COYOTE VALLEY DAM RESTORATION, CA	---	200	---	---	---	---
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) RESTORATION, CA	---	200	---	---	---	---
N CA STREAMS, LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND & VIC, CA	---	800	---	---	800	---
PORT OF LONG BEACH NAV IMP, CA	---	200	---	---	200	---
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	579	---	---	579	---
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	---	500	---	---	500	---
SALTON SEA RESTORATION, CA	200	---	---	---	---	---
SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA	---	900	---	---	900	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
ALASKA						
ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK	---	50	---	---	50	---
CRAIG HARBOR, AK	---	300	---	---	300	---
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	---	---	300	---	---	300
ARIZONA						
LITTLE COLORADO RIVER (WINSLOW), AZ	---	751	---	---	751	---
LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	---	200	---	---	200	---
ARKANSAS						
WHITE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE - LOWER CACHE, AR	---	150	---	---	150	---
CALIFORNIA						
ALISO CREEK, CA	---	717	---	---	717	---
ARROYO SECO, CA	---	450	---	---	450	---
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA	---	---	675	---	---	675
CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	---	449	---	---	449	---
COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	---	---	230	---	---	230
COYOTE VALLEY DAM RESTORATION, CA	---	200	---	---	---	---
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) RESTORATION, CA	---	200	---	---	---	---
N CA STREAMS, LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND & VIC, CA	---	800	---	---	800	---
PORT OF LONG BEACH NAV IMP, CA	---	200	---	---	200	---
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	579	---	---	579	---
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	---	500	---	---	500	---
SALTON SEA RESTORATION, CA	200	---	---	---	---	---
SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA	---	900	---	---	900	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
WESTMINSTER (EAST GARDEN GROVE) WATERSHED, CA	---	452	---	---	452	---
YUBA RIVER FISH PASSAGE, CA (ENGLEBRIGHT & DAGUERRE POINT DAMS)		200	---	---	---	---
COLORADO						
ADAMS AND DENVER COUNTIES, CO	---	500	---	---	500	---
CONNECTICUT						
FAIRFIELD AND NEW HAVEN COUNTIES (FLOODING), CT	100	---	---	---	---	---
NEW HAVEN HARBOR DEEPENING, CT	100	---	---	---	---	---
FLORIDA						
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	---	---	3,150	---	---	3,150
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	100	---	---	---	---	---
GEORGIA						
SATILLA RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, GA	---	200	---	---	200	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	---	1,520	---	---	---
HAWAII						
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	---	120	---	---	120	---
HILO HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HI	---	469	---	---	469	---
WAIAKEA-PALAI, HI	---	153	---	---	153	---
WEST MAUI WATERSHED, MAUI, HI	---	1,040	---	---	1,040	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
IDAHO						
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	---	1,000	---	---	1,000	---
ILLINOIS						
DU PAGE RIVER, IL	150	---	---	---	---	---
ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	---	400	---	---	400	---
INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES-MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES, IL, IN, OH & WI	---	500	---	---	500	---
KENTUCKY						
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS 1-4 DISP, KY	100	---	---	---	---	---
LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	---	---	1,100	---	---	1,100
LOUISIANA						
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYS REST- MISS. RIVER HYDRO, LA	---	2,500	---	---	2,500	---
MARYLAND						
ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD	---	250	---	---	250	---
ANACOSTIA WATERSHED RESTORATION, PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MD	---	250	---	---	250	---
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	---	600	---	---	600	---
CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD, PA & VA	---	100	---	---	---	---
MASSACHUSETTS						
BOSTON HARBOR DEEP DRAFT INVESTIGATION, MA	---	---	1,800	---	---	1,800

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
MINNESOTA						
MINNESOTA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MN & SD (MINNESOTA RIVER AUTHORITY)	---	600	---	---	600	---
MISSOURI						
MISSOURI RIVER DEGRADATION, MO	---	593	---	---	593	---
MONTANA						
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	---	295	---	---	295	---
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH & VT	---	23	---	---	23	---
MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	---	700	---	---	700	---
NEW JERSEY						
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	---	52	---	---	52	---
NEW MEXICO						
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	---	300	---	---	300	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM	---	276	---	---	276	---
RIO GRANDE BASIN WATERSHED, NM, CO & TX	---	300	---	---	300	---
NEW YORK						
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	---	202	---	---	202	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
NORTH CAROLINA						
WILMINGTON HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, NC	---	298	---	---	298	---
NORTH DAKOTA						
JAMES RIVER, ND	---	400	---	---	400	---
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, ND, MN, SD & MANITOBA, CANADA	---	600	---	---	600	---
OHIO						
SHORT CREEK AND WHEELING CREEK, OH	150	---	---	---	---	---
OREGON						
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	---	283	---	---	283	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	---	---	550	---	---	550
PENNSYLVANIA						
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	100	---	---	---	---	---
DELAWARE RIVER DREDGE MATERIAL UTILIZATION, PA	---	200	---	---	200	---
PUERTO RICO						
SAN JUAN HARBOR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT STUDY, PR	100	---	---	---	---	---
SOUTH CAROLINA						
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	---	695	---	---	695	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
TEXAS						
COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY, TX	---	200	---	---	200	---
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	---	---	1,200	---	---	1,200
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	---	200	---	---	200	---
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	---	300	---	---	300	---
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	---	583	---	---	583	---
SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	---	600	---	---	600	---
SULPHUR RIVER BASIN REALLOCATION, TX	---	500	---	---	500	---
VIRGINIA						
LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	---	---	600	---	---	600
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (DEEPENING)	---	700	---	---	700	---
WASHINGTON						
PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	---	500	---	---	500	---
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	---	200	---	---	200	---
SKAGIT R, WA/SKAGIT CO, WA	---	250	---	---	250	---
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	---	550	---	---	550	---
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	1,100	25,580	11,125	---	24,880	9,605
REMAINING ITEMS						
FISCAL YEAR 2014 NEW STARTS (ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION)	---	---	---	---	600	---
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK						
FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION	---	---	---	---	5,720	---
FLOOD CONTROL	---	---	---	---	8,000	---
SHORE PROTECTION	---	---	---	---	4,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
NAVIGATION	---	---	---	---	5,000	---
COASTAL AND DEEP-DRAFT	---	---	---	---	4,000	---
INLAND	---	---	---	---	4,000	---
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE	---	---	---	---	1,500	---
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES	---	---	---	---	2,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE	---	---	---	---	2,500	---
REMOTE, COASTAL, OR SMALL WATERSHED	---	---	---	---	1,500	---
COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES						
ACCESS TO WATER DATA	---	750	---	---	750	---
COMMITTEE ON MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	100	---	---	100	---
OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS						
CALFED	---	100	---	---	100	---
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM	---	75	---	---	75	---
COORDINATION WITH OTHER WATER RESOURCE AGENCIES	---	398	---	---	398	---
GULF OF MEXICO	---	100	---	---	100	---
INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	---	400	---	---	400	---
INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	---	721	---	---	721	---
INVENTORY OF DAMS	---	400	---	---	400	---
LAKE TAHOE	---	100	---	---	100	---
PACIFIC NW FOREST CASE	---	10	---	---	10	---
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS	---	1,350	---	---	1,350	---
FERC LICENSING	---	200	---	---	200	---
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	---	3,500	---	---	3,500	---
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA						
AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD	---	251	---	---	251	---
COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	---	1,000	---	---	1,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	---	75	---	---	75	---
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	---	220	---	---	220	---
FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	8,000	---	---	8,000	---
HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	243	---	---	243	---
INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	---	150	---	---	150	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED	RECON	FEASIBILITY	PED
PRECIPITATION STUDIES	---	225	---	---	225	---
REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	---	75	---	---	75	---
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	47	---	---	47	---
STREAM GAGING	---	550	---	---	550	---
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	385	---	---	385	---
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	12,270	---	---	12,270	---
OTHER - MISCELLANEOUS						
NATIONAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	---	5,000	---	---	5,000	---
NATIONAL SHORELINE	---	400	---	---	400	---
PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM	---	3,100	---	---	3,100	---
TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	---	1,500	---	---	1,500	---
WATER RESOURCES PRIORITIES STUDY	---	500	---	---	---	---
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	---	42,195	---	---	80,515	---
TOTAL, INVESTIGATIONS	1,100	67,775	11,125	---	105,395	9,605

Savannah Harbor Expansion, Georgia.—The Committee notes that funding for Savannah Harbor Expansion, GA, is provided in the Construction account, as in previous years.

Passaic River Main Stem, New Jersey.—The Committee is very concerned with the Corps' management of the Passaic River Main Stem study to date. This region experienced significant flooding from Hurricane Irene in 2011. In fact, the President and other Administration officials traveled to the area to promise federal assistance. Yet progress on this study has been hampered by a breakdown in coordination among the three levels of the organization (district, division, and headquarters), even though coordination is one of the three tenets of the Corps' new 3x3x3 planning framework. The Committee directs the Corps to be prepared to brief the Committee not later than 14 days after enactment of this Act on a detailed plan and schedule for this study.

Fiscal Year 2014 New Starts.—As explained in the Title I front matter, the budget request includes funding for four environmental restoration studies initiated in fiscal year 2014 even though only three new starts were authorized. The recommendation does not include funding for any of these four studies individually, but rather includes a line item under "Remaining Items" with funding to be allocated to three of these studies. The Corps retains complete discretion over which three studies to continue funding. The Administration shall not combine studies or in any other way attempt to continue funding in fiscal year 2015 for all four studies included in the budget request. No further work shall be done on the fourth study until such future time as it is selected as a new start.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Corps shall allocate the additional funding provided in this account in accordance with only the direction provided here and in the Title I front matter of this report. While this additional funding is shown in the feasibility column, the Corps should use these funds in recon, feasibility, and PED, as applicable. When developing the rating system(s) for use in allocating additional funds under this account, the Corps shall consider giving priority to completing or accelerating ongoing studies that: (1) will enhance the nation's economic development, job growth, and international competitiveness; (2) are for projects located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters; or (3) are for projects to address legal requirements. The executive branch retains complete discretion over methodology of the ratings system(s) and project-specific allocation decisions within the additional funds provided.

Research and Development.—The Committee continues to support the Corps' efforts to significantly improve the safety, efficiency, reliability, and cost of performing inspections of critical and aging infrastructure. The Committee is aware that innovative and technologically advanced methods of inspection that would assist in performing this vital mission, such as non-destructive testing (NDT) and non-destructive evaluation (NDE) techniques for the inspection of trunnion rods on dams, are being developed collaboratively by the Corps and the private sector. In order to accelerate the delivery and deployment of innovative technologies for infrastructure inspection, the Committee urges the Corps to prioritize funding for the validation of proven, high-payoff, innovative practices and technologies at the national level.

Water Resources Priorities Study.—No funding is included for this new item.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 2014	$1,656,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,125,000,000
Recommended, 2015	1,704,499,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+48,499,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+579,499,000

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 Fund and the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,704,499,000, $48,499,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $579,499,000 above the budget request.

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
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA	92,600	92,600
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA	1,200	1,200
HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	1,300	1,300
HAMILTON CITY, CA	3,800	3,800
ISABELLA LAKE, CA (DAM SAFETY)	8,000	8,000
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	1,000	1,000
OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	6,000	6,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	1,000	1,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	30,826	30,826
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	4,000	4,000
FLORIDA		
HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	75,000	75,000
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	65,551	65,551
GEORGIA		
LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA	80	80
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	850	850
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	1,520
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	200	200
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	9,810	9,810
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	29,000	29,000
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	18,500	18,500
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	3,800	3,800
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	160,000	160,000
UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	33,170	33,170
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, DEFICIENCY CORRECTION, IL	8,650	8,650
IOWA		
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD	48,771	48,771
KENTUCKY		
ROUGH RIVER, MAJOR REHAB, KY (DAM SAFETY)	25,000	25,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
LOUISIANA		
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	9,800	9,800
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	10,000	---
MARYLAND		
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	900	900
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	5,000	5,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	15,100	15,100
MASSACHUSETTS		
MUDDY RIVER, MA	1,798	1,798
MISSOURI		
KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS	1,600	1,600
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	50	50
MONARCH - CHESTERFIELD, MO	915	915
NEW JERSEY		
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	35,000	35,000
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	11,000	11,000
NEW YORK		
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	22,000	22,000
OHIO		
BOLIVAR DAM, OH (DAM SAFETY)	12,300	12,300
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	5,730	5,730
DOVER DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY)	2,800	2,800
OKLAHOMA		
CANTON LAKE, OK	18,000	18,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	16,333	16,333

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
OREGON		
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	1,000	1,000
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,400	1,400
PENNSYLVANIA		
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	64,800	64,800
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	9,032	9,032
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	1,000	1,000
PUERTO RICO		
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	3,000	3,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	1,572	1,572
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	53,400	53,400
TEXAS		
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	1,800	1,800
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	18,993	18,993
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	4,672	4,672
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN (WHARTON/ONION), TX	3,625	3,625
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	4,825	4,825
VIRGINIA		
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	300	300
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	69,000	69,000
COLUMBIA RIVER ACCORDS, PACIFIC LAMPREY PASSAGE, WA	2,000	2,000
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	2,160	2,160
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	22,000	22,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
WISCONSIN		
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	127	127
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	1,061,140	1,052,660
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK		
FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION	---	117,679
FLOOD CONTROL	---	140,000
SHORE PROTECTION	---	41,000
NAVIGATION	---	85,500
INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND PROJECTS	---	112,000
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES	---	22,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION OR COMPLIANCE	---	15,000
HYDROPOWER PROJECTS	---	8,000
CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	3,000	8,000
BENEFICIAL USES DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	2,000	7,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)	---	5,000
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	2,000	20,000
MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111)	---	1,300
NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107)	---	3,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135)	3,000	10,500
SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103)	---	2,000
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	34,000	34,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	19,000	19,000
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE	60	60
INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE	800	800
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	63,860	651,839
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	1,125,000	1,704,499

Savannah Harbor Expansion, Georgia.—The budget request for this item that was proposed in the Investigations account has been moved to this account where it has been funded since it received a new construction start in fiscal year 2009. As such, the Corps is directed to consider the project an ongoing construction project. Additionally, in light of the project's inclusion in the recently enacted WRRDA and the fact that the non-federal sponsor has significant funding available to begin work on its project responsibilities, the Committee anticipates the Corps will execute a project partnership agreement with the non-federal sponsor before the end of fiscal year 2014. If an agreement has not been signed by the date of enactment of this Act, the Corps shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 14 days after enactment of this Act regarding the specific reasons for the delay, as well as a schedule for executing the agreement. Thereafter, the Corps shall provide weekly updates until such time as the agreement is executed.

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Corps shall allocate the additional funding provided in this account in accordance with only the direction provided here and in the Title I front matter of this report. Of the additional funds provided in this account, the Corps shall allocate not less than $12,450,000 to projects with riverfront development components. Of the additional funds provided in this account for flood and storm damage reduction and flood control, the Corps shall allocate not less than $18,000,000 to additional nonstructural flood control projects. When developing the rating system(s) for use in allocating additional funds under this account, the Corps shall consider the following:

(1) benefits of the funded work to the national economy;

(2) extent to which the work will enhance national, regional, or local economic development;

(3) number of jobs created directly by the funded activity;

(4) ability to obligate the funds allocated within the fiscal year, including consideration of the ability of the non-federal sponsor to provide any required cost-share;

(5) ability to complete the project, separable element, project phase, or useful increment of work with the funds allocated;

(6) for flood and storm damage reduction projects,

—the population, economic activity, or public infrastructure at risk, as appropriate; and

—the severity of risk of flooding or the frequency with which an area has experienced flooding;

(7) for navigation projects, the number of jobs or level of economic activity to be supported by completion of the project, separable element, project phase, or useful increment of work; and

(8) for Inland Waterways Trust Fund projects, the economic impact on the local, regional, and national economy if the project is not funded, as well as useful increments of work that can be completed within the funding provided in this line item.

The executive branch retains complete discretion over methodology of the ratings system(s) and project-specific allocation decisions within the additional funds provided.

Continuing Authorities Program (CAP).—The Committee continues to support all sections of the Continuing Authorities Pro-

gram. Funding is provided for eight CAP sections at a total of $56,800,000, an increase of $46,800,000 above the budget request, which proposed funding for only five sections. This program provides a useful tool for the Corps to undertake small localized projects without the lengthy study and authorization process typical of most larger Corps projects. The management of the Continuing Authorities Program should continue consistent with direction provided in fiscal year 2014. This direction is restated here for convenience.

For each CAP section, available funds shall be allocated utilizing this sequence of steps until the funds are exhausted:

—capability-level funds for ongoing projects that have executed cost-sharing agreements for the applicable phase;

—capability-level funds for projects that are ready for execution of new cost-sharing agreements for the applicable phase and for which Corps headquarters authorizes execution of the agreements;

—funds, as permitted by Corps policies, for other projects previously funded for the applicable phase but not ready for execution of new cost-sharing agreements; and

—funds as permitted by Corps policies, for projects not previously funded for the applicable phase.

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

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

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

In order to provide a mix of studies, design, and construction within each CAP section, the Corps is directed to divide the funding generally 80/20 between the Design and Implementation and the Feasibility phases within each authority. The Chief of Engineers shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act detailing how funds will be distributed to the individual items in the various CAP sections for the fiscal year. The Chief shall also provide an annual report at the end of each fiscal year detailing the progress made on the backlog of projects. The report should include the completions and terminations as well as progress of ongoing work.

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriation, 2014	$307,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	245,000,000
Recommended, 2015	260,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−47,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+15,000,000

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 $260,000,000, $47,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $15,000,000 above the budget request.

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

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

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	384	384
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	544	544
YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	731	731
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	200	200
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	4,296	4,296
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	80	80
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	1,642	1,642
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	234,291	215,491
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK		
DREDGING	---	8,000
FLOOD CONTROL	---	25,800
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA (INVESTIGATIONS)	9,646	9,646
MAPPING (MAINTENANCE)	1,063	1,063
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	10,709	44,509
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	245,000	260,000

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Corps shall allocate the additional funding provided in this account in accordance with only the direction provided here and in the Title I front matter of this report. While this additional funding is shown under remaining items, the Corps should use these funds in investigations, construction, and operation and maintenance, as applicable. When developing the rating system(s) for use in allocating additional funds under this account, the Corps shall consider giving priority to completing or accelerating ongoing work that (1) will enhance the region and nation's economic development, job growth, and international competitiveness; or (2) is for projects located in areas that have suffered recent natural disasters. The executive branch retains complete discretion over methodology of the ratings system(s) and project-specific allocation decisions within the additional funds provided.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 2014	$2,861,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	2,600,000,000
Recommended, 2015	2,905,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+44,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+305,000,000

This appropriation funds operation, maintenance, and related activities at water resource projects the Corps 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 $2,905,000,000, $44,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $305,000,000 above 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	189	189
ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	13,443	13,443
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	21,661	21,661
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	5,493	5,493
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	26,633	26,633
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	148	148
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL & MS	1,700	1,700
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	24,191	24,191
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	8,101	8,101
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL	30	30
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	11,001	11,001
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	3,555	3,555
COOK INLET SHOALS, AK	2,616	2,616
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	1,140	1,140
HOMER HARBOR, AK	520	520
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	167	167
LOWELL CREEK TUNNELL (SEWARD) AK	300	300
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	319	319
NOME HARBOR, AK	1,451	1,451
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	921	921
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,859	1,859
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	105	105
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,280	1,280
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	48	48
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	405	405
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	8,000	8,000
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	7,558	7,558
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,927	1,927
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	7,523	7,523
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	9,162	9,162
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	5,652	5,652
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,912	1,912

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,631	1,631
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,509	1,509
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	7,272	7,272
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	539	539
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	27,553	27,553
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	2,691	2,691
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	5,639	5,639
NIMROD LAKE, AR	2,163	2,163
NORFORK LAKE, AR	6,137	6,137
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	15	15
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	9,234	9,234
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,376	6,376
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	3	3
WHITE RIVER, AR	31	31
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	3	3
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	2,233	2,233
BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,976	1,976
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	5,249	5,249
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,106	3,106
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	5,085	5,085
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	558	558
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,059	2,059
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	1,800	1,800
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CA	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	4,329	4,329
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,560	1,560
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	7,740	7,740
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	5,884	5,884
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	394	394
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	383	383
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,060	2,060
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,639	2,639
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	2,255	2,255
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	21,970	21,970
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,700	1,700
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	3,259	3,259
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,647	1,647
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	1,900	1,900
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	7,900	7,900
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,300	1,300
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,394	1,394

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	200	200
SAN FRANCISCO BAY DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,187	1,187
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	275	275
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	3,360	3,360
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,900	1,900
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	4,952	4,952
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	2,400	2,400
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,942	3,942
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	2,380	2,380
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,538	1,538
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,272	2,272
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,400	2,400
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA (DAM SAFETY)	2,143	2,143
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	3,354	3,354
YUBA RIVER, CA	3,178	3,178
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	696	696
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,475	1,475
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,036	1,036
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CO	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	441	441
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	3,057	3,057
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	646	646
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,762	1,762
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	548	548
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	675	675
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	431	431
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	1,158	1,158
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CT	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	334	334
LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT	329	329
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	771	771
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	476	476
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	850	850
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	1,066	1,066
THOMASTON DAM, CT	820	820
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	647	647

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
DELAWARE		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DE	40	40
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	22,355	22,355
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	200	200
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,690	3,690
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	125	125
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	875	875
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	25	25
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	25	25
FLORIDA		
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	6,505	6,505
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	15,112	15,112
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL & AL	130	130
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	1,300	1,300
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	600	600
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	6,450	6,450
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	7,615	7,615
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,645	2,645
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	100	100
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	2,159	2,159
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	3,300	3,300
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	2,084	2,084
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	500	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	1,306	1,306
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,200	3,200
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	33	33
SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	9,031	9,031
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	10,000	10,000
WATER / ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	100	100
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	7,927	7,927
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	2,541	2,541
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	176	176
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,862	3,862
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	9,547	9,547
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	8,593	8,593
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	11,052	11,052

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	277	277
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	13,477	13,477
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	125	125
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	8,759	8,759
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	16,420	16,420
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	109	109
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	7,823	7,823
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	1,412	1,412
HILO HARBOR, HI	1,900	1,900
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	2,200	2,200
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	677	677
KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	2,200	2,200
NAWILIWILI HARBOR, HI	1,500	1,500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	861	861
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,160	1,160
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,732	2,732
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	355	355
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	2,618	2,618
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	578	578
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	2,523	2,523
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	5,680	5,680
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,675	2,675
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	560	560
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	370	370
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	39,389	39,389
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,826	1,826
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL	50	50
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	2,347	2,347
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,988	1,988
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	775	775
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,658	5,658
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION), IL	52,900	52,900
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION), IL	25,624	25,624
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	106	106

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
REND LAKE, IL	6,072	6,072
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	702	702
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	1,370	1,370
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,189	1,189
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	1,127	1,127
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	1,392	1,392
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	13,814	13,814
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	967	967
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	1,142	1,142
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,279	1,279
MONROE LAKE, IN	1,395	1,395
PATOKA LAKE, IN	1,168	1,168
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	185	185
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	1,129	1,129
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	139	139
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	4,084	4,084
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	695	695
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO & NE	10,624	10,624
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD	7,700	7,700
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	3,313	3,313
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	4,576	4,576
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	6,266	6,266
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,544	2,544
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,765	1,765
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	950	950
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	1,083	1,083
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,064	1,064
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	970	970
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	1,004	1,004
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,873	1,873
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,828	1,828
MARION LAKE, KS	1,997	1,997
MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,660	2,660
MILFORD LAKE, KS	2,174	2,174
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	3,653	3,653
PERRY LAKE, KS	2,394	2,394

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
POMONA LAKE, KS	2,155	2,155
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	312	312
TORONTO LAKE, KS	715	715
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,258	2,258
WILSON LAKE, KS	2,014	2,014
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	9,933	9,933
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,578	2,578
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,885	1,885
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,644	1,644
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,873	1,873
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,763	1,763
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	15	15
FALLS OF THE OHIO NATIONAL WILDLIFE, KY & IN	19	19
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	2,079	2,079
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,467	1,467
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	2,085	2,085
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,452	2,452
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	1,028	1,028
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	10	10
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	2,587	2,587
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	257	257
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,596	2,596
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	42,856	42,856
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	5,200	5,200
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,237	1,237
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	2	2
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	2,660	2,660
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,170	1,170
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	8,587	8,587
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,175	1,175
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA	7,759	7,759
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	131	131
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	1,277	1,277
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	1,119	1,119
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	23	23
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	25	25
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	15	15

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
BAYOU TECHE, LA	156	156
CADDO LAKE, LA	204	204
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	11,721	11,721
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,789	1,789
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	20,837	20,837
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	1,652	1,652
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	1,044	1,044
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,260	8,260
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	14	14
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	4	4
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,471	2,471
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,985	1,985
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LA	85,341	85,341
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	59	59
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	200	200
WALLACE LAKE, LA	217	217
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	16	16
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA	36	36
MAINE		
DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	1,050	1,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, ME	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	127	127
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,100	1,100
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	25	25
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	23,725	23,725
BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	325	325
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	156	156
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	140	140
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,870	1,870
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	450	450
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	62	62
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	1,500	1,500
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	1,110	1,110
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	851	851
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	752	752
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	15,574	15,574
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	632	632

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	265	265
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	698	698
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	702	702
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, MA	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	344	344
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	589	589
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	629	629
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA	564	564
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	900	900
TULLY LAKE, MA	673	673
WEST HILL DAM, MA	642	642
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	659	659
MICHIGAN		
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	179	179
DETROIT RIVER, MI	5,969	5,969
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	522	522
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	219	219
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	28	28
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	500	500
MONROE HARBOR, MI	1,000	1,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	710	710
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	3,001	3,001
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	50	50
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,561	1,561
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	39,860	39,860
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,733	2,733
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	278	278
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	5,600	5,600
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	461	461
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	657	657
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	259	259
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION), MN	54,472	54,472
ORWELL LAKE, MN	555	555
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	88	88
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	176	176
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,612	3,612
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	483	483

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	2,211	2,211
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	1	1
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	285	285
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	5,050	5,050
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	116	116
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	34	34
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,818	1,818
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	7,740	7,740
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	150	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	152	152
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	9	9
WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS	115	115
YAZOO RIVER, MS	21	21
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	12	12
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	7,187	7,187
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	3,316	3,316
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	9,311	9,311
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	1,410	1,410
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	916	916
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	930	930
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	27,146	27,146
NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MO	23	23
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,461	2,461
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	3	3
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	112	112
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,473	1,473
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	1	1
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	4,675	4,675
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR	9,609	9,609
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	6,098	6,098
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	185	185
LIBBY DAM, MT	1,975	1,975
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	230	230

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	9,185	9,185
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	26,398	26,398
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	466	466
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	79	79
PAPILLION CREEK, NE	863	863
SALT CREEKS AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	1,038	1,038
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	67	67
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	1,462	1,462
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	407	407
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	672	672
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	897	897
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	798	798
HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,370	1,370
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	84	84
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	878	878
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	250	250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	714	714
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	420	420
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	375	375
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	15	15
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	20,445	20,445
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NJ	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	355	355
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	370	370
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	260	260
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	300	300
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	617	617
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,844	1,844
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	100	100
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	40	40
SHARK RIVER, NJ	350	350

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	2,794	2,794
COCHITI LAKE, NM	3,587	3,587
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	2,794	2,794
GALISTEO DAM, NM	1,150	1,150
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NM	30	30
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	654	654
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	1,392	1,392
RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, NM	2,492	2,492
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	1,594	1,594
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	330	330
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	797	797
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	1,289	1,289
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	578	578
ARKPORT DAM, NY	502	502
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	4,050	4,050
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,686	1,686
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,290	1,290
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	300	300
EAST RIVER, NY	250	250
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	220	220
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	697	697
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	100	100
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	50	50
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	20	20
GREAT KILLS HARBOR, NY	30	30
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	50	50
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	5,200	5,200
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O & C)	2,500	2,500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NY	20	20
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	1,522	1,522
JAMAICA BAY, NY	220	220
MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	3,842	3,842
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	450	450
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	100	100
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	7,413	7,413
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	9,300	9,300
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	1,045	1,045
NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	10	10
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	2,140	2,140
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	60	60

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	786	786
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	610	610
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	905	905
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	2,600	2,600
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,856	1,856
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	483	483
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,909	1,909
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	264	264
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	800	800
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	50	50
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	4,855	4,855
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	700	700
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	550	550
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	300	300
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	3,293	3,293
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	14,127	14,127
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN HALEY, ND	302	302
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	12,703	12,703
HOMME LAKE, ND	351	351
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	339	339
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,290	1,290
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	1,076	1,076
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	106	106
SOURIS RIVER, ND	366	366
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	32	32
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	1,483	1,483
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	2,280	2,280
BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,091	2,091
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,967	1,967
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	1,494	1,494
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	7,634	7,634
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	1,553	1,553
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	2,259	2,259
DILLON LAKE, OH	1,387	1,387
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,215	1,215
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	659	659

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	51	51
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	985	985
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	906	906
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	8,514	8,514
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	298	298
OHIO-MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH	1,763	1,763
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,576	1,576
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	305	305
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	35	35
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,600	1,600
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	255	255
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	6,143	6,143
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	948	948
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	1,217	1,217
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	1,429	1,429
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	409	409
BIRCH LAKE, OK	778	778
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	3,275	3,275
CANTON LAKE, OK	2,199	2,199
COPAN LAKE, OK	4,542	4,542
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	5,761	5,761
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	6,066	6,066
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	896	896
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	340	340
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	673	673
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,828	1,828
HULAH LAKE, OK	734	734
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	141	141
KAW LAKE, OK	2,244	2,244
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	5,435	5,435
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,355	5,355
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,580	2,580
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	27	27
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	138	138
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,884	1,884
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK	6,090	6,090
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,039	1,039
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	1,100	1,100
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,680	1,680
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	4,865	4,865
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,173	1,173

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	5,023	5,023
WISTER LAKE, OK	1,133	1,133
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	972	972
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	5,770	5,770
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,493	7,493
CHETCO RIVER, OR	26	26
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	25,463	25,463
COOS BAY, OR	6,423	6,423
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	26	26
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	1,315	1,315
COUGAR LAKE, OR	2,590	2,590
DEPOE BAY, OR	7	7
DETROIT LAKE, OR	1,227	1,227
DORENA LAKE, OR	1,249	1,249
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	177	177
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	6,052	6,052
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,736	1,736
GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,299	2,299
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	5,249	5,249
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	592	592
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,234	5,234
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,729	1,729
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,237	3,237
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	7,569	7,569
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	365	365
ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	31	31
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	74	74
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	32	32
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	2,806	2,806
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	59	59
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	128	128
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	244	244
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	616	616
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	3,252	3,252
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	4,721	4,721
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	607	607
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	279	279
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,835	1,835
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,670	2,670

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,651	1,651
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,860	1,860
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,561	1,561
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	889	889
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	5,410	5,410
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,259	1,259
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	1,256	1,256
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	916	916
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	300	300
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, PA	5	5
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	1,222	1,222
JOHNSTOWN, PA	65	65
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,234	1,234
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,898	1,898
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,121	1,121
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	22,621	22,621
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	30,097	30,097
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	700	700
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	170	170
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	475	475
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	40	40
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,817	3,817
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	45	45
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,805	1,805
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	537	537
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	105	105
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,292	2,292
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,875	1,875
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	400	400
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	957	957
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	965	965
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,232	2,232
PUERTO RICO		
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	800	800
RHODE ISLAND		
FOX POINT BARRIER, NARRANGANSETT BAY, RI	3,956	3,956
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, RI	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	48	48
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	350	350
WOONSOCKET, RI	1,088	1,088

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	500	500
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	13,149	13,149
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,930	5,930
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	67	67
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	875	875
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	10,409	10,409
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	412	412
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	291	291
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	11,252	11,252
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	153	153
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	609	609
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	12,256	12,256
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	121	121
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,568	5,568
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	8,945	8,945
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	7,587	7,587
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	6,818	6,818
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	94	94
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,896	4,896
NORTHWEST TENNESSEE REGIONAL HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, TN	10	10
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	12,059	12,059
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	2	2
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	24,864	24,864
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	239	239
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	1,397	1,397
ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX	1,827	1,827
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,966	1,966
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,164	3,164
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,242	2,242
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	6,300	6,300
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,655	2,655
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,677	2,677
CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	200	200
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,900	6,900

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	11,224	11,224
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	40	40
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	3,432	3,432
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	10,600	10,600
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	8,900	8,900
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	2,700	2,700
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,002	2,002
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,476	2,476
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	25,761	25,761
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,433	1,433
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	31,840	31,840
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	1,878	1,878
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,957	1,957
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,729	1,729
LAKE KEMP, TX	260	260
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,046	3,046
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	4,339	4,339
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,000	8,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	2,621	2,621
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	2,242	2,242
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,169	1,169
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,393	1,393
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,319	2,319
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	300	300
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	2,097	2,097
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	11,500	11,500
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	9,235	9,235
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	278	278
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,893	2,893
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,656	2,656
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	350	350
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	4,975	4,975
WACO LAKE, TX	2,958	2,958
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	3,353	3,353
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	6,891	6,891
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	3,495	3,495
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	40	40
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	561	561

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN, VT	1,044	1,044
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	643	643
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	105	105
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	756	756
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	1,569	1,569
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	849	849
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	694	694
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	2,390	2,390
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	4,555	4,555
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	500	500
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,081	2,081
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR, VA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	1,540	1,540
HAMPTON ROADS, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	104	104
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, VA	15	15
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	335	335
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,696	3,696
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	10,685	10,685
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,996	1,996
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	200	200
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	10,990	10,990
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	608	608
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	6,442	6,442
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	1,186	1,186
RUDEE INLET, VA	300	300
WATER AND ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATIONS, VA	135	135
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	589	589
COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND, OR	47,040	47,040
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	1,199	1,199
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	4,115	4,115
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,192	1,192
GRAYS HARBOR, WA	10,256	10,256
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	3,520	3,520
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,989	4,989
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA	49	49
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	840	840
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	12,404	12,404
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,576	2,576

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	3,840	3,840
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,646	2,646
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	2,913	2,913
MOUNT SAINT HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	260	260
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	4,122	4,122
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	746	746
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,100	1,100
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,470	1,470
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	381	381
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	1,498	1,498
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	274	274
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	64	64
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	159	159
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	4,911	4,911
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,338	1,338
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	2,304	2,304
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,505	2,505
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	2,824	2,824
ELKINS, WV	57	57
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	438	438
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	9,035	9,035
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	31,759	31,759
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,895	2,895
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	2,322	2,322
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,270	1,270
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	2,547	2,547
SUTTON LAKE, WV	2,519	2,519
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,305	1,305
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	747	747
FOX RIVER, WI	2,972	2,972
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	2,881	2,881
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	55	55
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	10	10
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	2,110	2,110
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	304	304
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	21	21
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	556	556

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
WYOMING		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WY	10	10
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	67	67
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	2,007	2,007
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	90	90
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES	2,439,962	2,439,962
REMAINING ITEMS		
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK		
NAVIGATION MAINTENANCE	---	25,400
DEEP-DRAFT HARBOR AND CHANNEL	---	150,500
INLAND WATERWAYS	---	45,000
SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE NAVIGATION	---	42,500
OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES	---	40,000
AQUATIC NUISANCE CONTROL RESEARCH	675	675
ASSET MANAGEMENT/FACILITIES AND EQUIP MAINT (FEM)	3,250	3,250
BUDGET/MANAGEMENT SUPPORT FOR O&M BUSINESS PROGRAMS:		
STEWARDSHIP SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,000	1,000
PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	3,939	3,939
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,650	1,650
OPTIMIZATION TOOLS FOR NAVIGATION	322	322
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,700	2,700
COASTAL OCEAN DATA SYSTEM (CODS)	3,400	5,000
RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AT CORPS PROJECTS	5,000	5,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	6,000	6,000
DREDGE MCFARLAND READY RESERVE	11,690	11,690
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	15,000	15,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,119	1,119
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,450	6,450
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	2,820	2,820
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM	270	270
FACILITY PROTECTION	3,500	3,500
FISH & WILDLIFE OPERATING FISH HATCHERY REIMBURSEMENT	4,700	4,700
GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL	600	600
INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS	3,000	3,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	28,000	28,000
INTERAGENCY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TASK FORCE/HURRICANE PROTECTION DECISION-CHRONOLOGY (IPET/HPDC) LESSONS LEARNED IMPLEMENTATION	5,800	5,800
MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,300	2,300
NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL (MULTIPLE PROJECT) NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	6,800	6,800
NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM	6,072	6,072

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

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM (PORTFOLIO RISK ASSESSMENT)	10,000	10,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP)	4,500	4,500
NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATIONS	1,071	1,071
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT	281	281
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,669	4,669
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	795	795
RECREATIONONESTOP (R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION SERVICE	65	65
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,800	1,800
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB.	300	300
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS)	500	500
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	160,038	465,038
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	2,600,000	2,905,000

Additional Funding for Ongoing Work.—The Corps shall allocate the additional funding provided in this account in accordance with only the direction provided here and in the Title I front matter of this report. When developing the rating system(s) for use in allocating additional funds under this account, the Corps shall consider giving priority to the following:

(1) ability to complete ongoing work maintaining authorized depths and widths of harbors and shipping channels, including where contaminated sediments are present;

(2) ability to address critical maintenance backlog;

(3) presence of the U.S. Coast Guard;

(4) extent to which the work will enhance national, regional, or local economic development, including domestic manufacturing capacity;

(5) extent to which the work will promote job growth or international competitiveness;

(6) number of jobs created directly by the funded activity;

(7) ability to obligate the funds allocated within the fiscal year;

(8) ability to complete the project, separable element, project phase, or useful increment of work within the funds allocated;

(9) the risk of imminent failure or closure of the facility; and

(10) for harbor maintenance activities,

—total tonnage handled;

—total exports;

—total imports;

—dollar value of cargo handled;

—energy infrastructure and national security needs served;

—designation as strategic seaports;

—lack of alternative means of freight movement;

—savings over alternative means of freight movement.

