

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS
BILL, 2016

____, 2015.—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.]

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, 2016, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

| | <i>Page Number</i> | |
|---|--------------------|---------------|
| | <i>Bill</i> | <i>Report</i> |
| Introduction | 00 | 00 |
| I. Department of Defense—Civil: | | |
| Corps of Engineers—Civil | 00 | 00 |
| Investigations | 00 | 00 |
| Construction | 00 | 00 |
| Mississippi River and Tributaries | 00 | 00 |
| Operation and Maintenance | 00 | 00 |
| Regulatory Program | 00 | 00 |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program | 00 | 00 |
| Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies | 00 | 00 |
| Expenses | 00 | 00 |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) | 00 | 00 |
| General Provisions | 00 | 00 |
| II. Department of the Interior: | | |
| Central Utah Project | 00 | 00 |
| Central Utah Project Completion Account | 00 | 00 |

| | <i>Page Number</i> | |
|--|--------------------|---------------|
| | <i>Bill</i> | <i>Report</i> |
| Bureau of Reclamation: | 00 | 00 |
| Water and Related Resources | 00 | 00 |
| Central Valley Project Restoration Fund | 00 | 00 |
| California Bay-Delta Restoration | 00 | 00 |
| Policy and Administration | 00 | 00 |
| Administrative Provision | 00 | 00 |
| General Provisions | 00 | 00 |
| III. Department of Energy: | | |
| Introduction | 00 | 00 |
| Committee Recommendations | 00 | 00 |
| Energy Programs: | 00 | 00 |
| Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy | 00 | 00 |
| Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability | 00 | 00 |
| Nuclear Energy | 00 | 00 |
| Fossil Energy Research and Development | 00 | 00 |
| Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves | 00 | 00 |
| Strategic Petroleum Reserve | 00 | 00 |
| Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve | 00 | 00 |
| Energy Information Administration | 00 | 00 |
| Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup | 00 | 00 |
| Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund | 00 | 00 |
| Science | 00 | 00 |
| Nuclear Waste Disposal | 00 | 00 |
| Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy | 00 | 00 |
| Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program | 00 | 00 |
| Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program | 00 | 00 |
| Departmental Administration | 00 | 00 |
| Office of the Inspector General | 00 | 00 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities: | 00 | 00 |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | 00 | 00 |
| Weapons Activities | 00 | 00 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 00 | 00 |
| Naval Reactors | 00 | 00 |
| Federal Salaries and Expenses | 00 | 00 |
| Environmental and Other Defense Activities | 00 | 00 |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup | 00 | 00 |
| Defense Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning | 00 | 00 |
| Other Defense Activities | 00 | 00 |
| Power Marketing Administrations: | 00 | 00 |
| Bonneville Power Administration | 00 | 00 |
| Southeastern Power Administration | 00 | 00 |
| Southwestern Power Administration | 00 | 00 |
| Western Area Power Administration | 00 | 00 |
| Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund | 00 | 00 |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission | 00 | 00 |
| Committee Recommendation | 00 | 00 |
| General Provisions | 00 | 00 |
| IV. Independent Agencies: | 00 | 00 |
| Appalachian Regional Commission | 00 | 00 |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 00 | 00 |
| Delta Regional Authority | 00 | 00 |
| Denali Commission | 00 | 00 |
| Northern Border Regional Commission | 00 | 00 |
| Southeast Crescent Regional Commission | 00 | 00 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | 00 | 00 |
| Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board | 00 | 00 |

| | <i>Page Number</i> | |
|--|--------------------|---------------|
| | <i>Bill</i> | <i>Report</i> |
| Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects | 00 | 00 |
| V. General Provisions | 00 | 00 |
| House of Representatives Report Requirements | 00 | 00 |

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates, which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2016. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2015, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2016.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted /1 | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Title I, Department of Defense - Civil..... | 5,454,500 | 4,732,000 | 5,596,750 | +142,250 | +864,750 |
| Title II, Department of the Interior..... | 1,140,000 | 1,105,968 | 1,104,542 | -35,458 | -1,426 |
| Title III, Department of Energy..... | 27,916,797 | 30,527,136 | 28,984,569 | +1,067,772 | -1,542,567 |
| Title IV, Independent Agencies..... | 268,980 | 280,910 | 325,285 | +56,305 | +44,375 |
| Title V, General Provisions..... | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 34,780,277 | 36,646,014 | 36,011,146 | +1,230,869 | -634,868 |
| Scorekeeping adjustments..... | -578,000 | -610,000 | -608,168 | -30,168 | +1,832 |
| Grand total for the bill..... | 34,202,277 | 36,036,014 | 35,402,978 | +1,200,701 | -633,036 |

1/ Excludes emergency appropriations

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016 totals \$35,402,978,000, \$1,200,701,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2015 and \$633,036,000 below the President's budget request. Total defense funding is \$18,883,978,000, \$1,039,978,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2015 and \$251,505,000 below the budget request. Total non-defense funding is \$16,519,000,000, \$160,723,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2015 and \$381,531,000 below the budget request.

Title I of the bill provides \$5,596,750,000 for the Civil Works programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, \$142,250,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$864,750,000 above the budget request. Total funding for activities eligible for reimbursement from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is estimated at \$1,178,000,000, which is \$73,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$263,000,000 above the budget request. The bill makes use of all estimated annual revenues from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

Title II provides \$1,104,542,000 for the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, \$35,458,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$1,426,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends \$1,094,668,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation, \$35,458,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$4,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends \$9,874,000 for the Central Utah Project, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$2,574,000 above the budget request.

Title III provides \$28,984,569,000 for the Department of Energy, \$1,067,772,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$1,542,567,000 below the budget request. Funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which includes nuclear weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation, naval reactors, and federal salaries and expenses, is \$12,329,000,000, \$921,705,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$236,400,000 below the budget request.

Funding for energy programs within the Department of Energy, which includes basic science research and the applied energy programs, is \$10,296,507,000, \$63,765,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$1,258,457,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommends \$5,100,000,000 for the Office of Science, \$1,657,774,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; \$936,161,000 for Nuclear Energy; \$605,000,000 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 \$5,909,743,000, \$38,743,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$91,719,000 above the budget request.

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

Title IV provides \$325,285,000 for several Independent Agencies, \$56,305,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$44,375,000 above the budget request. Net funding for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is \$168,459,000, \$50,601,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$48,311,000 above the budget request.

OVERVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation continues the strong investments in American infrastructure contained in the fiscal year 2015 Act. The recommendation rejects the Administration's ill-considered request to cut approximately \$708,000,000 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 reduction would have a detrimental impact on the nation's economic competitiveness and defenses against flooding. The Committee strongly encourages the Administration to request a fiscal year 2017 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 key advances in efficiency and emissions reduction.

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. The recommendation strongly supports the Department's proposals to modernize the nuclear weapons stockpile, increase investment in the NNSA's infrastructure, prevent the proliferation of nuclear materials, and provide for the needs of the naval nuclear propulsion program.

Within funding for the NNSA's Weapons Activities, the recommendation continues support of the multi-year modernization plans for the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and its supporting infrastructure. Early formulations of the modernization plan tended to focus on stretch goals for warhead life extension programs and major construction projects that relied on overly optimistic timelines and invalid cost assumptions. The Committee will continue to emphasize conservative and affordable options for life extension programs and major facility construction that are clearly defined, resource-informed, and properly scoped to meet the timelines required. The Committee is concerned that though the costs of the overall program are escalating, the NNSA is producing less, taking longer, and scaling back scope just to keep up pace with the cost growth. To restore credibility, the NNSA must take early action to resolve the inconsistencies between its goals for modernization and its ability to achieve those goals. In the meantime, the Committee will continue to hold the NNSA accountable for delivering those missions within scope, cost, and schedule requirements.

The recommendation provides strong support for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. The Committee recognizes the NNSA's responsiveness in refining its nonproliferation strategies to meet the changing geopolitical environment and to improve the effectiveness of its programs in targeting the greatest threats. The recommenda-

tion provides no new funds for projects in Russia and the Committee awaits submission of a Secretarial waiver for nonproliferation work with the Russian Federation should such activities be determined to be in the national security interest by the Secretary of Energy. The Committee continues to view the NNSA's programs as important for reducing international dangers to U.S. national security posed by the proliferation of nuclear technologies to other nation states and the threat of nuclear terrorism, rather than focused on domestic security activities that are the responsibility of other agencies.

The Committee also strongly supports the activities to maintain our country's nuclear naval fleet, which is funded through the Naval Reactors account. The recommendation continues to prioritize the multi-year development needs of the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine replacement reactor program. 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.

INVESTMENTS IN INFRASTRUCTURE

The water resource infrastructure funded by the recommendation is a critical component of ensuring a robust national economy and of supporting American competitiveness in international markets. 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 public safety, businesses, and much of this country's food-producing lands. The Bureau of Reclamation supplies reliable water to approximately ten percent of this country's population and to much of its fertile agricultural lands. Both agencies make significant contributions to national electricity production through hydropower facilities.

The U.S. marine transportation industry supports \$2,000,000,000,000 in commerce and creates employment for more than 13 million people. As the agency responsible for our nation's federal waterways, the Army Corps of Engineers maintains 926 ports 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 makes key changes to 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, Corps projects prevented damages of \$13,400,000,000 in 2013 alone. Between 1928 and 2013, each inflation-adjusted dollar invested in these projects prevented \$7.92 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. These facilities deliver water to one of every five western farmers resulting in approximately 10 million acres of irrigated land that produces 60 percent of the nation's vegetables and 25 percent of its fruits and nuts. Additionally, these facilities deliver water to more than 31 million people 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 reliable, safe water for their families and their businesses and many municipal and industrial users would face critical water shortages.

The Corps and Reclamation are the nation's largest and second largest producers of hydropower, respectively. Combined these federal hydropower facilities generate more than 112 billion kilowatt-hours, enough to power more than 10 million homes, annually. Gross revenues from the sale of this power reach nearly \$6,000,000,000 annually.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

In 2012 the President unveiled an "all of the above" energy strategy designed to take advantage and utilize all sources of American-made energy. Since that time, each budget request has proposed increased funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy at the expense of more reliable energy sources. A true "all of the above" approach has to measure a vision for the future against the practical realities of the present. While investments in renewable energy are important and vital to a coherent national energy policy, they represent a fraction of the energy production in this country. Fossil and nuclear sources provide nearly 85 percent of all electricity generation in this nation. An energy policy that divests from these sources plans for an unrealistic future.

The Administration's severe regulations on carbon pollution from existing and new fossil-fueled electric power plants only further the inconsistencies in the budget request's "all of the above" approach. These regulatory actions and the Administration's subsequent low prioritization of fossil energy sources reveals a broken "all of the above" approach that the Committee has to rebalance each year.

The Committee continues its long-standing support for the investment of taxpayer funds across the spectrum of all energy technologies. A national energy policy can only be successful if it maintains stability and resiliency while planning for long-term strategic goals of energy security, independence, and prosperity for the nation. The Committee recommends a balanced approach that focuses on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of fossil fuels while also investing in the latest technological breakthroughs of renewable fuel sources.

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 | Direction on Principles and Guidelines |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Brief on Legacy Studies |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Direction on 3x3x3 waiver process |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Direction on new Federal Flood Risk Management Standard |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Guidance on ratings systems for allocating additional funds |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Guidance on 2016 Work Plan submission |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Direction on prioritization of ongoing studies |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Direction on North Atlantic Coast Comprehensive Study |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Direction on New Starts |
| Army Corps of Engineers | Brief on "Remaining Items" |
| Army Corps of Engineers/Investigations | Report on Caño Martin Peña, Puerto Rico |
| Army Corps of Engineers/Construction | Guidance on allocating additional funding |
| Army Corps of Engineers/Mississippi River and Tributaries. | Guidance on allocating additional funding |
| Army Corps of Engineers/Mississippi River and Tributaries. | Direction on Mississippi River Commission funding |
| Army Corps of Engineers/Operation and Maintenance. | Guidance on allocating additional funding |
| Army Corps of Engineers/Operation and Maintenance. | Direction Dredged Material Disposal |
| Army Corps of Engineers/Operation and Maintenance. | Report on Ririe Reservoir |
| 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 | Report on Public-Private Partnerships |
| Army Corps of Engineers/Expenses | Report on Flood Damage Reduction Projects on Federal Lands |
| 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 |
| Army Corps of Engineers/General Provisions ... | Restriction on using funds to require permits for the discharge of dredged material. |
| Bureau of Reclamation/Water and Related Resources. | Report on Ririe Reservoir |
| Bureau of Reclamation/Water and Related Resources. | Direction on CALFED feasibility studies |
| Bureau of Reclamation/General Provisions | Reprogramming requirements |
| Department of Energy | Report on future years energy program |
| Department of Energy | Guidance on prior-year balances greater than five years old |
| Department of Energy | Report on cost audit coverage |
| Department of Energy | Report on alleviation of poverty |
| Department of Energy | Guidance on Administration's Yucca Mountain policy |
| Department of Energy | Guidance on inclusion of centers in future budget justifications |
| Department of Energy | Report on Office of Technology Transitions |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Direction on funding incubator programs |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Direction on developing list of bioenergy technologies |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Report on list of bioenergy technologies |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Direction on Solar Technologies program funding |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Direction on hydrokinetic power funding allocations |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Report on U.S. supply of lithium |

| Agency/Account | Requirement |
|---|---|
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Direction on building energy codes |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Direction on "smart home" electronics study |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Report on Weatherization Assistance Program |
| Department of Energy/Energy Efficiency | Guidance on social cost of carbon |
| Department of Energy/Electricity Delivery | Report on energy security |
| Department of Energy/Electricity Delivery | Report on EMP vulnerability |
| Department of Energy/Nuclear | Direction to support an SMR design award |
| Department of Energy/Nuclear | Direction on ATR update |
| Department of Energy/Nuclear | Report on spent fuel plans |
| Department of Energy/Fossil | Guidance on coal research and development |
| Department of Energy/Fossil | Direction on interagency research plan regarding hydraulic fracturing |
| Department of Energy/Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup. | Report on Mercury Export Ban Act |
| Department of Energy/UED&D | Report on uranium transfers |
| Department of Energy/Science | Report on exascale computing |
| Department of Energy/Departmental Administration. | Report on Working Capital Fund |
| Department of Energy/Departmental Administration. | Direction on renewable fuel standards |
| Department of Energy/Departmental Administration. | Direction on technical assistance to Ukraine |
| Department of Energy/Weapons | Guidance on definition of a "life extension program" |
| Department of Energy/Weapons | Direction on costs of the W88 life extension program |
| Department of Energy/Weapons | Report on red team assessment of alternatives |
| Department of Energy/Weapons | Guidance on infrastructure budget structure |
| Department of Energy/Weapons | Report on RLWTF project root causes |
| Department of Energy/Weapons | Guidance on funding for UPF |
| Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Non-proliferation. | Guidance on new nonproliferation projects in Russia |
| Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Non-proliferation. | Direction on offsetting costs associated with material removal |
| Department of Energy/Defense Nuclear Non-proliferation. | Report on Part 810 Process Improvement Program |
| Department of Energy/Naval Reactors | Direction on an update of progress regarding ATR |
| Department of Energy/Naval Reactors | Report on advanced fuel system using LEU fuel |
| Department of Energy/Defense Environmental Cleanup. | Report on Hanford site |
| Department of Energy/Defense Environmental Cleanup. | Report on IFDP |
| Department of Energy/Other Defense Activities | Direction on Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments annual report |
| Department of Energy/Other Defense Activities | Report on Graded Security Posture |
| 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 | Prohibit certain multi year funding agreements in Office of Science |
| 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. |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | Report on tank maintenance and upgrade requirement at Hanford and Savannah River. |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | Direction on allocation of any reduction in available resources |
| 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 | Direction on reducing corporate support |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | Report on comprehensive workforce review and strategic plan |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | Direction on rulemaking process |
| 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 | 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 2016 BUDGET REQUEST OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS

The fiscal year 2016 budget request for the Civil Works program of the Corps of Engineers is \$4,732,000,000, a decrease of \$722,500,000 from fiscal year 2015. After adjusting for the rescission of \$28,000,000 of prior-year appropriations in the fiscal year 2015 Act, the budget request represents a reduction from fiscal year 2015 of \$750,500,000 (–14%). Each of the four main project-based accounts would see a sharp decrease under the budget request. The Construction account would see the largest dollar reduction (–\$467,489,000) and largest percentage reduction (–29%). The Investigations, Mississippi River and Tributaries, and Operation and Maintenance accounts are reduced by 20, 26, and 7 percent, respectively.

Once again the Administration’s claims to understand the importance of infrastructure ring hollow when it comes to water resource infrastructure investments. 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 (–16 and –20 percent, respectively). Within the navigation mission area, the budget request proposes to reduce funding for activities eligible for reimbursement from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund by \$190,000,000 from fiscal year 2015. Capital improvements funded in part from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund are reduced by \$49,000,000 from fiscal year 2015. Funding for flood and storm damage reduction activities at each stage of the process—studies, construction, and operation and maintenance—would be reduced below fiscal year 2015 if the budget request were enacted.

Once again, however, the Committee rejects the low priority placed on infrastructure in the budget request. Instead, the Committee allocates \$810,046,000 above the budget request for additional investments in navigation and flood and storm damage reduction improvements.

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 2016 is estimated to be approximately \$8,989,000,000.

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2014 included target annual appropriations levels for use of HMTF receipts. 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.

For fiscal year 2016, the Committee provides an estimated \$1,178,000,000 for HMTF-related activities, an increase of \$73,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$263,000,000 above the budget request. This substantial increase should allow the Corps to make progress on the backlog of dredging needs.

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 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. Two statutory changes enacted last year, however, will lead to the availability of additional revenues to stand as the required cost-share for some additional work on the inland waterways system. These changes were the reduction in the portion of the costs of the Olmsted Locks and Dam project that is to be derived from the IWTF to 15 percent and the increase in the fuel tax to \$0.29 per gallon from \$0.20 per gallon.

It should be noted that funds from both the General Treasury and the IWTF are counted under overall discretionary spending limits, which remain relatively flat from fiscal year 2015. Nevertheless, for fiscal year 2016, the Committee provides appropriations making use of all estimated annual revenues from the IWTF. This funding includes the budget request of \$232,000,000 for construction of the Olmsted Locks and Dam project and the Locks 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River project, as well as \$108,000,000 above the budget request for additional capital improvements to the inland waterways system. The Committee also allocates \$42,000,000 above the budget request for additional operation and maintenance activities on the inland waterways.

PRINCIPLES AND REQUIREMENTS

Concerns persist that the effort to update the Water Resources Principles and Guidelines did not proceed 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 or the final Interagency Guidelines released in December 2014. 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 2016.

The Corps has been working diligently on assessing the impacts of the revised Principles and Requirements and Interagency Guidelines on the Civil Works program, consistent with congressional direction provided in the explanatory statement accompanying the fiscal year 2015 Act. The Committee looks forward to being briefed on this assessment in the near future. After an opportunity to review the assessment, the Committee may have further directions on this issue.

PLANNING MODERNIZATION

The Committee remains strongly supportive of 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 Committee is aware that multiple studies, termed Legacy Studies, were rightly not required to transition to the new SMART planning process. The Corps shall be prepared to brief the Committee not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act on the status of the Legacy Studies, including a schedule for bringing each study to completion.

North Atlantic Coast Comprehensive Study Focus Areas.—Several of the nine identified focus areas, including the three areas proposed for funding in fiscal year 2016, involve geographic scopes and levels of complexity not seen in the typical Corps study. As such, confining these studies to the standard 3x3x3 planning restrictions for time and cost is not advisable. Rather than starting with the attempt to meet these arbitrary timing and funding goals and requesting waivers at the end of the study process, the Corps is di-

rected to evaluate each focus area expeditiously to determine the appropriate scope, schedule, and cost, without the initial time and cost limits of the 3x3x3 process.

FEDERAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STANDARD

On January 30, 2015, the President issued Executive Order 13690 establishing a new Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and amending Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management). The Administration describes it as furtherance of the President's Climate Action Plan and as building on the work done by the interagency task force in the wake of Hurricane Sandy.

The Committee has heard numerous concerns about the new standard from many potentially-affected stakeholders. These concerns include the process by which the standard was developed, the lack of clarity as to which specific programs and activities will be affected, and the uncertainty related to how each agency will implement the new standard. The Committee takes these concerns seriously and will continue to closely monitor the Administration's activities related to this new Federal Flood Risk Management Standard.

The new standard and draft revised guidelines for implementing Executive Order 11988 are currently out for public comment until early May 2015. Executive Order 13690 directs each agency to issue or amend existing regulations and procedures to comply with the order and to submit to the National Security Council staff within 30 days of the closing of the public comment period for the revised guidelines an implementation plan that contains milestones and a timeline for implementation of the executive order and the standard. The Corps is directed to submit this implementation plan to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 3 days after it has been submitted to the National Security Council staff.

FIVE-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Historically, the Committee has encouraged the Administration to provide five-year investment plans for all the agencies within the Energy and Water Development jurisdiction, particularly the Corps. 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 appropriations 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 require-

ments 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 in fiscal year 2014 the Corps was directed to prepare a comprehensive estimate of the optimum timeline and funding requirements to complete each of the ongoing projects which 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 the 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 2016. 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.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK

As mentioned above, the budget request is woefully inadequate for meeting the critical water resource 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 \$879,807,000 in additional funding for ongoing work within the Investigations, Construction, Mississippi River and Tributaries, and Operation and Maintenance accounts. This funding is for addi-

tional work that either was not included in the Administration's request or was inadequately budgeted. The executive branch retains complete discretion over project-specific allocations of this funding.

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 2016. This eligibility includes reimbursements, as authorized by law and consistent with statutory funding limitations. 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 requirements; 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 continued lack of transparency in how work plan allocation decisions are made is troubling. The Committee's position on this issue has not changed from previous years—a list of general factors and management controls considered when making allocation decisions is not sufficient as a response to congressional direction nor is it sufficient explanation to federal taxpayers generally or local sponsors interested in improving their projects' competitiveness specifically.

The Committee expects considerable improvement in the quality and detail of information provided in fiscal year 2016 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." The Corps is reminded that these funds are in addition to the Administration's budget request. Administration budget metrics shall not be a reason to disqualify a study or project from being funded.

Work plan.—Not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, the Corps shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a work plan including the following information: (1) a detailed description of the ratings system(s) developed and used to evaluate studies and projects; (2) delineation of how these funds are to be allocated; (3) a summary of the work to be accomplished with each allocation, including phase of work; and

(4) a list of all studies and projects that were considered eligible for funding but did not receive funding, including an explanation of whether the study or project could have used funds in fiscal year 2016 and the specific reasons each study or project was considered as being less competitive for an allocation of funds.

Full allocation of funds.—It is expected that all of the additional funding provided will be allocated to specific programs, projects, or activities. The focus of the allocation process should favor the obligation of funds for work in fiscal year 2016 rather than expenditures. With the significant backlog of work in the Corps' inventory, there is absolutely no reason for funds provided above the budget request to remain unallocated.

NEW STARTS

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 years 2014 and 2015 Acts allowed the Corps to initiate a limited number of new studies and new construction projects. In each year, the Corps was required 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. Unfortunately, in both years the Administration submitted an analysis that fell far short of what was required. Due to the significant uncertainty remaining about the impact of recently initiated projects, the Committee recommends no new starts in any account in fiscal year 2016. The Corps is directed to prioritize ongoing studies and projects in an effort to complete them.

One exception to this restriction on new starts is the proposed Disposition of Completed Projects line item within the Investigations account. This item funds study efforts intended to reduce federal responsibilities, rather than study efforts that will result in new federal projects added to the existing backlog of construction and operation and maintenance projects. Therefore, the Committee believes an exception is appropriate and has included funding for this line item.

North Atlantic Coast Comprehensive Study Focus Areas.—The budget request proposed a single line item intended to fund feasibility activities for three focus areas identified in the North Atlantic Coast Comprehensive Study issued in January 2015. This line item was identified as a new start in the budget request since the initial work—the Comprehensive Study—was funded in the supplemental appropriations Act following Hurricane Sandy. While the Corps' restraint in this instance is appreciated, the Committee believes it is unnecessary. Funding is included for the three focus areas as separate and individual feasibility studies. The Corps is directed to maintain this characterization (individual, ongoing activities) when making future funding decisions for study activities for these three focus areas, as well as the other six focus areas identified in the Comprehensive Study.

Definition of a New Start.—The change in funding format prompted by the prohibition on congressional earmarks has resulted in greater significance for the Administration's definition of a new start. Unfortunately, the Administration has been less than transparent with the Committee on this issue as well. Without this

information, the Committee's ability to assert its prerogative as to whether specific projects are new starts or ongoing projects is seriously limited. Therefore, the Administration is directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act its definition of a new start, including any relevant guidelines or criteria used to make project-specific determinations. The Administration is reminded that no new start shall be required when moving from the feasibility phase to the preconstruction engineering and design (PED) phase.

ELIMINATING DUPLICATION

The budget request includes numerous line items under "Remaining Items" in the Investigations and Operation and Maintenance accounts. The budget justifications for several of these items seem to describe similar activities, thereby raising the question of whether these activities are truly distinct or whether overlapping or duplicative missions are leading to inefficiencies within the agency. The Corps is directed to be prepared to brief the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act on whether the agency believes that each line item under "Remaining Items" is appropriate as a separate line item or whether some line items could be combined to eliminate overlapping or duplicative activities.

ASIAN CARP

The threat of Asian Carp to the Great Lakes remains a concern for the Committee. The Army Corps of Engineers continues to play a critical role in preventing, controlling, and managing the threat of Asian carp. The Committee expects the Corps to expedite authorized actions related to Asian Carp, in particular the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Interbasin Study (GLMRIS) Brandon Road study. The Corps recently transferred management of the study to the Rock Island District. While this transfer may have been warranted, the Committee has not yet received a comprehensive explanation as to how this transfer will ensure the study will be executed efficiently and expeditiously.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION AND REPROGRAMMING

To ensure that the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 2016 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 \$5,596,750,000 for the Corps of Engineers, \$142,250,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$864,750,000 above the budget request.

A table summarizing the fiscal year 2015 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2016 budget request, and the Committee-recommended levels is provided below:

(Dollars in thousands)

| Account | FY 2015 enacted | FY 2016 request | Cmte. rec. |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| Investigations | \$122,000 | \$97,000 | \$110,000 |
| Construction | 1,639,489 | 1,172,000 | 1,631,000 |
| Mississippi River and tributaries | 302,000 | 225,000 | 275,000 |
| Operation and maintenance | 2,908,511 | 2,710,000 | 3,058,000 |
| Regulatory program | 200,000 | 205,000 | 200,000 |
| FUSRAP | 101,500 | 104,000 | 104,000 |
| Flood control and coastal emergencies | 28,000 | 34,000 | 34,000 |
| Expenses | 178,000 | 180,000 | 180,000 |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works | 3,000 | 5,000 | 4,750 |
| TOTAL, Program Level | 5,482,500 | 4,732,000 | 5,596,750 |
| Rescission | - 28,000 | - - - | - - - |
| NET APPROPRIATION, Corps of Engineers—Civil | 5,454,500 | 4,732,000 | 5,596,750 |

INVESTIGATIONS

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$122,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 97,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 110,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | - 12,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +13,000,000 |