The executive branch retains complete discretion over methodology of the ratings system(s) and project-specific allocation decisions within the additional funds provided.

Small, Remote, or Subsistence Navigation.—Concerns persist that the Administration's criteria for navigation maintenance do not allow small, remote, or subsistence harbors and waterways to properly compete for scarce navigation maintenance funds. The Committee directs the Corps to provide an update to the Committee on its previous request that the Corps review the criteria used for determining which navigation projects are funded in order to develop a reasonable and equitable allocation for small, remote, or subsistence harbors and waterways under this account.

Hopper Dredges.—The Water Resources Development Act of 1996 directed the Secretary to initiate a program to increase the use of private industry hopper dredges for the construction and maintenance of federal navigation channels and to develop and implement procedures to ensure that private industry hopper dredge capacity is available to meet both routine and time-sensitive dredging needs. The Committee notes that this "industry first" policy has worked well, with private industry increasing capacity by commissioning new hopper dredges and with the Corps instituting "raise the flag" procedures for time-sensitive situations. The Committee encourages the Corps to maintain the federal commitment to the

"industry first" policy, including by scheduling the federal hopper dredges in ready reserve status for only the number of routine testing days necessary to ensure the ability of the vessel to perform urgent and emergency work.

Lower Snake River Project.—The Committee is aware that the Walla Walla District and certain landowners adjacent to the project have been working together to resolve an issue regarding the use of Corps lands. The Committee encourages the Corps and the landowners to continue exploring all options, including potential land exchanges as necessary, to resolve this issue. The Committee directs the Corps to maintain the status quo use of these lands as long as good-faith efforts are being made to find resolution. The Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act an update on the status of the situation, including any actions taken or planned as well as any legislative authority that may be needed to resolve the situation.

Hydrilla.—Hydrilla is a submersed aquatic plant native to Asia that is now a serious nuisance plant in the United States. The Committee understands the challenges posed by the spread of hydrilla and supports ongoing work by the Corps to contain the spread of and treat the invasive species at existing Corps projects, including Walter F. George Lake in Alabama, Lake Seminole in Georgia, and the Tennessee Tombigbee Waterway in Mississippi.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2014	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	200,000,000
Recommended, 2015	200,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

This appropriation provides funds to administer laws pertaining to the 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 $200,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and the budget request.

In fiscal year 2014, the Committee raised two issues in which the Corps in recent years has changed its interpretation of Clean Water Act requirements. Congress rejected both new interpretations. Unfortunately, the Committee continues to hear concerns on these issues, including communications from the Corps expressing no intention to adhere to congressional direction. The Committee directs the Corps to ensure that all field offices adhere in all instances to the interpretations directed by the Congress. The fiscal year 2014 direction is repeated here for emphasis and clarity.

The Committee is aware of at least two recent instances in which local economic development organizations have applied for permits to prepare sites to attract new economic activity but the Corps has denied or otherwise frustrated those efforts. Although the local or-

ganizations have established precedent by providing several examples of where similar applications were approved, the Corps now claims its regulations require the identification of a specified end-user of a proposed development so it can review final design plans and other exact specifications of the proposed development in order to issue a permit. The Committee strongly rejects this new interpretation of Clean Water Act requirements. The Corps is not a local land-use planning agency, and the Clean Water Act provides neither the directive nor the authority for the Corps to assume such responsibilities. The Committee encourages the Corps to work with these permit applicants, and any others with similar applications, to reach a better balance between allowing desperately needed economic development while still safeguarding important environmental resources.

In 1977, Congress made a deliberate policy choice to exempt ordinary farming, silviculture, ranching, and mining related activities from the requirements to obtain Clean Water Act permits when undertaken as normal activities to prepare and maintain land, roads, ponds, or ditches. A "recapture provision" also was included to provide reasonable limits on the scope of these statutory exemptions, but not to nullify the exemptions. Concerns have been raised that in recent years the Corps has changed its interpretation of these provisions to significantly reduce the application of the statutory exemptions. The Corps is directed to ensure that the original balance intended by statute is implemented by all field offices.

Public Safety Projects.—The Committee continues to hear of public safety infrastructure projects that have been delayed due to excessive and repeated reviews. Many communities depend on these projects to protect residents from natural disasters. Considering the risk to life and other damages that these disasters inflict upon communities, it is in the public interest to have local governments mitigate for such harm. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Corps to keep in mind the public safety aspects of a project when considering permit applications and to pursue ways to shorten review times, including by performing reviews concurrently and eliminating duplicative reviews to the maximum extent practicable.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (FUSRAP)

Appropriation, 2014	$103,499,000
Budget estimate, 2015	100,000,000
Recommended, 2015	100,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−3,499,000
Budget estimate, 2015	− − −

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

The Congress transferred FUSRAP from the Department of Energy 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 the Department had not completed cleanup. The Committee did not transfer to the Corps ownership of and accountability for real property interests, which remain with the Department. The Committee expects the Department to continue to provide its institutional knowledge and

expertise to ensure the success of this program and to serve the nation and the affected communities.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $100,000,000, $3,499,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the request. The Committee continues to support the prioritization of sites, especially those that are nearing completion. Within the funds provided in accordance with the budget request, the Corps is directed to complete the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study of the former Sylvania nuclear fuel site at Hicksville, New York, and, as appropriate, to proceed expeditiously to a Record of Decision and initiation of any necessary remediation in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 2014	$28,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	28,000,000
Recommended, 2015	28,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

This appropriation funds planning, training, 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 Committee recommends $28,000,000 for this account, the same as fiscal year 2014 and the budget request.

EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2014	$182,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	178,000,000
Recommended, 2015	178,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	–4,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

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 $178,000,000, $4,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

Enactment of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA) provides the Corps with many new and amended authorities and directives for civil works projects, programs, and activities, including the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 (WIFIA). The Committee believes these new authorities will require specific appropriations prior to implementation, but has not had sufficient time to evaluate each provision for funding in fiscal year 2015. In the meantime, the Corps is directed to provide the Committee with notification prior to obligating funds for any provision not requiring specific appropriations, as well as monthly updates on the status of implementation guidance docu-

ments in draft and final form. Additionally, the Corps is directed to develop and submit to the Committee a detailed plan for how the WIFIA provisions, if funded, would be implemented. This plan shall discuss all aspects of implementation, including which types of projects would be eligible or prioritized; criteria for selecting specific projects for financing; the steps and general schedule of a potential application process; agency personnel and expertise needs; expected administrative costs; and measures necessary to ensure appropriate protections of federal tax dollars. Recognizing that the Corps has no prior experience with administering a loan or loan guarantee program, the Committee directs the Corps to consult with the Government Accountability Office and other federal agencies with similar authorities in order to avoid the problems that have occurred in other federal loan and loan guarantee programs.

Ability To Pay Rule.—The Committee recognizes that Indian tribes do not always have the ability to pay the non-federal portion of costs for water resources development projects on Tribal land. Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 established the Tribal Partnership Program and directed that the cost-share be subject to the non-federal interest's ability to pay to be determined by the Secretary in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Corps then drafted a rule, but to date the rule has not been finalized. The Committee encourages the Corps to finalize an ability to pay rule. Unless a rule has been finalized, the Committee directs the Corps to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act an explanation of why the ability to pay rule has not yet been finalized and a schedule for finalizing the rule.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR CIVIL WORKS

Appropriation, 2014	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	5,000,000
Recommended, 2015	2,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−3,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−3,000,000

The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works oversees the 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 $2,000,000, $3,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the Administration has not been taking congressional direction seriously. As discussed earlier in this report, the Administration has missed numerous deadlines and provided insufficient detail in response to other requests for information included in the fiscal year 2014 Act. The Committee also has been dissatisfied with the delays and lack of substance in providing information requested during hearings and other communications, including information related to the regulatory program. For these reasons, the recommendation reduces funding for this account. The Assistant Secretary would be well-served to develop and implement a plan for improving responsiveness to the Committee's concerns.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The bill continues a provision that prohibits the obligation or expenditure of funds through a reprogramming of funds in this title except in certain circumstances.

The bill continues a provision prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to carry out any contract that commits funds beyond the amounts appropriated for that program, project, or activity.

The bill continues a provision prohibiting the award of continuing contracts for any project for which funds are derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund until such time as a long-term mechanism to enhance revenues sufficient to meet the cost-sharing requirements is enacted.

The bill continues a provision authorizing the transfer of funds to the Fish and Wildlife Service to mitigate for fisheries lost due to Corps of Engineers projects.

The bill makes permanent a provision prohibiting funds from being used to develop or implement changes to certain definitions for the purposes of the Clean Water Act.

The bill makes permanent a provision prohibiting funds from being used to implement revised guidance on determining jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act.

The bill contains a provision allowing the possession of firearms at water resources development projects under certain circumstances.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2014	$8,725,000
Budget estimate, 2015	7,300,000
Recommended, 2015	9,874,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+1,149,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+2,574,000

The budget requests the Central Utah Project as part of the Bureau of Reclamation. For purposes of comparison, the budget request is shown here.

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 fiscal year 2015 budget request again proposes to repeal the statutory prohibition on delegation of responsibility and put oversight of the Central Utah Project under the Bureau of Reclamation. The Committee again rejects this proposal.

The Committee recommendation includes a total of $9,874,000 for the Central Utah Project Completion Account, which includes $7,574,000 for Central Utah Project construction, $1,000,000 for transfer to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, and $1,300,000 for necessary expenses of the Secretary of the Interior. This appropriation is $1,149,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $2,574,000 above the budget request.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation (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 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. Reclamation continues 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. Reclamation maintains 337 reservoirs with the capacity to store 245 million acre-feet of water.

As Reclamation's large impoundments and appurtenant facilities reach their design life, the projected cost of operating, maintaining, and rehabilitating Reclamation infrastructure continues to grow, yet Reclamation has not budgeted funding sufficient to implement a comprehensive program to reduce its maintenance backlog. At the same time, Reclamation is increasingly relied upon to provide water supply to federally-recognized Indian tribes through water settlements, rural communities through its Title I Rural Water Program, and municipalities through its Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program. Balancing these competing priorities will be challenging and requires active participation and leadership on the part of Reclamation and its technical staff.

DROUGHT CONDITIONS

Adding even greater challenges and consequences to Reclamation's operational decisions, much of the Western United States has been experiencing harsh drought conditions over the past year or more. As of May 15, the entire State of California was in severe, extreme, or exceptional drought, with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Climate Prediction Center expecting conditions to at least persist if not intensify through midsummer. The first half of water year 2014 (October 2013–March 2014) was the third-driest in history statewide, behind only the periods ending in 1977 and 1924.

The severity of the current drought coupled with Reclamation's Central Valley Project operational decisions have serious consequences for a wide variety of reasons. Continued high temperatures are expected and could pose a risk of rapid depletion of reservoir storage, which stood at only 69 percent of average in mid-May. For the first time, Reclamation has announced releases from

Friant Dam to address contractual obligations with the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors. Even with this historic action, these contractors and other contractors whose water supply is based on senior water rights have been allocated 75 percent or less of their contract supply. Many other agricultural water service contractors have been allocated no water at all. Considering the U.S. Department of Agriculture National Agricultural Statistics Service 2012 state report estimated the market value of products from California farms as approaching $45 billion annually, the economic consequences of these allocations are disastrous. Even Municipal and Industrial water service contractors have been allocated only 50 percent of their historic use, leading to water use restrictions in many communities.

The Committee notes that the fiscal year 2015 budget request does not prioritize funding for those activities that will respond directly to the severity of drought conditions in California and other Reclamation states, including potential long-term solutions that can eliminate or mitigate drought's impacts. Discussed most prominently in the budget justification materials are various components of the WaterSMART program, including two new programs related to comprehensive drought planning and resilient infrastructure. Unfortunately, Reclamation has provided very little detailed explanation of what these programs will accomplish and how they differ from existing programs.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET REQUEST AND COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The fiscal year 2015 budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation totals $1,042,995,000. After accounting for proposed changes in account structure, the request for activities funded under the Bureau of Reclamation in recent years is $1,035,695,000. The Committee recommendation totals $1,003,695,000, $100,678,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $32,000,000 below the adjusted budget request.

A table summarizing the fiscal year 2014 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2015 budget request, and the Committee recommendation is provided below.

[Dollars in thousands]

Account	FY 2014 enacted	FY 2015 request	Cmte rec.
Water and Related Resources	$954,085	$760,700	$856,351
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	53,288	56,995	56,995
California Bay-Delta Restoration	37,000	37,000	37,000
Policy and Administration	60,000	59,500	53,849
Indian Water Rights Settlements	– – –	90,000	– – –
San Joaquin River Restoration Fund	– – –	32,000	– – –
Central Utah Project Completion	– – –	7,300	– – –
TOTAL, Bureau of Reclamation	1,104,373	1,043,495	1,004,195
Rescission	– – –	–500	–500
NET APPROPRIATION, Bureau of Reclamation	1,104,373	1,042,995	1,003,695

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2014	$954,085,000
Budget estimate, 2015	760,700,000
Recommended, 2015	856,351,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−97,734,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+95,651,000

The Water and Related Resources account supports the development, construction, 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 2015, the Committee recommends $856,351,000, $97,734,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $95,651,000 above the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes in this account certain Indian water rights settlements proposed for funding under a separate account in the President's budget request. No funding is included for the San Joaquin River Restoration Fund, which the President's request also proposed as a new separate account. Adjusted for this change in account structure, the recommendation is $26,349,000 below the budget request.

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

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL
ARIZONA						
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	---	14,093	14,093	---	13,811	13,811
COLORADO RIVER BASIN - CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT	7,176	458	7,634	7,032	449	7,481
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	2,100	---	2,100	2,058	---	2,058
SALT RIVER PROJECT	724	250	974	710	245	955
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	200	---	200	196	---	196
SIERRA VISTA SUBWATERSHED FEASIBILITY STUDY	2	---	2	2	---	2
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,446	22,541	23,987	1,417	22,090	23,507
CALIFORNIA						
CACHUMA PROJECT	647	674	1,321	634	661	1,295
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECTS:						
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, FOLSOM DAM UNIT/MORMON ISLAND	1,577	9,138	10,715	1,545	8,955	10,500
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	35	2,184	2,219	34	2,140	2,174
DELTA DIVISION	5,718	5,511	11,229	5,604	5,401	11,005
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,290	2,772	4,062	1,264	2,717	3,981
FRIANT DIVISION	2,192	3,401	5,593	2,148	3,333	5,481
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	7,596	454	8,050	7,444	445	7,889
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT. PROGRAM	---	16,362	16,362	---	16,035	16,035
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	2,156	944	3,100	2,113	925	3,038
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	372	75	447	365	74	439
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	52	---	52	51	---	51
SHASTA DIVISION	720	8,627	9,347	706	8,454	9,160
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	12,309	4,359	16,668	12,063	4,272	16,335
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	4,389	7,393	11,782	4,301	7,245	11,546
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	12,917	6,043	18,960	12,659	5,922	18,581
ORLAND PROJECT	---	930	930	---	911	911
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	300	---	300	294	---	294
SOLANO PROJECT	1,329	2,367	3,696	1,302	2,320	3,622
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	313	33	346	307	32	339
COLORADO						
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	892	1,637	2,529	874	1,604	2,478
ARMEL UNIT, P-SMBP	20	449	469	20	440	460
COLLBRAN PROJECT	255	1,693	1,948	250	1,659	1,909
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	207	12,950	13,157	203	12,691	12,894

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	122	124	246	120	122	242
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	274	8,837	9,111	269	8,660	8,929
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT - ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT	500	---	500	490	---	490
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	244	1,713	1,957	239	1,679	1,918
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	---	1,987	1,987	---	1,947	1,947
MANCOS PROJECT	119	182	301	117	178	295
NARRROWS UNIT, P-SMBP	---	37	37	---	36	36
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	108	2,653	2,761	106	2,600	2,706
PINE RIVER PROJECT	202	326	528	198	319	517
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN	286	3,616	3,902	280	3,544	3,824
SAN LOUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CONEJOS DIVISION	21	38	59	21	37	58
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	804	191	995	788	187	975
UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	270	---	270	265	---	265
IDAHO						
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	3,237	2,213	5,450	3,172	2,169	5,341
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	17,000	---	17,000	16,660	---	16,660
LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS	425	30	455	417	29	446
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	2,451	4,694	7,145	2,402	4,600	7,002
PRESTON BENCH PROJECT	4	8	12	4	8	12
KANSAS						
ALMENA UNIT, P-SMBP	16	492	508	16	482	498
BOSTWICK UNIT, P-SMBP	239	935	1,174	234	916	1,150
CEDAR BLUFF UNIT, P-SMBP	11	638	649	11	625	636
GLEN ELDER UNIT, P-SMBP	25	1,840	1,865	25	1,803	1,828
KANSAS RIVER UNIT, P-SMBP	---	100	100	---	98	98
KIRWIN UNIT, P-SMBP	19	1,369	1,388	19	1,342	1,361
WEBSTER UNIT, P-SMBP	12	2,873	2,885	12	2,816	2,828
WICHITA PROJECT - CHENEY DIVISION	87	458	545	85	449	534
WICHITA PROJECT - EQUUS BEDS DIVISION	50	---	50	49	---	49

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL
MONTANA						
CANYON FERRY UNIT, P-SMBP	246	5,703	5,949	241	5,589	5,830
EAST BENCH UNIT, P-SMBP	202	660	862	198	647	845
FORT PECK RESERVATION / DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM	3,249	---	3,249	3,184	---	3,184
HELENA VALLEY UNIT, P-SMBP	19	163	182	19	160	179
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	---	1,014	1,014	---	994	994
HUNTLEY PROJECT	12	45	57	12	44	56
LOWER MARIAS UNIT, P-SMBP	102	1,622	1,724	100	1,590	1,690
LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT	364	16	380	357	16	373
MILK RIVER PROJECT	548	1,287	1,835	537	1,261	1,798
MISSOURI BASIN O&M, P-SMBP	1,032	269	1,301	1,011	264	1,275
ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MT RURAL WATER SYSTEM	4,059	---	4,059	3,978	---	3,978
SUN RIVER PROJECT	53	256	309	52	251	303
YELLOWTAIL UNIT, P-SMBP	22	7,433	7,455	22	7,284	7,306
NEBRASKA						
AINSWORTH UNIT, P-SMBP	26	138	164	25	135	160
FRENCHMAN-CAMBRIDGE UNIT, P-SMBP	261	2,088	2,349	256	2,046	2,302
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	14	116	130	14	114	128
NORTH LOUP UNIT, P-SMBP	52	179	231	51	175	226
NEVADA						
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	5,876	3,925	9,801	5,758	3,847	9,605
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	115	---	115	113	---	113
LAKE MEAD /LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	775	---	775	760	---	760
NEW MEXICO						
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,844	1,295	4,139	2,787	1,269	4,056
EASTERN NEW MEXICO RURAL WATER SUPPLY	47	---	47	46	---	46
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	11,009	11,726	22,735	10,789	11,491	22,280
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,224	4,182	5,406	1,200	4,098	5,298
RIO GRANDE PUEBLOS PROJECT	650	---	650	637	---	637
TUCUMCARI PROJECT	23	11	34	23	11	34

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL
NORTH DAKOTA						
DICKINSON UNIT, P-SMBP	404	288	692	396	282	678
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	15,502	6,417	21,919	15,192	6,289	21,481
HEART BUTTE UNIT, P-SMBP	6	1,139	1,145	6	1,116	1,122
OKLAHOMA						
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	69	189	258	68	185	253
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	90	796	886	88	780	868
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	25	584	609	25	572	597
NORMAN PROJECT	48	311	359	47	305	352
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	160	1,058	1,218	157	1,037	1,194
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	59	631	690	58	618	676
OREGON						
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	267	451	718	262	442	704
DESCHUTES PROJECT	292	269	561	286	264	550
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	584	232	816	572	227	799
KLAMATH PROJECT	13,390	4,610	18,000	13,122	4,518	17,640
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	1,527	602	2,129	1,496	590	2,086
TUALATIN PROJECT	130	642	772	127	629	756
UMATILLA PROJECT	521	3,161	3,682	511	3,098	3,609
SOUTH DAKOTA						
ANGOSTURA UNIT, P-SMBP	266	790	1,056	261	774	1,035
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	255	685	940	250	671	921
KEYHOLE UNIT, P-SMBP	196	558	754	192	547	739
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	2,432	---	2,432	2,383	---	2,383
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	---	15	15	---	15	15
MNI WICONI PROJECT	---	12,000	12,000	---	11,760	11,760
OAHE UNIT, P-SMBP	39	55	94	38	54	92
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT	---	92	92	---	90	90
RAPID VALLEY UNIT, P-SMBP	---	223	223	---	219	219
SHADEHILL UNIT, P-SMBP	75	511	586	74	501	575

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL
TEXAS						
BALMORHEA PROJECT	25	15	40	25	15	40
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	84	85	169	82	83	165
LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM	50	---	50	49	---	49
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	87	787	874	85	771	856
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	57	537	594	56	526	582
UTAH						
HYRUM PROJECT	180	173	353	176	170	346
MOON LAKE PROJECT	12	85	97	12	83	95
NEWTON PROJECT	33	94	127	32	92	124
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	240	262	502	235	257	492
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	1,260	448	1,708	1,235	439	1,674
SANPETE PROJECT	60	11	71	59	11	70
SCOFIELD PROJECT	406	84	490	398	82	480
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	822	100	922	806	98	904
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,096	1,111	2,207	1,074	1,089	2,163
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	60	86	146	59	84	143
WASHINGTON						
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	3,875	7,196	11,071	3,798	7,052	10,850
WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS	565	78	643	554	76	630
YAKIMA PROJECT	806	6,836	7,642	790	6,699	7,489
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,000	---	11,000	10,780	---	10,780
WYOMING						
BOYSEN UNIT, P-SMBP	231	1,791	2,022	226	1,755	1,981
BUFFALO BILL DAM DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP	32	2,812	2,844	31	2,756	2,787
KENDRICK PROJECT	107	3,582	3,689	105	3,510	3,615
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	205	2,270	2,475	201	2,225	2,426
NORTH PLATTE AREA, P-SMBP	111	4,886	4,997	109	4,788	4,897
OWL CREEK UNIT, P-SMBP	6	95	101	6	93	99
RIVERTON UNIT, P-SMBP	12	632	644	12	619	631
SHOSHONE PROJECT	72	771	843	71	756	827
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS	184,115	273,956	458,071	180,442	268,475	448,917

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL
REGIONAL PROGRAMS						
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:						
RURAL WATER	---	---	---	21,000	---	21,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	---	12,670	12,670	---	12,417	12,417
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE II	6,360	---	6,360	6,233	---	6,233
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT (CRSP), SECTION 5	4,103	5,592	9,695	4,021	5,480	9,501
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT (CRSP), SECTION 8	3,088	---	3,088	3,026	---	3,026
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	620	---	620	608	---	608
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:						
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,100	1,100	---	1,100	1,100
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION	---	62,000	62,000	---	62,000	62,000
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS	---	19,784	19,784	---	19,784	19,784
EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	---	1,250	1,250	---	1,225	1,225
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM	22,677	---	22,677	22,223	---	22,223
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,736	---	1,736	1,701	---	1,701
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	---	8,989	8,989	---	8,809	8,809
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES	2,000	---	2,000	1,960	---	1,960
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS:						
AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT	---	---	---	2,940	---	2,940
CROW TRIBE RIGHTS	---	---	---	1,960	---	1,960
NAVAJO-GALLUP	---	---	---	79,380	---	79,380
TAOS PUEBLO	---	---	---	3,920	---	3,920
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	9,657	---	9,657	9,464	---	9,464
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	28,345	---	28,345	27,778	---	27,778
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	---	846	846	---	829	829
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	8,088	---	8,088	7,926	---	7,926
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,984	---	1,984	1,944	---	1,944
OPERATION & PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	951	1,653	2,604	932	1,620	2,552
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	2,193	307	2,500	2,149	301	2,450
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	657	206	863	644	202	846
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	2,329	---	2,329	2,282	---	2,282
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,409	---	2,409	2,361	---	2,361
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:						
DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM	1,753	1,150	2,903	1,718	1,127	2,845
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	9,765	---	9,765	9,570	---	9,570
SITE SECURITY ACTIVITIES	---	26,220	26,220	---	25,696	25,696
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES - TECHNICAL SUPPORT	90	---	90	88	---	88

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST			HOUSE RECOMMENDED		
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL
WATERSMART PROGRAM:						
WATERSMART GRANTS	19,000	---	19,000	18,620	---	18,620
WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICES PROGRAM	4,457	---	4,457	4,368	---	4,368
COOPERATIVE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT	250	---	250	245	---	245
BASIN STUDIES	3,850	---	3,850	3,773	---	3,773
DROUGHT RESPONSE & COMPREHENSIVE DROUGHT PLANS	1,500	---	1,500	1,470	---	1,470
RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS	---	1,500	1,500	---	1,470	1,470
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE PROGRAM	21,500	---	21,500	21,070	---	21,070
SUBTOTAL, REGIONAL PROGRAMS	159,362	143,267	302,629	265,374	142,060	407,434
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	343,477	417,223	760,700	445,816	410,535	856,351

San Joaquin River Restoration Fund.—The budget request again proposes an account separate from the Water and Related Resources account for discretionary funding of San Joaquin River Restoration activities. As in past years, the Committee includes this line item within the Water and Related Resources account, although no funding is provided.

Indian Water Rights Settlements.—The budget request again proposes a new appropriations account for certain Indian water rights settlements. As in prior fiscal years, however, the Committee includes funding for these settlements in the Water and Related Resources account.

Central Valley Project Operation and Maintenance Rates.—The Central Valley Project is operationally and financially integrated, meaning construction and operation and maintenance costs are pooled across the system and allocated accordingly. The Committee strongly supports this model. During extraordinarily severe drought years—such as the current drought—in which very little water is delivered to Central Valley Project water contractors, however, this approach can lead to disproportionate operation and maintenance rates for the contractors that receive very little of their allocated water. Reclamation is encouraged to review its authorities to see if steps can be taken to help alleviate the impacts of these operation and maintenance rates during the current drought.

Scoggins Dam, Tualatin Project, Oregon.—As part of its Dam Safety Program, Reclamation is working on a Corrective Action Alternatives Study (CAS) for Scoggins Dam, the main feature of the Tualatin Project. Working with local stakeholders, Reclamation is evaluating how water supply objectives, such as increased storage, may be coordinated with CAS implementation. The Committee supports such integrated efforts and directs Reclamation to submit legislative language to the appropriate congressional committees as soon as it becomes clear such authorization is necessary and advisable.

Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project.—The Committee is aware of the Integrated Plan that has been developed by the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project Working Group, including the Bureau of Reclamation, to address water storage and water supply needs for agriculture, fish, and municipalities within the Yakima River Basin in Central Washington. The Committee is supportive of the Plan and encourages the Bureau to move forward on implementing authorized components of the Plan. The State of Washington has made significant investments in the land acquisition components of the Integrated Plan. Therefore, instead of using the proposed federal Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project funding for land and water acquisition, Reclamation should use these dollars for additional investments in Integrated Plan water storage and supply reliability activities.

WaterSMART Program, Title XVI Water Reclamation/Reuse Projects.—The Bureau of Reclamation's Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse program is intended to help ensure the reliability of water supplies throughout the West. The Committee continues to hear from advocates of regional-scale projects. The Committee notes that Reclamation adjusted the parameters of its most recent funding opportunity to address these suggestions. Reclamation is

encouraged to continue periodic reviews of this program to ensure the most effective results.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 2014	$53,288,000
Budget estimate, 2015	56,995,000
Recommended, 2015	56,995,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+3,707,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

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 also is financed through additional mitigation and restoration payments collected on an annual basis from project beneficiaries.

For fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommends $56,995,000, $3,707,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. The Committee notes that the increase for this account in the budget request and recommendation is based on a three-year rolling average of collections, in accordance with the authorizing statute.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2014	$37,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	37,000,000
Recommended, 2015	37,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

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 2015, the Committee recommends $37,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and the budget request.

The recommendation includes funding consistent with the budget request for four feasibility studies associated with the water storage projects identified in section 103(d)(1) of the Water Supply, Reliability, and Environmental Improvement Act (Public Law 108–361). According to information received from Reclamation, no additional funding for these studies could be used in fiscal year 2015. The Committee notes that one study is expected to be completed by December 2014, another study by July 2015, and the schedules for the remaining two studies are uncertain subject to further funding participation by the non-federal sponsor. Reclamation is strongly encouraged to take necessary steps, including use of the shortest

applicable process under the National Environmental Policy Act, to meet the established schedules.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2014	$60,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	59,500,000
Recommended, 2015	53,849,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−6,151,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−5,651,000

The Policy and Administration account provides for the executive direction and management of all Reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's office in Washington, D.C.; the Technical Service Center in 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 2015, the Committee recommends $53,849,000, $6,151,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $5,651,000 below the budget request.

This reduction in funding is a direct result of Reclamation's lack of responsiveness to congressional and statutory direction and to Committee information requests. The fiscal year 2012 joint explanatory statement provided direction regarding buried metallic water pipe. Reclamation chose to implement only certain pieces of that direction, so the fiscal year 2013 House report (House Report 112–462) and the fiscal year 2014 Act and explanatory statement included additional direction to Reclamation on this topic. The fiscal year 2014 language could not have been clearer that the status quo was unacceptable. Yet the status quo is exactly what was described in the report submitted by Reclamation.

Lengthy response times and incomplete answers to Committee requests also have been concerns over the past few years. It often takes weeks for Reclamation to respond to what should be simple information requests. The lack of timely and pertinent information weakens the Committee's ability to provide appropriate oversight. The Committee would like to believe it is not Reclamation's intent to slow delivery of information to the Committee to avoid rigorous oversight, but rather is a problem easier to solve, such as being a result of an overly bureaucratic clearance process or similar administrative issue. The Committee welcomes a discussion with Reclamation on ways to improve the Committee's access to information.

The Committee remains concerned about the limited information regarding activities included in the annual budget request that is provided to the Committee. Particularly as new, large, and costly projects and programs are proposed for initiation, Reclamation must provide detailed analysis and explanation of how these commitments will be met in the future and the impacts to ongoing projects and programs. Without an understanding of out-year funding needs of activities in the budget request, for example, it is difficult for the Committee to evaluate the budget proposal and the prioritization of actions it represents. Reclamation is directed to work with the Committee to develop a mutually acceptable scope of information to be included in, or concurrent with, the standard budget justification materials provided to the Congress.

The Committee previously has directed the Administration to produce a five-year plan that serves the public interest by providing visibility into Reclamation's future plans and spending. To date, Reclamation has failed to provide that plan to the Committee. The Committee once again directs the Administration to fulfill the Committee's request to provide an adequate and useful five-year plan.

The Committee expects that the five-year plan will include the following: (1) a funding scenario that reflects the Administration's expenditure ceilings, 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, Indian water rights settlements, and Title XVI projects that are currently authorized, the total authorization, the balance to complete, and total appropriations to date; (4) an estimate of the total cost of extraordinary and emergency operation and maintenance to address the backlog of project needs due to the aging of Reclamation infrastructure; and (5) 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.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	$ – 500,000
Recommended, 2015	– 500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– 500,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Public Law 84–984), loans and grants were made to non-federal organizations for construction or rehabilitation and betterment of small water resource projects. The Loan Program currently has an outstanding loan balance of approximately $42,000,000. The most recent discretionary appropriation to this account was in fiscal year 2002 for direct loans and in fiscal year 2004 for loan program administration. The fiscal year 2015 budget request proposes to cancel $500,000 in unobligated balances in this account. For fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommends a rescission of $500,000, the same as the budget request. Loan program administration costs can be accommodated using remaining carryover funds.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The bill continues a provision regarding the circumstances in which the Bureau of Reclamation may reprogram funds.

The bill continues 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 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 Elk Hills School Lands Fund, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, the Energy Information Administration, Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup, the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, Science, Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program, Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Loans 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, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Energy has requested a total budget in fiscal year 2015 of $28,436,428,000, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, to fund programs in its four primary mission areas: science, energy, environment, and national security. The Department of Energy budget request is $1,155,382,000 above fiscal year 2014 and, once again, includes significant increases to renewable energy programs and national defense mission areas while proposing significant reductions to Fossil Energy Research and Development and, to a much lesser extent, Nuclear Energy.

The Committee recommendation is $27,305,845,000 for the Department of Energy, $24,799,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $667,583,000 below the budget request after adjusting for the Department's legislative proposal, which the recommendation does not include. The Committee's recommendation recognizes the difficult budgetary realities faced for fiscal year 2015. It restructures the balance of the bill to ensure inherently federal responsibilities, such as national security, basic science activities, and environmental cleanup, are supported, while investing in long-term research to improve the efficiency of existing forms of energy production and to develop new and innovative forms of energy for the nation's long-term energy independence and prosperity. The remaining resources are allocated to programs that can best address the threat of high gasoline and electricity prices and to those that help support American economic competitiveness in a global energy marketplace.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

Article I, section 9 of the United States Constitution states "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law".

The Committee continues the Department's reprogramming authority in statute to ensure that the Department carries out its

programs consistent with congressional direction. This reprogramming authority is established at the program, project, or activity level, whichever is the most specific included in the text or table detailing the Committee's recommendation for the Department of Energy's various accounts. The Committee also prohibits new starts through the use of reprogramming and includes other direction to improve public oversight of the Department's actions. In addition, the recommendation continues a general provision specifying which transfer authorities may be used for accounts funded by this Act.

FINANCIAL REPORTING

The Department is directed to continue to provide monthly Financial Balances Reports to the Committee. The reports should provide, for each program at the congressional control level as specified in the table in this Report an accounting of the following balances: total available (prior and current year); unobligated; unobligated but committed; and obligated, uncosted. Data should be provided both in summary form and by the fiscal year the funding was appropriated. Emergency funding, including any unspent American Recovery and Reinvestment Act balances, should be displayed separately within the Report. When submitting its monthly report to the Committee, the Department shall identify and provide an explanation for any use of the Department's limited programming authority as provided under Section 301 of this Act. This direction shall apply to future fiscal years unless contradicted by the Committee.

The Committee remains concerned over the lack of transparency in the Department's use of program direction funds and has specified program direction funding in the bill for the relevant accounts. In order to address excessive prior-year balances in program direction accounts, the Committee has also limited the period of availability of all program direction funds for the Department of Energy. The Committee directs the Department to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate an annual Program Direction Report that includes details for expended amounts for salaries and benefits, travel, support services, other related expenses, and other relevant categories. This report should include program direction balances in summary form and by the fiscal year.