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 \$110,000,000, \$12,000,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$13,000,000 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 FEASIBILITY | PED | HOUSE RECOMMENDED FEASIBILITY | PED |
|---|-------------------------------|-------|----------------------------------|-------|
| ALABAMA | | | | |
| MOBILE HARBOR DEEPENING AND WIDENING, AL | 400 | --- | 400 | --- |
| ALASKA | | | | |
| CRAIG HARBOR, AK | 535 | --- | 535 | --- |
| KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| PERRYVILLE HARBOR, AK | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| SAINT GEORGE HARBOR IMPROVEMENT, AK | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| ARIZONA | | | | |
| LITTLE COLORADO RIVER (WINSLOW), AZ | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| ARKANSAS | | | | |
| THREE RIVERS, AR | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| AMERICAN RIVER COMMON FEATURES, NATOMAS BASIN, CA | --- | 3,500 | --- | 3,500 |
| DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) RESTORATION, CA | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND & VIC, CA | 570 | --- | 570 | --- |
| PORT OF LONG BEACH NAV IMP, CA | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| SAN FRANCISCO CREEK, CA | 331 | --- | 331 | --- |
| YUBA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
 (AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST FEASIBILITY | PED | HOUSE RECOMMENDED FEASIBILITY | PED |
|---|-------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----|
| COLORADO | | | | |
| ADAMS AND DENVER COUNTIES, CO | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| COMMONWEALTH NORTHERN MARIANAS | | | | |
| ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| CONNECTICUT | | | | |
| FAIRFIELD AND NEW HAVEN COUNTIES (FLOODING), CT | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| NEW HAVEN HARBOR DEEPENING, CT | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| FLORIDA | | | | |
| MANATEE HARBOR, FL | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| GEORGIA | | | | |
| PROCTOR CREEK, GA | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| SATILLA WATERSHED, GA | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| IDAHO | | | | |
| BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID | 275 | --- | 275 | --- |
| ILLINOIS | | | | |
| DU PAGE RIVER, IL | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL | 400 | --- | 400 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST FEASIBILITY | PED | HOUSE RECOMMENDED FEASIBILITY | PED |
|--|-------------------------------|-------|----------------------------------|-------|
| INTERBASIN CONTROL OF GREAT LAKES-MISSISSIPPI RIVER AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES, IL, IN, OH & WI | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| KASKASKIA RIVER BASIN, IL | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| IOWA | | | | |
| DES MOINES LEVEE SYSTEM, DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| LOUISIANA | | | | |
| INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA | 1,400 | --- | 1,400 | --- |
| LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA | 50 | --- | 50 | --- |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, LA | 550 | --- | 550 | --- |
| MARYLAND | | | | |
| CHESAPEAKE BAY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD, PA & VA | 250 | --- | 250 | --- |
| MASSACHUSETTS | | | | |
| BOSTON HARBOR DEEP DRAFT INVESTIGATION, MA | --- | 1,835 | --- | 1,835 |
| MICHIGAN | | | | |
| SAGINAW RIVER DEEPENING, SAGINAW, MI | 100 | --- | 100 | --- |
| MINNESOTA | | | | |
| MINNESOTA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, MN & SD (MINNESOTA RIVER AUTHORITY) | 600 | --- | 600 | --- |
| MISSOURI | | | | |
| ST LOUIS RIVERFRONT, MO & IL | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED | PED |
|---|----------------|-------------------|-----|
| | FEASIBILITY | FEASIBILITY | PED |
| NEW JERSEY | | | |
| NEW JERSEY BACKBAY, NJ | --- | 300 | --- |
| PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ | 982 | 982 | --- |
| RAHWAY RIVER BASIN (UPPER BASIN), NJ | 500 | 500 | --- |
| NEW YORK | | | |
| NEW YORK - NEW JERSEY HARBOR & TRIBUTARIES, NY & NJ | --- | 400 | --- |
| UPPER SUSQUEHANNA COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, NY | 600 | 600 | --- |
| WESTCHESTER COUNTY STREAMS, BYRAM RIVER BASIN, NY & CT | 703 | 703 | --- |
| NORTH DAKOTA | | | |
| RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, ND, MN, SD & MANITOBA, CANADA | 786 | 786 | --- |
| OKLAHOMA | | | |
| ARKANSAS RIVER CORRIDOR, OK | 815 | 815 | --- |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | | |
| DELAWARE RIVER DREDGE MATERIAL UTILIZATION, PA | 700 | 700 | --- |
| PUERTO RICO | | | |
| SAN JUAN HARBOR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, PR | 700 | 700 | --- |
| TEXAS | | | |
| COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY, TX | 700 | 700 | --- |
| HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 700 | 700 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | PED | HOUSE RECOMMENDED | PED |
|---|----------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| | FEASIBILITY | | FEASIBILITY | |
| SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX | 600 | --- | 600 | --- |
| SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX | 200 | --- | 200 | --- |
| SULPHUR RIVER BASIN, TX | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| VIRGINIA | | | | |
| CITY OF NORFOLK, VA | --- | --- | 300 | --- |
| NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (55-FOOT), VA | 800 | --- | 800 | --- |
| WASHINGTON | | | | |
| DUNGENESS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION STUDY, WA | 700 | --- | 700 | --- |
| SEATTLE HARBOR, WA | 500 | --- | 500 | --- |
| SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES | 30,847 | 5,335 | 31,847 | 5,335 |
| REMAINING ITEMS | | | | |
| ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK | --- | --- | 6,500 | --- |
| FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION | --- | --- | 4,000 | --- |
| NAVIGATION | --- | --- | 2,000 | --- |
| OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - INVESTIGATIONS
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED | PED |
|--|----------------|-------------------|-------|
| | FEASIBILITY | FEASIBILITY | PED |
| INVENTORY OF DAMS | 400 | 400 | --- |
| LAKE TAHOE | 50 | 50 | --- |
| PACIFIC NW FOREST CASE | 10 | 10 | --- |
| SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS | 1,350 | 1,350 | --- |
| FERC LICENSING | 200 | 200 | --- |
| PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES | 5,500 | 6,000 | --- |
| COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA | | | |
| AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUPPORT TRI-CADD | 251 | 251 | --- |
| COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION | 1,000 | 1,000 | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES | 75 | 75 | --- |
| FLOOD DAMAGE DATA | 220 | 220 | --- |
| FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES | 15,000 | 15,000 | --- |
| HYDROLOGIC STUDIES | 1,743 | 1,743 | --- |
| INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES | 150 | 150 | --- |
| PRECIPITATION STUDIES | 225 | 225 | --- |
| REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT | 75 | 75 | --- |
| SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS | 47 | 47 | --- |
| STREAM GAGING | 550 | 550 | --- |
| TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS | 385 | 385 | --- |
| RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | 18,143 | 18,143 | --- |
| OTHER - MISCELLANEOUS | | | |
| DISPOSITION OF COMPLETED PROJECTS | 800 | 800 | --- |
| NATIONAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM | 6,000 | 6,000 | --- |
| NATIONAL SHORELINE | 400 | 400 | --- |
| NORTH ATLANTIC COAST COMPREHENSIVE STUDY FOCUS AREAS | 1,000 | --- | --- |
| PLANNING SUPPORT PROGRAM | 3,100 | 3,100 | --- |
| TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM | 1,500 | 1,500 | --- |
| SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS | 60,818 | 72,818 | --- |
| TOTAL, INVESTIGATIONS | 91,665 | 104,665 | 5,335 |

Caño Martin Peña, Puerto Rico.—The Corps is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act on how this project is, or is not, consistent with current law and policy regarding hazardous and toxic materials.

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 both 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, Additional Topics.—Within the funds provided, and in accordance with the amount requested for each mission area, the Corps is encouraged to consider conducting work on the following topics:

1. *The impact of reduced lock operations on endangered, threatened, and game fish species in low-use waterways and effective mitigation methods.* The Committee has heard concerns that a reduction in or elimination of navigational lock operations is having a negative impact on the ability of some endangered, threatened, and game fish species to migrate through waterways, particularly during critical spawning periods. The Committee is aware that the Corps has collaborated with other federal agencies, such as the Fish and Wildlife Service, on two research initiatives that would provide a good foundation for this additional research effort.

2. *Urban flood damage reduction and stream restoration in arid regions.* Previous work in this area included the development of tools and technologies for stakeholders, including Corps District personnel, other federal agencies, state and local governments, and flood control districts. It also demonstrated the application of new and innovative techniques, models, and methods to arid and semi-arid regions.

Research and Development, Partnerships.—The budget request includes funding for work on controlling invasive aquatic species throughout our nations waterways, including the Columbia River Basin. The Corps is encouraged to utilize local and regional research partners, as appropriate, when conducting work to address this serious issue.

Budgeting for Tribal Areas.—Tribal communities located in remote areas that experience severe weather-related conditions jeopardizing public safety and health face a significant disadvantage under the Corps' utilization of benefit-cost ratios in its budgeting process. The Committee encourages the Corps to examine ways that federal trust and treaty obligations and the need to protect public safety and health in severe weather situations could be better incorporated into determining budget priorities.

CONSTRUCTION

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$1,639,489,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 1,172,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 1,631,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | - 8,489,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +459,000,000 |

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,631,000,000, \$8,489,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$459,000,000 above the budget request.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| ALASKA | | |
| PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK (DEEPENING AND BREAKWATER) | 7,928 | --- |
| CALIFORNIA | | |
| AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS), CA | 56,024 | 56,024 |
| AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (FOLSOM DAM RAISE), CA | 18,641 | 18,641 |
| COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA | 12,739 | --- |
| HAMILTON CITY, CA | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| ISABELLA LAKE, CA (DAM SAFETY) | 49,900 | 49,900 |
| OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA | 21,500 | 21,500 |
| YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA | 7,361 | 7,361 |
| FLORIDA | | |
| HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL) | 64,141 | 64,141 |
| SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL | 123,742 | 123,742 |
| GEORGIA | | |
| RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC | 770 | 770 |
| SAVANNAH HARBOR DISPOSAL AREAS, GA & SC | 8,663 | 8,663 |
| SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA | 21,050 | 21,050 |
| ILLINOIS | | |
| CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN | 1,100 | 1,100 |
| CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL | 28,000 | 28,000 |
| EAST ST LOUIS, IL | 50 | 50 |
| MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL | 9,000 | 9,000 |
| MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY | 180,000 | 180,000 |
| UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI | 19,787 | 19,787 |
| WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL (DEFICIENCY CORRECTION) | 50 | 50 |
| IOWA | | |
| MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD | 47,127 | 47,127 |
| KANSAS | | |
| TOPEKA, KS | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| KENTUCKY | | |
| OHIO RIVER SHORELINE, PADUCAH, KY | 5,500 | --- |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| LOUISIANA | | |
| BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL PROGRAM, LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| MARYLAND | | |
| ASSATEAGUE, MD | 600 | 600 |
| CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA | 1,970 | 1,970 |
| POPLAR ISLAND, MD | 26,500 | 26,500 |
| MINNESOTA | | |
| MARSH LAKE, MN (MINNESOTA RIVER AUTHORITY) | 2,700 | --- |
| MISSOURI | | |
| KANSAS CITYS, MO & KS | 1,815 | 1,815 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL | 50 | 50 |
| MONARCH - CHESTERFIELD, MO | 1,275 | 1,275 |
| NEW JERSEY | | |
| RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| OHIO | | |
| BOLIVAR DAM, OH (DAM SAFETY) | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| OKLAHOMA | | |
| CANTON LAKE, OK | 3,632 | 3,632 |
| PINE CREEK LAKE, OK | 1,957 | 1,957 |
| OREGON | | |
| COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA | 11,000 | 11,000 |
| LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA | 13,300 | 13,300 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | |
| EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA | 59,000 | 59,000 |
| LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA | 52,000 | 52,000 |
| WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING) | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| PUERTO RICO | | |
| RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR | 1,700 | 1,700 |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | |
| CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC | 2,893 | 2,893 |
| TENNESSEE | | |
| CENTER HILL LAKE, TN | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| TEXAS | | |
| BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX | 36,410 | 36,410 |
| GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX | 13,913 | 13,913 |
| GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX | 16,287 | 16,287 |
| LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN (ONION CREEK), TX | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| WASHINGTON | | |
| COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID | 85,300 | 85,300 |
| GRAYS HARBOR (38-FOOT DEEPENING), WA | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | | |
| BLUESTONE LAKE, WV | 9,400 | 9,400 |
| SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES | 1,124,975 | 1,096,108 |
| REMAINING ITEMS | | |
| ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK | | |
| FLOOD AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION | --- | 136,117 |
| FLOOD CONTROL | --- | 105,000 |
| SHORE PROTECTION | --- | 45,000 |
| NAVIGATION | --- | 49,500 |
| INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND PROJECTS | --- | 108,000 |
| OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES | --- | 10,000 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE | --- | 10,000 |
| AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM | --- | 4,000 |
| CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROJECTS | | |
| AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206) | 500 | 2,500 |
| BENEFICIAL USES DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204) | 2,000 | 2,750 |
| EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14) | --- | 3,000 |
| FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205) | 500 | 8,000 |
| MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES (SECTION 111) | --- | 750 |
| NAVIGATION PROGRAM (SECTION 107) | --- | 2,500 |
| PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 1135) | 500 | 3,000 |
| SHORE PROTECTION (SECTION 103) | --- | 1,250 |
| DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM | 24,200 | 24,200 |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION | 19,000 | 19,000 |
| INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE | 50 | 50 |
| INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE | 275 | 275 |
| SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS | 47,025 | 534,892 |
| TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION | 1,172,000 | 1,631,000 |