In addition to the buildup of unexpended prior-year program direction balances, the Committee is concerned by the buildup of excessive prior-year balances that are greater than five years old. The Department of Energy has exceptional operational flexibility because the period of availability of most of its funding is not limited. However, the Department has not properly managed its prior-year balances to ensure that funds are expeditiously expended. Retaining these old balances places a cumbersome administrative burden on DOE programs and makes the Department's financial management processes inefficient and unnecessarily complex. The bill contains a General Provision that eliminates unobligated balances older than five years from the Department's science and energy programs. By rescinding these old balances, this General Provision will serve to eliminate approximately one hundred existing budget and reporting codes that the Department is continuing to maintain

and report against. For future years, the Department should consider all balances greater than five years old effectively expired. The Department shall submit all remaining unexpended balances greater than five years old as an offset to its annual budget request. If there is a valid justification for retaining certain balances, the Department may submit a specific request to retain such balances as an exception to this general direction.

MANAGEMENT OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL AND DEFENSE WASTE

Again this year, the Obama Administration continues its willful disregard for its legal responsibilities regarding Yucca Mountain. By unilaterally halting the Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Geological Repository, the Administration has delayed fulfilling the federal government's legal requirement to take responsibility for civilian spent nuclear fuel, increasing the financial penalties taxpayers must bear. The Department's fiscal year 2013 Financial Report shows the estimated liability facing taxpayers is $25,100,000,000, an increase of $2,800,000,000 from the previous year and $9,800,000,000 since 2010, with $3,700,000,000 already paid by the Judgment Fund. This liability will continue to grow. In addition, high-level defense waste at sites across the country now have no disposition pathway, presenting the likelihood that the federal government will have to pay penalties to the states as deadlines for removal are missed.

The credibility of the federal government has been further eroded by the blatant political maneuverings the Administration needed to skirt the law and halt the program. On August 13, 2013, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals definitively ruled that the Administration's refusal to finish the Yucca Mountain license application was illegal. As a result, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has restarted the license application process and is scheduled to soon complete the final Safety Evaluation Report. The D.C. Circuit Court also unanimously ruled that the Department must stop collecting Nuclear Waste Fund fees "until such time as either the Secretary chooses to comply with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as it is currently written, or until Congress enacts an alternative waste management plan."

Nevertheless, the Administration's fiscal year 2015 budget request once again includes a proposal to implement the Department's *Strategy for the Management and Disposal of Used Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste*, which was informed by the Administration's Blue Ribbon Commission that by its very charter did not examine the suitability of Yucca Mountain as a permanent repository. This strategy is estimated to cost $5,700,000,000 over the next ten years and proposes to reform the current funding arrangement for the Department's nuclear waste fund management program. The Committee notes that the Department's proposal has not been considered by Congress, yet the Administration included $79,000,000 in its fiscal year 2015 request for used nuclear fuel disposition, including activities necessary solely as a consequence of the Administration's Yucca Mountain policy. The recommendation rejects these non-Yucca proposals and makes clear that any activities funded from the Nuclear Waste Fund must be in support of Yucca Mountain.

In addition, the recommendation provides $150,000,000 within Nuclear Waste Disposal to support the Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Geological Repository and $55,000,000 within the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to support the continued adjudication of the Yucca Mountain license application. The Committee notes that geological repositories in addition to Yucca Mountain will be needed. If the Congress provides the authority for such repositories, as well as for a consensus-based siting process, the Committee will consider support for such activities at that time. In the meantime, the bill contains a prohibition on using funds to close the Yucca Mountain license application or to take actions that would irrevocably remove Yucca Mountain as an option for a repository.

PROLIFERATION OF CENTERS

The Committee has for years expressed concern with the Department's establishment of a variety of new research centers, or persistent, location-based grantees that receive funding across a number of years and that often require out-year commitments subject to appropriations. Examples include Energy Frontier Research Centers, Energy Innovation Hubs, and BioEnergy Research Centers. The Department has continued to add to this list by proposing at least one additional Clean Energy Manufacturing Innovation (CEMI) Institute in fiscal year 2015, in addition to the two to be established using fiscal year 2014 funding and the one already established using fiscal year 2013 funding—each for five-year awards. The Department is also proposing to renew two of its Energy Innovation Hubs for their second five-year terms.

Unfortunately, the Administration continues to propose these new ideas without examining, or at least articulating, why existing programs are inadequate or underperforming. No offsets are offered within existing programs, and no policy prescriptions are offered. The Committee continues to support the ongoing review of all existing research centers and expects frequent and thorough updates as the Department considers their relative effectiveness and potential renewal or termination in future years. The Committee urges the Department to look at its programs as a portfolio of approaches to achieve results and to propose eliminating less effective programs and support mechanisms.

While many of these centers have been proposed openly and established with congressional concurrence, several have been established or renewed over the years with little or no justification in the budget requests, including Manufacturing Demonstration Facilities and CEMI Institutes. Further, many centers have been funded perennially and lack a concrete goal after which they would be terminated. This practice has led to the proliferation of centers across many Departmental programs consuming program budgets and preventing prioritization of funds towards other higher-priority activities. Addressing this problem requires greater transparency, evaluation, and prioritization to ensure that only highly-effective centers closely aligned to program missions are funded.

In fiscal year 2014, the Department was directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a comprehensive list of all centers to be funded in the fiscal year, including the date of establishment, purpose, milestones, funding level in the fiscal year, total funding received to

date, out-year mortgages, and expected termination date. The Department has yet to submit this list, so the Committee reiterates its previous direction. Furthermore, the Department is directed to explicitly include in future budget justifications all centers, hubs, institutes, facilities, and any other persistent, location-based grantee; their current and proposed funding levels; expected out-year commitments; and details on their programmatic and technical goals.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Department is prohibited from funding fellowship and scholarship programs in fiscal year 2015 unless the programs were explicitly included in the budget justification or funded within this recommendation. Any new or ongoing programs that the Department chooses to fund in fiscal year 2015 must be detailed in the fiscal year 2015 budget request documents. This direction shall be followed in future fiscal years unless contradicted by the Committee.

Understanding that harnessing scientific and technological ingenuity has long been at the core of America's prosperity, the Department of Energy has programs designed to increase the number of underrepresented minorities in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) area. The Committee strongly encourages the Department to maintain this commitment by engaging in competitions supporting programs, including within the energy sciences and nonproliferation and in partnership with the national laboratories, that increase the number of underrepresented college minorities in STEM fields.

The Department has also recognized that beyond federal programs, there are successful initiatives being pursued by non-profit organizations that provide examples of best practices, including exposure to STEM education and career opportunities at all levels of education, financial assistance, one-on-one mentoring, and expanded participation in crucial research and development. The Committee encourages the Department to look for opportunities to leverage its investment with these non-profits.

REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFER GUIDELINES

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

Definition.—A reprogramming includes the reallocation of funds from one activity to another within an appropriation. The recommendation includes a general provision providing internal reprogramming authority to the Department, as long as no program, project, or activity is increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, compared to the levels in the text or table detailing the Committee's recommendations for the Department's various accounts. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one con-

struction project to another project or a change of $2,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, in the scope of an approved project.

Criteria for Reprogramming.—A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if delay of the project or activity until the next fiscal year would result in a detrimental impact to an agency program or priority. A reprogramming 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 a factor for consideration. A reprogramming may not be employed to initiate new programs, or to change program, project, or activity allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by the Congress in the Act or report.

Reporting and Approval Procedures.—In recognition of the security missions of the Department, the legislative guidelines allow the Secretary and the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration jointly to waive the reprogramming restriction by certifying to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the nation's security interest to do so. The Department shall not deviate from the levels for activities specified in the report that are below the level of the detail table, except through the regular notification procedures of the Committee. No funds may be added to programs for which funding has been denied. Any reallocation of new or prior-year budget authority or prior-year de-obligations, or any request to implement a reorganization which includes moving previous appropriations between appropriations accounts must be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees.

Transfers.—As in fiscal year 2014, funding actions into or out of accounts funded by Title III of this Act may be made by transfer authorities provided only by this or other Appropriations Acts.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations for Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 2015 are described in the following sections. A detailed funding table is included at the end of this title.

ENERGY PROGRAMS

ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriation, 2014	$1,901,686,000
Budget estimate, 2015	2,316,749,000
Recommended, 2015	1,789,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−112,686,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−527,749,000

Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) programs include research, development, demonstration, and deployment activities advancing energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies, as well as federal energy assistance programs. The EERE program is divided into three portfolios: sustainable transportation, renewable energy, and energy efficiency. The sustainable transportation portfolio, which consists of the vehicles, bioenergy, and hy-

drogen and fuel cell programs, advances the development of plug-in electric and other alternative vehicles, high-efficiency advanced combustion engines, and the replacement of oil with clean domestic transportation fuels. The renewable energy portfolio, which consists of the solar, wind, water, and geothermal programs, aims to develop innovative technologies to make renewable electricity generation cost competitive with traditional sources of energy. The energy efficiency portfolio, which consists of the advanced manufacturing, buildings, and federal energy assistance programs, seeks cost-effective solutions to reduce energy consumption in plants, buildings, and homes.

The Committee recommends $1,789,000,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, $112,686,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $527,749,000 below the budget request.

For the purposes of allocating funding, the Committee encourages the Department to examine the feasibility of ultraconductive copper as an application-driven, crosscutting technology area, including funding to support prototype development and the scale-up of manufacturing with established experts within EERE.

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION

The Vehicle, Bioenergy, and Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technologies programs fund activities that can reduce American exposure to future high oil prices. Research into cutting-edge technologies that will increase the fuel economy of gasoline and diesel fuel vehicles—the vast majority of today's fleet—will allow Americans to spend less on fuel while traveling the same distance. Research into next-generation automotive and fuel cell technologies that power vehicles with domestic energy sources such as natural gas, electricity, biofuels, and hydrogen can likewise dramatically lower the impact of future high gas prices on Americans.

The Committee recommends $557,500,000 for Sustainable Transportation, $57,822,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $147,683,000 below the budget request.

Vehicle Technologies.—The Committee recommends $277,500,000 for Vehicle Technologies, $12,410,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $81,500,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the SuperTruck program, a cost-shared project with industry to design a heavy-duty Class 8 truck with 50 percent improvement in overall freight efficiency. The Committee acknowledges the progress made towards the SuperTruck program's goals, anticipates continued progress in fiscal year 2015, and supports the fulfillment of existing contracts to advance commercialization of truck technologies demonstrated by industry partners. The Committee encourages the Department to assess the achievements of the current program and whether additional measures should be identified to further advance fuel economy gains and to demonstrate the most promising technologies that incorporate both the long-haul and regional-haul segments.

The recommendation provides $102,000,000 for Batteries and Electric Drive Technology, of which $40,800,000 is for advanced battery development. With additional funds above the request for advanced battery development, the Department is directed to expand high quality, independent, national laboratory performance testing and lifecycle diagnostic assessment activities, in order to

validate and verify advanced battery performance under normal operating conditions. The Department is further directed to submit, not later than December 31, 2014, a report on its plan to utilize national laboratory capabilities to expand battery performance science capabilities for validation and to predict energy storage performance.

The recommendation provides $27,900,000 for Outreach and Development, of which $24,000,000 is for the Clean Cities program. No funding is provided for Advanced Fuel Vehicle Community Projects or the Transportation Electrification Program.

For other subprograms within Vehicle Technologies, the recommendation provides $34,500,000 for Vehicle and Systems Simulation and Testing, of which no funding is included for the grid integration initiative; $49,000,000 for Advanced Combustion Engines; $36,000,000 for Materials Technology; and $25,000,000 for Fuels Technology.

The Committee encourages Vehicle Technologies to leverage the expertise of various experimental and computational collaborative programs among universities, national laboratories, and industry to develop sustainable technologies that will improve the overall fuel economy of heavy-duty transportation systems.

Bioenergy Technologies.—The Committee recommends $180,000,000 for Bioenergy Technologies, $52,429,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $73,200,000 below the budget request.

Within available funds, the recommendation includes $46,500,000 for Feedstocks, of which $30,000,000 is for research and development of biofuels from algae feedstocks; $90,500,000 for Conversion Technologies, of which no funding is included for a conversion incubator; $25,800,000 for Demonstration and Deployment, of which no funding is for the joint initiative with the Navy and the Department of Agriculture to develop commercial diesel and jet biofuels production capacity for defense purposes; and $11,000,000 for Strategic Analysis and Crosscutting Sustainability.

The Department is directed not to procure or use commonly recycled paper that is segregated from municipal solid waste for electricity generation or to make grants for renewable biofuels production to any facility that uses as a feedstock recycled paper that is segregated from municipal solid waste. For the purposes of allocating resources, the Department is encouraged to include biosolids derived from the municipal wastewater treatment process and other similar renewables within the definition of noncellulosic biomass. The Committee also encourages the Department to evaluate the potential for the conversion of degradables in combined trash to liquid- and gaseous-fuels, and chemical intermediates at distributed locations where optimal, in order to determine the national resource potential and the benefits of this approach compared to other approaches, including the densification of wastes to be transferred to centralized conversion facilities.

The Committee notes that research, development, and demonstration of direct liquefaction of biomass via a pyrolysis event and the subsequent upgrading and cracking to renewable gasoline, diesel, and jet fuels is a high priority pathway to produce fuels from a range of biomass sources. The Committee supports the Department's continued efforts to examine the testing of new catalysts, separations strategies, and engineering designs at the bench-

and pilot-scale to enable rapid evaluation of promising technologies.

The Committee also notes that the oil content of algae is only approximately 25 percent of the total biomass of algae, yet efforts to date have predominantly focused on extracting and processing oil from algae. The Committee encourages the Department to examine the commercial potential for value added renewable products that are derived from biomass intermediates or a slipstream on the trajectory towards biofuels, which might include proteins, fish food, and other renewable chemicals.

Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technologies.—The Committee recommends $100,000,000 for Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technologies, $7,017,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $7,017,000 above the budget request.

Of the funding provided above the budget request, an additional $5,000,000 is for Technology Validation to conduct testing and analysis of fuel cells as industrial-scale energy storage devices, with validation and testing using full-scale testing and demonstration capabilities. To support this effort, the Committee recommends that the Department leverage national laboratory, university, and regional stakeholder partnerships and capabilities, including at-scale grid infrastructure, modeling expertise, extreme environment testing capabilities, and public-private partnerships. The remaining $2,017,000 above the request is to support cost-shared advanced demonstration and deployment activities that validate commercial viability, including material handling equipment, ground support equipment, refrigerated trucks, auxiliary power units, and associated hydrogen infrastructure.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Solar Energy, Wind Energy, Water Power, and Geothermal Technologies programs fund applied research, development, and demonstration to reduce the cost of renewable energy to economically competitive levels. Research into innovative technologies, such as photovoltaic and concentrating solar technologies, offshore wind, hydropower, and ground heat, can expand energy production from our domestic resources and reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

The Committee recommends $369,500,000 for Renewable Energy, $80,292,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $151,800,000 below the budget request.

Solar Energy.—The Committee recommends $178,000,000 for Solar Energy, $79,211,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $104,300,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $37,000,000 for Concentrating Solar Power, of which $10,000,000 is for the joint Supercritical Transformational Electric Power (STEP) Generation program with the Offices of Fossil Energy and Nuclear Energy; $38,000,000 for Photovoltaic Research and Development; $39,500,000 for Systems Integration, of which no funding is included for the grid integration initiative; and $43,000,000 for Innovations in Manufacturing Competitiveness, of which $10,000,000 is for the Sunshot Incubator.

Within the funds available for Innovations in Manufacturing Competitiveness, the Committee directs the Solar Technologies program to provide funding opportunities, as proposed in the budget request, that support U.S. equipment supply chain technology ef-

forts, which will reduce the cost of manufacturing silicon photovoltaic cells by reducing the amount of raw material silicon needed to produce a solar cell while also increasing manufacturing efficiencies by removing manufacturing process steps to produce solar cells.

Keeping American manufacturing competitive continues to be a major priority for the Committee across all technology areas, and the Committee encourages the Department to continue to prioritize solar manufacturing initiatives within this program and, to the extent possible within available funding, to explore crosscutting advanced solar films aimed at improving the cost-effectiveness of solar technologies. The Committee also recognizes the need to lower the cost of solar power products and installation for customers and requests that the Department work with interested stakeholders to achieve that end.

Wind Energy.—The Committee recommends $107,000,000 for Wind Energy, $18,821,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $8,000,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides the requested level of $42,613,000 for the Offshore Wind Advanced Technology Demonstration Project; an additional $5,000,000 to continue research and development in support of the offshore demonstration project; and $500,000 for the Wind for Schools program.

The Committee continues to support wind activities with large generation potential that rely on technology innovations that would not be developed by the private sector alone. To this end, the Committee supports an emphasis on offshore wind technologies that address the unique opportunities and issues across the nation's waterways, such as high winds, icing, and deep water, rather than those technologies currently being considered by the private sector.

Water Power.—The Committee recommends $38,500,000 for Water Power, $20,100,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $24,000,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $19,000,000 for marine and hydrokinetic technologies and $19,000,000 for conventional hydropower, of which $3,960,000 is for the purposes of Section 242 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Geothermal Technologies.—The Committee recommends $46,000,000 for Geothermal Technologies, $198,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $15,500,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $27,000,000 for Enhanced Geothermal Systems, of which $21,000,000 is for site selection and characterization activities for the Frontier Observatory for Research in Geothermal Energy project.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

The Advanced Manufacturing, Building Technologies, Federal Energy Management, and Weatherization and Intergovernmental programs advance cost-effective solutions to reduce energy consumption through increased efficiency. Research into cutting-edge technologies that enhance manufacturing processes, develop advanced materials, and reduce energy use in buildings, homes, and factories can serve the national interest by greatly reducing our energy needs, while also giving American manufacturers an advantage to compete in the global marketplace.

The Committee recommends $644,000,000 for Energy Efficiency, $26,182,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $213,700,000 below the budget request.

Within available funds for energy efficiency, the Committee directs the Department to work with its partner agencies and relevant industry partners to submit, not later than September 30, 2015, a report on the potential benefits, cost savings, and reduced energy use of a mechanical insulation maintenance and upgrade program in federal facilities, as well as an evaluation of approaches for increasing the use of mechanical insulation in federal energy efficiency programs.

Advanced Manufacturing.—The Committee recommends $206,000,000 for Advanced Manufacturing, $25,421,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $99,100,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides not less than $4,205,000 for improvements in the steel industry; not less than $20,000,000 for combined heat and power activities relevant to industrial applications and energy savings in manufacturing processes; and not less than $500,000 to continue efforts furthering improvements in mechanical insulation. The Committee encourages the Department to continue to support technical assistance for combined heat and power demonstrations and deployments that support systems-level optimization, microgrids, and grid integration, as well as research and development into next-generation combined heat and power technologies.

For subprograms within Advanced Manufacturing, the recommendation provides $84,900,000 for Next Generation Manufacturing Research and Development Projects, of which $12,900,000 is for the Advanced Manufacturing Incubator; $28,500,000 for Industrial Technical Assistance; and $92,500,000 for Advanced Manufacturing Research and Development Facilities, of which $25,000,000 is for the fourth year of funding for the Critical Materials Energy Innovation Hub, $10,000,000 is for the Manufacturing Demonstration Facility and the Carbon Fiber Test Facility, $1,500,000 is for the joint additive manufacturing pilot institute with the Department of Defense, and $56,000,000 is for four Clean Energy Manufacturing Innovation (CEMI) Institutes. The Department may use up to $6,000,000 of funding provided under Research and Development Projects to support operations of the Manufacturing Demonstration Facility and the Carbon Fiber Test Facility, should additional funding be needed.

The Committee notes that CEMI Institutes constitute the largest funding activity within Advanced Manufacturing's fiscal year 2015 budget request, yet the Department has provided scant justification on its proposed research topics or mission needs. For example, the Department requests $155,500,000 for CEMI Institutes in fiscal year 2015 to establish "at least one new Clean Energy Manufacturing Innovation Institute," in addition to the two to be established using fiscal year 2014 funds and one already established using fiscal year 2013 funds, with the balance of the request presumably to forward fund existing CEMI Institutes or to establish additional CEMI Institutes not enumerated in the request. The recommendation supports the establishment of one new CEMI Institute in fiscal year 2015, in addition to the three established using fiscal years 2013 and 2014 funding. Should the Department pro-

pose funding for additional CEMI Institutes in the future, the Committee directs that all future budget justifications include a specific research topic associated with a CEMI Institute, which will provide the Committee with the necessary transparency to evaluate and prioritize funding to ensure that only highly-effective centers closely aligned with Advanced Manufacturing program missions are funded.

The Committee is aware that efficiency is a key focus in the upcoming Advanced Manufacturing Office motors survey study. The Department is encouraged to investigate efficiencies that will be derived from electric propulsion systems, which the Committee recognizes can equate to significant national annual energy savings on the magnitude of $100,000,000,000.

The Committee is also aware that the U.S. represents the largest market for lithium metal, a near critical material with national security and advanced manufacturing applications. The U.S. military relies on primary lithium batteries to provide power for communication devices, countermeasure devices, global positioning systems, guidance systems, missiles, torpedoes, guided artillery, and fuses. Lithium metal is also essential in fuel-efficient aircraft bodies, medical devices, and as a means to produce organometallics, which are used in manufacturing eco-friendlier tires, widely used drugs, superior fungicides, recyclable polymer materials, and grid energy storage devices. The Committee notes that the U.S. domestic supply and technology position of lithium metal is on a downward trend relative to China and Russia should U.S. domestic supply not increase by 2020. The Committee directs the Department to examine the impact federal investment may have in strengthening our availability and usage of lithium, including low-sodium lithium metal.

Building Technologies.—The Committee recommends $165,000,000 for Building Technologies, $12,974,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $46,700,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, up to $15,000,000 is to continue high value research into energy efficient building systems with national application, should the Department determine additional work to be merited. Prior to execution of these funds, the Department shall ensure that the research has clear and measurable goals with realistic timeframes to improve the energy efficiency of buildings and submit the research plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Furthermore, the recommendation includes $14,000,000 for the Building America program, the same as the request, and $6,000,000 for research and development activities for small scale combined heat and power systems that can be used for residential and small commercial settings.

For the subprograms within Building Technologies, the recommendation provides $28,000,000 for Commercial Buildings Integration; $55,862,000 for Emerging Technologies, of which $25,800,000 is for solid state lighting and, in addition to funds recommended for lighting research and development, $5,000,000 is for the second Bright Tomorrow Lighting Prize, or "L Prize," which offers both a monetary prize and federal procurement and other benefits to the first organization that manufactures highly-efficient PAR38 halogen replacement lamps meeting various technical re-

quirements; $40,438,000 for Equipment and Buildings Standards; and $23,000,000 for Residential Buildings Integration. The recommendation provides no funding within Building Technologies for the grid integration initiative.

Consistent with current policy, the Department is directed not to advocate, promote, or discourage the adoption or inclusion of a particular building energy code or code provision, other than the technical and economic analysis work required by statutory mandate, or to provide funding to private third parties or non-governmental organizations that engage in this type of advocacy.

The Committee is aware that the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 assigned the Department the role to develop energy efficiency standards for manufactured housing, a responsibility which had previously been assumed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Committee directs the Department to work closely with HUD, industry, and tenant groups to ensure that any proposed standards take equally into account the up-front cost of housing and life cycle operating costs.

In June 2010, the Department of Energy amended the existing energy conservation standards for residential water heaters. The Committee is concerned that efficiency standards for large-capacity water heaters, scheduled to take effect in April 2015, would endanger the long-term sustainability of more than 250 voluntary demand response programs in 34 states. These programs reduce energy use during peak hours, improve the integration of renewable energy resources, and lower energy costs for consumers. The Committee is aware of bipartisan agreement in both chambers to create a new classification for certain grid-enabled residential water heaters that are intended for use as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program and that would be exempt from this final rule. The Committee continues to track progress of this bipartisan legislation and directs the Department to work with stakeholders to allow for the continued manufacture and use of grid-enabled water heaters.

Federal Energy Management Program.—The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for the Federal Energy Management Program, $8,265,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $16,200,000 below the budget request.

Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs.—The Committee recommends $253,000,000 for Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs, $22,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $51,700,000 below the budget request.

The recommendation provides $200,000,000 for Weatherization Assistance Grants, all of which is for formula grants; $3,000,000 for Training and Technical Assistance; and $50,000,000 for the State Energy Program. The recommendation includes no funding for Clean Energy and Economic Development Partnerships or for competitive awards within the Weatherization Assistance Program to develop and test financing models to support energy efficiency retrofits. The recommendation includes the Tribal Energy Program in Departmental Administration.

Social Cost of Carbon.—The Committee understands that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) is currently reviewing the process the Administration used to develop estimates to calculate the social cost of carbon. The Committee believes that the Office of

Information and Regulatory Affairs should not allow any regulations to be finalized using the Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866, Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, May 2013 until public comments on the document have been evaluated, the GAO report has been submitted and reviewed, and any necessary changes to the technical support document are incorporated.

CORPORATE SUPPORT

The Program Direction, Strategic Programs, and Facilities and Infrastructure budgets provide the necessary resources for program and project management across all of EERE's technology programs, for the adoption of technologies to market, and for the operation and upkeep of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory.

The Committee recommends $218,000,000 for Corporate Support programs, $13,554,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $19,779,000 below the budget request.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends $150,000,000 for Program Direction, $12,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $10,000,000 below the budget request.

Strategic Programs.—The Committee recommends $12,000,000 for Strategic Programs, of which $2,000,000 is for the U.S.-Israel energy cooperative agreement and $2,000,000 is for the joint industrial scale integrated energy systems research and development effort with the Office of Nuclear Energy.

Facilities and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $56,000,000 for Facilities and Infrastructure, of which $26,000,000 is for Operations and Maintenance and $30,000,000 is for Facility Management.

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

Appropriation, 2014	$147,306,000
Budget estimate, 2015	180,000,000
Recommended, 2014	160,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+12,694,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−20,000,000

The Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability program advances technologies and provides operational support to increase the efficiency, resilience, and security of the nation's electricity delivery system. The power grid employs aging technologies at a time when power demands, the deployment of new intermittent technologies, and rising security threats are imposing new stresses on the system. The Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability aims to develop a modern power grid by advancing cyber security technologies, intelligent and high-efficiency grid components, and energy storage systems.

The Committee recommends $160,000,000 for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, $12,694,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $20,000,000 below the budget request.

Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Research and Development.—The Committee recommends $109,500,000 for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Research and Development, $3,800,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $11,900,000 below the budg-

et request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $32,700,000 for Clean Energy Transmission and Reliability, of which $5,000,000 is for the Energy Systems Predictive Capability activity; $14,600,000 for Smart Grid; $15,200,000 for Energy Storage; and $47,000,000 for cyber security for energy delivery systems, of which $5,000,000 is to continue development of the industry-scale electric grid test bed.

Within available funds for Energy Storage, the Committee encourages the Department to continue examining evolving battery technologies when funding research and development and pilot programs on the basis of long lifecycle and low capital and maintenance costs, with the battery system able to provide grid storage of energy that can be drawn on by demand.

The Committee recognizes the value an independent assessment may have to verify, criticize, and reinforce key issues within the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability's mission to support the nation's electricity delivery system. Within available funds for Clean Energy Transmission and Reliability, up to $1,000,000 shall be for the Department to contract with an appropriate organization, such as the National Research Council, to conduct a national level comprehensive study on the future resilience and reliability of the nation's electric power transmission and distribution system. At a minimum, the report should include technological options for strengthening the capabilities of the nation's power grid; a review of federal, State, industry, and academic research and development programs; and an evaluation of cyber security for energy delivery systems. Not later than September 30, 2015, the Department shall submit the findings to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration (ISER).—The Committee recommends $16,000,000 for Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration, $8,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $6,600,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $8,000,000 for the ISER activity and $8,000,000 for the Operational Energy and Resilience (OER) program, of which all funding shall be to support construction of the Energy Resilience and Operations Center within the Department's Washington, D.C. headquarters. The Committee notes that physical construction of this strategic operations center will take approximately one year and must be completed before equipment installation may take place. The recommendation provides no funding for dedicated staff for the OER program, about which the Committee reiterates its concerns of the Department's intent to embed staff within each of the ten Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regions. The Committee directs the Department to submit not later than February 1, 2015, a strategic workforce plan, including out-year budget costs, for a modified OER program in which staff is not embedded into the FEMA regional offices. The Committee further directs any funding for staff be included in Program Direction in future budget submissions.

The Committee directs the Department to submit not later than three months after enactment of this Act a report on its efforts to support the physical and cyber security of the electricity grid. The report should include the following: an analysis of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation physical security standards de-

veloped in response to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's March 7, 2014, order, as well as areas for improvement, if necessary; the Department's plans to better understand and respond to the correlation of threats against physical infrastructure, operational technology systems, and informational technology systems of the electricity grid; the Department's efforts to reach out to and incorporate the private sector; and whether the Department should have a larger role to assist owners of critical infrastructure to develop the necessary capabilities to provide security to the nation's electricity grid.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Appropriation, 2014	$889,190,000
Budget estimate, 2015	863,386,000
Recommended, 2015	899,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+9,810,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+35,614,000

Nuclear power generates approximately one-fifth of the nation's electricity and will continue to be an important base-load energy source in the future. The Department of Energy's Nuclear Energy program invests in research, development, and demonstration activities that develop the next generation of clean and safe reactors, further improve the safety of our current reactor fleet, and contribute to the nation's long-term leadership in the global nuclear power industry.

The Committee recommends $899,000,000 for Nuclear Energy, $9,810,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $35,614,000 above the budget request.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee provides $483,500,000 for Nuclear Energy Research and Development, $5,130,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $15,614,000 above the budget request.

Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies.—The Committee recommends $101,000,000 for Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies, $29,870,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $22,754,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $14,000,000 for Crosscutting Technology Development; $26,200,000 for Nuclear Energy Advanced Modeling and Simulation, of which funding above the request is for additional support of the advanced computational tools and methods developed by various Nuclear Energy programs; $24,300,000 for the first year of the second five-year term of the Energy Innovation Hub for Modeling and Simulation; and $36,500,000 for the National Science User Facility, of which funding above the request is to complete the installation of advanced post-irradiation examination equipment at the Irradiated Materials Characterization Laboratory.

Integrated University Program.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 to continue the Integrated University Program, which is critical to ensuring the nation's nuclear science and engineering workforce in future years.

Small Modular Reactor (SMR) Licensing Technical Support.—The Committee recommends $54,500,000 for SMR Licensing Technical Support, $55,500,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $42,500,000

below the budget request. The Committee directs that all fiscal year 2015 funding within this program is to support the second award for an SMR design. The Committee is aware that the need for fiscal year 2015 funding for the first award under the SMR Licensing Technical Support program may change throughout the year and will consider additional funding according to developments.

Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration.—The Committee recommends $138,000,000 for Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration, $25,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $37,460,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $35,000,000 for Light Water Reactor Sustainability, of which $12,700,000 is to support advanced safety methods development and the risk informed safety margin characterization methodology; $2,000,000 for the joint industrial scale integrated energy systems research and development effort with the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; and $101,000,000 for Advanced Reactor Concepts to include the following activities: $33,000,000 is for research of the fuel and graphite qualification program for the High Temperature Gas Reactor; $12,500,000 is for the further development of two performance-based advanced reactor concepts, of which $7,500,000 is for industry-only competition of two performance-based advanced reactor concepts and $5,000,000 is for the national laboratories selected to work with the awardees to perform the work required by the awardees to meet the goals of the awards; and $7,000,000 is for an advanced test/demonstration reactor planning study by the national laboratories, industry, and other relevant stakeholders of such a reactor in the U.S. The study will evaluate advanced reactor technology options, capabilities, and requirements within the context of national needs and public policy to support innovation in nuclear energy. The recommendation funds other activities within Advanced Reactor Concepts at the requested level and accepts the Department's proposal to consolidate Advanced SMR Research and Development with Advanced Reactor Concepts.

Fuel Cycle Research and Development.—The Committee recommends $182,000,000 for Fuel Cycle Research and Development, $4,500,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $7,100,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $60,100,000 for the Advanced Fuels Program to continue implementation of accident tolerant fuels development, of which $12,000,000 is for additional support of feasibility studies for accident tolerant light water reactor fuels and $5,000,000 is for additional support of capability development of transient testing, including test design, modeling, and simulation.

The recommendation provides $55,000,000 for Used Nuclear Fuel Disposition (UNFD), $5,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $24,000,000 below the budget request. The budget request for UNFD is organized into two distinct activities: $49,000,000 for research and development activities to enable storage, transportation, and disposal of used nuclear fuel and wastes generated by existing and future nuclear cycles, and $30,000,000 for integrated waste management system activities to lay the groundwork and develop options for decision makers on the design of an integrated waste management system. The recommendation provides $55,000,000 for

UNFD research and development activities, $25,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $6,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to support research and development of advanced sensors, online monitoring, and other non-destructive evaluation and examination technologies to ensure long-term dry cask storage integrity. Of the funding provided above the budget request for UNFD research and development, $6,000,000 is to support activities to design and certify a rail car or cars for use with licensed and anticipated transportation casks. No funding is provided for integrated waste management system activities.

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for Radiological Facilities Management, $20,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request, to support the continued operation of U.S. research reactors by providing research reactor fuel services and maintenance of fuel fabrication equipment.

IDAHO FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $206,000,000 for Idaho Facilities Management, $9,440,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $20,090,000 above the budget request.

INL Operations and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $200,631,000 for INL Operations and Infrastructure, $20,469,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $20,090,000 above the budget request. Of the funds provided above the budget request, the recommendation provides an additional $5,000,000 for nuclear facility and support systems major maintenance; $6,000,000 for Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) safety margin improvement preliminary design and estimating; $4,000,000 for ATR evaporation pond liner replacement; and $3,000,000 for the replacement of windows, manipulators, and process equipment at the Hot Fuel Examination Facility.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $5,369,000 for Construction, $11,029,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the request, for design and construction of the Remote-Handled Low-Level Waste Disposal Project, a joint project with Naval Reactors.

IDAHO SITEWIDE SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $104,000,000 for Idaho Sitewide Safeguards and Security, $10,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. The recommendation continues to fund this activity out of the Nuclear Energy account, as proposed in the budget request, and not out of Other Defense Activities, as it was prior to fiscal year 2014.

SUPERCRITICAL TRANSFORMATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER GENERATION

The Committee recommends $27,500,000 for the Supercritical Transformational Electric Power (STEP) Generation Initiative, $27,500,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request, to develop and scale up advanced supercritical carbon dioxide Brayton Cycle energy conversion technologies to pre-commercial pilot demonstration to facilitate commercial development. This is a

joint initiative with the Office of Fossil Energy and the Solar Energy program within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

The Committee directs that any demonstration funding be to support a partnership with commercial channel partners to develop a pilot-scale supercritical carbon dioxide demonstration facility for temperatures greater than 700 degrees Celsius and that has broad applicability to fossil, nuclear, and solar heat sources. The Department may modify the cost-share ratio in accordance with the Energy Policy Act of 2005 as well as the temperature requirement upon certification the operating parameters have broad applicability to fossil, nuclear, and solar heat sources that achieve the high performance characteristics afforded by supercritical carbon dioxide cycles. The Committee encourages the Office of Nuclear Energy to utilize the expertise already developed within the Office of Fossil Energy's turbine program, which has experience in similar conversion work and component development.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriation, 2014	$562,065,000
Budget estimate, 2015	475,500,000
Recommended, 2015	593,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+30,935,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+117,500,000

Fossil energy resources, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, provide approximately 82 percent of all energy used by the nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide for the majority of our needs for the foreseeable future. The Fossil Energy Research and Development program funds research, development, and demonstration activities to improve existing technologies and to develop next-generation systems in the full spectrum of fossil energy areas. At a time when fossil fuel power generation is expanding around the globe and gas prices remain at historically high levels, the activities funded within this program advance our nation's position as a leader in fossil energy technologies and ensure that we use the full extent of our domestic resources safely and efficiently.

The Committee recommends $593,000,000 for Fossil Energy Research and Development, $30,935,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $117,500,000 above the budget request.

Once again, the budget request proposes severe reductions to the Office of Fossil Energy's coal program and requests funding be focused on carbon capture and storage technologies and projects. This focus underemphasizes two areas critical to our nation's energy future: the efficient use of existing fossil energy resources and the full, safe, and responsible use of untapped domestic resources. The Committee recommendation increases funding in these areas to improve the efficiency of power generation and to bolster efforts that can help protect Americans from future high gasoline and diesel prices. In addition to securing the domestic energy sector and protecting consumers and businesses from future increases in electricity and gas prices, technological advances in these areas will help American industry compete in the booming global marketplace for fossil energy technologies.

Liquefied Natural Gas Export Applications.—The Committee remains concerned about the backlog of liquefied natural gas export applications at the Department of Energy. To date, applications for export to non-free trade agreement (FTA) countries have been prone to lengthy delays, with only seven of 33 applications approved to date and multiple applications pending at the Department for more than two years. On May 29, 2014, the Department proposed to discontinue conditional approvals of applications for export to non-FTA countries and instead make final public interest determinations only after the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission conducts environmental reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act. It is unclear whether these proposed changes would accelerate the Department's adjudication of applications or make them susceptible to further bureaucratic delays. The Committee continues to support a clearly communicated, timely process to reach an appropriate determination on each application and reiterates its previous direction to the Department, as first required in House Report 113–135 and referenced by the fiscal year 2014 Act, to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than one month after enactment of this Act its plan to complete consideration of all applications filed with the Department.

Carbon Utilization Technologies.—The Committee encourages the Office of Fossil Energy to examine the feasibility of carbon utilization technologies in addition to its work on enhanced oil recovery, such as projects that utilize large volumes of carbon dioxide in the production of algae. The Committee urges the Office of Fossil Energy to coordinate with the Bioenergy Technologies program within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy in areas of mutual interest, such as algae production.

COAL—CCS AND POWER SYSTEMS

The Committee recommends $412,000,000 for Coal Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) and Power Systems, $19,664,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $134,593,000 above the budget request. The Committee notes the Department improperly requested $25,000,000 for a natural gas carbon capture and storage demonstration project within the coal program; subprogram totals referenced within this report reflect that proposal as if it were made within the Natural Gas Technologies program. The Department is directed to use funds within the coal program only for coal research and development, with the exception of the Supercritical Transformational Electric Power Generation program, which has applications to all high-temperature fossil heat sources.

The Committee encourages the Department to establish university partnerships to support ongoing fossil energy programs, to promote broader research into CCS technologies, and to expand its technology transfer efforts. The Department has previously funded several university-based CCS projects and can build on an established research base to support ongoing research and to address the wider implementation of CCS technologies.

The Committee is aware that the Fossil Energy program supports research for all coal types, including lignite, which presents unique technical challenges due to its higher moisture content and lower heating value than other varieties of coal. The Committee en-

courages the Department to continue supporting projects that advance technology development for power sources that use lignite as a primary feedstock.

Carbon Capture.—The Committee recommends $90,000,000 for Carbon Capture, $2,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $13,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $12,000,000 for pre-combustion capture systems and $78,000,000 for post-combustion capture systems, of which funding above the request is for additional support of bench-scale and pilot projects.

Carbon Storage.—The Committee recommends $100,000,000 for Carbon Storage, $8,900,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $19,916,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $13,500,000 for Geologic Storage Technologies; $10,000,000 for Monitoring, Verification, Accounting, and Assessment; $2,000,000 for Carbon Use and Reuse; $8,500,000 for Carbon Sequestration Science; and $66,000,000 for Storage Infrastructure, of which not less than $6,000,000 is for additional support of enhanced oil recovery (EOR) technologies and projects, which can advance American industry and clean fossil energy power generation while increasing domestic oil production.

The Committee encourages the Department to expand its support for carbon dioxide EOR technologies beyond the current scope and urges the Department to support the demonstration and deployment of promising, next-generation technologies at mature oil fields.

Advanced Energy Systems.—The Committee recommends $107,000,000 for Advanced Energy Systems, $7,500,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $56,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $30,000,000 for Advanced Combustion Systems, of which funding above the request is for additional support of pressure gain reduction, chemical looping, and pressurized combustion technologies and projects; $27,000,000 for Gasification Systems, of which $8,000,000 is for the Advanced Air Separation Program to continue activities improving advanced air separation technologies; $15,000,000 for Hydrogen Turbines; $5,000,000 for coal-biomass to liquids activities, which seek to produce liquid fuels from blends of domestic coal and biomass resources with reduced emissions and land and water use through integration of carbon capture and other technologies; and $30,000,000 for Solid Oxide Fuel Cells, which have the potential to increase substantially the efficiency of clean coal power generation systems, to create new opportunities for the efficient use of natural gas, and to contribute significantly to the development of alternative-fuel vehicles.

Crosscutting Research.—The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for Crosscutting Research, $8,075,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $14,708,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $25,000,000 for Coal Utilization Science; $1,500,000 for Energy Analyses; $3,900,000 for University Training and Research; and $18,500,000 for Plant Optimization Technologies, of which $5,000,000 is for the Advanced Ultrasupercritical Program to identify, test, qualify, and develop domestic suppliers capable of producing components from high temperature materials

and $7,000,000 is for water management research and development.

National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) Coal Research and Development.—The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for NETL Coal Research and Development, $11,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $15,969,000 above the budget request. The Committee notes that this program was funded within Program Direction prior to fiscal year 2012. The Department is directed to continue including in the budget request all full-time equivalent employee information within this program, as it does under Program Direction.

The recommendation includes $15,000,000 for the Department to continue its activities to economically recover rare earth elements from coal and coal byproduct streams, such as fly ash, coal refuse, and aqueous effluents, pending the submission of findings on the feasibility of rare earth element recovery from coal and, if determined feasible, a multi-year research and development program as directed in House Report 113–135 and referenced by the fiscal year 2014 Act.

Supercritical Transformational Electric Power (STEP) Generation Program.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 within Fossil Energy for the STEP program, a joint initiative with the Office of Nuclear Energy and the Solar Energy program within the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to spur the development of the necessary designs, materials, components, operation and control systems, sensors, and understanding and characterization for large-scale supercritical carbon dioxide power conversion.

The supercritical carbon dioxide Brayton cycle energy conversion system transforms heat energy through use of a supercritical fluid medium with no condensation rather than through steam and water and offers the possibility of higher cycle efficiency over steam turbines by increasing turbine inlet temperatures. Within the Fossil Energy program, higher inlet temperatures and materials development are already underway to develop ultrasupercritical steam turbines at 700 degrees Celsius in conjunction with coal power plants. At this inlet temperature, the supercritical carbon dioxide cycle-based plant systems offer the potential for efficiency improvements of up to four percent compared to steam systems.

The approach to develop supercritical carbon dioxide-based power conversion is crosscutting except for the difference in heat sources and, thus, the inlet temperatures expected. Currently, only fossil heat sources have achieved the desired high temperature inlet conditions necessary to achieve significant thermal efficiency gains afforded by supercritical carbon dioxide cycles. The Committee, therefore, has included $15,000,000 for the Office of Fossil Energy to support the technology development of supercritical carbon dioxide-based power conversion from fossil heat sources, as well as $10,000,000 for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to support the technology development of supercritical carbon dioxide-based power conversion from solar energy. The Committee has also included direction within Nuclear Energy requiring the Department to ensure that a pilot demonstration project takes advantage of the current availability of high-temperature fossil heat sources.

NATURAL GAS TECHNOLOGIES

The Committee recommends $22,600,000 for Natural Gas Technologies, $2,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $37,400,000 below the budget request.

Research.—The Committee recommends $22,600,000 for Natural Gas Technologies Research. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $12,700,000 for research into the cost-effective and responsible extraction of methane hydrates, a vast but currently inaccessible resource whose total energy reserves rival those from all other known fossil fuels combined; $5,200,000 for the Risk Based Data Management System; and $4,700,000 for midstream natural gas infrastructure research and development. The Committee directs that any funding for midstream natural gas infrastructure research and development be to enhance the deliverability efficiency of natural gas.

Other than its support for the Risk Based Data Management System, the recommendation provides no funding for the joint research effort with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) into hydraulic fracturing technologies. The Committee notes the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 restricted certain fiscal year 2014 funding for this collaborative research effort pending submission of a finalized interagency research plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Department has not yet submitted this plan, which will allow the Committee to understand why the Department of Energy has allocated funding for this joint research effort the last two fiscal years despite no funding being allocated by the EPA and significantly reduced funding being allocated by the USGS. The Committee directs the Department to submit this plan as previously directed. The Committee further reiterates its previous direction that any funding in the area of hydraulic fracturing, including any funding to support the proposed joint effort with EPA and USGS, is for research into hydraulic fracturing technologies that aims both to improve the economics and recoverability of reserves and to address the health, safety, and environmental risks of shale gas extraction.

Natural Gas Carbon Capture and Storage Demonstration Project.—The recommendation includes no funding for a Natural Gas Carbon Capture and Storage demonstration project.

UNCONVENTIONAL FOSSIL ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

The Committee recommends $13,000,000 for Unconventional Fossil Energy Technologies, $2,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $13,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides not less than $12,500,000 for activities to improve the economic viability, safety, and environmental responsibility of offshore exploration and production in challenging conditions, of exploration and production from unconventional natural gas and other petroleum resources, and of production by small producers; and up to $500,000 for the Department to assess the technical landscape of scalable energy conversion technologies, such as gas-to-liquid or solid-to-liquid conversions or electrical power generation, for use on unconventional and underutilized energy resources such as stranded, sour, and hindered gas; anaerobic di-

gester wastes; small coal and waste coal streams; municipal treatment plants; and municipal solid waste. The Department is directed to report its findings to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than six months after enactment of this Act.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

Appropriation, 2014	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	19,950,000
Recommended, 2015	19,950,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−50,000
Budget estimate, 2015	− − −

The Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves no longer serve the national defense purpose envisioned in the early 1900's, and consequently the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 required the sale of the Government's interest in the Naval Petroleum Reserve 1 (NPR–1). To comply with this requirement, the Elk Hills field in California was sold to Occidental Petroleum Corporation in 1998. Following the sale of Elk Hills, the transfer of the oil shale reserves, and transfer of administrative jurisdiction and environmental remediation of the Naval Petroleum Reserve 2 (NPR–2) to the Department of the Interior, the Department retains one Naval Petroleum Reserve property, the Naval Petroleum Reserve 3 (NPR–3) in Wyoming (Teapot Dome field). This is a stripper well oil field that the Department has maintained while it remained economically productive.

The fiscal year 2015 budget request supports continued implementation of the disposition plan for NPR–3 as recommended in a June 2013 report. Fiscal year 2015 activities include disposal through competitive sale and continued environmental remediation.

The Committee recommendation for the operation of the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves is $19,950,000, $50,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

Appropriation, 2014	− − −
Budget estimate, 2015	$15,579,815
Recommended, 2015	15,579,815
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+15,579,815
Budget estimate, 2015	− − −

Payment to the State of California through the Elk Hills school lands fund was part of the settlement associated with the sale of the Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 1 (NPR–1). Under the settlement, payments to the State are to total nine percent of the net proceeds of the sale. Payments to date have totaled $299,520,000. Final equity for the sale of NPR–1 was settled in fiscal year 2011, allowing the Department and the State to agree on the amount of a final payment.

The Committee recommendation for the final payment is $15,579,815, the same as the budget request.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

Appropriation, 2014	$189,400,000
Budget estimate, 2015	205,000,000
Recommended, 2015	205,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+15,600,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The mission of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) is to store petroleum to reduce the adverse economic impact of a major petroleum supply interruption to the U.S. and to carry out obligations under the international energy program. The capacity of the Reserve is 727 million barrels. The current inventory is approximately 691 million barrels or approximately 111 days of net import protection for the United States economy. Operational activities, however, will leave approximately 59 million barrels unavailable for drawdown, thereby reducing the U.S. net import protection to 102 days. Additionally, damage at one storage tank reduces the drawdown rate to 4.25 million barrels per day from 4.4 million barrels per day.

The Committee recommendation for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is $205,000,000, $15,600,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. The funding increase above fiscal year 2014 is primarily for the major maintenance program to address aging infrastructure and the deferred maintenance backlog.

In March 2014, the Department announced it would be conducting the first test drawdown and sale since 1990. This test sale of 5 million barrels was said to be necessary in light of significant changes in the system, including pipeline expansions, construction of new infrastructure, reversed flow of existing pipelines, and increased use of domestic crude oil terminals. The Committee looks forward to reviewing all information learned from this test sale once the Department's detailed explanation of the test, required by statute, is received. Based on original bids, the Department estimates as much as $495,000,000 in revenues from this test sale will be deposited in the SPR Petroleum Account.

In May 2014, the Secretary announced, as part of the President's Climate Action Plan, the creation of the first federal regional refined petroleum product reserve. This reserve is to contain gasoline and be located in the Northeast United States. It is described as enabling a more secure and resilient energy infrastructure, building on lessons learned from Superstorm Sandy. Fuel acquisition and commercial storage service contracts for 4.5 years will be funded through the SPR Petroleum Account, using receipts from the March 2014 test sale. The Department has indicated it is conducting a series of regional fuel resiliency studies and, based on the results, may consider additional regional refined petroleum product reserves.

The Committee acknowledges that a test drawdown sale may provide useful information in light of changes in the crude oil system. The Committee also acknowledges that the concept of regional refined petroleum product reserves may have merit and deserves further consideration. The timing of these announcements, the use of receipts from the test sale rather than appropriated funds, and the lack of prior consultation with the Congress, however, is extremely concerning.

The SPR has been focused on creating and maintaining a supply of emergency crude oil. The Department's own web site explains that only crude oil is stored in the Reserve because ". . . in preparing the 1977 SPR Plan for development of the Reserve, an analysis of the U.S. refining industry indicated that the industry was robust and had the refining capacity to satisfy the major portion of the nation's demand for petroleum products. This continues to be true today—over 30 years later. The U.S. petroleum import dependency is overwhelmingly crude oil, not refined products. In addition, crude oil is cheaper to acquire, store and transport than refined products. Crude oil quality does not degrade over time as do refined products and crude oil provides flexibility in responding to fluctuations in refined product market needs; whereas, refined products are expensive to maintain and are subject to changes in specifications mandated by environmental legislation." To date, the Department has not provided any analysis to contradict this explanation or justify a change in course for the SPR.

The Department has conceded that certain management and oversight functions associated with the newly announced regional reserve will need to be funded through the annual appropriations process. The Committee assumes that storage costs beyond the initial 4.5 years will need to be funded through the annual appropriations process also. Based on current estimates, these costs may represent an increase in funding requirements of 5 percent of the total SPR annual appropriation. For all these reasons, the creation of new regional refined petroleum product reserves constitutes significant policy and budgetary changes that the Department should have discussed with the Congress prior to making a public announcement and taking administrative action.

The recommendation includes a general provision requiring the Department to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate with advance notification of any test drawdown and sale or exchange of petroleum products from the SPR. The information required will enable the Committees to ensure that future test sales are conducted solely for the purpose of testing the drawdown and sales processes and not to generate funds outside the annual appropriations process for use by the Department for activities not specifically approved by the Congress.

The general provision also prohibits the Department from using any funds remaining from revenues generated by the March 2014 test sale for the purchase of any petroleum product other than crude oil, since that is the petroleum product that was sold. The Committee strongly believes the Congress must be a partner in such a significant policy and budgetary decision as expanding the location or types of petroleum product stored in the SPR. The Committee expects that if the Department completes regional fuel resiliency studies and determines that additional regional refined petroleum product reserves are advisable, then the Department will provide the analysis to the Congress, engage the appropriate committees in discussions over details, and include any necessary funding in subsequent budget requests.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2014	$8,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,600,000
Recommended, 2015	1,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−6,400,000
Budget estimate, 2015	− − −

The acquisition and storage of heating oil for the Northeast began in August 2000 when the Department of Energy, through the Strategic Petroleum Reserve account, awarded contracts for the lease of commercial storage facilities and acquisition of heating oil. The purpose of the reserve is to assure home heating oil supplies for the Northeastern States during times of very low inventories and significant threats to the immediate supply of heating oil. The Northeast Heating Oil Reserve was established as a separate entity from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve on March 6, 2001. The reserve contains one million barrels of Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD), with approximately one-half located in commercial facilities in Boston, Massachusetts and approximately one-half located in commercial facilities in Groton, Connecticut. This reserve is the equivalent of three to four days of emergency stocks in New England.

The Committee recommendation for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve is $1,600,000, $6,400,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. After accounting for a rescission of $6,000,000 of prior-year unobligated balances in the recommendation and the use of $6,000,000 in prior-year balances in the budget request, the fiscal year 2015 program level is $400,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2014	$117,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	122,500,000
Recommended, 2015	120,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+3,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−2,500,000

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) is a quasi-independent agency within the Department of Energy established to provide timely, objective, and accurate energy-related information to the Congress, the executive branch, state governments, industry, and the public. The Committee recommends $120,000,000 for the Energy Information Administration, $3,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $2,500,000 below the budget request.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriation, 2014	$231,765,000
Budget estimate, 2015	226,174,000
Recommended, 2015	241,174,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+9,409,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+15,000,000

Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup includes funds to manage and clean up sites used for civilian, energy research, and non-de-

fense related activities. These past activities resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination that requires remediation, stabilization, or some other action. The Committee recommends $241,174,000 for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup, $9,409,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $15,000,000 above the budget request. To the extent possible within available funds, the Department of Energy should take advantage of near-term opportunities to realize lifecycle cost savings by accelerating completion of ongoing small sites projects.

Small Sites.—The Committee recommends $65,223,000, $5,981,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $5,000,000 above the budget request. Within funding for Small Sites, $5,000,000 is provided to clean up outstanding Department of Energy liabilities at the Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for physical security upgrades at the Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Generating Station. Considering the growing cost of continuing to store these materials for which the Department has assumed responsibility, the Department is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than December 1, 2014, a report that describes the costs of continuing to store spent nuclear fuel at Fort St. Vrain and the feasibility and costs of consolidating this material at another DOE site.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 2014	$598,823,000
Budget estimate, 2015	530,976,000
Recommended, 2015	585,976,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−12,847,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+55,000,000

The Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund was established by the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to pay for the cleanup of gaseous diffusion plants at Portsmouth, Ohio; Paducah, Kentucky; and the East Tennessee Technology Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The Committee recommends $585,976,000 for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, $12,847,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $55,000,000 above the budget request.

Oak Ridge.—The Committee recommends $157,898,000, $38,092,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $20,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee commends the Department for its high level of performance in completing demolition of the K–25 building and provides funding above the budget request to preserve momentum on completing cleanup work at the site.

Paducah.—The Committee recommends $207,215,000, $58,005,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. The Committee is aware that the Department intends to carry over approximately $107,000,000 into fiscal year 2015 as a result of the delays in the turnover of the gaseous diffusion plant from the United States Enrichment Corporation. With the additional funds provided in this bill, the Department will have approximately $314,000,000 to conduct cleanup activities in fiscal

year 2015. The Department is obligated to decommission and decontaminate the gaseous diffusion plant and other structures at the Paducah site in a timely fashion, but has done a poor job explaining its future cleanup plans to the Committee, stakeholders, and the public. The Committee does not support placing the gaseous diffusion plant in a cold and dark state. The Department is directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days after enactment a report that clearly describes the anticipated timeline for decontamination and decommissioning of the Paducah gaseous diffusion plant and that includes the Department's five-year projected cost and schedule planning assumptions for accomplishing work at the site.

Portsmouth.—The Committee recommends $175,000,000, $37,387,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $15,000,000 above the budget request. Additional funds above the budget request are to compensate for reduced uranium barter proceeds anticipated by the continued depression of uranium market prices.

Title X Uranium/Thorium Reimbursements.—The Committee recommends $20,000,000 to reimburse private licensees for the federal government's share of the cost of cleaning up uranium and thorium processing sites in accordance with Title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, $20,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $20,000,000 above the budget request. The Department reports that it has $54,586,000 in approved but unpaid claim balances, but the Department has failed to provide plans for addressing these liabilities. These cleanup activities are important to the health and safety of a number of communities, and the recommendation provides funding above the budget request to reduce the backlog of outstanding claims. The Committee expects the Department to provide sufficient resources within future budget plans to reimburse licensees for approved claim balances.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 2014	$5,071,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	5,111,155,000
Recommended, 2015	5,071,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	–40,155,000

The Office of Science funds basic science research across national laboratories, universities, and other research institutions in support of American innovation and the Department's energy-focused missions. Through research in physics, biology, chemistry, and other science disciplines, these activities expand scientific understanding and secure the nation's leadership in energy innovation. The Office of Science funds a significant portion of science research nationwide.

The Science program office includes Advanced Scientific Computing Research, Basic Energy Sciences, Biological and Environmental Research, Fusion Energy Sciences, High Energy Physics, Nuclear Physics, Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists, Science Laboratories Infrastructure, Safeguards and Security, and Program Direction. The Committee has placed a high priority on funding these activities within the limited resources avail-

able in fiscal year 2015, given the private sector is not likely to fund research whose findings either have high non-commercial value or are not likely to be commercialized in the near- or medium-term. However, this work is vital to sustaining the scientific leadership of the United States and can provide the underpinnings for valuable intellectual property in the coming decades.

The Committee recommendation is $5,071,000,000 for the Office of Science, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $40,155,000 below the budget request.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The Advanced Scientific Computing Research program develops and hosts some of the world's fastest computing and network capabilities to enable science and energy modeling, simulation, and research. The Committee recommends $541,000,000 for Advanced Scientific Computing Research, $62,407,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

Exascale Computing.—The Committee continues to support the exascale initiative, which seeks to develop the next generation of computing systems three orders of magnitude faster than today's fastest systems. This decade-long effort is critical to enabling basic and energy-focused science research not previously possible and to maintaining the nation's global leadership in computing technologies. The recommendation includes the requested level of $91,000,000.

High Performance Computing and Network Facilities.—In addition to the long-term exascale intiative, the Committee supports continued upgrade and operation of the Leadership Computing Facilities at Argonne and Oak Ridge National Laboratories and of the High Performance Production Computing capabilities at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. These systems' capabilities are a critical component of science and industrial research and development across the nation, and they should be maintained as world-leading facilities. The recommendation includes the requested levels of $80,320,000 for the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility; $104,317,000 for the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility; and $69,000,000 for the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

All other activities within the Advanced Scientific Computing Research program are funded at the requested level.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Basic Energy Sciences program funds basic research in materials science, chemistry, geoscience, and bioscience. The science breakthroughs in this program enable a broad array of innovation in energy technologies and other industries critical to American economic competitiveness. The Committee recommends $1,702,000,000 for Basic Energy Sciences, $10,757,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $104,500,000 below the budget request.

The program's budget consists of funding for research, the operation of existing user facilities, and the design, procurement, and construction of new facilities and equipment. The long-term success of the program hinges on striking a careful balance among these three areas. However, the increasing level of research commitments and completion of new facilities make it difficult to adequately fund

all three components of the Basic Energy Sciences program within existing budgetary constraints. The Committee strongly cautions the Department against assuming an ever-increasing budget when planning the balance among facility runtime, construction, and research funding.

Research.—The Committee recommends $1,574,000,000 for Basic Energy Sciences research, $36,757,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $93,800,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $100,000,000 for Energy Frontier Research Centers.

For materials science and engineering research, the recommendation includes $371,382,000, of which $10,000,000 is for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research and $8,000,000 is for Computational Materials Sciences. All other activities within this subprogram are funded at the requested level, including $24,175,000 for the third year of the Batteries and Energy Storage Innovation Hub.

For chemical sciences, geosciences, and biosciences, the recommendation includes $291,280,000. The recommendation includes no funding for the Fuels from Sunlight Innovation Hub, which received its final year of funding for its initial five-year award term in fiscal year 2014. The Committee notes the Department has made no decision for continued funding for the hub beyond the initial term, which ends in September 2015.

For scientific user facilities, the recommendation includes $911,338,000, of which $32,168,000 is for research; $42,500,000 is for major items of equipment; and $9,300,000 is for other projects costs. The recommendation includes $799,529,000 for facilities operations of the nation's synchrotron radiation light sources, high flux neutron sources, and nanoscale science research centers, of which $248,490,000 is for the High-Flux Neutron Sources to operate at optimal levels and $105,000,000 is for the National Synchrotron Light Source-II at Brookhaven National Laboratory to transition from early operations to full operations during fiscal year 2015.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $128,000,000 for Basic Energy Sciences construction, $26,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $10,700,000 below the budget request. The recommendation supports the second year of construction funding for the revised LINAC Coherent Light Source II project to include the addition of a superconducting linear accelerator and additional undulators to generate an unprecedented high-repetition-rate free-electron laser.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Biological and Environmental Research program supports advances in energy technologies and related science through research into complex biological and environmental systems. The Committee recommends $540,000,000 for Biological and Environmental Research, $70,196,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $88,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee continues to support the Biological Systems Science subprogram, which focuses on the biology of plant and microbes with the ultimate goal of enabling future generations of biofuels from a variety of sustainable domestic biomass sources. In

addition to reducing our nation's dependence on petroleum-based fuels with chronically high prices, the biofuels produced through this program's science breakthroughs can lower the cost of, improve the sustainability of, and ease industry's transition to those fuel alternatives.

The recommendation includes $75,000,000 for the third year of the second five-year term of the three Bioenergy Research Centers, the same as fiscal year 2014 and the budget request. The recommendation includes no funding for the new Climate Model Development and Validation activity.

Quickly advancing capabilities in high performance computing, informatics, data science and analysis, and simulation and modeling have a profound impact on scientific discovery and innovation. The Committee encourages the Biological Systems Science subprogram to leverage the computational, data, and informatics capabilities of the national laboratories, research universities, and other stakeholders to advance its biological mission, and to see that the benefits of these resources are accessible to a broad set of researchers.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Fusion Energy Sciences program supports basic research and experimentation aiming to harness nuclear fusion for energy production. The Committee recommends $540,000,000 for Fusion Energy Sciences, $34,323,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $124,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides not less than $71,220,000 for the National Spherical Torus Experiment (NSTX); not less than $80,250,000 for DIII–D; and not less than $22,260,000 for Alcator C–Mod.

Research.—The Committee recommends $315,000,000 for the domestic fusion program, $9,323,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $49,000,000 above the budget request. The domestic fusion program is a critical component of United States science leadership and a necessary building block of any successful fusion project, including the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER).

For the science subprogram, which advances the predictive understanding of plasma confinement, dynamics, and interactions with surrounding materials, the recommendation provides $184,138,000, of which $35,500,000 is for DIII–D research; $8,000,000 is for Alcator C–Mod research; $11,545,000 is for international research; $28,500,000 is for NSTX research; $17,500,000 is for High Energy Density Laboratory Plasmas; $25,170,000 is for theory; and $9,500,000 is for Scientific Discovery through Advanced Computing.

For facilities operations, which support operation, maintenance, and modifications to the research equipment and diagnostics at the major U.S. fusion facilities, the recommendation provides $103,855,000, of which $44,750,000 is for DIII–D; $38,250,000 is for NSTX operations; $3,470,000 is for the NSTX upgrade project; and $14,260,000 is for Alcator C–Mod.

For enabling research and development, which develops and continually improves the hardware, materials, and technology incorporated into existing and next-generation fusion research facilities,

the recommendation provides $27,007,000, of which $13,597,000 is for Materials Research.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $225,000,000 for the U.S. contribution to the ITER project, $25,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $75,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides not less than $200,000,000 for in-kind hardware contributions and up to $25,000,000 for cash contributions to the ITER Organization. The recommendation continues a reprogramming control point for the ITER project, as well as bill language restricting cash contributions to the ITER Organization pending implementation of the Third Biennial International Organization Management Assessment Report recommendations.

The Committee continues its support for a robust fusion program and believes ITER to be an important international collaboration that represents a major step forward for the fusion energy sciences. However, the Committee is alarmed by the breadth of the findings in the latest management assessment report and dismayed that the main challenge for the project remains its management, rather than the science and technology of the experiment itself. The Committee interprets the collection of these shortfalls as a serious threat to the ultimate success of the project. The Committee will not tolerate lower project management standards for scientific experiments conducted outside of the U.S. compared to those conducted inside of the U.S., particularly those that result in cost overruns, lengthy delays, and unrealistic schedules.

Nevertheless, if successful, the ITER project continues to represent a significant leap forward towards the ultimate goal of a prototype commercial fusion reactor. It has the support of 35 countries and seven member organizations, of which the U.S. is responsible for approximately nine percent of the total cost and in-kind hardware contributions. It remains the most practical U.S. investment in the fusion energy sciences, pending implementation of the management assessment reforms. The Committee strongly supports the recent efforts of the ITER Council to adopt the latest management assessment recommendations and, by the summer of 2015, to adopt a realistic schedule and funding profile for the ITER project among all member nations. For fiscal year 2015, the Committee includes funding to allow the ITER Council the time it needs to implement these recommendations as soon as practicable. Should the ITER Council fail in its attempts to create a strong project culture within the ITER Organization, the Committee questions whether the project can succeed as a scientific experiment and, as such, will be forced to reconsider its support for the international project.

The Committee is discouraged by the Department's budget request of $150,000,000 for ITER, of which $110,000,000 is for in-kind hardware contributions and $40,000,000 is for cash contributions. If adopted, the request would only serve to extend the timeline of the project by six months to two years and result in cost overruns—both for U.S. in-kind hardware contributions and the U.S. share of the ITER Organization—for no apparent reason. This is not a fiscally responsible proposal. According to the Department's latest cost estimate of the ITER project, which was submitted before the fiscal year 2015 budget request, the U.S. share to reach first plasma—the primary major milestone on the path to total

project completion—is $2,751,885,000, with the total U.S. share of construction, operating and decommissioning costs at $3,900,000,000 excluding contingency funding. The recommendation supports the Department's latest estimate to meet the U.S. obligations to first plasma by 2023.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The High Energy Physics program supports fundamental research into the elementary constituents of matter and energy, and ultimately into the nature of space and time. The program focuses on particle physics theory and experimentation in three areas: the energy frontier, which investigates new particles and fundamental forces through high-energy experimentation; the intensity frontier, which focuses on rare events to better understand our fundamental model of the universe's elementary constituents; and the cosmic frontier, which investigates the nature of the universe and its form of matter and energy on cosmic scales. The Committee recommends $775,000,000 for High Energy Physics, $22,521,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $31,000,000 above the budget request.

The Committee notes that the high energy physics research community is currently engaged in developing a ten-year plan for U.S. particle physics, which will include a ten-year report by the Particle Physics Project Prioritization Panel under various budget scenarios. The Committee applauds the Department for this undertaking and continues to support a clearly articulated vision under realistic budget scenarios for each of the Science programs. The Committee encourages the Department to make modifications to its high energy physics fiscal year 2015 budget request as necessary based on the findings of this multi-step planning process.

The Department is directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act a work plan that would advance second-generation dark matter direct detection experiments, stage four cosmic microwave background experiments, and the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument.

Within available funds, the recommendation includes $22,000,000 for the Long Baseline Neutrino Experiment (LBNE) and its alternatives, to include $10,000,000 for research and development and $12,000,000 for project engineering and design activities. The recommendation includes no funding for long-lead procurements or construction activities for the LBNE project. The Committee recognizes the importance of this project to maintaining American leadership in the intensity frontier and to basic science discovery of neutrino and standard model physics. However, the Committee also recognizes that LBNE construction must be affordable under existing budgetary constraints.

The recommendation also includes $23,000,000 to support Superconducting Radio Frequency Accelerator research and development, as well as facilities and infrastructure.

Research.—The Committee recommends $738,000,000 for High Energy Physics research, $8,521,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $19,000,000 above the budget request. The recommendation rejects the Department's proposal to reduce core research funding by three percent and instead restores funding for all affected activities.

For energy frontier experimental physics, the recommendation provides $157,888,000. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $15,000,000 for two new major items of equipment, consisting of $7,500,000 for the A Large Toroidal Large Hadron Collider (LHC) Apparatus Detector Upgrade and $7,500,000 for the LHC Compact Muon Solenoid Detector Upgrade.

For intensity frontier experimental physics, the recommendation provides $266,691,000. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $52,946,000 for research; $179,775,000 for facility operations and experimental support, of which $156,796,000 is for Fermi Complex Operations and $15,000,000 is for Homestake Mine; and $33,970,000 for projects, of which $13,000,000 is for the Muon g-2 Experiment and $10,000,000 is for Future Projects research and development.

For cosmic frontier experimental physics, the recommendation provides $103,056,000. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $50,364,000 for research; $11,692,000 for facility operations and experimental support; and $41,000,000 for projects, of which $35,000,000 is for the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope Camera and $6,000,000 is for the Second Generation Dark Matter experiments, to include $2,000,000 for design activities as a major item of equipment.

For other subprograms that comprise the high energy physics program, the recommendation provides $60,670,000 for theoretical and computational physics; $125,076,000 for advanced technology research and development, of which $54,736,000 is for General Accelerators; and $3,000,000 for accelerator stewardship.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $37,000,000 for High Energy Physics construction, $14,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $12,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation includes $25,000,000 for the Muon to Electron Conversion Experiment.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The Nuclear Physics program supports basic research into the fundamental particles that compose nuclear matter, how they interact, and how they combine to form the different types of matter observed in the universe today. The Committee recommends $600,000,000 for Nuclear Physics, $30,062,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $6,427,000 above the budget request.

Operations and Maintenance.—The Committee recommends $493,500,000 for Nuclear Physics operations and maintenance, $4,062,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $6,427,000 above the budget request. For medium energy nuclear physics, the recommendation provides $153,842,000, of which $100,000,000 is for operations at Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility to support up to 27 weeks of runtime at the 12 GeV Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility. For heavy ion nuclear physics, the recommendation provides $201,466,000, of which $167,572,000 is for operations at Brookhaven National Lab to support 22 weeks of runtime at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider. All activities within the low energy nuclear physics, nuclear theory, and isotope development and production for research and applications subprograms are funded at the requested level.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $106,500,000 for Nuclear Physics construction, $26,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the request. The recommended level of funding includes the requested level of $90,000,000 for the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –
Recommended, 2014	$150,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+150,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+150,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes $150,000,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal, $150,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $150,000,000 above the budget request, to continue the Department of Energy's statutorily required activities for the Yucca Mountain license application. Within available funds, the Department is directed to reestablish its organizations to respond to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission during its adjudicatory process, and to otherwise fully support the Yucca Mountain licensing process.

While the Committee notes that some of the recommendations within the Administration's *Strategy for the Management and Disposal of Used Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste* may have merit, Congress has neither formally considered nor approved them. In addition, the implementation of many of the recommendations would require changes to authorizing statutes. Nuclear waste disposal is too complex of an issue for the Administration to unilaterally develop or implement policy, and the Committee encourages the Administration to take this into account while formulating its fiscal year 2016 budget request.

The Committee reiterates that the Administration's repeated statements that Yucca Mountain is not a "workable option" ignores both the support of the host community and the expressed intent of Congress.

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY

Appropriation, 2014	$280,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	325,000,000
Recommended, 2015	280,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	–45,000,000

The Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy (ARPA–E) supports research aimed at rapidly developing energy technologies whose development and commercialization are too risky to attract sufficient private sector investment but are capable of significantly changing the energy sector to address our critical economic and energy security challenges. Projects funded by ARPA–E include such wide-ranging areas as production processes for transportation fuel alternatives that can reduce our dependence on imported oil, heating and cooling technologies with exceptionally high energy efficiency, and improvements in petroleum refining processes.

The Committee recommends $280,000,000 for the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, the same as fiscal year 2014 and

$45,000,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides $28,000,000 for Program Direction.

TITLE 17 INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2014	$42,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	42,000,000
Recommended, 2015	42,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS

Appropriation, 2014	$ – 22,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– 25,000,000
Recommended, 2015	– 25,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+3,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2014	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	17,000,000
Recommended, 2015	17,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– 3,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Committee recommends administrative expenses of $42,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request, which are offset by fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) of the Energy Policy Act, for a final net appropriation of $17,000,000.