Success Dam, California.—The Committee notes that in 2003 a project was initiated to increase the reservoir capacity, primarily for flood control but also for irrigation water storage. The project has been on hold for more than a decade due to seismic and seepage concerns, which have now been addressed. The drought in California continues to demonstrate the importance of and need for expanding water storage capacity to capture water during wet years for use in dry years. The non-federal sponsors remain very interested in continuing implementation of the project. The Committee urges the Corps to move expeditiously to resolve remaining hydrologic concerns and to update, as necessary, documents related to the project to increase reservoir capacity so that the project can finally be completed.

South Florida Ecosystem Restoration, Florida.—The Committee is aware that the Corps currently is engaging a public process to update the Integrated Delivery System (IDS). The Committee encourages the Corps to include the Big Cypress–L–28 Interceptor Modifications Project into the updated IDS.

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 giving priority to 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;
- (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; and
- (9) for environmental infrastructure, projects with the greater economic impact, projects in rural communities, and projects in counties or parishes with high poverty rates.

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

The Committee is aware that the Corps is developing a report describing a 20-year program for making capital investments on the inland and intracoastal waterways, pursuant to section 2002(d) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2014. This report is due to be submitted to Congress in June 2015. The Committee requires an opportunity to review any new report prior to the Corps incorporating any part of the report into funding decisions. Therefore, when allocating the fiscal year 2016 additional funding provided in this account for Inland Waterways Trust Fund Projects, the Corps shall not use the report being developed pursuant to WRRDA. The Corps shall continue to use, as appropriate, the Inland Marine Transportation System (IMTS) Capital Projects Business Model, Final Report published on April 13, 2010, as the applicable 20-year plan.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—Funding is provided for watercraft inspection stations, as authorized by section 1039 of WRRDA 2014.

Continuing Authorities Program (CAP).—The Committee continues to support all sections of the Continuing Authorities Program. Funding is provided for eight CAP sections at a total of \$23,750,000, an increase of \$20,250,000 above the budget request, which proposed funding for only four 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 previous fiscal years.

Continuing Authorities Program, Extraordinary Circumstances.—The Committee urges the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) to review past projects with extraordinary circumstances to determine whether exceptions to policy are reasonable and advisable, including when implementing section 1030 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$302,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 225,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 275,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | – 27,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +50,000,000 |

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 \$275,000,000, \$27,000,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$50,000,000 above the budget request.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| CONSTRUCTION | | |
| CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN | 43,231 | 43,231 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN | 15,909 | 15,909 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA | 758 | 758 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA | 2,709 | 2,709 |
| OPERATION & MAINTENANCE | | |
| CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN | 65,124 | 65,124 |
| HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR | 15 | 15 |
| 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 | 9,175 | 9,175 |
| ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO | 5,900 | 5,900 |
| TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA | 2,589 | 2,589 |
| WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL | 170 | 170 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY | 100 | 100 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA | 1,889 | 1,889 |
| ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA | 12,085 | 12,085 |
| BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA | 53 | 53 |
| BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA | 48 | 48 |
| BONNET CARRE, LA | 2,909 | 2,909 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA | 1,399 | 1,399 |
| LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA | 498 | 498 |
| MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA | 567 | 567 |
| OLD RIVER, LA | 9,246 | 9,246 |
| TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA | 3,345 | 3,345 |
| GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS | 24 | 24 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS | 130 | 130 |
| VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS | 42 | 42 |
| YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS | 5,483 | 5,483 |
| YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS | 185 | 185 |
| YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS | 4,924 | 4,924 |
| YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS | 807 | 807 |
| YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS | 5,487 | 5,487 |
| YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS | 1,344 | 1,344 |
| YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS | 6,640 | 6,640 |
| YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS | 967 | 967 |
| 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 | 220 | 220 |
| WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO | 4,512 | 4,512 |

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN | 80 | 80 |
| MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN | 2,107 | 2,107 |
| SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES | 214,072 | 214,072 |
| REMAINING ITEMS | | |
| ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK | | |
| DREDGING | --- | 6,000 |
| FLOOD CONTROL | --- | 39,090 |
| OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES | --- | 5,000 |
| COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA (INVESTIGATIONS) | 9,700 | 9,700 |
| MAPPING (MAINTENANCE) | 1,138 | 1,138 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION | 90 | --- |
| SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS | 10,928 | 60,928 |
| TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES | 225,000 | 275,000 |

Lower Mississippi River Main Stem.—The budget request proposes to consolidate several activities across multiple states into one line item. The Committee does not support this change and instead continues to fund these activities as separate line items.

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.

Mississippi River Commission.—No funding is provided for this new line item. The Corps is directed to continue funding the costs of the commission from within the funds provided for activities within the Mississippi River and Tributaries project.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$2,908,511,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 2,710,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 3,058,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +149,489,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +348,000,000 |