The Committee is concerned about the credit review, compliance, and reporting functions that the Department has in place to adequately monitor risk. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act evaluating the effectiveness of the Department's portfolio monitoring and risk management efforts. This report is to also include a plan for fully complying with its credit review, compliance, and reporting functions.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2014	$6,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	4,000,000
Recommended, 2015	4,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– 2,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 established a direct loan program to support the development of advanced technology vehicles and associated components in the United States. The program provides loans to automobile and automobile part manufacturers for the cost of re-equipping, expanding, or establishing manufacturing facilities in the United States to produce ad-

vanced technology vehicles or qualified components, and for associated engineering integration costs.

The Committee recommends $4,000,000 for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program, $2,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. The funds provided support administrative operations only.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	$ – 6,600,000
Recommended, 2015	– 6,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– 6,600,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Clean Coal Technology Program was established in 1985 to perform commercial-scale demonstrations of advanced coal-based technologies. All projects within this program have concluded and only closeout activities remain. The fiscal year 2015 budget request proposes to cancel $6,600,000 in unobligated balances in this account. For fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommends a rescission of $6,600,000, the same as the budget request.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2014	$234,637,000
Budget estimate, 2015	248,223,000
Recommended, 2015	255,171,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+20,534,000
Budget estimate, 2015	6,948,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2014	$ – 108,188,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– 119,171,000
Recommended, 2015	– 119,171,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– 10,983,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2014	$126,449,000
Budget estimate, 2015	129,052,000
Recommended, 2015	136,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+9,551,000
Budget estimate, 2015	6,948,000

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Administration is $255,171,000, $20,534,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $6,948,000 above the budget request. The recommendation for revenues is $119,171,000 as requested, resulting in a net appropriation of $136,000,000. Funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration. The account

funds a wide array of Headquarters activities not directly associated with the execution of specific programs.

Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs.—The recommendation includes $4,700,000, $1,600,000 less than the request.

International Affairs.—The Committee is aware the Department of Energy is examining the potential for leveraging its expertise in support of energy-related issues in Ukraine. The Department is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than July 30, 2014, on what appropriate technical assistance the Department could provide in support of U.S. foreign assistance through the State Department.

Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs.—The Committee recommends $16,000,000, $16,000,000 above the budget request, to coordinate and implement energy management, conservation, education, and delivery systems for Native Americans. The Committee includes full funding for the Department's request in this account rather than in a new account, as requested.

Office of Human Capital.—The recommendation includes $24,500,000 for the Office of Human Capital, $900,000 below the budget request.

Minority Economic Impact.—The recommendation includes $2,800,000 for Minority Economic Impact, $1,127,000 above the budget request.

Office of Management.—The recommendation includes $67,352,000 for the Office of Management, $941,000 below the budget request.

Office of Energy Policy and Systems Analysis.—The recommendation includes $31,181,000, $7,364,000 below the budget request. The Committee includes requested funding to support the development of the Quadrennial Energy Review. If the Department wishes to pursue activities related to grid modernization and consumer energy consumption, the Committee will consider funding for those projects in the appropriate program accounts. Until then, these activities should continue in the program accounts where they have been traditionally funded.

Use of Prior-Year Balances.—The recommendation includes the use of $4,205,000 in prior-year balances, as requested.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 2014	$42,120,000
Budget estimate, 2015	39,868,000
Recommended, 2015	42,120,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	+2,252,000

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

tion provides for the detection and investigation of improper and illegal activities involving programs, personnel, and operations.

The budget request proposes the use of $10,420,000 in prior-year balances to offset fiscal year 2015 needs. While the recommendation does not direct the use of specific prior-year balances, the Office of the Inspector General should ensure it is effectively managing its prior-year funds and is using those balances to fully support its mission in fiscal year 2015.

The Committee recommendation is $42,120,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $2,252,000 above the budget request.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs of the Department of Energy in the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) consist of Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and the Office of the Administrator; outside of the NNSA, these include Defense Environmental Management and Other Defense Activities. Descriptions of each of these accounts are provided below.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The Department of Energy is responsible for enhancing U.S. national security through the military application of nuclear technology and reducing the global danger from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The NNSA, a semi-autonomous agency within the Department, carries out these responsibilities. Established in March 2000 pursuant to Title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, the NNSA is responsible for the management and operation of the nation's nuclear weapons complex, naval reactors, and nuclear nonproliferation activities. The Office of the NNSA Administrator oversees all NNSA programs.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—The fiscal year 2014 Act updated the percentage of funds that the Secretary could authorize for laboratory directed research and development (LDRD). It has come to the attention of the Committee that the NNSA is considering allowing some NNSA laboratories to charge as much as 7.75 percent to DOE programs in fiscal year 2014 because it has interpreted the statutory cap to apply to the total operating budget of the laboratory, which includes additional amounts received from Work For Others (WFO). The bill contains a general provision which clarifies congressional intent that no greater than the statutory cap, established at 6 percent in the fiscal year 2014 Act, shall be charged to any individual DOE activity for LDRD. The provision should not be interpreted to limit the ability of the national laboratories to charge LDRD to WFO or to conflict with the Department's policy to charge the same LDRD percentage that is authorized for DOE programs to WFO customers.

The Committee is concerned that the LDRD funds derived from cleanup work performed by the Office of Environmental Management do not sufficiently benefit the cleanup mission of the Department. The Department must provide additional information on the use of these funds to better justify to the Committee why cleanup funds should continue to be charged for LDRD.

The Committee is concerned that the Department is not accurately representing the size and nature of individual LDRD projects in the annual LDRD report to Congress. To improve reporting, the Department is directed to include the total amount of funding awarded to each LDRD project if that LDRD project is a multi-year award and to identify all major items of equipment and real property assets to be funded by any LDRD project, consistent with other Committee reporting requirements for multi-year grants, minor construction, and capital equipment.

Overpayments into the NNSA's Contractor Defined Benefit Pension Plans.—The budget request includes more than $400,000,000 to avoid potential future costs predicted in the NNSA's latest out-year projections for its contractor defined benefit pension plans. These additional payments represent amounts that are above requirements established by the Congress in the Pension Protection Act and other applicable legislation. Defined benefit pension costs are highly dependent on market conditions and the Department's ability to accurately predict payments several years in advance is inherently limited. With emergent national security needs such as the recovery of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and time-sensitive modernization plans at risk, the actual needs today outweigh the hypothetical future benefits of overpayment. None of the funds for the NNSA shall be available to make contractor defined benefit pension payments above requirements in fiscal year 2015 if those payments would result in a funded status in excess of 100 percent. This direction shall not be interpreted to permit the Department to transfer funds already contributed to a pension plan or reduce payments into any contractor employee pension plan below statutory or contractual requirements. The recommendation contains a provision that allows the Secretary of Energy to transfer up to $120,000,000 of NNSA funds that are requested for payments above requirements to meet the needs of WIPP recovery. These funds shall be proportionally derived according to the normal distribution of pension costs for the NNSA, with 75 percent of the total amount to be derived from Weapons Activities and 25 percent of the total amount to be derived from Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2014	$7,781,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	8,314,902,000
Recommended, 2015	8,204,209,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+423,209,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−110,693,000

Weapons Activities provides funding to ensure the safety, security, reliability, and effectiveness of the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. The activities funded under this appropriation include the maintenance and refurbishment of nuclear weapons to sustain confidence in their security, safety, and reliability under the nuclear testing moratorium and arms reduction treaties. The Committee recommends a fiscal year 2015 program level of $8,204,209,000 for Weapons Activities, $423,209,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $110,693,000 below the budget request.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

Directed Stockpile Work includes all activities that directly support weapons in the nuclear stockpile, including maintenance, research, development, engineering, certification, dismantlement, and disposal activities. The Committee recommends $2,696,960,000 for Directed Stockpile Work, $254,927,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $49,644,000 below the budget request.

Life Extension Programs.—The Committee recommends full funding for the NNSA's life extension programs (LEPs), including the ongoing refurbishment efforts for the B61, W76, and W88. The recommendation includes $17,018,000 for a new life extension study for the cruise missile warhead, $7,600,000 above the budget request.

In response to the reporting requirements in the fiscal year 2014 Act, the NNSA has provided a detailed analysis of its alternatives for extending the life of the B61 and has certified to the Committee that the less costly alternatives that were originally considered do not address the needs for extending the life of the B61. Rather, pursuing a more limited near-term scope would drive up costs considerably due to the successive updates that would still be needed to extend the life of the B61 to an extent comparable to the W76–1. The NNSA's analysis also showed that the cost of the B61 LEP is much higher than the cost of the W76–1 largely due to the complexity of the B61's nonnuclear components. While the Committee supports continued full funding for the B61 LEP, the high cost of the program will continue to exert significant pressure on the NNSA's budget. The process of conducting a comprehensive analysis of alternatives, informed by independently-verified cost estimates, must be incorporated into the NNSA's normal way of doing business. The bill contains an updated provision that permanently establishes a requirement to conduct a comprehensive analysis of alternatives as part of all future life extension programs. The NNSA is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act a report that describes the interagency plan for revising and updating its joint Phase 6.x warhead acquisition process to ensure these improvements are formalized and integrated into future life extension programs.

Weapons Dismantlement and Disposition.—The Committee recommends $54,264,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $24,256,000 above the budget request. The NNSA continues to cut funding for dismantlement in its budget request, despite a clear requirement to continue to dismantle warheads, sustain production line capacity, and harvest materials for recycling to meet stockpile needs.

Research and Development Certification and Safety.—The Committee recommends $154,508,000, $3,375,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $46,971,000 below the budget request. No funding is provided for technology maturation or exploratory development activities, the same as in fiscal year 2014. It is essential that the NNSA establish dedicated funding to conduct Significant Finding Investigations and respond to stockpile issues, rather than continuing to fund technology maturation and exploratory development activities

within Stockpile Services in an effort to distribute funding for these activities across multiple control points.

Tritium Readiness.—The Committee recommends $138,053,000, $58,053,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $2,000,000 below the budget request. The recommendation includes a one-time increase for the purchase of low enriched uranium to fuel multiple reactors. No funds shall be available for the NNSA to enter into a future agreement to supply low enriched fuel to reactors that are not being actively used for tritium production.

CAMPAIGNS

Campaigns are focused efforts involving the three weapons laboratories, the Nevada National Security Site, the weapons production plants, and selected external organizations to address critical capabilities needed to achieve program objectives. For Campaigns, the Committee recommends $1,726,989,000, $68,662,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $114,358,000 below the budget request.

Science.—The Committee recommends $395,091,000, $25,368,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $61,339,000 below the budget request. The recommendation provides a substantial increase for a robust experimental effort in fiscal year 2015 to better understand the properties of plutonium and ensure the NNSA can support certification requirements for pit reuse as an option for future LEPs. The recommendation includes full funding for Primary Assessment Technologies to expand predictive science capabilities to enhance U.S. capabilities to assess foreign state weapons activities. The recommendation includes no funding for new radiography capabilities at U1a within Advanced Radiography. The NNSA has outstanding reporting requirements related to its scaled experiments program and must be able to provide a clear and direct linkage to stockpile needs if additional radiography capabilities are needed.

Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield.—The Committee recommends $511,993,000, $1,964,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $902,000 below the budget request. Within these funds, $68,000,000 is for the OMEGA Laser Facility at the University of Rochester and $328,500,000 is for the National Ignition Facility.

Readiness.—The Committee previously directed the NNSA to eliminate the Readiness Campaign and provides no funding in fiscal year 2015, $125,909,000 below the budget request. The recommendation includes funding requested for these and related activities under Advanced Manufacturing as described below.

Advanced Manufacturing.—The Committee recommends $93,900,000 to develop, demonstrate, and utilize advanced technologies that are needed to enhance the NNSA's secure manufacturing capabilities and ensure timely support for the production of nuclear weapons and other critical national security components. The NNSA has requested funding for a variety of manufacturing development-related projects under Readiness Campaign, Recapitalization, Material Recycle and Recovery, and Directed Stockpile Work. The Committee recommends consolidating funding for these related activities within Campaigns because these development efforts represent more focused programmatic investments that have the potential to shorten production schedules, reduce risks, enhance personnel safety, and ultimately improve the NNSA's ability to meet its production requirements on time and within budget.

Development funds within Advanced Manufacturing shall be limited to low technology readiness levels, whereas production engineering that is at a sufficient maturity level as to be associated with a particular LEP or project should be planned and executed within funds for that LEP or project. Development activities that are related to a construction project should be fully incorporated into that project's performance baseline at Critical Decision-2.

The NNSA has yet to close out recommendations from a 2009 Government Accountability Office report that attributed the significant cost growth for the W76 LEP to the NNSA's failure to plan for manufacturing of a critical material used in the W76. In addition, the Government Accountability Office recently investigated the NNSA's manufacturing technology maturation efforts for the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) and identified numerous risks in developing and integrating new production technologies. The Committee is seriously concerned that the NNSA has failed to integrate its technology development requirements with its major construction plans and has primarily funded UPF technology development from plant-directed research and development, which should not be used to meet programmatic needs. These production technologies remain at low technology readiness levels and will require dedicated funding to ensure they are sufficiently mature prior to selection in the UPF project to reduce technology-related risks.

Within funds for Advanced Manufacturing, the recommendation includes $12,600,000 for development of Additive Manufacturing technologies that will support secure stockpile production needs, including $2,100,000 for a secure additive manufacturing machine at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The recommendation includes $60,000,000 for Component Manufacturing Development for development activities requested within the Readiness Campaign. The recommendation includes $21,300,000 for Processing Technology Development to develop and demonstrate new production technologies and ensure new technologies reach optimal levels of maturity prior to critical project and program acquisition milestones. Within Processing Technology Development, the recommendation includes $5,000,000 for Direct Electrolytic Reduction, $2,000,000 for Enriched Uranium Salt Synthesis, $7,800,000 for the Y–12 Calciner, and $6,500,000 for Y–12 Electrorefiners, as requested within the budget request for Recapitalization and Material Recycle and Recovery.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF) provides funding for the operations, maintenance, and recapitalization of NNSA facilities and infrastructure. The Committee recommends $2,045,962,000 for RTBF, $21,463,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $9,559,000 below the budget request.

The Committee takes a dim view of the NNSA's prioritization of its infrastructure needs in its fiscal year 2015 budget request. The NNSA historically has failed to adequately fund its facility maintenance and recapitalization needs. The NNSA's budget request proposes to defer ten percent of its preventative maintenance planned at each of its eight sites, activities that are critical to ensure long term sustainment and viability of the infrastructure. At the same time, the budget request proposes to start two new projects that to-

gether will cost approximately $65,000,000 in order to replace emergency operations facilities that are not yet beyond their useful lifetimes. Meanwhile, buildings are literally falling apart elsewhere in the complex and the NNSA has yet to request project funding to address those safety and security needs. The Committee will continue to prioritize infrastructure funding within Weapons Activities to address the backlog of facilities operating beyond their useful lifetimes and to ensure that legacy facilities can be operated safely and securely.

Maintenance and Repair of Facilities.—The Committee recommends $227,000,000, $591,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $22,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee is disappointed that the NNSA continues to undercut maintenance and repair in its budget request. The recommendation includes funding above the request to restore overall maintenance and repair funding to the fiscal year 2014 level. Within this amount, $10,000,000 is provided to address immediate health and safety issues at the NNSA Albuquerque Complex while the NNSA reexamines its long-term recapitalization plans using line-item project funds as directed below.

Recapitalization.—The Committee recommends $224,600,000, $44,600,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $15,279,000 above the budget request. Despite instructions to submit a project list in the budget request, the NNSA was able to provide details on only a portion of its Recapitalization funds. In addition, the NNSA was considerably late in providing an accounting of its use of fiscal year 2014 funds and did not provide sufficient detail in its report. The Committee requires considerably better planning and reporting from the NNSA to ensure that it will efficiently execute funds for the highest priority projects. As a result, the Committee will designate funding for specific recapitalization projects until the NNSA can demonstrate it has made improvement in its infrastructure planning processes. The NNSA shall allocate Recapitalization funds according to the table that follows. To the extent possible, the recommendation provides full funding for small sized projects, instead of funding those projects over multiple years as in the budget request. The recommendation includes $23,400,000 for advanced manufacturing projects within the Advanced Manufacturing Campaign, instead of within Recapitalization as requested. Including the shift of those projects, the Committee's recommendation for recapitalization-related projects totals $248,000,000, which represents a substantial investment to sustain and modernize the NNSA's nuclear security enterprise.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION - RECAPITALIZATION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE RECOMMENDED
SPACE EXPANSION, KCP	500	8,000
ARMAG UPGADE, LANL	3,000	5,100
LANSCE REFURBISHMENT MODULES 2,3,4, LANL	8,500	7,000
TA-55 WET VACUUM MATERIAL HANDLING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT, LANL	1,500	1,500
TRUPACK III, LANL	4,500	8,800
ADDITIVE MACHINE, LLNL	2,100	---
B-654 LIVERMORE COMPUTING FACILITY, LLNL	3,380	3,380
IHE QUALIFICATION CAPABILITIES RECAPITALIZATION, LLNL	1,500	1,500
JIG BORER, LLNL	2,600	2,600
VERSON HYDRO-FORM PRESS, LLNL	2,400	2,400
WARHEAD COMPONENT TEST AND ANALYSIS UPGRADES, LLNL	14,000	14,000
DAF ELECTRICAL & CONTROL SYSTEMS, NNSS	1,400	9,000
DAF FIRE LEAD-INS, NNSS	---	10,000
DAF LINAC, NNSS	1,100	1,100
POWER TRANSMISSION LINE REPLACEMENT, NNSS	3,300	2,500
WATER/WASTEWATER SYSTEMS, NNSS	1,200	---
U1A SUBCRITICAL SUPPORT INVESTMENTS, NNSS	1,800	3,200
BUILDING 12-75 UPGRADES, PX	9,200	9,200
CONTAINER STEWARDSHIP FACILITY, PX	10,000	10,000
FLAME DETECTION/RAMS REPLACEMENT, PX	5,000	5,000
VACUUM CHAMBER UPGRADES, PX	7,000	7,000
BATTERY TEST FACILITY, SNL	4,550	4,900
BUILDING 03-57 UTILITY TOWER ADDITION, SNL	5,740	5,740
SITE RECONFIGURATION, SNL	560	---
234-7H AHU REPLACEMENT, SRS	8,000	8,000
CATALYST VESSEL SYSTEM REPLACEMENT, SRS	1,300	3,300
GTS UNLOADING LASER REPLACEMENT, SRS	2,500	5,000
HANM RESERVOIR FINISHING, SRS	2,800	6,000
HAOM REVERIFICATION RELOCATION, SRS	3,000	6,000
RESERVOIR STORAGE, SRS	1,500	7,800
UNLOADING AREA B MODIFICATIONS, SRS	1,500	5,500
CALCINER, Y-12	7,800	---
DIRECT ELECTROLYTIC REDUCTION DEVELOPMENT, Y-12	5,000	---
ELECTROREFINERS, Y-12	6,500	---
ENRICHED URANIUM SALT SYNTHESIS, Y-12	2,000	---
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER RECAPITALIZATION	136,730	163,520
REMAINING ITEMS		
NON-MIE CAPITAL EQUIPMENT (>500K)	46,278	45,571
CONSTRUCTION, OTHER PROJECT COSTS	---	10,509
DEMOLITION AND DECOMMISSIONING	---	5,000
SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS	46,278	61,080
TOTAL, RECAPITALIZATION	183,008	224,600

Albuquerque Complex Upgrades.—The Committee recommends $12,000,000 for recapitalization of the NNSA's federal complex at Albuquerque, rather than $19,900,000 to lease new space under Office of the Administrator as in the budget request. Twenty years of deferred maintenance with no major upgrades has resulted in deteriorating conditions at the Albuquerque Complex. The Committee is concerned that the NNSA has failed to take any action to sustain its existing infrastructure and has instead made a decision to lease commercial space that does not provide the best value to the government, does not take responsibility for ultimate disposition of the existing infrastructure, and will introduce security vulnerabilities and operational inefficiencies by locating secure federal functions off-site.

The NNSA's previous efforts to address these recapitalization needs resulted in an overbuilt and unaffordable big-box design that did not leverage the ability to use existing facilities that are not yet beyond their useful life and that prioritized goals for obtaining energy efficiency savings over the need to provide clean and safe facilities for its workers. In addition, the NNSA inappropriately eliminated an option to construct several smaller stand-alone facilities early on in its analysis. The Committee directs the NNSA to undertake a new analysis of alternatives using an expedited red team approach to develop a more cost-effective solution that might accelerate delivery of the NNSA's most immediate and pressing federal space needs. In conducting this analysis, the NNSA is directed to make use of recent Government Accountability Office workspace utilization studies. These studies suggest ways for federal agencies to efficiently and effectively minimize the square footage usage per person and achieve savings significantly below the 220 square foot per person assumed in the NNSA's analysis of its space needs, which is considerably greater than the prevailing standard workspace average of 190 square feet per person.

15–D–613 Emergency Operations Center, Y–12.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000, the same as the budget request, to construct a new facility that will address seismic and safety deficiencies identified by the DOE Office of Health, Safety and Security.

12–D–301 TRU Waste Facilities, LANL.—The Committee recommends no funding, $6,938,000 below the budget request. The budget request is to provide additional contingency funds for the project, which the NNSA estimates at 25 percent of the total construction costs. The Committee will consider a request for additional contingency funds for the project in future years if performance on the project indicates that the estimated contingency amount is actually needed.

06–D–141, Uranium Processing Facility, Y–12.—The Committee recommends $335,000,000, $26,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. No funding shall be available for site preparation or facility construction until the NNSA achieves 90 percent design completion for the entire project. The Committee supports the Department's decision to move forward with a more affordable alternative for the project that would expedite the NNSA's plans to move out of Building 9212.

04–D–125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research (CMR) Replacement Project, LANL.—The Committee recommends $35,700,000, in-

stead of providing funds for these activities under Program Readiness as in the budget request. This approach is consistent with the Committee's previous direction to the NNSA to carry out all CMR replacement activities in accordance with DOE Order 413.3B, rather than within operations funding where there is little transparency or accountability for delivering these activities on time and within budget. While the capacity and amount of process equipment needed may be evolving due to changing programmatic requirements for plutonium, the scope of the additional work being requested is consistent with the original mission need to provide analytic chemistry and material characterization space in a different facility than the legacy CMR building. Similarly, PF–4 reconfiguration activities are also appropriate to be conducted as part of the original CMR Replacement project so long as they are limited to re-equipping lab space for capabilities that were previously housed in the legacy CMR building. Construction of new modular facilities and installation of equipment within PF–4 to establish enhanced pit production capabilities are not sufficiently related to the original mission need of the existing project, and the Committee does not support the inclusion of these activities as subprojects within the existing CMR replacement project.

SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET

The Office of Secure Transportation Asset provides for the safe, secure movement of nuclear weapons, special nuclear materials, and non-nuclear weapon components between military locations and nuclear weapons complex facilities within the United States. The Committee recommends $219,000,000 for Secure Transportation Asset, $9,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $14,813,000 below the budget request.

The reduction below the budget request is due to excessive prior-year balances in program direction. In addition, the NNSA has not provided sufficiently detailed acquisition plans for the Mobile Guardian Transporter and its vehicle and tractor fleet. The NNSA is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act an acquisition plan that details the number of transporters, replacement vehicles, and tractors to be procured, according to a five-year cost and schedule baseline.

NUCLEAR COUNTERTERRORISM INCIDENT RESPONSE

The NNSA Office of Emergency Operations responds to and mitigates nuclear and radiological incidents worldwide in order to defend the nation from the threat of nuclear terrorism. The Committee recommends $202,940,000 for Nuclear Counterterrorism Incident Response (NCTIR), $25,303,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $29,500,000 above the budget request. Within this amount, the recommendation includes $25,000,000 for Render Safe, disablement, and other emergency response-related research and development activities that traditionally have been funded within Weapons Activities, $25,000,000 above the budget request; $142,577,000 for emergency response activities, $3,500,000 above the budget request, to fully support the NNSA costs of the ninth stabilization city as part of its joint program with the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and $14,850,000 for Operations Support, $3,000,000 above

the request, to address improvements needed to ensure the functionality of the Department of Energy's Operations Center.

The Committee is concerned that the nation's emergency response capabilities necessary to respond to domestic nuclear incidents are not being appropriately funded because the NNSA has prioritized expansion of counterproliferation-related activities that are driven by international cooperative nuclear security and other nonproliferation goals. To address gaps in the NNSA's support of counterproliferation and other cooperative nuclear security missions, the NNSA created the Office of Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation and requested separate funding for this office within Weapons Activities, instead of integrating these activities under the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, a Senate-confirmed position whose existing statutory responsibilities for preventing the spread of nuclear materials, technology, and expertise, providing for international nuclear safety, and detecting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction worldwide are clearly established under the NNSA Act. While the recommendation does not provide constraints on which NNSA organizations should execute funds provided for NCTIR, the recommendation provides no funding requested specifically for Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs within Weapons Activities. The Committee recommends consolidating research and development activities related to countering nuclear device proliferation within Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, as part of broader direction to reinvigorate the NNSA's nonproliferation research and development base.

The recommendation includes $4,595,000 for international emergency management and cooperation, $2,000,000 below the request. The Committee has funded international emergency management and cooperation activities within NCTIR since fiscal year 2009, when the NNSA requested to transfer these activities from Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation to Weapons Activities. The NNSA should reconsider transferring these activities back to Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, where they may be better integrated with other international cooperative nuclear security activities.

SITE STEWARDSHIP

Site Stewardship provides funding for Long-Term Stewardship, Nuclear Materials Integration, and Minority Serving Institution Partnerships. Funding for Corporate Project Management has been shifted to the Office of the Administrator to consolidate funding for support services contracts. The Committee recommends $79,531,000 for Site Stewardship, $7,795,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $2,918,000 below the budget request.

Minority Serving Institution Partnerships.—The Committee recommends $14,531,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $1,300,000 above the budget request. The Committee is disappointed the budget request reduced funding for this important program and provides additional funding above the budget request to sustain the current level of funding for the program. The Committee supports the educational and research partnerships of the Department and encourages additional partnerships to be developed with minority serving institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), to ensure diversity within the next generation

of scientists and researchers addressing nuclear security and environmental management issues.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR SECURITY

Defense Nuclear Security is responsible for developing and implementing security programs for the protection, control, and accountability of materials and for the physical security of all facilities of the nuclear security enterprise. The Committee recommends $650,123,000 for Defense Nuclear Security, $14,858,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $32,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee is concerned that the NNSA proposed a seven percent reduction in funding for Defense Nuclear Security and no construction funds to address the backlog of maintenance and upgrades needed at NNSA sites. In addition, the NNSA has overestimated the savings it expects to realize from organizational and contract reforms and has not assured the Committee it can provide adequate protective force levels at a lower level of funding. The Committee expects the NNSA to request a more appropriate level of funding in future years to ensure protection of special nuclear materials at the NNSA sites.

14–D–710 Device Assembly Facility (DAF) Argus Installation Project, NNSS.—The Committee recommends $14,000,000, $14,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the budget request. This project was deferred in the fiscal year 2014 Act while the NNSA implemented organizational reforms. The recommendation allows the NNSA to proceed with its plans to upgrade aging security systems at the Nevada Nuclear Security Site.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND CYBER SECURITY

Information Technology and Cyber Security provides funding for the NNSA's cyber infrastructure, cyber development activities, and information technology needs. The Committee recommends $179,646,000 for Information Technology and Cyber Security, $34,578,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

LEGACY CONTRACTOR PENSIONS

The Committee provides $307,058,000 for payments into the legacy University of California contractor employee defined benefit pension plans, $27,461,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

DOMESTIC URANIUM ENRICHMENT

Domestic Uranium Enrichment provides research, development, operations, and maintenance funding to sustain the availability of low enriched uranium to support stockpile stewardship and other national security needs. The Committee recommends $96,000,000 for Domestic Uranium Enrichment, $34,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $96,000,000 above the budget request.

The NNSA has concluded its project to demonstrate the technical viability of centrifuges with the United States Enrichment Corporation. Funding for Domestic Uranium Enrichment is provided to maintain those centrifuges in warm standby while the Department conducts further analysis of its tritium and enriched uranium re-

quirements. No funds shall be used to construct additional centrifuges in fiscal year 2015. The Committee will consider further investments in domestic enriched uranium capabilities only after the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense conduct a bottoms-up interagency reevaluation of the active and reserve tritium stockpile requirements, and the Nuclear Weapons Council certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representative and the Senate that the revalidated tritium stockpile amounts to be maintained by the Department of Energy represent the minimum active and reserve national security requirements. To ensure that the results of such analysis are available for consideration of the fiscal year 2016 budget request, the Nuclear Weapons Council should provide this certification to the Committees not later than March 1, 2015.

The NNSA is further directed to conduct an analysis of the process technologies available for providing enriched uranium, produce a conceptualized plant size for the options evaluated, and estimate the costs and time necessary for build-out of such plants. As part of this analysis, the NNSA shall include an option that represents the minimum train needed to produce LEU for anticipated tritium production needs, and compare the return on investment of additional acquisition costs needed to operate a full national security train at optimal efficiency. The NNSA shall provide the results of its analysis to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than June 1, 2015.

United States Enrichment Corporation Fund.—The Committee notes that despite the Government Accountability Office's May 2014 decision that the authorized uses of the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund (Fund) have been fulfilled, the Department is considering using approximately $40,000,000 of the Fund to support domestic uranium enrichment capabilities through the end of fiscal year 2014. The Committee notes that the fiscal year 2014 Act made available transfer authority, which the Department has not utilized, to support these activities. The Committee recognizes that funding for domestic enrichment for defense purposes must be balanced against all other priorities and includes discretionary appropriations for such activities. The recommendation includes a general provision that rescinds the remaining balances of the Fund.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Appropriation, 2014	$1,954,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,555,156,000
Recommended, 2015	1,555,156,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−398,844,000
Budget estimate, 2015	− − −

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation includes funding for Research and Development; Nonproliferation and International Security; International Material Protection and Cooperation; Fissile Materials Disposition; and the Global Threat Reduction Initiative. The Committee recommendation for new budget authority for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation is $1,592,156,000, $361,844,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $37,000,000 above the budget request. After accounting for the rescission of $37,000,000 in prior-year unobligated

balances in this bill, the recommendation is $1,555,156,000, $398,844,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

Continuing Nonproliferation Activities in Russia.—In consideration of recent Russian aggression in Ukraine and the resultant changes in the geopolitical environment, the NNSA must reexamine existing strategies for securing nuclear materials in Russia to confirm the United States government is not inappropriately subsidizing the cost of the Russian government or other Russian interests. Furthermore, it is essential that the NNSA demonstrate that its activities with Russia are effectively addressing U.S. national security interests according to measurable national security goals. The recommendation includes a provision that requires the Secretary of Energy to reassess the Department of Energy's engagement with Russia and to certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that any ongoing and new contracts or agreements made with Russia are in the national security interest of the United States. While the Secretary of Energy undertakes this strategic reassessment, the Committee provides no funds to enter into new contracts or agreements in the Russian Federation in fiscal year 2015. In addition, the Committee directs the use of funds provided in previous years for nonproliferation projects in Russia, but which have not yet been expended, to fund additional nonproliferation-related work in fiscal year 2015. The NNSA is directed to request new budget authority for any new work or agreements with Russia in future years. While eliminating all funding requested for new projects in Russia in fiscal year 2015, the recommendation nevertheless sustains overall funding for the NNSA's nonproliferation activities at the level of the budget request to reflect the importance of these activities.

Reinvesting in the Nonproliferation Capabilities of the DOE National Laboratories.—The Department of Energy's national laboratories are world-class institutions that provide a national capability for developing innovative and advanced technical solutions to difficult nuclear security problems. However, the NNSA has failed to fully access those capabilities and continues to reduce funding in its budget request for nonproliferation-related research and development, among other nonproliferation programs. Considering the large reductions in the budget request, it appears that the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) has not sufficiently adapted its programs to meet evolving nuclear security challenges. Rather, the NNSA continues to operate in a fragmented manner where DNN is limited to carrying out only traditional nonproliferation programs, many of which are in their sunset years. While DNN has supported several Nuclear Security Summits, it has assigned responsibility for many follow up initiatives to other organizations. Further, the NNSA has adopted a dispersed approach to address strategic gaps in NNSA's support of counterproliferation missions. Specifically, the NNSA created the Office of Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation, instead of integrating these activities under the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, a Senate-confirmed position whose existing statutory responsibilities for preventing the spread of nuclear materials, technology, and expertise, providing for international nuclear safety, and detecting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction

worldwide are clearly established under the NNSA Act. Given the concerns regarding the spread of nuclear technologies and the continued reluctance of DNN to evolve its programs to meet the latest threats, the Committee recommendation reprioritizes funding to reinvigorate the nonproliferation research and development base of the Department's national laboratories, provide focus to nuclear forensics and attribution activities, and integrate new counterproliferation-related research and development into the NNSA's ongoing nonproliferation activities.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Research and Development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation of science and technology to respond to threats to national security posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and special nuclear materials. The Committee recommends $452,709,000 for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Research and Development, $53,871,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $91,901,000 above the budget request.

Nuclear Forensics and Attribution.—The NNSA has failed to respond to Committee direction to name a lead office within the NNSA that is responsible for coordinating development of a national nuclear forensics capability. Therefore, the recommendation provides $25,000,000 for nuclear forensics and attribution to focus NNSA's efforts that support development of U.S. nuclear forensics capabilities.

Counterproliferation Research and Development.—The recommendation includes $51,901,000 for counterproliferation-related research and development activities that were requested to be funded within Weapons Activities under a new program for Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation. The recommendation for Weapons Activities only includes funding for counterterrorism activities that have been traditionally funded within that account and includes funds for the remaining requested activities within Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Research and Development.

NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The Nonproliferation and International Security program applies technical and policy expertise to facilitate nuclear cooperation, safeguard and secure nuclear materials, and provide solutions for treaty monitoring and compliance. The Committee recommends $144,246,000 for Nonproliferation and International Security, $15,571,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $2,887,000 above the budget request. Funding above the request is provided to accelerate technical review of export licenses for dual-use commodities to better support U.S. industry and to provide enhanced capabilities to determine proliferation trends and impacts.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION AND COOPERATION

The International Materials Protection and Cooperation (IMPC) program works cooperatively with partner countries to secure weapons and weapons-usable nuclear material in order to improve the physical security at facilities that possess or process significant

quantities of materials that are of proliferation concern. The Committee recommends $233,367,000 for IMPC activities, $186,258,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $72,100,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommendation does not include $72,100,000 that was requested for Second Line of Defense activities downblending operations, physical security upgrades, and sustainability of facilities in the Russian Federation. No IMPC or other NNSA funds may be used for the purchase of the Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System (MILES) for Russia.

While Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction and other successful cooperative nuclear security initiatives have concluded, follow-on proposals to continue related work must be reassessed from a U.S. national security standpoint. For example, the recently completed Megatons to Megawatts program represented a programmatic model that exemplified how a cooperative nuclear security agreement could provide high national security value as well as other national benefits. Under Megatons to Megawatts, Russian weapons-origin highly enriched uranium (HEU) was downblended to low enriched uranium (LEU) so that it could never again be used for nuclear weapons, and the resulting LEU was made available to U.S. nuclear utilities in what was effectively a mutually advantageous commercial deal. The NNSA is requesting to continue to pay for Russian HEU downblending operations for nuclear material that is not verified to be Russian weapons-origin and that is not made available to U.S. utilities. Russia has extremely large stockpiles of HEU and the relatively small quantity of HEU that is reduced by the NNSA's IMPC program has little impact on the overall size of Russian HEU stockpiles. Rather, continuing the program appears to primarily benefit Russian interests by providing access in Russia to a source of LEU fuel whose production is effectively subsidized by the United States. As the NNSA reanalyzes its cooperative nonproliferation activities with Russia, the NNSA must ensure that only those activities which are effectively and measurably contributing to U.S. nuclear security objectives are continued.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The Fissile Materials Disposition (FMD) program is responsible for meeting commitments under the U.S.-Russia Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement. The Committee recommendation provides $430,000,000 for fissile materials disposition, $96,057,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $118,875,000 above the budget request.

U.S. Plutonium Disposition.—The Committee recommends $60,000,000, $97,557,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $25,000,000 below the budget request. Funding below the budget request is a result of the transfer of MOX Other Project Costs (OPCs) to the MOX project as described below.

Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, Savannah River, SC.—The Committee recommends $345,000,000, $1,500,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $149,000,000 above the budget request. The recommended amount includes $25,000,000 requested for MOX OPCs within U.S. plutonium disposition, consistent with the Committee's recommendation for other major DOE projects with a total project cost greater than $750,000,000. Consolidating OPCs into one project line improves integration of startup and commissioning ac-

tivities, eliminates a common need for reprogramming, and provides greater transparency into the costs of major construction projects. After accounting for this shift, the total amount recommended for the MOX project is $38,500,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $124,000,000 above the budget request.

The Plutonium Management Disposition Agreement (PMDA) represents the only active and verifiable agreement that the United States has with the Russian Federation to permanently dispose of weapons-grade plutonium. The Department has released a report that describes five alternatives to meeting U.S. commitments under the PMDA that suggests downblending the material and disposing of it at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) may be less expensive than continuing to construct the MOX plant. However, the Committee is concerned that the Department has not accurately represented the comparative life cycle costs of these alternatives. The NNSA has little capability to accurately estimate programmatic and project costs and did not seek outside assistance to independently verify its lifecycle cost estimates.

The omissions in the lifecycle cost estimates are numerous. While the NNSA explains that feedstock production capabilities are needed for each option, the cost of providing feedstock is not estimated consistently across the options. There is no attempt to quantify project risks, and the Department's analysis does not properly account for risk reduction strategies that are already mature, such as contract modifications that could cap construction costs. Considering the very long timeline for the downblending option, estimated to take 43 years or nearly twice as long as the MOX option, quantifying those risks could have a significant impact on the life-cycle costs of downblending. In addition, the NNSA has made little progress working with nuclear utilities to identify potential sources of income that might offset MOX operating costs and has not attempted to quantify the economic benefit to ratepayers of providing access to a relatively inexpensive source of nuclear fuel. Furthermore, and perhaps most significantly, the NNSA has identified some issues but has not provided critical analysis on the feasibility of downblending considering the necessity of gaining congressional support for changing the Land Withdrawal Act for WIPP at a time when the Department's mismanagement of its cleanup operations has resulted in the shutdown of that facility.

To address these inadequacies, the NNSA is directed to prepare an independent lifecycle cost estimate for the MOX construction and downblending options, and to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act a report that describes those lifecycle costs and discusses the relative costs and benefits and feasibility of the two options. The Department shall discontinue further study of all other options. The Department's alternatives report did not suggest that any of the other three alternatives identified would save costs, which was the Department's primary rationale for reconsidering potential alternatives. There is no value to continuing to analyze alternatives that are not feasible and do not save costs. Rather, establishing a protracted deadline for making a decision drives up costs, wastes additional taxpayer funds, and delays resolution of project management issues that must be addressed no matter which alternative is selected.

The recommendation provides funding above the budget request to sustain the current pace of construction on the MOX facility in fiscal year 2015 and includes a provision that prohibits the use of MOX funding to place the project in cold standby.

Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC.—The Committee recommends no funding, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $5,125,000 below the budget request. The Committee will not allocate additional taxpayer dollars to this project that continues to fall further behind schedule. The NNSA must first exhaust all options to pay for further cost increases out of prior-year funds.

GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE

The Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI) mission is to identify, secure, remove, and facilitate the disposition of high-risk, vulnerable nuclear and radiological materials and equipment around the world. The Committee recommends $342,888,000 for GTRI activities, $99,214,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $9,400,000 above the budget request.

HEU Reactor Conversions.—The Committee recommends $118,083,000, $43,917,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $4,300,000 below the budget request. The reduction below the budget request eliminates funding for conversion costs of the reactor at the Kurchatov Institute in Russia which has ties to the Russian military.

International Nuclear and Radiological Material Removal and Protection.—The Committee recommends $161,173,000, to remove and secure nuclear and radiological materials around the world, $38,929,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $28,700,000 above the budget request. The Committee recommendation does not include $11,300,000 that was requested to upgrade security systems in Russian facilities housing radiological materials and does not include $10,000,000 that was requested to consolidate nuclear materials within Russia to reduce its financial burden associated with maintaining those security systems. The Committee directs those funds be used instead to pay for storage, management, and processing of spent foreign fuel removals at the Savannah River Site and Idaho National Laboratory. The NNSA has not been accounting for the costs of its material removal program and is placing an increasing financial burden on the Defense Environmental Cleanup program to pay for these costs. Funding for Defense Environmental Cleanup is intended to be used for the cleanup of the legacy of the U.S. nuclear weapons program, not to meet the costs of international material consolidation and removal activities in support of U.S. nonproliferation goals. The cost sharing arrangement between the NNSA and Office of Environmental Management (EM) is nearly ten years old and was negotiated before the President's Four Year Goal brought increased quantities of foreign spent fuel into the U.S. for management and disposal by EM. The Department is directed to reanalyze the costs of the GTRI program and to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act a report describing an updated cost sharing arrangement for spent fuel storage, processing, and EM support of other NNSA missions, such as feedstock production.

Domestic Radiological Material Removal and Protection.—The Committee recommends $63,632,000, $16,368,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $15,000,000 below the budget request. The fiscal year 2014 Act contained a large increase for these activities that at the time of the writing of this report is approximately 78 percent unencumbered. The Committee will not support continuing such high levels of funding if the NNSA cannot demonstrate it can efficiently execute those funds in a timely manner.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

Rescissions.—The Committee rescinds $37,000,000 in unobligated and unencumbered prior-year balances that were planned for projects in Russia, but which the NNSA has no plan to use in fiscal year 2014.

Use of prior-year balances.—The Committee directs the use of $113,963,000 in prior-year balances to offset fiscal year 2015 needs as described above. Prior-year balances shall be derived from unencumbered funds that the NNSA planned to use for projects in Russia in fiscal years 2014 and 2015. The NNSA should request new budget authority to support new agreements or contracts in Russia that are certified to be in the U.S. national security interest in future budget requests.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriation, 2014	$1,095,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,377,100,000
Recommended, 2015	1,215,342,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+120,342,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−161,758,000

The Naval Reactors (NR) program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion from technology development through reactor operations to ultimate reactor plant disposal. The program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. The Committee recommendation for Naval Reactors is $1,215,342,000, $120,342,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $161,758,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommendation fully funds development of the Ohio-Replacement ballistic missile submarine and refueling of the S8G prototype, which is closely linked to the Ohio-Replacement. The Committee continues to provide funding separately for these high-priority activities.

Naval Reactors Budget Review.—The Committee remains concerned about the high year-to-year increases that NR is using for its programmatic planning basis in future years. In order to carry out its plans, NR's out-year budgets would need to grow dramatically, an unlikely scenario considering the current fiscal environment. Even if the increases planned were attainable, NR's five-year budget figures in the budget request appear to artificially limit funding in order to fit within the Administration's projected budget caps. In light of these fiscal realities, NR is directed to conduct a multi-year review of its programmatic requirements to better understand how funding levels below its five-year projections might impact its long-term strategies. As part of its review, NR should consider how its projects and activities may need to be reprioritized

or re-sequenced in order to stay on track with the highest priority goals. NR is directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act a report that describes the results of its review and includes an integrated priority list of its budgetary requirements.

Ohio-Replacement Reactor Systems Development.—The Committee recommends $156,100,000, $29,700,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. The Committee's recommendation prioritizes increases for new development work associated with the Ohio-replacement above base development activities funded under NR Development that are not associated with a major development effort.

S8G Prototype Refueling.—The Committee recommends $126,400,000, $18,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

NR Development.—The Committee recommends $410,351,000, $3,947,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $15,349,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, $68,000,000 is provided for the Advanced Test Reactor at Idaho National Laboratory to resolve fuel supply shortages that have occurred due to funding cuts over the past few years.

NR Operations and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $368,071,000, $11,771,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $44,309,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, not less than $119,279,000 is provided for Research Reactor Facility Operations and Maintenance to ensure sufficient funding is available for a maintenance shutdown of the prototype reactor at the Kesselring Site. Funding for Spent Fuel Handling Facility Other Project Costs (OPCs) is transferred to the line-item construction project as described below.

Construction.—The Committee recommends $112,920,000, $88,547,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $97,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee supports increased investment in NR infrastructure, but prioritizes continued funding for ongoing projects and those that address outstanding safety and security issues. As a result, the recommendation defers commencement of an overpack storage expansion project that is not needed until 2022. In addition, the Committee provides no funding to construct a simulation training facility that is primarily intended to meet Navy training needs because the training of Navy nuclear operators is a Navy rather than DOE responsibility.

The Committee is concerned about the affordability of NR's construction plans. The fiscal year 2015 budget request proposes to commence five new construction projects, despite failing to identify all the funds needed to complete these projects within its projected five-year budget plan. In addition, estimated project costs are continuing to rise due to what appears to be a failure to control project scope. The total project cost of the Kesselring Central Office Building project has grown to $24,850,000, an increase of $9,600,000 or 63 percent above its previously reported cost of $15,250,000. The total project cost of the Materials Characterization Laboratory Expansion project has grown to $38,200,000, an increase of $16,400,000 or 75 percent above its previously reported cost of $21,800,000. The Committee defers additional funding and directs

NR to resolve the expansion of scope before requesting additional funds for these two projects.

The budget request fails to provide the minimum required information regarding square footage of each new facility and associated demolition work. The Committee provides clarification that this reporting requirement is applicable to NR projects and should be clearly reported in each project data sheet in future budget requests.

Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project, NRF.—The Committee recommends $70,000,000, $70,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $71,100,000 below the budget request. The Committee provides funding for Other Project Costs (OPCs) within project funds, consistent with the recommendation for accounting for OPCs for other DOE major projects with a total project cost greater than $750,000,000. Consolidating OPCs into one project line improves integration of startup and commissioning activities, eliminates a common need for reprogramming, and provides greater transparency into the costs of major construction projects. The recommended level permits work on the project to move forward, but maintains a slight delay that will stagger peak funding requirements with NR's other major multi-year activities in order to provide a more reliable planning basis. The Committee expects NR to conduct an independent cost review and to establish a clear path for completing its National Environmental Policy Act requirements prior to the award of Critical Decision-1.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriation, 2014	$377,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	410,842,000
Recommended, 2015	386,863,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+9,863,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−23,979,000

The Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) provides corporate planning and oversight for Defense Programs, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors, including the NNSA field offices in New Mexico, Nevada, and California. The Committee recommendation is $386,863,000, $9,863,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $23,979,000 below the budget request. The Committee does not approve the NNSA's request to change the name of this appropriation to Federal Salaries and Expenses.

Corporate Project Management.—The Committee recommends $9,863,000, $1,946,000 below the budget request. After accounting for the transfer of these activities from Weapons Activities as directed in the fiscal year 2014 Act, the recommended amount for Corporate Project Management is $745,000 below fiscal year 2014. The NNSA should expedite establishing permanent federal capabilities for cost estimating and project management instead of relying on large support service contracts to conduct its oversight.

Albuquerque Complex.—The recommendation provides no funding to build out or lease commercial office space in Albuquerque, $19,900,000 below the budget request. The NNSA's proposal does not provide the best value to the government and will cost the taxpayer more over time than refurbishing existing space and con-

structing new facilities. In addition, the NNSA's proposal to build out secure space for handling highly sensitive national security information creates a security vulnerability that is not acceptable considering the availability of existing onsite facilities that are not yet beyond their useful life. The recommendation includes funding and additional direction within Weapons Activities to address facility conditions at the Albuquerque Complex.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

Appropriation, 2014	$5,000,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	4,864,538,000
Recommended, 2015	4,801,280,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−198,720,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−63,258,000

The Defense Environmental Cleanup program is responsible for identifying and reducing risks and managing waste at sites where the nation carried out defense-related nuclear research and production activities that resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination requiring remediation, stabilization, or some other cleanup action. The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Cleanup is $4,801,280,000, $198,720,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $63,258,000 below the budget request. The recommendation does not include a federal contribution of $463,000,000 into the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund. Within the amounts provided, the Department is directed to fund hazardous waste worker training at $10,000,000.

The recommendation reflects the fiscal constraints that are impacting resources available to accelerate work at cleanup sites and to respond to new challenges that might arise. While the recommended funding level for Defense Environmental Cleanup is reduced from the request, additional funds have been provided to non-defense cleanup activities to provide an overall level of funding for the Office of Environmental Management (EM) of $5,628,430,000, $202,158,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $6,742,000 above the budget request.

Special Transfer Authority.—The Department has identified no funds in its budget request to address the recent incidents that have led to the shutdown of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Investigative reports have found that at least some of the problems that the Department must now address were entirely preventable. The Committee anticipates that funding available for environmental cleanup will continue to be highly constrained for the next several years. The Department's ability to safely and efficiently execute its program of work will directly impact its ability to meet other cleanup commitments, and events at WIPP increase the likelihood that the Department will have to use its limited cleanup funds to pay penalties to the states rather than to make progress on cleanup goals.

To meet the immediate needs for expediting the return of WIPP to full operations, the Committee has identified funds in the budget request for payments in excess of requirements into the NNSA's

contractor defined benefit pension plans. Pension payments are highly dependent on market conditions and the Department's ability to accurately predict payments several years in advance is inherently limited. The Committee notes that the intent of contributing funds above requirements is to avoid future programmatic risk if changes in market conditions require large variations in future required payments. However, the actual needs today at WIPP outweigh the hypothetical future benefits of overpaying into plans. The bill contains a provision that allows the Secretary of Energy to transfer up to $120,000,000 of NNSA funds that were requested for overpayments to pay for the costs of WIPP recovery.

Hanford Site.—The Committee recommends $2,085,071,000, $66,145,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $2,000,000 above the budget request. In recognition of the responsiveness of the Department to better account for its smaller construction activities, the Committee has provided greater flexibility by combining control points for Richland. While funding for Hanford is consolidated to enhance transparency into the overall funding provided to the site, the Committee maintains separate funding for DOE's two distinct site offices at Hanford.

For the Richland Office, the recommendation funds the request of $26,290,000 for Richland construction activities, funds the request of $14,701,000 for community and regulatory support, and provides $832,080,000, $25,000,000 above the budget request, for Richland cleanup and disposition operations. Within that amount, at least $235,000,000 shall be used for the River Corridor Closure project.

For the Office of River Protection, the recommendation provides $522,000,000 for Tank Farm Activities, $1,784,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the request. For Office of River Protection construction activities, the recommendation provides $690,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $25,000,000 below the request. Within this amount, $12,000,000 is provided to commence detailed design activities on the Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System project. The Committee does not support further acceleration of construction for the new framework agreement until DOE can resolve the cost and schedule uncertainties of its proposal. While the recommendation continues to provide control point flexibility between subprojects of the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) in fiscal year 2015, the Committee expects the rebaseline effort currently underway to result in a proposal that will better account for the various costs of the project. The Department needs to provide considerably greater detail on the use of its funding, including its anticipated costs and schedule requirements for resolving the outstanding technical issues of the WTP. The Committee is also concerned that DOE has been shifting the allocation of funding for WTP-related work between Tank Farms and WTP subprojects by adjusting accounting codes for "Shared Services" in an effort to artificially show that a nominal $690,000,000 per year is being spent on the project. It is essential that the Department establish formal methods of accounting for its project costs so that overall progress can be tracked, contractor performance can be monitored, and taxpayer dollars are not wasted.

Hanford's Tank Farms.—The Committee is concerned about the continued deterioration of aging tanks at Hanford and directs the

Department to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than February 1, 2015, a comprehensive report on tank maintenance and upgrade requirements, including projected costs of needed safety and maintenance upgrades. The report shall include an estimate of the costs and timeline for constructing new tanks with a description of the impacts on the timeline for constructing the Waste Treatment Plant if new tanks were required.

Idaho National Laboratory.—The Committee recommends $380,203,000, $6,797,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $13,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee is concerned about the impact that the closure of WIPP is having on DOE's ability to meet its cleanup milestones. The recommendation includes an additional $10,000,000 to support work plan adjustments needed to meet 2018 milestones now that TRU waste shipments have been temporarily suspended. The recommendation also includes $3,000,000 to accelerate shipments of mixed low level waste to maximize inventory disposals.

NNSA Sites.—The Committee recommends $249,018,000, $65,658,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $44,617,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, the Committee recommends $180,000,000 for Los Alamos National Laboratory. The recommendation funds the request of $4,600,000 for project engineering and design of the Hexavalent Chromium Pump and Treatment Facility but does not provide the $24,000,000 requested for construction because DOE cannot initiate the project until it is approved by the State of New Mexico. The fiscal year 2014 Act provided a one-time increase to support an agreement to expedite the removal of above ground legacy TRU waste. Now that TRU waste shipments to WIPP are suspended, the recommendation maintains overall funding for Los Alamos above the fiscal year 2013 level and urges the Department to obtain resolution of its long-term cleanup plans for the site.

Separations Process Research Unit (SPRU).—The Committee recognizes that the Department of Energy and the private contractor are continuing cleanup at the site. The Committee notes that $12,500,000 is available from prior-year appropriations and an additional $20,500,000 is obligated but uncosted. The Committee directs the Department to preserve the $33,000,000 until a plan has been determined for the site. If, at that time, the Department is found to have a liability, the Committee expects the Department to apply the $32,500,000 toward that outstanding obligation. If additional funding is needed once final agreement between the parties is achieved, the Committee expects the Department to submit a reprogramming request to fully support the agreed plan.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The Committee recommends $212,818,000, $2,182,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $5,935,000 above the budget request. The recommendation provides funding above the request for Oak Ridge Cleanup and Disposition to address work plan revisions for contact- and remote-handled TRU waste that are necessary due to the closure of WIPP. The recommendation also provides additional control point flexibility by including funding requested for OR Nuclear Facility D&D within OR cleanup and waste disposition.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee recommends $1,104,904,000, $29,330,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $45,202,000 below the budget request. The recommendation reduces funding for site risk management, but includes additional funding within Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation to better account for the costs of the NNSA's spent fuel removal initiatives. The recommendation also includes direction for the Department to conduct a review of the cost sharing arrangement between EM and the NNSA to better account for the costs of NNSA programmatic needs. The recommendation does not provide the amount requested for radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition because the Department has not updated the performance baseline for the full scope of the Salt Waste Processing Facility project and cannot justify its timeline for conducting supporting startup and commissioning work.

Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF).—The Committee recommends $135,000,000, $10,000,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. This amount includes "Other Project Costs" consistent with funding for OPCs for other Department of Energy projects with a total project cost greater than $750,000,000. Completion of the SWPF represents the critical path for meeting the Department's cleanup commitments at the site and therefore remains the Committee's highest priority at Savannah River.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).—The Committee recommends $236,020,000, $19,827,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $20,000,000 above the budget request. Funds above the request are provided to initiate two new construction projects, a safety-significant ventilation system and a new exhaust shaft, which are needed to ensure WIPP can be safely operated.

The Secretary of Energy is directed to designate an official to be responsible for developing a formal WIPP Recovery Plan that will return the facility to full operations. The recovery plan shall detail the Department's strategy to implement corrective actions to address the root causes of the fire and radiological incidents. The recovery plan shall continue to be updated with findings of ongoing accident and root cause investigations. While the Committee does not require outside independent review, the Department should seriously consider this action in light of the importance of WIPP to other Department sites as well as the uniqueness of the event and the facility. Before use of its special transfer authority, the Department shall provide its WIPP Recovery Plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Department shall further provide the Committees a monthly update on its progress in implementing its recovery plan and addressing the root causes of the fire and radiological event.

Program Support.—The Committee recommends $16,979,000, $1,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $2,000,000 above the budget request. Additional funding above the request is provided to expedite WIPP recovery efforts, including funding for mine safety expertise, review of documented safety analyses and engineered changes, and study of decontamination alternatives.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000, $8,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $3,007,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, $2,000,000 is provided for the National Spent Fuel Program at

Idaho National Laboratory in order to maintain and update the database regarding the current inventory and characteristics of EM-managed spent fuel. In addition, the Department is directed to assess the current status of its spent fuel storage and processing infrastructure and to provide an assessment of the current risks and status of deferred maintenance to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than September 30, 2015.

Use of prior-year balances.—The Committee directs the use of $13,367,000 in prior-year balances that are greater than five years old.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2014	$755,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	753,000,000
Recommended, 2015	754,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−1,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+1,000,000

This account provides funding for the Office of Environment, Health, Safety and Security; Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments; Office of Legacy Management; Defense Related Administrative Support; and the Office of Hearings and Appeals. The Committee recommendation for Other Defense Activities (ODA) is $754,000,000, $1,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $1,000,000 above the budget request.

Environment, Health, Safety and Security.—The Committee supports the Department of Energy's request to provide separate funding for the newly reorganized Health, Safety and Security activities. The Committee recommends $180,998,000 for the Office of Environment, Health, Safety and Security and $73,534,000 for the Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments, the same as the budget request. Overall funding for these two organizations is $2,615,000 above fiscal year 2014.

The Committee believes it is critical to preserve the ability of the Department to conduct independent assessments of compliance and performance and that access to and cooperation from all Departmental programs is provided to the Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments. The Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments is directed to provide to the Committee an annual report that provides an overview of its oversight activities, findings, and recommendations for the fiscal year.

The Committee notes that the Department still has not approved a revision to its Graded Security Posture (GSP) that will update security standards at DOE sites to meet the latest threats. While the Department has implemented organizational reforms, it has not yet demonstrated those reorganized offices can effectively reform security practices or impose accountability. The Department is directed to move expeditiously in updating its analysis with the latest known threats and approving a GSP that can be used to set and enforce consistent and appropriate standards of protection at each DOE site.

Specialized Security Activities.—The Committee recommends $203,152,000 for Specialized Security Activities, $910,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $1,000,000 above the budget request.

Office of Legacy Management.—The Office of Legacy Management provides long-term stewardship following site closure. The Committee recommends $171,980,000 for Legacy Management, $5,003,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. The Committee commends the Office of Legacy Management's efforts to undertake creative reforms to limit the volatility of its liabilities for contractor employee defined benefit pension plans while preserving the commitments made to legacy employees. The Committee supports additional reforms that might further reduce risks to ongoing programmatic activities at the Department of Energy.

Defense Related Administrative Support.—The Committee recommends $118,836,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and the budget request, to provide administrative support for programs funded in the atomic energy defense activities accounts.

Office of Hearings and Appeals.—The Office of Hearings and Appeals is responsible for all of the Department's adjudicatory processes, other than those administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends $5,500,000, $478,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Management of the federal power marketing functions was transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Energy in the Department of Energy Organization Act of 1977 (P.L. 95–91). These functions include the power marketing activities authorized under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation that have been transferred to the Western Area Power Administration.

All four power marketing administrations give preference in the sale of their power to publicly-owned and cooperatively-owned utilities. Operations of the Bonneville Power Administration are financed principally under the authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act (P.L. 93–454). Under this Act, the Bonneville Power Administration is authorized to use its revenues to finance the costs of its operations, maintenance, and capital construction, and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any additional capital program requirements.

Beginning in fiscal year 2011, power revenues from the Southeastern, Southwestern, and Western Area Power Administrations, which were previously classified as mandatory offsetting receipts, were reclassified as discretionary offsetting collections to directly offset annual expenses. The capital expenses of Southwestern and Western Area Power Administrations are appropriated annually.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Department of Energy's marketing agency for electric power in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides electricity to a 300,000 square mile service area in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets the

power from federal hydropower projects in the Northwest, as well as power from non-federal generating facilities in the region, and exchanges and markets surplus power with Canada and California. Language is included to allow expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund for the Black Canyon Trout Hatchery.

The Committee recognizes extraordinary measures were taken recently by the Department of Energy in an effort to correct hiring irregularities that negatively impacted veterans applying for employment at the Bonneville Power Administration. Both the Department and Bonneville need to ensure that all job applicants are treated fairly, all appropriate federal hiring laws are followed, and whistleblowers are protected. At the same time, the Committee reiterates its longstanding recognition of Bonneville's autonomy within the Department of Energy as a separate and distinct self-funding agency under the Bonneville Project Act, DOE Organization Act, and the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act. Accordingly, the Committee expects the Department intervention in Bonneville management provoked by this matter to be both temporary and limited.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Budget estimate, 2015	$– – –
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Recommended, 2015	– – –
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Southeastern Power Administration (SEPA) markets hydroelectric power produced at 22 Army Corps of Engineers Projects in 11 states in the southeast. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities, so it contracts to "wheel" its power using the existing transmission facilities of area utilities.

The total program level for SEPA in fiscal year 2015 is $96,930,000, with $89,710,000 for purchase power and wheeling and $7,220,000 for program direction. The purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by collections of $73,579,000, and annual expenses will be offset by collections of $2,220,000 provided in this Act and the use of prior-year balances of $5,000,000. Additionally, SEPA has identified $16,131,000 in alternative financing for purchase power and wheeling. The net appropriation, therefore, is $0 in the recommendation and the budget request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2014	$11,892,000
Budget estimate, 2015	11,400,000
Recommended, 2015	11,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−492,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA) markets hydroelectric power produced at 24 Corps of Engineers projects in the six-state area of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. SWPA operates and maintains 1,380 miles of

transmission lines, along with supporting substations and communications sites.

The Committee recommendation for the Southwestern Power Administration is a net appropriation of $11,400,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Southwestern in fiscal year 2015 is $122,666,000, including $15,174,000 for operation and maintenance expenses, $63,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling, $31,089,000 for program direction, and $13,403,000 for construction. Offsetting collections total $87,840,000, including $5,438,000 for operation and maintenance, $53,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $29,402,000 for program direction. Southwestern estimates it will secure alternative financing from customers in the amount of $23,426,000.

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

Appropriation, 2014	$95,930,000
Budget estimate, 2015	93,372,000
Recommended, 2015	93,372,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−2,558,000
Budget estimate, 2015	− − −

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

The Committee recommendation for the Western Area Power Administration is a net appropriation of $93,372,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Western in fiscal year 2015 is recommended at $837,731,000, which includes $86,645,000 for construction and rehabilitation, $81,958,000 for system operation and maintenance, $441,223,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and $227,905,000 for program direction. Offsetting collections include $471,540,000 for purchase power and wheeling and annual expenses, and the use of $7,161,000 of offsetting collections from the Colorado River Dam Fund (as authorized in P.L. 98–381). Western Area estimates it will secure alternative financing from customers in the amount of $265,658,000.

The Committee is concerned that Western has not been as responsive as it could be in its efforts to work with its customers. Accordingly, the Committee encourages Western to improve its approach to addressing customer concerns, and the Committee will continue to monitor further developments.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 2014	$420,000
Budget estimate, 2015	228,000
Recommended, 2015	228,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−192,000
Budget estimate, 2015	− − −

Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam are two international water projects located on the Rio Grande River between Texas and Mex-

ico. Power generated by hydroelectric facilities at these two dams is sold to public utilities through the Western Area Power Administration. The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 created the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund to defray the costs of operation, maintenance, and emergency activities. The Fund is administered by the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

The budget request includes a proposal for authority to accept contributed funds in fiscal year 2015 for use in fulfilling duties associated with the Falcon and Amistad Dams. This authority would be equivalent to the authority used throughout the Western Area Power Administration to secure alternative financing. The Committee includes this proposal.

The Committee recommendation is a net appropriation of $228,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level is $5,529,000, with $4,499,000 of offsetting collections applied toward annual expenses and $802,000 of alternative financing.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2014	$304,600,000
Budget estimate, 2015	327,277,000
Recommended, 2015	304,389,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	−211,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−22,888,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2014	$−304,600,000
Budget estimate, 2015	−327,277,000
Recommended, 2015	−304,389,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+211,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+22,888,000

The Committee recommendation for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is $304,389,000, $211,000 below fiscal year 2014 and $22,888,000 below the budget request. Revenues for FERC are established at a rate equal to the budget authority, resulting in a net appropriation of $0. As described below, the Committee is concerned about the Commission's lack of responsiveness to ratepayers, state and local leaders, and the Committee, and has rejected the proposed one percent increase in salaries and benefits and delimited the Commissioners' use of funding.

In addition, the Committee has denied the request for $20,277,000 to partially fund a $44,000,000 building consolidation project. The Commission has approximately $22,000,000 in carryover balances that it intends to use on this project, which is not scheduled to be completed until fiscal year 2020. The Committee encourages the Commission to request funding for this multi-year project so as not to create spikes in its requested salaries and expenses, and therefore revenues, in any one year.

The Committee is aware that concerns remain about the degree of consideration given by FERC to the rights and concerns of private property owners during the process for developing, reviewing, and approving shoreline management plans. The Committee reiter-

ates its support for the expeditious development and implementation of innovative and mutually agreeable solutions to resolve conflicts among project purposes and private property at specific locations.

The Committee is concerned with recent reports from localities experiencing dramatic increases in their electricity costs for January 2014 due to transmission charges, with some localities reporting increases of more than one hundred percent over their estimated charges. The Committee appreciates FERC taking note of these impacts and hosting a technical conference on Winter 2013–2014 Operations and Market Performance in Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators. The Commission shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the causes of these increased costs, the impacts on localities and residents, and any authorities and actions that have been or potentially could be used to address these issues.

However, the Committee urges the Commission to be more proactive in addressing the concerns of ratepayers. In particular, when the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission considers a request for approval of a new capacity zone, the Committee expects the views of local and state officials, regulators, and business leaders to be taken into account during the process. Further, the Committee also expects that the process will include considerations such as costs to ratepayers in addition to electrical reliability and availability.

The Committee remains concerned about the backlog of liquefied natural gas export applications at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and continues to support a clearly communicated, timely process to reach an appropriate determination on each application. The Committee notes that FERC has yet to comply with the report directive included in House Report 113–135 and referenced by the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014, which required FERC to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, not later than February 16, 2014, its plan to complete consideration of all applications filed with the Commission. The Committee reiterates its previous direction.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
ENERGY PROGRAMS					
ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY					
Sustainable Transportation:					
Vehicle technologies	289,910	359,000	277,500	-12,410	-81,500
Bioenergy technologies	232,429	253,200	180,000	-52,429	-73,200
Hydrogen and fuel cell technologies	92,983	92,983	100,000	+7,017	+7,017
Subtotal, Sustainable Transportation	615,322	705,183	557,500	-57,822	-147,683
Renewable Energy:					
Solar energy	257,211	282,300	178,000	-79,211	-104,300
Wind energy	88,179	115,000	107,000	+18,821	-8,000
Water power	58,600	62,500	38,500	-20,100	-24,000
Geothermal technologies	45,802	61,500	46,000	+198	-15,500
Subtotal, Renewable Energy	449,792	521,300	369,500	-80,292	-151,800
Energy Efficiency:					
Advanced manufacturing	180,579	305,100	206,000	+25,421	-99,100
Building technologies	177,974	211,700	165,000	-12,974	-46,700
Federal energy management program	28,265	36,200	20,000	-8,265	-16,200
Weatherization and intergovernmental:					
Weatherization:					
Weatherization assistance	171,000	224,600	200,000	+29,000	-24,600
Training and technical assistance	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---
State energy program grants	50,000	63,100	50,000	---	-13,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Tribal energy activities	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
Clean energy and economic development partnerships	---	14,000	---	---	-14,000
Subtotal, Weatherization and intergovernmental	231,000	304,700	253,000	+22,000	-51,700
Subtotal, Energy Efficiency	617,818	857,700	644,000	+26,182	-213,700
Corporate Support:					
Facilities and infrastructure:					
National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)	46,000	56,000	56,000	+10,000	---
Program direction	162,000	160,000	150,000	-12,000	-10,000
Strategic programs	23,554	21,779	12,000	-11,554	-9,779
Subtotal, Corporate Support	231,554	237,779	218,000	-13,554	-19,779
Use of prior-year balances	-2,382	-5,213	---	+2,382	+5,213
Subtotal, Energy efficiency and renewable energy	1,912,104	2,316,749	1,789,000	-123,104	-527,749
Rescission	-10,418	---	---	+10,418	---
TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	1,901,686	2,316,749	1,789,000	-112,686	-527,749

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY					
Research and development:					
Clean energy transmission and reliability	32,400	36,000	32,700	+300	-3,300
Smart grid research and development	14,600	24,400	14,600	---	-9,800
Cyber security for energy delivery systems	43,500	42,000	47,000	+3,500	+5,000
Energy storage	15,200	19,000	15,200	---	-3,800
Subtotal	105,700	121,400	109,500	+3,800	-11,900
National electricity delivery	6,000	7,000	7,000	+1,000	---
Infrastructure security and energy restoration	8,000	22,600	16,000	+8,000	-6,600
Program direction	27,606	29,000	27,500	-106	-1,500
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY	147,306	180,000	160,000	+12,694	-20,000
NUCLEAR ENERGY					
Research and development:					
Nuclear energy enabling technologies	71,130	78,246	101,000	+29,870	+22,754
Integrated university program	5,500	---	5,000	-500	+5,000
Small modular reactor licensing technical support	110,000	97,000	54,500	-55,500	-42,500
Reactor concepts RD&D	113,000	100,540	138,000	+25,000	+37,460
Fuel cycle research and development	186,500	189,100	182,000	-4,500	-7,100
International nuclear energy cooperation	2,500	3,000	3,000	+500	---
Subtotal	488,630	467,886	483,500	-5,130	+15,614

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Infrastructure:					
Radiological facilities management:					
Space and defense infrastructure	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Research reactor infrastructure	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---
Subtotal	25,000	5,000	5,000	-20,000	---
INL facilities management:					
INL operations and infrastructure	180,162	180,541	200,631	+20,469	+20,090
Construction:					
13-D-905 Remote-handled low level waste disposal project, INL	16,398	5,369	5,369	-11,029	---
Subtotal, Construction	16,398	5,369	5,369	-11,029	---
Subtotal, INL facilities management	196,560	185,910	206,000	+9,440	+20,090
Subtotal, Infrastructure	221,560	190,910	211,000	-10,560	+20,090
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	94,000	104,000	104,000	+10,000	---
STEP (Supercritical CO2)	---	27,500	27,500	+27,500	---
Program direction	90,000	73,090	73,000	-17,000	-90
Use of prior-year balances	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	889,190	863,386	899,000	+9,810	+35,614

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT					
Coal CCS and power systems:					
Carbon capture	92,000	77,000	90,000	-2,000	+13,000
Carbon storage	108,900	80,084	100,000	-8,900	+19,916
Advanced energy systems	99,500	51,000	107,000	+7,500	+56,000
Cross cutting research	41,925	35,292	50,000	+8,075	+14,708
NETL coal research and development	50,011	34,031	50,000	-11	+15,969
STEP (Supercritical CO2)	---	---	15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Subtotal, CCS and power systems	392,336	277,407	412,000	+19,664	+134,593
Natural Gas Technologies:					
CCS demonstrations:					
Natural gas carbon capture and storage	---	25,000	---	---	-25,000
Research	20,600	35,000	22,600	+2,000	-12,400
Subtotal, Natural Gas Technologies	20,600	60,000	22,600	+2,000	-37,400
Unconventional fossil energy technologies from petroleum - oil technologies	15,000	---	13,000	-2,000	+13,000
Program direction	120,000	114,202	120,000	---	+5,798
Plant and capital equipment	16,032	15,294	16,803	+771	+1,509
Fossil energy environmental restoration	5,897	7,897	7,897	+2,000	---
Special recruitment programs	700	700	700	---	---
Use of prior-year balances	-8,500	---	---	+8,500	---
TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	562,065	475,500	593,000	+30,935	+117,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES	20,000	19,950	19,950	-50	---
ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND	---	15,580	15,580	+15,580	---
STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE	189,400	205,000	205,000	+15,600	---
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE					
NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	8,000	1,600	7,600	-400	+6,000
Rescission	---	---	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000
TOTAL, NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE	8,000	1,600	1,600	-6,400	---
ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION	117,000	122,500	120,000	+3,000	-2,500
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP					
Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)	2,545	2,562	2,562	+17	---
Gaseous Diffusion Plants	96,222	104,403	104,403	+8,181	---
Small sites	71,204	60,223	65,223	-5,981	+5,000
West Valley Demonstration Project	64,000	58,986	58,986	-5,014	---
Construction:					
15-D-410 Ft. St. Vrain Security Upgrades	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Use of prior-year balances	-2,206	---	---	+2,206	---
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	231,765	226,174	241,174	+9,409	+15,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND					
Oak Ridge	195,990	137,898	157,898	-38,092	+20,000
Paducah:					
Nuclear facility D&D, Paducah	265,220	198,729	198,729	-66,491	---
Construction:					
15-U-407 On-site waste disposal facility, Paducah	---	8,486	8,486	+8,486	---
Total, Paducah	265,220	207,215	207,215	-58,005	---
Portsmouth:					
Nuclear facility D&D, Portsmouth	137,613	131,461	146,461	+8,848	+15,000
Construction:					
15-U-408 On-site waste disposal facility, Portsmouth	---	28,539	28,539	+28,539	---
Total, Portsmouth	137,613	160,000	175,000	+37,387	+15,000
Pension and community and regulatory support	---	25,863	25,863	+25,863	---
Title X uranium/thorium reimbursement program	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
TOTAL, UED&D FUND	598,823	530,976	585,976	-12,847	+55,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
SCIENCE					
Advanced scientific computing research	478,593	541,000	541,000	+62,407	---
Basic energy sciences:					
Research	1,610,757	1,667,800	1,574,000	-36,757	-93,800
Construction:					
07-SC-06 National synchrotron light source II, BNL	26,300	---	---	-26,300	---
13-SC-10 LINAC coherent light source II, SLAC	75,700	138,700	128,000	+52,300	-10,700
Subtotal, Construction	102,000	138,700	128,000	+26,000	-10,700
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	1,712,757	1,806,500	1,702,000	-10,757	-104,500
Biological and environmental research	610,196	628,000	540,000	-70,196	-88,000
Subtotal, Biological and environmental research	610,196	628,000	540,000	-70,196	-88,000
Fusion energy sciences:					
Research	305,677	266,000	315,000	+9,323	+49,000
Construction:					
14-SC-60 ITER	200,000	150,000	225,000	+25,000	+75,000
Subtotal, Fusion energy sciences	505,677	416,000	540,000	+34,323	+124,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
High energy physics:					
Research	746,521	719,000	738,000	-8,521	+19,000
Construction:					
11-SC-40 Project engineering and design (PED) long baseline neutrino experiment, FNAL	16,000	---	12,000	-4,000	+12,000
11-SC-41 Muon to electron conversion experiment, FNAL	35,000	25,000	25,000	-10,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	51,000	25,000	37,000	-14,000	+12,000
Subtotal, High energy physics	797,521	744,000	775,000	-22,521	+31,000
Nuclear physics:					
Operations and maintenance	489,438	487,073	493,500	+4,062	+6,427
Construction:					
14-SC-50 Facility for rare isotope beams, Michigan State University	55,000	90,000	90,000	+35,000	---
06-SC-01 12 GeV continuous electron beam facility upgrade, TJNAF	25,500	16,500	16,500	-9,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	80,500	106,500	106,500	+26,000	---
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	569,938	593,573	600,000	+30,062	+6,427
Workforce development for teachers and scientists	26,500	19,500	19,500	-7,000	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Science laboratories infrastructure:					
Infrastructure support:					
Payment in lieu of taxes	1,385	1,412	1,723	+338	+311
Oak Ridge landlord	5,951	5,777	5,777	-174	---
Facilities and infrastructure	900	3,100	3,100	+2,200	---
Subtotal	8,236	10,289	10,600	+2,364	+311
Construction:					
15-SC-78 Integrative genomics building, LBNL	---	12,090	12,090	+12,090	---
15-SC-77 Photon science laboratory building, SLAC	---	12,890	12,890	+12,890	---
15-SC-76 Materials design laboratory, ANL	---	7,000	7,000	+7,000	---
15-SC-75 Infrastructure and operational improvements, PPPL	---	25,000	25,000	+25,000	---
13-SC-70 Utilities upgrade, FNAL	34,900	---	---	-34,900	---
13-SC-71 Utility infrastructure modernization, TJNAF	29,200	---	---	-29,200	---
12-SC-70 Science and user support building, SLAC	25,482	11,920	11,920	-13,562	---
Subtotal	89,582	68,900	68,900	-20,682	---
Subtotal, Science laboratories infrastructure	97,818	79,189	79,500	-18,318	+311
Safeguards and security	87,000	94,000	94,000	+7,000	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Science program direction	185,000	189,393	180,000	-5,000	-9,393
Subtotal, Science	5,071,000	5,111,155	5,071,000	---	-40,155
TOTAL, SCIENCE	5,071,000	5,111,155	5,071,000	---	-40,155
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	---	---	150,000	+150,000	+150,000
ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY					
ARPA-E projects	252,000	295,750	252,000	---	-43,750
Program direction	28,000	29,250	28,000	---	-1,250
TOTAL, ARPA-E	280,000	325,000	280,000	---	-45,000
INDIAN ENERGY PROGRAMS					
Office of Indian energy policy and programs (IE)	---	2,510	---	---	-2,510
Tribal energy program	---	13,490	---	---	-13,490
TOTAL, INDIAN ENERGY PROGRAMS	---	16,000	---	---	-16,000
TITLE 17 - INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PGM					
Administrative expenses	42,000	42,000	42,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Offsetting collection	-22,000	-25,000	-25,000	-3,000	---
TOTAL, TITLE 17 - INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM	20,000	17,000	17,000	-3,000	---
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PGM					
Administrative expenses	6,000	4,000	4,000	-2,000	---
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM	6,000	4,000	4,000	-2,000	---
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY (RESCISSION)	---	-6,600	-6,600	-6,600	---
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION					
Administrative operations:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Office of the Secretary:					
Program direction	5,008	5,008	5,008	---	---
Chief Financial Officer	47,825	47,182	47,182	-643	---
Management	57,599	68,293	67,352	+9,753	-941
Chief human capital officer	24,488	25,400	24,500	+12	-900
Chief Information Officer	35,401	33,188	33,188	-2,213	---
Office of Indian energy policy and programs	2,506	---	16,000	+13,494	+16,000
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,700	6,300	4,700	---	-1,600

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office Of Small and disadvantaged business utilization	---	2,253	2,253	+2,253	---
Economic impact and diversity	6,197	5,574	6,200	+3	+626
General Counsel	33,053	33,000	33,000	-53	---
Energy policy and systems analysis	16,181	38,545	31,181	+15,000	-7,364
International Affairs	12,518	18,441	18,441	+5,923	---
Public affairs	3,597	3,431	3,431	-166	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	249,073	286,615	292,436	+43,363	+5,821
Program support:					
Economic impact and diversity	2,759	1,673	2,800	+41	+1,127
Policy analysis and system studies	441	---	---	-441	---
Environmental policy studies	520	---	---	-520	---
Climate change technology program (prog. supp)	5,482	---	---	-5,482	---
Cybersecurity and secure communications	30,795	21,364	21,364	-9,431	---
Corporate IT program support (CIO)	15,866	19,612	19,612	+3,746	---
Subtotal, Program support	55,863	42,649	43,776	-12,087	+1,127
Subtotal, Administrative operations	304,936	329,264	336,212	+31,276	+6,948
Cost of work for others	48,537	42,000	42,000	-6,537	---
Subtotal, Departmental administration	353,473	371,264	378,212	+24,739	+6,948
Use of prior-year balances	---	-4,205	-4,205	-4,205	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Funding from other defense activities	-118,836	-118,836	-118,836	---	---
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	234,637	248,223	255,171	+20,534	+6,948
Miscellaneous revenues	-108,188	-119,171	-119,171	-10,983	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	126,449	129,052	136,000	+9,551	+6,948
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL					
Office of the inspector general	42,120	50,288	42,120	---	-8,168
Use of prior-year balances	---	-10,420	---	---	+10,420
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	42,120	39,868	42,120	---	+2,252
TOTAL, ENERGY PROGRAMS	10,210,804	10,592,890	10,323,800	+112,996	-269,090
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES					
Directed stockpile work:					
B61 Life extension program	537,044	643,000	643,000	+105,956	---
W76 Life extension program	248,454	259,168	259,168	+10,714	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
W78 Life extension program	38,000	---	---	-38,000	---
W88 Alt 370	169,487	165,400	165,400	-4,087	---
Cruise missile warhead life extension program	---	9,418	17,018	+17,018	+7,600
Stockpile systems:					
B61 Stockpile systems	83,536	109,615	109,615	+26,079	---
W76 Stockpile systems	47,187	45,728	45,728	-1,459	---
W78 Stockpile systems	54,381	62,703	62,703	+8,322	---
W80 Stockpile systems	50,330	70,610	70,610	+20,280	---
B83 Stockpile systems	54,948	63,136	63,136	+8,188	---
W87 Stockpile systems	101,506	91,255	91,255	-10,251	---
W88 Stockpile systems	62,600	88,060	88,060	+25,460	---
Subtotal	454,488	531,107	531,107	+76,619	---
Weapons dismantlement and disposition	54,264	30,008	54,264	---	+24,256
Stockpile services:					
Production support	345,000	350,942	350,942	+5,942	---
Research and Development support	24,928	29,649	25,500	+572	-4,149
R and D certification and safety	151,133	201,479	154,508	+3,375	-46,971
Management, technology, and production	214,187	241,805	226,000	+11,813	-15,805
Plutonium sustainment	125,048	144,575	132,000	+6,952	-12,575
Tritium readiness	80,000	140,053	138,053	+58,053	-2,000
Subtotal	940,296	1,108,503	1,027,003	+86,707	-81,500
Subtotal, Directed stockpile work	2,442,033	2,746,604	2,696,960	+254,927	-49,644

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Campaigns:					
Science campaign:					
Advanced certification	58,747	58,747	58,747	---	---
Primary assessment technologies	92,000	112,000	112,000	+20,000	---
Dynamic materials properties	104,000	117,999	110,000	+6,000	-7,999
Advanced radiography	29,509	79,340	26,000	-3,509	-53,340
Secondary assessment technologies	85,467	88,344	88,344	+2,877	---
Subtotal	369,723	456,430	395,091	+25,368	-61,339
Engineering campaign:					
Enhanced surety	51,771	52,003	52,003	+232	---
Weapons system engineering assessment technology	23,727	20,832	20,832	-2,895	---
Nuclear survivability	19,504	25,371	25,371	+5,867	---
Enhanced surveillance	54,909	37,799	37,799	-17,110	---
Subtotal	149,911	136,005	136,005	-13,906	---
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign:					
Ignition	80,245	77,994	77,994	-2,251	---
Support of other stockpile programs	15,001	23,598	23,598	+8,597	---
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	59,897	61,297	61,297	+1,400	---
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	5,024	5,024	5,024	---	---
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	8,198	9,100	8,198	---	-902

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Facility operations and target production.....	345,592	335,882	335,882	-9,710	---
Subtotal.....	513,957	512,895	511,993	-1,964	-902
Advanced simulation and computing campaign.....	569,329	610,108	590,000	+20,671	-20,108
Readiness campaign:					
Nonnuclear readiness.....	55,407	125,909	---	-55,407	-125,909
Subtotal.....	55,407	125,909	---	-55,407	-125,909
Advanced manufacturing campaign:					
Additive manfacturing.....	---	---	12,600	+12,600	+12,600
Component manufacturing development.....	---	---	60,000	+60,000	+60,000
Processing technology development.....	---	---	21,300	+21,300	+21,300
Subtotal.....	---	---	93,900	+93,900	+93,900
Subtotal, Campaigns.....	1,658,327	1,841,347	1,726,989	+68,662	-114,358
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF):					
Operations of facilities:					
Kansas City Plant.....	135,834	125,000	125,000	-10,834	---
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.....	77,287	71,000	71,000	-6,287	---
Los Alamos National Laboratory.....	213,707	198,000	198,000	-15,707	---
Nevada Test Site.....	100,929	89,000	89,000	-11,929	---
Pantex.....	81,420	75,000	75,000	-6,420	---
Sandia National Laboratory.....	115,000	106,000	106,000	-9,000	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Savannah River Site	90,236	81,000	81,000	-9,236	---
Y-12 National Security Complex	170,042	151,000	151,000	-19,042	---
Subtotal	984,455	896,000	896,000	-88,455	---
Program readiness	67,259	136,700	68,000	+741	-68,700
Material recycle and recovery	125,000	138,900	126,000	+1,000	-12,900
Containers	26,000	26,000	26,000	---	---
Storage	35,000	40,800	40,800	+5,800	---
Maintenance and repair of facilities	227,591	205,000	227,000	-591	+22,000
Recapitalization	180,000	209,321	224,600	+44,600	+15,279
Construction:					
Albuquerque Complex Upgrades project	---	---	12,000	+12,000	+12,000
15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12	---	2,000	2,000	+2,000	---
15-D-612 Emergency Operations Center, LLNL	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
15-D-611 Emergency Operations Center, SNL	---	4,000	---	---	-4,000
15-D-301 HE Science & Engineering Facility, PX	---	11,800	11,800	+11,800	---
15-D-302 TA-55 Reinvestment project III, LANL	---	16,062	16,062	+16,062	---
12-D-301 TRU waste facility project, LANL	26,722	6,938	---	-26,722	-6,938
11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project II, LANL	30,679	10,000	10,000	-20,679	---
06-D-141 Uranium Processing Facility, Oak Ridge,TN	309,000	335,000	335,000	+26,000	---
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility, LANL	45,114	---	---	-45,114	---
07-O-220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL	10,605	15,000	15,000	+4,395	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy replacement project, LANL	---	---	35,700	+35,700	+35,700
Subtotal	422,120	402,800	437,562	+15,442	+34,762
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	2,067,425	2,055,521	2,045,962	-21,463	-9,559
Secure transportation asset:					
Operations and equipment	112,882	132,851	121,882	+9,000	-10,969
Program direction	97,118	100,962	97,118	---	-3,844
Subtotal, Secure transportation asset	210,000	233,813	219,000	+9,000	-14,813
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	228,243	173,440	202,940	-25,303	+29,500
Counterterrorism and counterproliferation programs	---	76,901	---	---	-76,901
Site stewardship	87,326	82,449	79,531	-7,795	-2,918
Defense nuclear security	664,981	618,123	636,123	-28,858	+18,000
Construction:					
14-D-710 Device assembly facility argus installation project, NV	---	---	14,000	+14,000	+14,000
Subtotal, Defense nuclear security	664,981	618,123	650,123	-14,858	+32,000
Information technology and cyber security	145,068	179,646	179,646	+34,578	---
Legacy contractor pensions	279,597	307,058	307,058	+27,461	---
Domestic uranium enrichment	62,000	---	96,000	+34,000	+96,000
Subtotal, Weapons Activities	7,845,000	8,314,902	8,204,209	+359,209	-110,693

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescission	-64,000	---	---	+64,000	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	7,781,000	8,314,902	8,204,209	+423,209	-110,693
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION					
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D:					
Nonproliferation and verification	398,838	360,808	375,808	-23,030	+15,000
Nuclear forensics and attribution	---	---	25,000	+25,000	+25,000
Counterproliferation	---	---	51,901	+51,901	+51,901
Subtotal, Defense nuclear nonproliferation R&D	398,838	360,808	452,709	+53,871	+91,901
Nonproliferation and international security	128,675	141,359	144,246	+15,571	+2,887
International materials protection and cooperation	419,625	305,467	233,367	-186,258	-72,100
Fissile materials disposition:					
U.S. plutonium disposition	157,557	85,000	60,000	-97,557	-25,000
U.S. uranium disposition	25,000	25,000	25,000	---	---
Construction:					
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	343,500	196,000	345,000	+1,500	+149,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
99-D-141-02 Waste solidification building, Savannah River, SC	---	5,125	---	---	-5,125
Subtotal, Construction	343,500	201,125	345,000	+1,500	+143,875
Total, Fissile materials disposition	526,057	311,125	430,000	-96,057	+118,875
Global threat reduction initiative:					
HEU reactor conversion	162,000	122,383	118,083	-43,917	-4,300
International nuclear and radiological material removal and protection	200,102	132,473	161,173	-38,929	+28,700
Domestic radiological material removal and protection	80,000	78,632	63,632	-16,368	-15,000
Subtotal, Global threat reduction initiative	442,102	333,488	342,888	-99,214	+9,400
Legacy contractor pensions	93,703	102,909	102,909	+9,206	---
Use of prior-year balances	-55,000	---	-113,963	-58,963	-113,963
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,954,000	1,555,156	1,592,156	-361,844	+37,000
Rescission	---	---	-37,000	-37,000	-37,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	1,954,000	1,555,156	1,555,156	-398,844	---
NAVAL REACTORS					
Naval reactors development	414,298	425,700	410,351	-3,947	-15,349

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
OHIO replacement reactor systems development	126,400	156,100	156,100	+29,700	---
S8G Prototype refueling	144,400	126,400	126,400	-18,000	---
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	356,300	412,380	368,071	+11,771	-44,309
Construction:					
15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3	---	400	---	---	-400
15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade	---	600	600	+600	---
15-D-902 KS Engineroom team trainer facility	---	1,500	---	---	-1,500
15-D-901 KS Central office building and prototype staff facility	---	24,000	---	---	-24,000
14-D-902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	---	141,100	70,000	+70,000	-71,100
13-D-905 Remote-handled low-level waste disposal project, INL	21,073	14,420	14,420	-6,653	---
13-D-904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO	600	20,100	20,100	+19,500	---
10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL	---	7,400	7,400	+7,400	---
08-D-190 Expended Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, NRF, ID	1,700	400	400	-1,300	---
Subtotal, Construction	24,373	209,920	112,920	+88,547	-97,000
Program direction	43,212	46,600	41,500	-1,712	-5,100
Use of prior-year balances	-13,983	---	---	+13,983	---
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	1,095,000	1,377,100	1,215,342	+120,342	-161,758

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	377,000	410,842	386,863	+9,863	-23,979
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	11,207,000	11,658,000	11,361,570	+154,570	-296,430
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP					
Closure sites	4,702	4,889	4,889	+187	---
Hanford Site:					
Richland cleanup and waste disposition	---	---	832,080	+832,080	+832,080
River corridor and other cleanup operations	408,634	332,788	---	-408,634	-332,788
Central plateau remediation	512,665	474,292	---	-512,665	-474,292
Office of River Protection rad liquid waste stabilization and disposition	520,216	522,000	522,000	+1,784	---
RL community and regulatory support	19,701	14,701	14,701	-5,000	---
Construction:					
15-D-401 Containerized sludge removal annex, RL	---	26,290	26,290	+26,290	---
15-D-409 Low activity waste pretreatment sysem, ORP	---	23,000	12,000	+12,000	-11,000
01-D-16 A-D, Waste treatment and immobilization plant, ORP	510,000	575,000	563,000	+53,000	-12,000
01-D-16 E, Waste treatment and immobilization plant, Pretreatment facility, ORP	180,000	115,000	115,000	-65,000	---
Total, Hanford Site	2,151,216	2,083,071	2,085,071	-66,145	+2,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Idaho National Laboratory:					
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	383,300	364,293	377,293	-6,007	+13,000
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,700	2,910	2,910	-790	---
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	387,000	367,203	380,203	-6,797	+13,000
NNSA sites and Nevada offsites:					
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	314,676	---	---	-314,676	---
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	---	1,366	1,366	+1,366	---
Nevada	---	64,851	64,851	+64,851	---
Sandia National Laboratory	---	2,801	2,801	+2,801	---
Los Alamos National Laboratory	---	196,017	175,400	+175,400	-20,617
Construction:					
15-D-406 Hexavalent chromium Pump and Treatment facility, LANL	---	28,600	4,600	+4,600	-24,000
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	314,676	293,635	249,018	-65,658	-44,617
Oak Ridge Reservation:					
OR Nuclear facility D&D	73,716	73,155	---	-73,716	-73,155
U233 disposition program	45,000	41,626	41,626	-3,374	---
OR cleanup and waste disposition	83,220	71,137	149,292	+66,072	+78,155
OR community & regulatory support	4,365	4,365	5,300	+935	+935
OR Technology development and deployment	4,091	3,000	3,000	-1,091	---
Construction:					
15-D-405 Sludge processing facility buildouts	---	4,200	4,200	+4,200	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
14-D-403 Outfall 200 mercury treatment facility	4,608	9,400	9,400	+4,792	---
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	215,000	206,883	212,818	-2,182	+5,935
Savannah River Site:					
SR site risk management operations	432,491	416,276	397,976	-34,515	-18,300
SR community and regulatory support	11,210	11,013	11,013	-197	---
SR radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	565,533	553,175	530,915	-34,618	-22,260
Construction:					
15-D-402 Saltstone disposal Unit #6, SRS	---	34,642	30,000	+30,000	-4,642
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, SRS	125,000	135,000	135,000	+10,000	---
Total, Savannah River Site	1,134,234	1,150,106	1,104,904	-29,330	-45,202
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant:					
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	216,193	216,020	216,020	-173	---
Construction:					
15-D-411 Safety significant confinement ventilation system, WIPP	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
15-D-412 Exhaust shaft, WIPP	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Total, Waste isolation pilot plant	216,193	216,020	236,020	+19,827	+20,000
Program direction	300,000	280,784	280,784	-19,216	---
Program support	17,979	14,979	16,979	-1,000	+2,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Safeguards and Security	241,000	233,961	233,961	-7,039	---
Technology development	18,000	13,007	10,000	-8,000	-3,007
Use of prior year balances	---	---	-13,367	-13,367	-13,367
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP	5,000,000	4,864,538	4,801,280	-198,720	-63,258
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP (LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL)	---	463,000	---	---	-463,000
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES					
Health, safety and security:					
Health, safety and security	143,616	---	---	-143,616	---
Program direction	108,301	---	---	-108,301	---
Total, Health, safety and security	251,917	---	---	-251,917	---
Environment, health, safety and security:					
Environment, health, safety and security	---	118,763	118,763	+118,763	---
Program direction	---	62,235	62,235	+62,235	---
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security	---	180,998	180,998	+180,998	---
Independent enterprise assessments:					
Independent enterprise assessments	---	24,068	24,068	+24,068	---
Program direction	---	49,466	49,466	+49,466	---
Total, Independent enterprise assessments	---	73,534	73,534	+73,534	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Specialized security activities	202,242	202,152	203,152	+910	+1,000
Office of Legacy Management:					
Legacy management	163,271	158,639	158,639	-4,632	---
Program direction	13,712	13,341	13,341	-371	---
Total, Office of Legacy Management	176,983	171,980	171,980	-5,003	---
Defense related administrative support	118,836	118,836	118,836	---	---
Office of hearings and appeals	5,022	5,500	5,500	+478	---
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	755,000	753,000	754,000	-1,000	+1,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	16,962,000	17,738,538	16,916,850	-45,150	-821,688

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS (1)

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Operation and maintenance:					
Purchase power and wheeling	93,284	89,710	89,710	-3,574	---
Program direction	7,750	7,220	7,220	-530	---
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	101,034	96,930	96,930	-4,104	---
Less alternative financing (PPW)	-15,203	-16,131	-16,131	-928	---
Offsetting collections (for PPW)	-78,081	-73,579	-73,579	+4,502	---
Offsetting collections (PD)	-7,750	-2,220	-2,220	+5,530	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Use of prior-year balances	---	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000	---
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	---	---	---	---	---
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Operating expenses	13,598	15,174	15,174	+1,576	---
Purchase power and wheeling	52,000	63,000	63,000	+11,000	---
Program direction	29,939	31,089	31,089	+1,150	---
Construction	6,227	13,403	13,403	+7,176	---
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	101,764	122,666	122,666	+20,902	---
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	---	-5,934	-5,934	-5,934	---
Less alternative financing (for PPW)	---	-10,000	-10,000	-10,000	---
Less alternative financing (Const)	---	-7,492	-7,492	-7,492	---
Less alternative financing	-14,308	---	---	+14,308	---
Offsetting collections (PD)	-75,564	-29,402	-29,402	+46,162	---
Offsetting collections (for O&M)	---	-5,438	-5,438	-5,438	---
Offsetting collections (for PPW)	---	-53,000	-53,000	-53,000	---
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	11,892	11,400	11,400	-492	---
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance:					
Construction and rehabilitation	122,437	86,645	86,645	-35,792	---
Operation and maintenance	82,843	81,958	81,958	-885	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Purchase power and wheeling	407,109	441,223	441,223	+34,114	---
Program direction	217,709	227,905	227,905	+10,196	---
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	830,098	837,731	837,731	+7,633	---
Less alternative financing (for O&M)	-293,349	-5,197	-5,197	+288,152	---
Less alternative financing (for Construction)	---	-74,448	-74,448	-74,448	---
Less alternative financing (for Program Dir.)	---	-5,300	-5,300	-5,300	---
Less alternative financing (for PPW)	---	-180,713	-180,713	-180,713	---
Offsetting collections (for program direction)	-168,193	-174,285	-174,285	-6,092	---
Offsetting collections (for O&M)	-35,796	-36,745	-36,745	-949	---
Offsetting collections (P.L. 108-477, P.L. 109-103)	-230,738	-260,510	-260,510	-29,772	---
Offsetting collections (P.L. 98-381)	-6,092	-7,161	-7,161	-1,069	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	95,930	93,372	93,372	-2,558	---
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND					
Operation and maintenance	6,196	5,529	5,529	-667	---
Offsetting collections	-4,911	-4,499	-4,499	+412	---
Less alternative financing	-865	-802	-802	+63	---
TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD O&M FUND	420	228	228	-192	---
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	108,242	105,000	105,000	-3,242	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION					
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	304,600	327,277	304,389	-211	-22,888
FERC revenues	-304,600	-327,277	-304,389	+211	+22,888
General Provisions					
Sec. 309 Rescissions:					
Department of Energy:					
Energy Efficiency and Energy Reliability	---	---	-18,111	-18,111	-18,111
Science	---	---	-5,257	-5,257	-5,257
Nuclear Energy	---	---	-1,046	-1,046	-1,046
Fossil Energy Research and Development	---	---	-8,243	-8,243	-8,243
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	---	---	-4,809	-4,809	-4,809
Advanced Research Projects Agency - Energy	---	---	-619	-619	-619
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	---	---	-1,720	-1,720	-1,720
Total, General Provisions	---	---	-39,805	-39,805	-39,805
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	27,281,046	28,436,428	27,305,845	+24,799	-1,130,583
(Total amount appropriated)	(27,355,464)	(28,443,028)	(27,395,250)	(+39,786)	(-1,047,778)
(Rescissions)	(-74,418)	(-6,600)	(-89,405)	(-14,987)	(-82,805)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS					
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	1,901,686	2,316,749	1,789,000	-112,686	-527,749
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	147,306	180,000	160,000	+12,694	-20,000
Nuclear energy	889,190	863,386	899,000	+9,810	+35,614
Fossil Energy Research and Development	562,065	475,500	593,000	+30,935	+117,500
Naval Petroleum & Oil Shale Reserves	20,000	19,950	19,950	-50	---
Elk Hills School Lands Fund	---	15,580	15,580	+15,580	---
Strategic petroleum reserves	189,400	205,000	205,000	+15,600	---
Northeast home heating oil reserve	8,000	1,600	1,600	-6,400	---
Energy Information Administration	117,000	122,500	120,000	+3,000	-2,500
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup	231,765	226,174	241,174	+9,409	+15,000
Uranium enrichment D&D fund	598,823	530,976	585,976	-12,847	+55,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal	---	---	150,000	+150,000	+150,000
Science	5,071,000	5,111,155	5,071,000	---	-40,155
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy	280,000	325,000	280,000	---	-45,000
Departmental administration	126,449	129,052	136,000	+9,551	+6,948
Indian energy program	---	16,000	---	---	-16,000
Office of the Inspector General	42,120	39,868	42,120	---	+2,252
Title 17 Innovative technology loan guarantee program	20,000	17,000	17,000	-3,000	---
Advanced technology vehicles manufacturing loan pgm	6,000	4,000	4,000	-2,000	---
Clean coal technology	---	-6,600	-6,600	-6,600	---
Atomic energy defense activities:					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	7,781,000	8,314,902	8,204,209	+423,209	-110,693
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,954,000	1,555,156	1,555,156	-398,844	---
Naval reactors	1,095,000	1,377,100	1,215,342	+120,342	-161,758

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of the Administrator	377,000	410,842	386,863	+9,863	-23,979
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Admin	11,207,000	11,658,000	11,361,570	+154,570	-296,430
Defense environmental cleanup	5,000,000	4,864,538	4,801,280	-198,720	-63,258
Defense environmental cleanup (legislative proposal)	---	463,000	---	---	-463,000
Other defense activities	755,000	753,000	754,000	-1,000	+1,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,962,000	17,738,538	16,916,850	-45,150	-821,688
Power marketing administrations (1):					
Southeastern Power Administration	---	---	---	---	---
Southwestern Power Administration	11,892	11,400	11,400	-492	---
Western Area Power Administration	95,930	93,372	93,372	-2,558	---
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	420	228	228	-192	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	108,242	105,000	105,000	-3,242	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	304,600	327,277	304,389	-211	-22,888
Revenues	-304,600	-327,277	-304,389	+211	+22,888
General Provisions	---	---	-39,805	-39,805	-39,805
Total Summary of Accounts, Department of Energy	27,281,046	28,436,428	27,305,845	+24,799	-1,130,583

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

The bill includes a provision that prohibits the use of funds provided in this title to initiate requests for proposals, other solicitations or arrangements for new programs or activities that have not yet been approved and funded by the Congress; requires notification or a report for certain funding actions; prohibits funds to be used for certain multi-year "Energy Programs" activities without notification; and prohibits the obligation or expenditure of funds provided in this title through a reprogramming of funds except in certain circumstances.

The bill continues a provision that permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill.

The bill continues a provision that authorizes intelligence activities of the Department of Energy for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947.

The bill modifies a provision that prohibits the use of funds in this title for capital construction of high hazard nuclear facilities, unless certain independent oversight is conducted, to account for a change in the Department of Energy's organizational structure.

The bill continues a provision that prohibits the use of funds provided in this title to approve critical decision-2 or critical decision-3 for certain construction projects, unless a separate independent cost estimate has been developed for that critical decision.

The bill modifies a provision regarding uranium transfer notifications. A new subparagraph (c) has been included to increase the accuracy of Secretarial determinations required by the USEC Privatization Act. In implementing this subparagraph (c), the Department shall seek to minimize impacts on uranium transfers already planned during the fiscal year in which the new determination is required and should continue uranium transfers until the new determination is completed. The Department shall explore the use of expedited determination procedures and determinations completed on a timeframe to accommodate upcoming transfers.

The bill continues a provision prohibiting the Office of Science from entering into multi-year funding agreements with a value of less than $1,000,000.

The bill modifies a provision requiring cost reporting for major warhead refurbishment programs.

The bill includes a provision rescinding funds from specific accounts.

The bill includes a provision transferring funds to "Defense Environmental Cleanup."

The bill includes a provision restricting certain activities in the Russian Federation.

The bill includes a provision rescinding funds from "United States Enrichment Corporation Fund."

The bill includes a provision regarding management of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The bill includes a provision clarifying laboratory directed research and development authorities.

The bill includes a provision regarding a Department of Energy rule on ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2014	$80,317,000
Budget estimate, 2015	68,200,000
Recommended, 2015	80,317,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	+12,117,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965 by the Appalachian Regional Development Act (Public Law 89–4). It is comprised of the governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a federal co-chair appointed by the President. Each year, the ARC provides funding for several hundred projects in the Appalachian Region in areas such as business development, education and job training, telecommunications, infrastructure, community development, housing, and transportation.

The Committee recommendation for the ARC is $80,317,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $12,117,000 above the budget request.

To diversify and enhance regional business development, $10,000,000 is provided to continue the program of high-speed broadband deployment in distressed counties within the Central Appalachian region that have been most negatively impacted by the downturn in the coal industry. This funding shall be in addition to the 30 percent directed to distressed counties.

The ARC targets 50 percent of its funds to distressed counties or distressed areas in the Appalachian region. The Committee continues to believe this should be the primary focus of the ARC.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Appropriation, 2014	$28,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	30,150,000
Recommended, 2015	29,150,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+1,150,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– 1,000,000

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) was created by the fiscal year 1989 National Defense Authorization Act. The Board, composed of five members appointed by the President, provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy regarding public health and safety issues at the Department's defense nuclear facilities. The DNFSB is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Department of Energy's defense nuclear facilities. The Committee expects the DNFSB to continue to play a significant role in scrutinizing the Department's safety and security activities, including the reform initiatives underway in the Department that may impact projects under its jurisdiction. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2015 is $29,150,000, $1,150,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $1,000,000 below the budget request.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 2014	$12,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	12,319,000
Recommended, 2015	12,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	–319,000

The Delta Regional Authority (DRA) is a federal-state partnership established by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–554) that serves a 252-county/parish area in an eight-state region near the mouth of the Mississippi River. Led by a federal co-chair and the governors of each participating state, the DRA is designed to remedy severe and chronic economic distress by stimulating economic development and fostering partnerships that will have a positive impact on the region's economy. The DRA seeks to help local communities leverage other federal and state programs, which are focused on basic infrastructure development, transportation improvements, business development, and job training services. Under federal law, at least 75 percent of appropriated funds must be invested in distressed counties and parishes, with 50 percent of the funds designated for transportation and basic infrastructure improvements.

For fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommends $12,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $319,000 below the budget request.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2014	$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	7,396,000
Recommended, 2015	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	+2,604,000

The Denali Commission is a regional development agency established by the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–277) to provide critical utilities, infrastructure, health services, and economic support throughout Alaska. To ensure that local communities have a stake in Commission-funded projects, local cost-share requirements for construction and equipment have been established for both distressed and non-distressed communities.

For the cost of the Commission's operations in fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommends $10,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $2,604,000 above the budget request.

The Committee supports the Denali Commission's recent efforts to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Commerce to provide oversight of the Commission's management, expenditures, and programs.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2014	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	3,000,000
Recommended, 2015	3,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	–2,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–234) authorized the establishment of the Northern Border Regional Commission (NBRC) as a federal-state partnership intended to address the economic development needs of distressed portions of the four-state region of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. The Committee has continued legislative language addressing the Commission's administrative expenses.

The Committee recommends $3,000,000 to support the Commission's activities in fiscal year 2015, $2,000,000 below fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request.

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2014	$250,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –
Recommended, 2015	250,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	+250,000

The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–234) authorized the establishment of the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission as a federal-state partnership intended to address the economic development needs of distressed portions of the seven-state region in the southeastern United States not already served by a regional development agency.

The Committee recommends $250,000 for operations of the commission in fiscal year 2015, the same as fiscal year 2014 and $250,000 above the budget request.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2014	$1,043,937,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,047,433,000
Recommended, 2015	1,052,433,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+8,496,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+5,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2014	$ – 920,721,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– 925,155,000
Recommended, 2015	– 880,155,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+40,566,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+45,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2014	$123,216,000
Budget estimate, 2015	122,278,000
Recommended, 2015	172,278,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+49,062,000
Budget estimate, 2015	+50,000,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2015 is $1,052,433,000, $8,496,000 above fiscal year 2014 and $5,000,000 above the budget request. The total amount of budget authority is graphic by estimated revenues of $880,155,000, $40,566,000 less

than fiscal year 2014 and $45,000,000 less than the budget request. Including revenues, the net appropriation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is $172,278,000.

The recommendation reduces the amount made available for salaries and expenses by $40,000,000 to account for anticipated carryover from fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2015. The Committee authorizes the NRC to re-allocate its unobligated carryover to supplement its fiscal year 2015 appropriation and directs the NRC, not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, to submit a base table that documents this re-allocation. The recommendation further reduces salaries and expenses by $10,000,000 below the fiscal year 2015 budget request to account for lower-than-anticipated staffing levels. Within available funds, not more than $9,500,000 is included for salaries, travel, and other support costs for the Office of the Commission. These salaries and expenses shall include only salaries and benefits costs and travel costs, and are not to include general and administrative and infrastructure costs. The Committee directs that these funds are to be jointly managed by the Commissioners, and the bill requires that the use and expenditure of these salaries and expenses shall only be by a majority vote of the Commission. The NRC shall continue to include a breakout and explanation of the Commission salaries and expenses in its annual budget requests. If the Commission wishes to change the composition of the funds requested for its salaries and expenses in future years, it must do so in an annual budget request or through a reprogramming.

The Committee notes that the NRC continues its administrative shutdown of the Yucca Mountain license application, as well as its willful misrepresentation of congressional intent. The recommendation continues language prohibiting the Chairman of the NRC from terminating any program, project, or activity without the approval of a majority of Commissioners. In addition, the recommendation requires the NRC to notify and report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the use of emergency functions.

The recommendation directs $55,000,000 to continue adjudication of the Yucca Mountain license application. The Committee does not share the Administration's perspective that once Nuclear Waste Fund resources are depleted, the NRC's responsibility to complete the Yucca Mountain license application is obviated. The NRC is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than January 1, 2015, on its plan to complete the license application and its additional funding needs as necessary.

Integrated University Program.—From within available funds, the Committee recommends $15,000,000 to provide financial support for the university education programs relevant to the NRC mission, as the Commission continues to be reliant on a pipeline of highly trained nuclear engineers and scientists and benefits substantially from this university program. Not less than $5,000,000 of this amount is to be used for grants to support research projects that do not align with programmatic missions, but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

Reporting Requirements.—The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide semi-annual reports on the status of its licensing and other regulatory activities.

The Committee is aware that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is planning to conduct a comprehensive review of its business lines, including a five-year plan of the agency's anticipated workload for licensing and construction of new and advanced facilities, an assessment of the size of the operating fleet, and an evaluation of required corporate support resources. As part of that process, the Committee directs the Commission to engage an outside entity with expertise on federal agency management to recommend ways the Commission can reduce its corporate support requirements and improve the efficiency of the Commission's internal processes. Not later than March 1, 2015, the Committee directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to submit the review's findings, budgetary impacts, and a long-term strategic workforce plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2014	$11,955,000
Budget estimate, 2015	12,071,000
Recommended, 2015	12,071,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+116,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2014	$ – 9,994,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– 10,099,000
Recommended, 2015	– 10,099,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– 105,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2014	$1,961,000
Budget estimate, 2015	1,972,000
Recommended, 2015	1,972,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	+11,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Committee recommends $12,071,000, $116,000 above fiscal year 2014 and the same as the budget request. Given the formula for fee recovery, the revenue estimate is $10,099,000, resulting in a net appropriation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Inspector General of $1,972,000.

The Committee has included $850,000 within the appropriation for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for the Board to procure Inspector General services from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Inspector General.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 2014	$3,400,000
Budget estimate, 2015	3,400,000
Recommended, 2015	3,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– – –
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NWTRB) was established by the 1987 amendments to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to provide independent technical oversight of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Committee expects the NWTRB to continue its active engagement with the Department and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on issues involving nuclear waste disposal.

The Committee recommends $3,400,000 for the NWTRB, the same as fiscal year 2014 and the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Appropriation, 2014	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –
Recommended, 2015	– – –
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2014	– 1,000,000
Budget estimate, 2015	– – –

The Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects was established as an independent agency in the Executive Branch on December 13, 2006, pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–324). The Federal Coordinator is responsible for coordinating local, federal, and international activities for a natural gas transportation project, including facilitating the permitting process, as well as joint surveillance and monitoring of construction with the State of Alaska. The recent market shift in the supply and demand for natural gas, coupled with the recently announced plans for a pipeline to deliver natural gas to Pacific Rim markets leads the Committee to conclude that no active or pending projects fit within the scope of the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects.

The Committee recommends no funds to support the activities of this office in fiscal year 2015, and directs that the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects use remaining balances to implement an orderly shutdown.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

The bill includes a provision making permanent reporting on the use of emergency authority.

The bill modifies a provision requiring the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to fully comply with congressional requests for information to allow changes or modifications to procedures governing congressional requests. In allowing procedural changes with the support of the majority of the commissioners, the Committee continues to expect that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will be

responsive to congressional requests in a timely and transparent manner.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The bill continues a provision that prohibits the use of funds provided in this Act to, in any way, directly or indirectly influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code.

The bill continues a provision limiting the use of funds to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with; make a grant to; or provide a loan or loan guarantee to corporations convicted of a felony criminal violation of Federal law within the preceding 24 months. The Department shall provide an annual report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, due not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, detailing its implementation of this provision, including a list of affected corporations and a justification for any cases in which the Department has determined that the limitation should not apply.

The bill continues a provision limiting the use of funds to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with; make a grant to; or provide a loan or loan guarantee to corporations with certain unpaid Federal tax liabilities. The Department shall provide an annual report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, due not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year, detailing its implementation of this provision, including a list of affected corporations and a justification for any cases in which the Department has determined that the limitation should not apply.

The bill continues a provision consolidating the transfer authorities into and out of accounts funded by this Act. No additional transfer authority is implied or conveyed by this provision. For the purposes of this provision, the term "transfer" shall mean the shifting of all or part of the budget authority in one account to another. In addition to transfers provided in this Act or other appropriation Acts, and existing authorities, such as the Economy Act (31 U.S.C. 1535), by which one part of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another part, the Act allows transfers using Section 4705 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2745). The first semiannual report required by subsection (c) shall be submitted not later than six months after enactment of this Act.

The bill continues a provision prohibiting funds in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994, regarding environmental justice.

The bill continues a provision prohibiting funds in this Act from being used to close the Yucca Mountain license application process or for actions that would remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain might be an option in the future.

The bill includes a provision setting at $0 the amount that the proposed new budget authority in this recommendation exceeds the

allocation made by the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

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

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

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

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

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is submitted describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Under section 104, "General Provisions, Corps of Engineers—Civil", $4,700,000 under the heading "Operation and Maintenance" may be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service to mitigate for fisheries lost due to Corps projects.

TITLE II—BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Under "Water and Related Resources", $25,000 is available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $6,840,000 is available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund. Such funds as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund. The amounts of transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation under the heading.

Under "California Bay Delta Restoration", such sums as may be necessary to carry out authorized purposes may be transferred to appropriate accounts of other participating federal agencies.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Under section 302, "General Provisions—Department of Energy", unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

Under section 310, "General Provisions—Department of Energy", up to $90,000,000 from "Weapons Activities" and up to $30,000,000 from "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation" pension plan overpayments are available to transfer to "Defense Environmental Cleanup" to support needs at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Under section 504, transfer authorities are clarified for the purposes of accounts funded by the Act.

DISCLOSURE OF EARMARKS AND CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Neither the bill nor the report contains any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1)(A) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Investigations, providing for detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, stating that funds can be used for the construction of river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, shore protection, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related projects authorized by law, and for detailed studies and plans and specifications of such projects.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Mississippi River and Tributaries, permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Language has been included under the Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, stating that funds can be used for: the operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood and storm damage reduction, aquatic ecosystem restoration, and related projects authorized by law; providing security for infrastructure owned or operated by the Corps, including administrative buildings and laboratories; maintaining authorized harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency that serve essential navigation needs of general commerce; surveying and charting northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removing obstructions to navigation.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund; providing for the use of funds from a special account for resource protection, research, interpretation, and maintenance activities at outdoor recreation areas; and allowing use of funds to cover the cost of operation and maintenance of dredged material disposal facilities for which fees have been collected.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Operation and Maintenance, providing that one percent of the total amount of funds provided for each of the programs, projects, or activities funded under the Operation and Maintenance heading shall not be allocated to a field operating activity until the fourth quarter of the fiscal year and permitting the use of these funds for emergency activities as determined by the Chief of Engineers to be necessary and appropriate.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Expenses, regarding support of the Humphreys Engineer Support Center Activity, the Institute for Water Resources, the United States Army Engineer Research and Development Center, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers Finance Center.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Expenses, providing that funds are available for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Expenses, prohibiting the use of other funds in Title I of this Act for the activities funded in Expenses.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, Expenses, permitting any Flood Control and Coastal Emergency appropriation to be used to fund the supervision and general administration of emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in response to any flood, hurricane or other natural disaster.

Language has been included to provide for funding for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 101, providing that none of the funds may be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds except in certain circumstances.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 102, prohibiting the execution of any contract for a program, project or activity which commits funds in excess of the amount appropriated (to include funds reprogrammed under section 101) that remain unobligated.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 103, prohibiting the award of a continuing contract for any project funded out of the Inland Waterway Trust Fund.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 104, providing for transfer authority to the Fish and Wildlife Service for mitigation for lost fisheries.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 105, prohibiting certain actions related to the definition of fill material or discharge of fill material under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 106, prohibiting certain actions related to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 107, allowing the possession of firearms at water resources development projects under certain circumstances.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources, providing that funds are available for fulfilling federal responsibilities to Native Americans and for grants to and cooperative agreements with State and local governments and Indian tribes.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources, allowing fund transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund; providing that such sums as necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; and, transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources, providing for funds to be derived from the Reclamation Fund or the special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 6806; that funds contributed under 43 U.S.C. 395 by non-federal entities shall be available for expenditure; and that funds advanced under 43 U.S.C. 397a are to be credited to the Water and Related Resources account and available for expenditure.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources, providing that funds may be used for high priority projects carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, directing the Bureau of Reclamation to assess and collect the full amount of additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102–575.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, providing that none of the funds under the heading may be used for the acquisition or lease of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court order adopted by consent or decree.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, California Bay-Delta Restoration, permitting the transfer of funds to appropriate accounts of other participating federal agencies to carry out authorized programs; allowing funds made available under this heading to be used for the federal share of the costs of the CALFED Program management; and requiring that CALFED implementation be carried out with clear performance measures demonstrating concurrent progress in achieving the goals and objectives of the program.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Policy and Administration, providing that funds are to be derived from the Reclamation Fund and prohibiting the use of any other appropriation in the Act for activities budgeted as policy and administration expenses.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account, rescinding unobligated funds.

Language has been included under Bureau of Reclamation, Administrative Provision, providing for the purchase of motor vehicles for replacement.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Department of the Interior, section 201, providing that none of the funds may be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds except in certain circumstances.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Department of the Interior, section 202, regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Language has been included under Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment.

Language has been included under Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment.

Language has been included under Nuclear Energy for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; and for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Fossil Energy Research and Development for the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interest in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquires, technological investigations, and research concerning the extraction, processing, use and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental cost under 30 U.S.C. 3, 1602 and 1603.

Language has been included under the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, permitting the use of unobligated balances.

Language has been included under the Elk Hills School Lands Fund, permitting payment to California for the State Teachers' Retirement Fund.

Language has been included under Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve rescinding funds that were not designated by the Congress as emergency funding.

Language has been included under Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment.

Language has been included under Science providing for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; and for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Science restricting the availability of funds for an international project until certain conditions are met, or a waiver is issued.

Language has been included under Nuclear Waste Disposal for the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion.

Language has been included under Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program crediting fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 as graphicting collections to this account and making fees collected under section 1702(h) in excess of the appropriated amount unavailable for expenditure until appropriated.

Language has been included under Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program prohibiting the subordination of certain interests.

Language has been included under Clean Coal Technology rescinding funds that were not designated by the Congress as emergency funding.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration providing for the hire of passenger vehicles and for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration providing, notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act, such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others, as long as such increases are graphic by revenue increases of the same or greater amounts.

Language has been included under Departmental Administration, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and consistent with the authorization in Public Law 95–238, to permit the Department of Energy to use revenues to graphic appropriations. The appropriations language for this account reflects the total estimated program funding to be reduced as revenues are received.

Language has been included under Weapons Activities for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; and for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses.

Language has been included under Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation restricting the use of funds provided for a specific project.

Language has been included under Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation rescinding funds that were not designated by the Congress as emergency funding.

Language has been included under Naval Reactors for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion.

Language has been included under the Office of the Administrator providing funding for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Defense Environmental Cleanup for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; and for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language has been included under Other Defense Activities for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment.

Language has been included under Bonneville Power Administration Fund providing funding for official reception and representation expenses; approving funds for certain programs; and precluding any new direct loan obligations.

Language has been included under Southeastern Power Administration providing funds for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Southeastern Power Administration providing that, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and 16 U.S.C. 825s, amounts collected from the sale of power and related

services shall be credited to the account as discretionary graphicting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southeastern Power Administration; amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as graphicting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under Southwestern Power Administration providing funds for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Southwestern Power Administration providing that, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and 16 U.S.C. 825s, amounts collected from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to the account as discretionary graphicting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration; amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as graphicting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration, providing funds for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration providing that, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, 16 U.S.C. 825s, and 43 U.S.C. 392a, amounts collected from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to the account as discretionary graphicting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Western Area Power Administration; amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as graphicting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund providing that, notwithstanding 68 Stat. 255 and 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to the account as discretionary graphicting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the hydroelectric facilities of those dams and associated Western Area Power Administration activities.

Language has been included under Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund providing that the Western Area Power Administration may accept a limited amount of contributions from the United States power customers of the Falcon and Amistad Dams for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission for operating and maintenance of hydroelectric facilities.

Language has been included under Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to permit the hire of passenger motor vehicles, to provide official reception and representation expenses, and to permit the use of revenues collected to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 301, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare or initiate requests for proposals or other solicitations or arrangements for programs that have not yet been fully funded by the Congress; requiring notification and reporting requirements for certain funding awards; limiting the use of multi-year funding mechanisms; and providing that none of the funds may be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds except in certain circumstances.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 302, providing that unexpended balances of prior appropriations may be transferred and merged with new appropriation accounts established in this Act.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 303, providing that funds for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 during fiscal year 2015 until enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 304, prohibiting the use of funds for capital construction of high hazard nuclear facilities unless certain independent oversight is conducted.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 305, prohibiting the use of funds to approve critical decision-2 or critical decision-3 for certain construction projects, unless a separate independent cost estimate has been developed for that critical decision.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 306, regarding uranium determinations.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 307, requiring the Office of Science to fund up-front funding arrangements for less than $1,000,000.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 308, requiring certain reporting on major warhead refurbishments.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 309, rescinding certain funds that were not designated by the Congress as emergency funding.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 310, providing transfer authority to support an environmental cleanup project.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 311, prohibiting nonproliferation activities in the Russian Federation until certain reporting requirements are met.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 312, rescinding funds under "USEC Privatization Fund".

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 313, prohibiting funds for certain activities related to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve without prior notification to the Congress and limiting the type of petroleum product that may be purchased with certain funds.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 314, clarifying laboratory directed research and development authorities.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 315, regarding a Department of Energy rule on ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Language has been included under Appalachian Regional Commission providing for the hire of passenger vehicles and allowing the expenditure of funds as authorized by subtitle IV of title 40, United States Code, without regard to section 14704.

Language has been included under Delta Regional Authority allowing the expenditure of funds as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act without regard to section 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), 382M and 382N of said Act.

Language has been included under Denali Commission allowing the expenditure of funds notwithstanding section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998, and providing for cost-share requirements for Commission-funded construction projects in distressed and non-distressed communities, as defined by section 307 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (Division C, Title III, Public Law 105–277), and an amount not to exceed 50 percent for non-distressed communities.

Language has been included under Northern Border Regional Commission for expenditure as authorized by subtitle V of title 40, Untied States Code, without regard to section 15751(b).

Language has been included under Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Salaries and Expenses that provides for salaries and other support costs for the Office of the Commission, to be controlled by majority vote of the Commission.

Language has been included under Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Salaries and Expenses that provides for official representation expenses and permits the use of revenues from licensing fees, inspections services, and other services for salaries and expenses to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received. Funding is provided to support university research and development, and for a Nuclear Science and Engineering Grant Program.

Language has been included under Office of Inspector General that provides for the use of revenues from licensing fees, inspections services, and other services for salaries and expenses, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received.

Language has been included under Independent Agencies, General Provisions, section 401, permanently improving transparency for the use of emergency powers at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Language has been included under Independent Agencies, General Provisions, section 402, requiring the NRC to comply with certain procedures when responding to Congressional requests for information.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 501, prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 502, prohibiting funds for any financial arrangement with a corporation which has been convicted of a felony, except in certain circumstances.

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 503, prohibiting funds for any financial arrangement with a corporation which has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, except in certain circumstances.

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 504, prohibiting the transfer of funds except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in this or any other appropriations Act, or certain other authorities, and requiring a report.

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 505, prohibiting funds in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994, regarding environmental justice.

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 506, prohibiting funds in this Act from being used to close the Yucca Mountain license application process, or for actions that would remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain might be an option in the future.

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 507, setting at $0 the amount that the proposed new budget authority exceeds the allocation made by the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

PROGRAM DUPLICATION

No provision of this bill establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

DIRECTED RULE MAKING

The bill does not direct any rule making.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII, CL. 3(e) (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee notes that the accompanying bill does not propose to repeal or amend a statute or part thereof.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized:

[in thousands of dollars]

Agency/Program	Last Year of Authorization	Authorization Level	Appropriation in Last Year of Authorization	Net Appropriation in this Bill
Corps FUSRAP		[1]		100,000
EERE Program Direction	2006	110,500	164,198	150,000
EERE Weatherization Activities	2012	1,400,000	68,000	203,000
EERE State Energy Programs	2012	125,000	50,000	50,000
Nuclear Energy	2009	495,000	792,000	899,000
Fossil Energy	2009	641,000	727,320	593,000
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	2014	20,000	20,000	19,950
Office of Science	2013	6,007,000	4,876,000	5,071,000
Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy	2013	312,000	265,000	280,000
Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program	2012	not specified	6,000	4,000
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup:				
West Valley Demonstration	1981	5,000	5,000	58,986
Departmental Administration	1984	246,963	185,682	136,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:				
National Nuclear Security Administration:				
Weapons Activities	2014	7,909,252	7,781,000	8,204,209
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2014	2,180,142	1,954,000	1,555,156
Naval Reactors	2014	1,246,134	1,095,000	1,215,342
Office of the Administrator	2014	382,000	377,000	386,863
Defense Environmental Cleanup	2014	5,015,409	5,000,000	4,801,280
Other Defense Activities	2014	758,658	755,000	754,000
Power Marketing Administrations:				
Southwestern	1984	40,254	36,229	11,400
Western Area	1984	259,700	194,630	93,372
Appalachian Regional Commission	2013	110,000	68,263	80,317
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	2014	29,915	28,000	29,150
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	1985	460,000	448,200	172,278

[1] Program was initiated in 1972 and has never received a separate authorization

RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

Department or Activity	*Amount*
Bureau of Reclamation: Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account	$500,000
Department of Energy: Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve	6,000,000
Department of Energy: Clean Coal Technology	6,600,000
Department of Energy: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	18,111,000
Department of Energy: Science	5,257,000
Department of Energy: Nuclear Energy	1,046,000
Department of Energy: Fossil Energy Research and Development	8,243,000
Department of Energy: Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	4,809,000
Department of Energy: Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy	619,000
Department of Energy: Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	37,000,000
Department of Energy: Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	1,720,000

COMPARISON WITH THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following table compares the levels of new budget authority provided in the bill with the appropriate allocation under section 302(b) of the Budget Act.

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) Allocation		This Bill	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Mandatory	n.a.	n.a.	0	0 [1]
Discretionary	34,010	37,831	34,010	37,831

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

Five Year Outlay Projections

Pursuant to section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following table contains five-year projections prepared by the Congressional Budget Office of outlays associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

[In millions of dollars]

Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:	
2014	20,141 [1]
2015	9,554
2016	2,988
2017	643
2018 and future years	600

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

Assistance to State and Local Governments

Pursuant to section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amount of financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Budget Authority	94
Outlays	19 [1]

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

Full Committee Votes

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 1

Date: June 18, 2014
Measure: Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, FY 2015
Motion by: Mr. Moran
Description of Motion: To strike the prohibition of the use of funds by the Army Corps of Engineers to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations and guidance pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.
Results: Defeated 18 yeas to 31 nays.

Members Voting Yea
Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Honda
Ms. Kaptur
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Pastor
Ms. Pingree
Mr. Price
Mr. Quigley
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky
Ms. Wasserman Schultz

Members Voting Nay
Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Amodei
Mr. Bishop
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Cuellar
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Dent
Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mr. Fleischmann
Mr. Fortenberry
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Graves
Dr. Harris
Ms. Herrera Beutler
Mr. Joyce
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. Owens
Mrs. Roby
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Rooney
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Stewart
Mr. Valadao
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 2

Date: June 18, 2014
Measure: Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, FY 2015
Motion by: Mr. Graves
Description of Motion: To allow the possession of firearms at water resources development projects under certain circumstances.
Results: Adopted 31 yeas to 18 nays.

Members Voting Yea
Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Amodei
Mr. Bishop
Mr. Calvert
Mr. Carter
Mr. Cole
Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Cuellar
Mr. Culberson
Mr. Dent
Mr. Diaz-Balart
Mr. Fleischmann
Mr. Fortenberry
Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Granger
Mr. Graves
Dr. Harris
Ms. Herrera Beutler
Mr. Joyce
Mr. Kingston
Mr. Latham
Mr. Owens
Mrs. Roby
Mr. Rogers
Mr. Rooney
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Stewart
Mr. Valadao
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Womack
Mr. Yoder

Members Voting Nay
Ms. DeLauro
Mr. Farr
Mr. Fattah
Mr. Honda
Ms. Kaptur
Ms. Lee
Mrs. Lowey
Ms. McCollum
Mr. Moran
Mr. Pastor
Ms. Pingree
Mr. Price
Mr. Quigley
Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Schiff
Mr. Serrano
Mr. Visclosky
Ms. Wasserman Schultz

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
Investigations	125,000	80,000	115,000	-10,000	+35,000
Construction	1,656,000	1,125,000	1,704,499	+48,499	+579,499
Mississippi River and Tributaries	307,000	245,000	260,000	-47,000	+15,000
Operations and Maintenance	2,861,000	2,600,000	2,905,000	+44,000	+305,000
Regulatory Program	200,000	200,000	200,000	---	---
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)	103,499	100,000	100,000	-3,499	---
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	28,000	28,000	28,000	---	---
Expenses	182,000	178,000	178,000	-4,000	---
Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)	5,000	5,000	2,000	-3,000	-3,000
Rescission	---	-28,000	---	---	+28,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	5,467,499	4,533,000	5,492,499	+25,000	+959,499
Appropriations	(5,467,499)	(4,561,000)	(5,492,499)	(+25,000)	(+931,499)
Rescissions	---	(-28,000)	---	---	(+28,000)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah Project Completion Account	8,725	---	9,874	+1,149	+9,874

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and Related Resources	954,085	760,700	856,351	-97,734	+95,651
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund	53,288	56,995	56,995	+3,707	---
California Bay-Delta Restoration	37,000	37,000	37,000	---	---
Policy and Administration	60,000	59,500	53,849	-6,151	-5,651
Indian Water Rights Settlements	---	90,000	---	---	-90,000
San Joaquin River Restoration Fund	---	32,000	---	---	-32,000
Central Utah Project Completion Account	---	7,300	---	---	-7,300
Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account (Rescission)	---	-500	-500	-500	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	1,104,373	1,042,995	1,003,695	-100,678	-39,300
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	1,113,098	1,042,995	1,013,569	-99,529	-29,426
Appropriations	(1,113,098)	(1,043,495)	(1,014,069)	(-99,029)	(-29,426)
Rescissions	---	(-500)	(-500)	(-500)	---
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Programs					
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	1,912,104	2,316,749	1,789,000	-123,104	-527,749
Rescission	-10,418	---	---	+10,418	---
Subtotal, Energy efficiency	1,901,686	2,316,749	1,789,000	-112,686	-527,749
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	139,306	180,000	160,000	+20,694	-20,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Defense function	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
Subtotal	147,306	180,000	160,000	+12,694	-20,000
Nuclear Energy	795,190	753,386	795,000	-190	+41,614
Defense function	94,000	110,000	104,000	+10,000	-6,000
Subtotal	889,190	863,386	899,000	+9,810	+35,614
Fossil Energy Research and Development	562,065	475,500	593,000	+30,935	+117,500
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves	20,000	19,950	19,950	-50	---
Elk Hills School Lands Fund	---	15,580	15,580	+15,580	---
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	189,400	205,000	205,000	+15,600	---
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve	8,000	1,600	7,600	-400	+6,000
Rescission	---	---	-6,000	-6,000	-6,000
Subtotal	8,000	1,600	1,600	-6,400	---
Energy Information Administration	117,000	122,500	120,000	+3,000	-2,500
Non-defense Environmental Cleanup	231,765	226,174	241,174	+9,409	+15,000
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	598,823	530,976	585,976	-12,847	+55,000
Science	5,071,000	5,111,155	5,071,000	---	-40,155
Nuclear Waste Disposal	---	---	150,000	+150,000	+150,000
Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy	280,000	325,000	280,000	---	-45,000
Office of Indian Energy Policy and Programs	---	16,000	---	---	-16,000
Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program	42,000	42,000	42,000	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Offsetting collection	-22,000	-25,000	-25,000	-3,000	---
Subtotal	20,000	17,000	17,000	-3,000	---
Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loans program	6,000	4,000	4,000	-2,000	---
Clean Coal Technology (Rescission)	---	-6,600	-6,600	-6,600	---
Departmental Administration	234,637	248,223	255,171	+20,534	+6,948
Miscellaneous revenues	-108,188	-119,171	-119,171	-10,983	---
Net appropriation	126,449	129,052	136,000	+9,551	+6,948
Office of the Inspector General	42,120	39,868	42,120	---	+2,252
Total, Energy programs	10,210,804	10,592,890	10,323,800	+112,996	-269,090
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration					
Weapons Activities	7,845,000	8,314,902	8,204,209	+359,209	-110,693
Rescission	-64,000	---	---	+64,000	---
Subtotal	7,781,000	8,314,902	8,204,209	+423,209	-110,693
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,954,000	1,555,156	1,592,156	-361,844	+37,000
Rescission	---	---	-37,000	-37,000	-37,000
Subtotal	1,954,000	1,555,156	1,555,156	-398,844	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Naval Reactors	1,095,000	1,377,100	1,215,342	+120,342	-161,758
Office of the Administrator	377,000	410,842	386,863	+9,863	-23,979
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	11,207,000	11,658,000	11,361,570	+154,570	-296,430
Environmental and Other Defense Activities					
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,000,000	4,864,538	4,801,280	-198,720	-63,258
Defense Environmental Cleanup (legislative proposal)	---	463,000	---	---	-463,000
Other Defense Activities	755,000	753,000	754,000	-1,000	+1,000
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	5,755,000	6,080,538	5,555,280	-199,720	-525,258
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	16,962,000	17,738,538	16,916,850	-45,150	-821,688
Power Marketing Administrations /1					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	7,750	7,220	7,220	-530	---
Offsetting collections	-7,750	-7,220	-7,220	+530	---
Subtotal	---	---	---	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	45,456	46,240	46,240	+784	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Offsetting collections	-33,564	-34,840	-34,840	-1,276	---
Subtotal	11,892	11,400	11,400	-492	---
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	299,919	304,402	304,402	+4,483	---
Offsetting collections	-203,989	-211,030	-211,030	-7,041	---
Subtotal	95,930	93,372	93,372	-2,558	---
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	5,331	4,727	4,727	-604	---
Offsetting collections	-4,911	-4,499	-4,499	+412	---
Subtotal	420	228	228	-192	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	108,242	105,000	105,000	-3,242	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	304,600	327,277	304,389	-211	-22,888
Revenues applied	-304,600	-327,277	-304,389	+211	+22,888
General Provisions					
Sec. 309 Rescissions:					
Department of Energy:					
Energy Efficiency and Energy Reliability	---	---	-18,111	-18,111	-18,111
Science	---	---	-5,257	-5,257	-5,257

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Nuclear Energy	---	---	-1,046	-1,046	-1,046
Fossil Energy Research and Development	---	---	-8,243	-8,243	-8,243
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	---	---	-4,809	-4,809	-4,809
Advanced Research Projects Agency - Energy	---	---	-619	-619	-619
Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	---	---	-1,720	-1,720	-1,720
Subtotal	---	---	-39,805	-39,805	-39,805
Total, title III, Department of Energy	27,281,046	28,436,428	27,305,845	+24,799	-1,130,583
Appropriations	(27,355,464)	(28,443,028)	(27,395,250)	(+39,786)	(-1,047,778)
Rescissions	(-74,418)	(-6,600)	(-89,405)	(-14,987)	(-82,805)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	80,317	68,200	80,317	---	+12,117
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	28,000	30,150	29,150	+1,150	-1,000
Delta Regional Authority	12,000	12,319	12,000	---	-319
Denali Commission	10,000	7,396	10,000	---	+2,604
Northern Border Regional Commission	5,000	3,000	3,000	-2,000	---
Southeast Crescent Regional Commission	250	---	250	---	+250
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	1,043,937	1,047,433	1,052,433	+8,496	+5,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Revenues	-920,721	-925,155	-880,155	+40,566	+45,000
Subtotal	123,216	122,278	172,278	+49,062	+50,000
Office of Inspector General	11,955	12,071	12,071	+116	---
Revenues	-9,994	-10,099	-10,099	-105	---
Subtotal	1,961	1,972	1,972	+11	---
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	125,177	124,250	174,250	+49,073	+50,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	3,400	3,400	3,400	---	---
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	265,144	248,715	312,367	+47,223	+63,652
Appropriations	(265,144)	(248,715)	(312,367)	(+47,223)	(+63,652)
Grand total	34,126,787	34,261,138	34,124,280	-2,507	-136,858
Appropriations	(34,201,205)	(34,296,238)	(34,214,185)	(+12,980)	(-82,053)
Rescissions	(-74,418)	(-35,100)	(-89,905)	(-15,487)	(-54,805)

1/ Totals adjusted to net out alternative financing costs, reimbursable agreement funding, and power purchase and wheeling expenditures. Offsetting

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2014
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2015
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
collection totals only reflect funds collected for annual expenses, excluding power purchase wheeling					

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF NITA LOWEY AND MARCY KAPTUR

We commend Chairman Rogers and Chairman Simpson for their efforts to assemble this bill in an inclusive manner. The bill funds critical water resource projects, supports science activities necessary for American competitiveness, and contributes to our national defense through vital weapons, naval reactor research, and nonproliferation funding, all priorities that unite rather than divide us. Chairman Simpson has worked hard to incorporate the interests of Members from both parties. As a result, the bill is largely a reflection of priorities from both sides of the aisle.

The subcommittee's allocation is $34,010,000,000, an increase of $326,862,000 from the Administration's budget request and $50,499,000 below the 2014 level. While the non-defense allocation for the bill is the same as 2014, the defense allocation is $50,000,000 below 2014. Within the constraints placed on the committee by the overall budget number, the allocation is a reasonable one; yet, the allocation still necessitated difficult decisions, particularly within the defense activities.

We commend the Chairman for increasing Corps of Engineers funding by $959,499,000 above the President's woefully inadequate request, ensuring that some ongoing projects will continue. The bill also provides more than $1,100,000,000 for projects funded from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, in excess of $185,000,000 above the budget request. This funding will allow preventive and proactive investments necessary for the economy and the safety of American citizens. As we are reminded often by increasingly common weather events, in every case, it makes more fiscal sense to prevent a disaster than to respond. The funding will also allow investments in the nation's ports and waterways, which are critical to ensuring that American made goods can move to market, both domestically and abroad. We firmly believe that our underinvestment in infrastructure continues to hamper economic gains and prolongs the current employment crisis.

The Corps of Engineers currently has a backlog of authorized projects in excess of $60,000,000,000, without including the deauthorization of $18,000,000,000 in the recent Water Resource Reform and Development Act. Even limiting the figure to those projects currently budgeted, the balance to complete these ongoing projects is more than $20,000,000,000. While this bill ensures increased investment beyond that included in the budget request, we should be doing more to build infrastructure and create jobs, not less. Federal support of water resource projects creates construction jobs and indirect economic benefits that encourage local businesses and individuals to embrace risk and make critical investments in their communities. The bill does not include funding for new projects. While we understand the Chairman's reasoning, we must

start investing in projects that meet tomorrow's needs, not yesterday's.

The Science and ARPA–E accounts, critical to the competitiveness of our nation, are equal to the level of funding provided in 2014. With a return on investment of 20 to 67 percent, publicly funded research grows our economy and helps the United States maintain its position as the global leader in innovation. If we truly wish to achieve energy independence and tackle the challenges posed by climate change, the federal government must continue to prioritize investments in cutting edge research at our national laboratories and universities along with supporting advancements in high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that are too early for private-sector investment.

With regard to the applied energy programs at the Department of Energy, investments in energy technology programs are skewed too heavily toward fossil fuels, that undermines the future of a clean energy economy. While we must provide for critical research and development for the nuclear and fossil energy sectors that currently provide the bulk of our current electricity generation, but continued and sustained research and development programs in renewable energy are necessary and appropriate. Renewable energy has achieved cost competitiveness in some areas and this investment can drive down the costs of existing technology and provide breakthroughs in others. While current trends show that the nation will meet 97 percent of our energy needs through domestic production by 2035, investment in portfolio diversity remain necessary for the long term. The United States can leverage its strength—innovation—to restore the United States to a position of global leadership in clean energy. This effort is a critical national priority, with implications for our economic competitiveness, national security, and environmental legacy.

Our nation's chief strategic vulnerability is its dependence on foreign energy imports and our lack of energy independence. The United States has spent $2,300,000,000,000 importing foreign petroleum since 2003. This represents thousands of dollars out of the pockets of every hard-working American spent, not in much-needed American job creation, but overseas, assisting our competitors in developing their economies and their energy futures. Our republic will not compete in the 21st Century and beyond if we further reduce investments in this area and cede the energy future to other countries.

Nonproliferation programs are our first line of defense and the most cost-effective way to achieve the urgent goal of securing and reducing the amount of vulnerable bomb-grade material. While the Chairman reprioritizes within the account to meet the most pressing needs, the defense allocation prevents the bill from overcoming the disappointing reduction, some $398,844,000 below 2014 to these activities contained in the budget request.

Within the weapons account we very much appreciate the Chairman's decision to restore the funding to the dismantlement of retired weapons. The Chairman continues the strong oversight of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) which has been plagued by breathtaking cost overruns and schedule delays. While we understand the need to modernize a complex built substantially

in the 1950's, we question whether the organization has the necessary tools and processes to continue to manage large increases to these activities year after year. Further, we question whether the NNSA can objectively plan for its mission requirements. Year after year, the NNSA informs Congress that certain investments are critical, the minimum required, and the only option, only to return with a more affordable alternative once faced with budgetary realities. The nuclear deterrent is too important and resources too precious to waste funds pursuing capital investments which are unnecessary.

We are concerned that the funding the bill includes for Environmental Management (EM) activities is insufficient to meet the federal government's legal obligations to clean up its defense nuclear waste. This program is critical to addressing the environmental legacies of the Cold War and the Manhattan Project. Given that EM's portfolio is one of the nation's largest environmental and financial liabilities, we have the responsibility to address the waste and contamination in the affected communities in a timely and competent manner. This, again, was driven by a defense allocation which left the Chairman little choice.

While the funding levels of the bill are fair, the inclusion of controversial riders is an unnecessary diversion from our primary responsibility—ensuring that taxpayer funds are invested wisely in Federal programs which will contribute to the economic vitality of our Nation.

Most concerning is the inclusion of two water riders which, taken together, risk environmental gains and protection of the world's most precious resource: water. The first Clean Water Act prohibition prevents the Corps of Engineers from taking steps to clarify which waters are protected by the Clean Water Act, and lock in place a widely-acknowledged state of confusion about the scope of the law's pollution control programs. The second prevents the Corps of Engineers from using funds to "develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change" to regulations pertaining to the definitions of the terms "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" under the Clean Water Act. This rider would lock in industry loopholes, leaving many of our nation's waterways vulnerable to harmful pollution.

Lastly, the inclusion of the rider allowing guns to be carried on all Corps of Engineers lands injects into the bill an unnecessarily partisan topic that is unwarranted. The Second Amendment provides a right that we do not dispute at its core. However, we do disagree with the notion that reasonable limits on where guns can be carried are an infringement upon that right. In an era when a school shooting seems to engender collective shrugs, we see no need to contribute to an environment where guns are commonplace in recreational areas where families are trying to escape the pressures of everyday life.

In spite of these concerns, we would like to reiterate our appreciation for the Chairman's work with us on many issues, ensuring the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee continues its tradition of bipartisanship—the Subcommittee has operated collaboratively and effectively for many years and, within the constraints facing the bill, it largely addresses the interests we have expressed. We look forward to working with the Chairman and the Members of the Committee to advance the process and complete the task before us.

NITA LOWEY
MARCY KAPTUR

○