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 \$3,058,000,000, \$149,489,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$348,000,000 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 | 158 | 158 |
| ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL | 21,238 | 21,238 |
| BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL | 43,295 | 43,295 |
| GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL | 5,869 | 5,869 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL | 65 | 65 |
| MOBILE HARBOR, AL | 23,230 | 23,230 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL | 148 | 148 |
| TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL & MS | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS | 24,725 | 24,725 |
| WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA | 10,644 | 10,644 |
| WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL | 25 | 25 |
| ALASKA | | |
| ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK | 11,904 | 11,904 |
| CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK | 3,615 | 3,615 |
| CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK | 400 | 400 |
| DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK | 1,231 | 1,231 |
| HOMER HARBOR, AK | 462 | 462 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK | 180 | 180 |
| KETCHIKAN, THOMAS BASIN, AK | 334 | 334 |
| LOWELL CREEK TUNNELL (SEWARD) AK | 2,286 | 2,286 |
| NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK | 345 | 345 |
| NOME HARBOR, AK | 1,550 | 1,550 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK | 700 | 700 |
| ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| ARIZONA | | |
| ALAMO LAKE, AZ | 1,472 | 1,472 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ | 71 | 71 |
| PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ | 1,024 | 1,024 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ | 133 | 133 |
| WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ | 367 | 367 |
| ARKANSAS | | |
| BEAVER LAKE, AR | 7,632 | 7,632 |
| BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR | 7,513 | 7,513 |
| BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR | 2,496 | 2,496 |
| BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR | 9,646 | 9,646 |
| DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR | 8,183 | 8,183 |
| DEGRAY LAKE, AR | 6,121 | 6,121 |
| DEQUEEN LAKE, AR | 1,754 | 1,754 |
| DIERKS LAKE, AR | 1,702 | 1,702 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| GILLHAM LAKE, AR | 1,519 | 1,519 |
| GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR | 9,474 | 9,474 |
| HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR | 15 | 15 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR | 538 | 538 |
| MCCELLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR | 30,554 | 30,554 |
| MILLWOOD LAKE, AR | 2,946 | 2,946 |
| NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR | 8,975 | 8,975 |
| NIMROD LAKE, AR | 2,520 | 2,520 |
| NORFORK LAKE, AR | 5,172 | 5,172 |
| OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR | 15 | 15 |
| OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA | 8,076 | 8,076 |
| OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR | 6,611 | 6,611 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR | 2 | 2 |
| WHITE RIVER, AR | 25 | 25 |
| YELLOW BEND PORT, AR | 3 | 3 |
| CALIFORNIA | | |
| BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA | 2,777 | 2,777 |
| BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA | 2,001 | 2,001 |
| COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA | 4,001 | 4,001 |
| DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA | 6,411 | 6,411 |
| FARMINGTON DAM, CA | 431 | 431 |
| HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA | 2,180 | 2,180 |
| HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA | 3,106 | 3,106 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA | 4,198 | 4,198 |
| ISABELLA LAKE, CA | 1,550 | 1,550 |
| LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA | 7,327 | 7,327 |
| MARINA DEL REY, CA | 3,846 | 3,846 |
| MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA | 387 | 387 |
| MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA | 389 | 389 |
| MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA | 3,070 | 3,070 |
| NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA | 2,993 | 2,993 |
| NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA | 1,998 | 1,998 |
| NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR, CA | 2,365 | 2,365 |
| OAKLAND HARBOR, CA | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA | 2,285 | 2,285 |
| PINE FLAT LAKE, CA | 3,409 | 3,409 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA | 1,794 | 1,794 |
| REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| RICHMOND HARBOR, CA | 12,243 | 12,243 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA | 2,042 | 2,042 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA | 1,100 | 1,100 |
| SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA | 160 | 160 |
| SAN FRANCISCO BAY DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA | 500 | 500 |
| SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 4,240 | 4,240 |
| SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA | 3,220 | 3,220 |
| SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA | 4,442 | 4,442 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA | 1,180 | 1,180 |
| SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA | 4,521 | 4,521 |
| SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA | 2,760 | 2,760 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA | 1,310 | 1,310 |
| SUCCESS LAKE, CA | 2,423 | 2,423 |
| SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA | 3,250 | 3,250 |
| TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA | 2,212 | 2,212 |
| VENTURA HARBOR, CA | 4,830 | 4,830 |
| YUBA RIVER, CA | 1,450 | 1,450 |
| COLORADO | | |
| BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO | 883 | 883 |
| CHATFIELD LAKE, CO | 1,919 | 1,919 |
| CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO | 1,677 | 1,677 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO | 364 | 364 |
| JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO | 2,865 | 2,865 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO | 529 | 529 |
| TRINIDAD LAKE, CO | 1,449 | 1,449 |
| CONNECTICUT | | |
| BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT | 603 | 603 |
| COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT | 708 | 708 |
| HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT | 686 | 686 |
| HOP BROOK LAKE, CT | 1,113 | 1,113 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, CT | 10 | 10 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT | 260 | 260 |
| MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT | 647 | 647 |
| NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT | 743 | 743 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT | 850 | 850 |
| STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT | 566 | 566 |
| THOMASTON DAM, CT | 1,026 | 1,026 |
| WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT | 1,753 | 1,753 |
| DELAWARE | | |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DE | 40 | 40 |
| INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD | 13,429 | 13,429 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE | 200 | 200 |
| WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE | 3,845 | 3,845 |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | | |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC | 142 | 142 |
| POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 875 | 875 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC | 25 | 25 |
| WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC | 25 | 25 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| FLORIDA | | |
| CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL | 4,430 | 4,430 |
| CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL | 14,683 | 14,683 |
| ESCAMBIA AND CONECHU RIVERS, FL & AL | 1,123 | 1,123 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL | 1,450 | 1,450 |
| INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL | 700 | 700 |
| JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA | 7,269 | 7,269 |
| MANATEE HARBOR, FL | 400 | 400 |
| MIAMI HARBOR, FL | 250 | 250 |
| OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL | 2,750 | 2,750 |
| PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL | 1,840 | 1,840 |
| PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL | 300 | 300 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL | 1,425 | 1,425 |
| REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL | 33 | 33 |
| SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL | 7,181 | 7,181 |
| TAMPA HARBOR, FL | 9,500 | 9,500 |
| WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL | 40 | 40 |
| GEORGIA | | |
| ALLATOONA LAKE, GA | 7,406 | 7,406 |
| APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL | 1,525 | 1,525 |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA | 176 | 176 |
| BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA | 5,808 | 5,808 |
| BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA | 12,141 | 12,141 |
| CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA | 7,584 | 7,584 |
| HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC | 11,175 | 11,175 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, GA | 12 | 12 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA | 190 | 190 |
| J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC | 9,887 | 9,887 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA | 125 | 125 |
| RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC | 8,065 | 8,065 |
| SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA | 17,321 | 17,321 |
| SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA | 105 | 105 |
| WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL | 7,000 | 7,000 |
| HAWAII | | |
| BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI | 317 | 317 |
| HONOLULU HARBOR, HI | 5,600 | 5,600 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI | 725 | 725 |
| KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI | 773 | 773 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI | 798 | 798 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| IDAHO | | |
| ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID | 1,337 | 1,337 |
| DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID | 2,983 | 2,983 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID | 377 | 377 |
| LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID | 2,806 | 2,806 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID | 623 | 623 |
| ILLINOIS | | |
| CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN | 4,506 | 4,506 |
| CARLYLE LAKE, IL | 5,837 | 5,837 |
| CHICAGO HARBOR, IL | 3,735 | 3,735 |
| CHICAGO RIVER, IL | 560 | 560 |
| FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL | 296 | 296 |
| ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN | 48,709 | 48,709 |
| ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN | 1,826 | 1,826 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, IL | 50 | 50 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL | 2,393 | 2,393 |
| KASKASKIA RIVER BASIN, IL | 3,648 | 3,648 |
| LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL | 784 | 784 |
| LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL | 6,208 | 6,208 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION), IL | 82,208 | 82,208 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION), IL | 22,226 | 22,226 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL | 104 | 104 |
| REND LAKE, IL | 5,606 | 5,606 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL | 741 | 741 |
| WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL | 1,439 | 1,439 |
| INDIANA | | |
| BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN | 1,128 | 1,128 |
| BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN | 1,852 | 1,852 |
| CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN | 1,628 | 1,628 |
| CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN | 1,656 | 1,656 |
| INDIANA HARBOR, IN | 11,339 | 11,339 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN | 1,124 | 1,124 |
| J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN | 1,950 | 1,950 |
| MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN | 1,235 | 1,235 |
| MONROE LAKE, IN | 1,226 | 1,226 |
| PATOKA LAKE, IN | 1,222 | 1,222 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN | 185 | 185 |
| SALAMONIE LAKE, IN | 1,154 | 1,154 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN | 141 | 141 |
| IOWA | | |
| CORALVILLE LAKE, IA | 4,204 | 4,204 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA | 762 | 762 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA, KS, MO & NE | 9,143 | 9,143 |
| MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY, IA, KS, MO, MT, NE, ND & SD | 5,436 | 5,436 |
| RATHBUN LAKE, IA | 2,913 | 2,913 |
| RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA | 4,725 | 4,725 |
| SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA | 5,266 | 5,266 |
| KANSAS | | |
| CLINTON LAKE, KS | 2,441 | 2,441 |
| COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS | 1,502 | 1,502 |
| EL DORADO LAKE, KS | 2,701 | 2,701 |
| ELK CITY LAKE, KS | 951 | 951 |
| FALL RIVER LAKE, KS | 1,136 | 1,136 |
| HILLSDALE LAKE, KS | 976 | 976 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS | 944 | 944 |
| JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS | 1,549 | 1,549 |
| KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS | 2,915 | 2,915 |
| MARION LAKE, KS | 3,207 | 3,207 |
| MELVERN LAKE, KS | 2,444 | 2,444 |
| MILFORD LAKE, KS | 2,376 | 2,376 |
| PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS | 1,552 | 1,552 |
| PERRY LAKE, KS | 2,485 | 2,485 |
| POMONA LAKE, KS | 2,259 | 2,259 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS | 290 | 290 |
| TORONTO LAKE, KS | 724 | 724 |
| TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS | 3,142 | 3,142 |
| WILSON LAKE, KS | 1,911 | 1,911 |
| KENTUCKY | | |
| BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN | 11,554 | 11,554 |
| BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY | 2,993 | 2,993 |
| BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY | 1,904 | 1,904 |
| BUCKHORN LAKE, KY | 1,725 | 1,725 |
| CARR CREEK LAKE, KY | 1,969 | 1,969 |
| CAVE RUN LAKE, KY | 1,038 | 1,038 |
| DEWEY LAKE, KY | 1,853 | 1,853 |
| ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY | 15 | 15 |
| FALLS OF THE OHIO NATIONAL WILDLIFE, KY & IN | 19 | 19 |
| FISHTRAP LAKE, KY | 2,075 | 2,075 |
| GRAYSON LAKE, KY | 1,526 | 1,526 |
| GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY | 2,139 | 2,139 |
| GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY | 2,709 | 2,709 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY | 975 | 975 |
| KENTUCKY RIVER, KY | 10 | 10 |
| LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY | 2,042 | 2,042 |
| MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY | 1,091 | 1,091 |
| MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY | 264 | 264 |
| NOLIN LAKE, KY | 2,743 | 2,743 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH | 31,219 | 31,219 |
| OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV | 5,600 | 5,600 |
| PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY | 1,430 | 1,430 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY | 2 | 2 |
| ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY | 2,826 | 2,826 |
| TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY | 1,444 | 1,444 |
| WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY | 9,189 | 9,189 |
| YATESVILLE LAKE, KY | 1,215 | 1,215 |
| LOUISIANA | | |
| ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA | 7,051 | 7,051 |
| BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA | 108 | 108 |
| BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA | 1,221 | 1,221 |
| BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA | 956 | 956 |
| BAYOU PIERRE, LA | 23 | 23 |
| BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA | 15 | 15 |
| BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA | 5 | 5 |
| BAYOU TECHE, LA | 72 | 72 |
| CADDO LAKE, LA | 209 | 209 |
| CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA | 20,386 | 20,386 |
| FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA | 1,547 | 1,547 |
| GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA | 19,681 | 19,681 |
| HOUUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA | 1,276 | 1,276 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA | 961 | 961 |
| J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA | 8,782 | 8,782 |
| LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA | 14 | 14 |
| MADISON PARISH PORT, LA | 4 | 4 |
| MERMENTAU RIVER, LA | 1,374 | 1,374 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA | 1,575 | 1,575 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LA | 85,866 | 85,866 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA | 49 | 49 |
| REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA | 384 | 384 |
| WALLACE LAKE, LA | 226 | 226 |
| WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA | 6 | 6 |
| WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA | 15 | 15 |
| MAINE | | |
| DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME | 1,050 | 1,050 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, ME | 5 | 5 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME | 111 | 111 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME | 1,100 | 1,100 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME | 25 | 25 |
| MARYLAND | | |
| BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD | 18,925 | 18,925 |
| BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 325 | 325 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV | 150 | 150 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD | 162 | 162 |
| JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV | 1,905 | 1,905 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD | 450 | 450 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD | 61 | 61 |
| WICOMICO RIVER, MD | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| MASSACHUSETTS | | |
| BARRE FALLS DAM, MA | 718 | 718 |
| BIRCH HILL DAM, MA | 933 | 933 |
| BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA | 609 | 609 |
| CAPE COD CANAL, MA | 9,665 | 9,665 |
| CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA | 388 | 388 |
| CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA | 609 | 609 |
| EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA | 772 | 772 |
| HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA | 620 | 620 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, MA | 20 | 20 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA | 331 | 331 |
| KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA | 841 | 841 |
| LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA | 790 | 790 |
| NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA | 806 | 806 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA | 900 | 900 |
| TULLY LAKE, MA | 721 | 721 |
| WEST HILL DAM, MA | 831 | 831 |
| WESTVILLE LAKE, MA | 603 | 603 |
| WEYMOUTH-FORE RIVER, MA | 500 | 500 |
| MICHIGAN | | |
| CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI | 180 | 180 |
| DETROIT RIVER, MI | 5,475 | 5,475 |
| GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI | 1,015 | 1,015 |
| HOLLAND HARBOR, MI | 750 | 750 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI | 210 | 210 |
| KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI | 28 | 28 |
| LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI | 590 | 590 |
| MANISTEE HARBOR, MI | 650 | 650 |
| MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI | 1,400 | 1,400 |
| ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI | 850 | 850 |
| PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI | 596 | 596 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI | 710 | 710 |
| ROUGE RIVER, MI | 900 | 900 |
| SAGINAW RIVER, MI | 2,775 | 2,775 |
| SEBEWAING RIVER, MI | 40 | 40 |
| ST CLAIR RIVER, MI | 665 | 665 |
| ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI | 1,590 | 1,590 |
| ST MARYS RIVER, MI | 31,160 | 31,160 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI | 2,788 | 2,788 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| MINNESOTA | | |
| BIGSTONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD | 257 | 257 |
| DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI | 6,641 | 6,641 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN | 332 | 332 |
| LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN | 1,805 | 1,805 |
| MINNESOTA RIVER, MN | 262 | 262 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION), MN | 58,644 | 58,644 |
| ORWELL LAKE, MN | 468 | 468 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN | 88 | 88 |
| RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN | 184 | 184 |
| RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN | 4,240 | 4,240 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN | 490 | 490 |
| TWO HARBORS, MN | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| MISSISSIPPI | | |
| CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS | 1 | 1 |
| EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS | 285 | 285 |
| GULFPORT HARBOR, MS | 4,492 | 4,492 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS | 92 | 92 |
| MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS | 34 | 34 |
| OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS | 1,569 | 1,569 |
| PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS | 7,055 | 7,055 |
| PEARL RIVER, MS & LA | 150 | 150 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS | 150 | 150 |
| ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS | 9 | 9 |
| WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS | 15 | 15 |
| YAZOO RIVER, MS | 21 | 21 |
| MISSOURI | | |
| CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO | 15 | 15 |
| CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO | 8,813 | 8,813 |
| CLEARWATER LAKE, MO | 3,353 | 3,353 |
| HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO | 9,698 | 9,698 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO | 1,401 | 1,401 |
| LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO | 950 | 950 |
| LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO | 882 | 882 |
| MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN THE OHIO AND MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL | 24,487 | 24,487 |
| NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MO | 10 | 10 |
| NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO (MILE 889) | 15 | 15 |
| POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO | 2,739 | 2,739 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO | 2 | 2 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO | 90 | 90 |
| SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO | 1,620 | 1,620 |
| SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO | 1 | 1 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| STOCKTON LAKE, MO | 4,960 | 4,960 |
| TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR | 9,352 | 9,352 |
| MONTANA | | |
| FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT | 5,271 | 5,271 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT | 206 | 206 |
| LIBBY DAM, MT | 2,088 | 2,088 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT | 125 | 125 |
| NEBRASKA | | |
| GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD | 9,726 | 9,726 |
| HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE | 3,742 | 3,742 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE | 505 | 505 |
| MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA | 90 | 90 |
| PAPILLION CREEK, NE | 989 | 989 |
| SALT CREEKS AND TRIBUTARIES, NE | 1,089 | 1,089 |
| NEVADA | | |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV | 75 | 75 |
| MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA | 1,163 | 1,163 |
| PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV | 353 | 353 |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | | |
| BLACKWATER DAM, NH | 674 | 674 |
| EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH | 863 | 863 |
| FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH | 1,007 | 1,007 |
| HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH | 1,348 | 1,348 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH | 76 | 76 |
| OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH | 740 | 740 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH | 250 | 250 |
| SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH | 1,139 | 1,139 |
| NEW JERSEY | | |
| BARNEGAT INLET, NJ | 425 | 425 |
| COLD SPRING INLET, NJ | 375 | 375 |
| DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ | 15 | 15 |
| DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE | 23,305 | 23,305 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ | 285 | 285 |
| MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ | 420 | 420 |
| NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ | 260 | 260 |
| NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ | 300 | 300 |
| PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ | 605 | 605 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ | 1,893 | 1,893 |
| RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ | 150 | 150 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| RARITAN RIVER, NJ | 150 | 150 |
| SHARK RIVER, NJ | 460 | 460 |
| NEW MEXICO | | |
| ABIQUIU DAM, NM | 3,357 | 3,357 |
| COCHITI LAKE, NM | 3,172 | 3,172 |
| CONCHAS LAKE, NM | 2,616 | 2,616 |
| GALISTEO DAM, NM | 762 | 762 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, NM | 20 | 20 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM | 650 | 650 |
| JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM | 1,047 | 1,047 |
| MIDDLE RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, NM | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM | 1,894 | 1,894 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM | 330 | 330 |
| TWO RIVERS DAM, NM | 1,028 | 1,028 |
| UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM | 1,300 | 1,300 |
| NEW YORK | | |
| ALMOND LAKE, NY | 439 | 439 |
| ARKPORT DAM, NY | 307 | 307 |
| BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY | 1,735 | 1,735 |
| BUFFALO HARBOR, NY | 320 | 320 |
| BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY | 100 | 100 |
| EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY | 220 | 220 |
| EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY | 906 | 906 |
| FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY | 50 | 50 |
| FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY | 50 | 50 |
| HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT) | 3,640 | 3,640 |
| HUDSON RIVER, NY (O & C) | 4,250 | 4,250 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY | 1,220 | 1,220 |
| JAMAICA BAY, NY | 251 | 251 |
| LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY | 100 | 100 |
| MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY | 3,595 | 3,595 |
| NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY | 400 | 400 |
| NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ | 5,480 | 5,480 |
| NEW YORK HARBOR, NY | 3,650 | 3,650 |
| NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 9,300 | 9,300 |
| NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS) | 1,045 | 1,045 |
| OSWEGO HARBOR, NY | 1,285 | 1,285 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY | 2,193 | 2,193 |
| ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY | 2,320 | 2,320 |
| RONDOUT HARBOR, NY | 250 | 250 |
| SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY | 587 | 587 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY | 616 | 616 |
| WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY | 1,120 | 1,120 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| NORTH CAROLINA | | |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC | 2,600 | 2,600 |
| B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC | 2,049 | 2,049 |
| CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC | 772 | 772 |
| FALLS LAKE, NC | 1,776 | 1,776 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC | 270 | 270 |
| MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC | 50 | 50 |
| MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC | 8,796 | 8,796 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC | 700 | 700 |
| ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC | 300 | 300 |
| SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC | 300 | 300 |
| W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC | 3,363 | 3,363 |
| WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC | 15,019 | 15,019 |
| NORTH DAKOTA | | |
| BOWMAN HALEY, ND | 186 | 186 |
| GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND | 13,290 | 13,290 |
| HOMME LAKE, ND | 284 | 284 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND | 332 | 332 |
| LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND | 1,533 | 1,533 |
| PIPESTEM LAKE, ND | 518 | 518 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND | 127 | 127 |
| SOURIS RIVER, ND | 382 | 382 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND | 32 | 32 |
| OHIO | | |
| ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH | 1,715 | 1,715 |
| BERLIN LAKE, OH | 2,360 | 2,360 |
| CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH | 2,035 | 2,035 |
| CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH | 1,251 | 1,251 |
| CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH | 9,540 | 9,540 |
| CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH | 2,665 | 2,665 |
| DEER CREEK LAKE, OH | 1,398 | 1,398 |
| DELAWARE LAKE, OH | 1,773 | 1,773 |
| DILLON LAKE, OH | 1,333 | 1,333 |
| FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH | 190 | 190 |
| HURON HARBOR, OH | 3,200 | 3,200 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH | 697 | 697 |
| MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH | 66 | 66 |
| MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH | 1,201 | 1,201 |
| MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH | 1,429 | 1,429 |
| MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH | 10,584 | 10,584 |
| NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH | 400 | 400 |
| OHIO-MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH | 1,792 | 1,792 |
| PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH | 1,396 | 1,396 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH | 305 | 305 |
| ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH | 36 | 36 |
| SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH | 258 | 258 |
| TOLEDO HARBOR, OH | 7,165 | 7,165 |
| TOM JENKINS DAM, OH | 780 | 780 |
| WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH | 959 | 959 |
| WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH | 1,595 | 1,595 |
| OKLAHOMA | | |
| ARCADIA LAKE, OK | 472 | 472 |
| BIRCH LAKE, OK | 673 | 673 |
| BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK | 2,213 | 2,213 |
| CANTON LAKE, OK | 4,350 | 4,350 |
| COPAN LAKE, OK | 1,666 | 1,666 |
| EUFULA LAKE, OK | 5,748 | 5,748 |
| FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK | 5,593 | 5,593 |
| FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK | 1,173 | 1,173 |
| GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK | 432 | 432 |
| HEYBURN LAKE, OK | 820 | 820 |
| HUGO LAKE, OK | 1,996 | 1,996 |
| HULAH LAKE, OK | 3,792 | 3,792 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK | 141 | 141 |
| KAW LAKE, OK | 1,967 | 1,967 |
| KEYSTONE LAKE, OK | 3,891 | 3,891 |
| MCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK | 5,662 | 5,662 |
| OLOGAH LAKE, OK | 2,573 | 2,573 |
| OPTIMA LAKE, OK | 36 | 36 |
| PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK | 148 | 148 |
| PINE CREEK LAKE, OK | 1,366 | 1,366 |
| ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK | 6,360 | 6,360 |
| SARDIS LAKE, OK | 991 | 991 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| SKIATOOK LAKE, OK | 1,676 | 1,676 |
| TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK | 4,697 | 4,697 |
| WAURIKA LAKE, OK | 1,622 | 1,622 |
| WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK | 6,354 | 6,354 |
| WISTER LAKE, OK | 829 | 829 |
| OREGON | | |
| APPLEGATE LAKE, OR | 1,018 | 1,018 |
| BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR | 1,128 | 1,128 |
| BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA | 7,570 | 7,570 |
| COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA | 19,825 | 19,825 |
| COOS BAY, OR | 6,239 | 6,239 |
| COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR | 1,349 | 1,349 |
| COUGAR LAKE, OR | 5,466 | 5,466 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| DETROIT LAKE, OR | 1,131 | 1,131 |
| DORENA LAKE, OR | 1,168 | 1,168 |
| ELK CREEK LAKE, OR | 386 | 386 |
| FALL CREEK LAKE, OR | 5,224 | 5,224 |
| FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR | 1,727 | 1,727 |
| GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR | 2,161 | 2,161 |
| HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR | 1,381 | 1,381 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, OR | 20 | 20 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR | 1,040 | 1,040 |
| JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA | 4,865 | 4,865 |
| LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR | 2,371 | 2,371 |
| LOST CREEK LAKE, OR | 4,004 | 4,004 |
| MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA | 7,011 | 7,011 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR | 400 | 400 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR | 86 | 86 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR | 2,598 | 2,598 |
| WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR | 128 | 128 |
| WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR | 200 | 200 |
| WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR | 909 | 909 |
| YAUQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR | 3,002 | 3,002 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | |
| ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA | 5,317 | 5,317 |
| ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA | 740 | 740 |
| AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA | 345 | 345 |
| BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA | 1,290 | 1,290 |
| BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA | 2,774 | 2,774 |
| CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA | 1,347 | 1,347 |
| COWANESQUE LAKE, PA | 1,896 | 1,896 |
| CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA | 1,731 | 1,731 |
| CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA | 851 | 851 |
| DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ | 5,460 | 5,460 |
| EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA | 1,205 | 1,205 |
| ERIE HARBOR, PA | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA | 1,178 | 1,178 |
| FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA | 905 | 905 |
| GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA | 385 | 385 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA | 1,179 | 1,179 |
| JOHNSTOWN, PA | 62 | 62 |
| KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA | 1,191 | 1,191 |
| LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA | 1,682 | 1,682 |
| MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA | 1,308 | 1,308 |
| MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA | 15,986 | 15,986 |
| OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV | 47,965 | 47,965 |
| OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV | 800 | 800 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA | 170 | 170 |
| PROMPTON LAKE, PA | 585 | 585 |
| PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA | 27 | 27 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA | 5,357 | 5,357 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA | 45 | 45 |
| SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA | 2,031 | 2,031 |
| STILLWATER LAKE, PA | 570 | 570 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA | 106 | 106 |
| TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA | 2,611 | 2,611 |
| TIONESTA LAKE, PA | 2,032 | 2,032 |
| UNION CITY LAKE, PA | 414 | 414 |
| WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA | 944 | 944 |
| YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA | 1,463 | 1,463 |
| YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD | 3,274 | 3,274 |
| PUERTO RICO | | |
| SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR | 5,700 | 5,700 |
| RHODE ISLAND | | |
| BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI | 350 | 350 |
| FOX POINT BARRIER, NARRANGANSETT BAY, RI | 2,636 | 2,636 |
| GREAT SALT POND, BLOCK ISLAND, RI | 350 | 350 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, RI | 25 | 25 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI | 48 | 48 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI | 350 | 350 |
| WOONSOCKET, RI | 499 | 499 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC | 100 | 100 |
| CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC | 17,059 | 17,059 |
| COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC | 6,930 | 6,930 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC | 65 | 65 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC | 875 | 875 |
| TOWN CREEK, SC | 530 | 530 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | | |
| BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD | 10,363 | 10,363 |
| COLD BROOK LAKE, SD | 355 | 355 |
| COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD | 313 | 313 |
| FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD | 11,253 | 11,253 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD | 169 | 169 |
| LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN | 594 | 594 |
| OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND | 12,222 | 12,222 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD | 143 | 143 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| TENNESSEE | | |
| CENTER HILL LAKE, TN | 5,893 | 5,893 |
| CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN | 9,429 | 9,429 |
| CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN | 1,630 | 1,630 |
| CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN | 7,210 | 7,210 |
| DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN | 6,824 | 6,824 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN | 182 | 182 |
| J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN | 5,060 | 5,060 |
| NORTHWEST TENNESSEE REGIONAL HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, TN | 10 | 10 |
| OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN | 10,416 | 10,416 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN | 2 | 2 |
| TENNESSEE RIVER, TN | 23,759 | 23,759 |
| WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN | 250 | 250 |
| TEXAS | | |
| AQUILLA LAKE, TX | 1,727 | 1,727 |
| ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX | 1,660 | 1,660 |
| BARDWELL LAKE, TX | 2,621 | 2,621 |
| BELTON LAKE, TX | 4,654 | 4,654 |
| BENBROOK LAKE, TX | 2,612 | 2,612 |
| BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX | 2,700 | 2,700 |
| BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX | 2,612 | 2,612 |
| CANYON LAKE, TX | 3,897 | 3,897 |
| CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX | 1,478 | 1,478 |
| CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX | 168 | 168 |
| CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 8,750 | 8,750 |
| DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX | 9,656 | 9,656 |
| ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX | 33 | 33 |
| FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX | 3,408 | 3,408 |
| FREEPORT HARBOR, TX | 5,800 | 5,800 |
| GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX | 10,900 | 10,900 |
| GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX | 2,700 | 2,700 |
| GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX | 2,624 | 2,624 |
| GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX | 3,191 | 3,191 |
| GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX | 23,785 | 23,785 |
| HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX | 1,555 | 1,555 |
| HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 32,633 | 32,633 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX | 1,937 | 1,937 |
| JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX | 1,466 | 1,466 |
| JOE POOL LAKE, TX | 1,130 | 1,130 |
| LAKE KEMP, TX | 302 | 302 |
| LAVON LAKE, TX | 4,267 | 4,267 |
| LEWISVILLE DAM, TX | 4,035 | 4,035 |
| MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX | 3,839 | 3,839 |
| NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX | 2,226 | 2,226 |
| O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX | 860 | 860 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX | 1,065 | 1,065 |
| PROCTOR LAKE, TX | 2,644 | 2,644 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX | 300 | 300 |
| RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX | 2,217 | 2,217 |
| SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX | 14,100 | 14,100 |
| SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX | 7,613 | 7,613 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX | 271 | 271 |
| SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX | 3,075 | 3,075 |
| STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX | 2,413 | 2,413 |
| TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX | 3,894 | 3,894 |
| WACO LAKE, TX | 6,614 | 6,614 |
| WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX | 1,999 | 1,999 |
| WHITNEY LAKE, TX | 7,007 | 7,007 |
| WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX | 4,270 | 4,270 |
| UTAH | | |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT | 40 | 40 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT | 655 | 655 |
| VERMONT | | |
| BALL MOUNTAIN, VT | 930 | 930 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT | 46 | 46 |
| NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY | 40 | 40 |
| NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT | 1,067 | 1,067 |
| NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT | 1,038 | 1,038 |
| TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT | 1,026 | 1,026 |
| UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT | 811 | 811 |
| VIRGINIA | | |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA | 2,525 | 2,525 |
| ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA | 1,130 | 1,130 |
| CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA | 600 | 600 |
| GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA | 2,070 | 2,070 |
| HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HARBOR, VA (DRIFT REMOVAL) | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| HAMPTON ROADS, VA (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS) | 114 | 114 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA | 297 | 297 |
| JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA | 4,006 | 4,006 |
| JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC | 10,976 | 10,976 |
| JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA | 2,347 | 2,347 |
| LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA | 500 | 500 |
| NORFOLK HARBOR, VA | 12,543 | 12,543 |
| NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA | 685 | 685 |
| PHILPOTT LAKE, VA | 5,023 | 5,023 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA | 1,298 | 1,298 |
| RUDEE INLET, VA | 400 | 400 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, VA | 135 | 135 |
| WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA | 50 | 50 |
| WASHINGTON | | |
| CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA | 672 | 672 |
| COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND, OR | 38,132 | 38,132 |
| COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR | 1,001 | 1,001 |
| COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID (CRFM) | 3,498 | 3,498 |
| EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA | 1,358 | 1,358 |
| GRAYS HARBOR (38-FOOT DEEPENING), WA | 12,018 | 12,018 |
| HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA | 3,347 | 3,347 |
| ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA | 9,172 | 9,172 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WA | 70 | 70 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA | 1,087 | 1,087 |
| LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA | 8,872 | 8,872 |
| LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA | 7,267 | 7,267 |
| LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA | 3,222 | 3,222 |
| LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA | 6,695 | 6,695 |
| MILL CREEK LAKE, WA | 2,255 | 2,255 |
| MOUNT SAINT HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA | 268 | 268 |
| MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA | 9,548 | 9,548 |
| NEAH BAY, WA | 275 | 275 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA | 580 | 580 |
| PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA | 100 | 100 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA | 423 | 423 |
| SEATTLE HARBOR, WA | 565 | 565 |
| STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA | 290 | 290 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA | 64 | 64 |
| TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA | 155 | 155 |
| THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR | 10,931 | 10,931 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | | |
| BEECH FORK LAKE, WV | 1,330 | 1,330 |
| BLUESTONE LAKE, WV | 2,043 | 2,043 |
| BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV | 2,458 | 2,458 |
| EAST LYNN LAKE, WV | 2,497 | 2,497 |
| ELKINS, WV | 55 | 55 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV | 424 | 424 |
| KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV | 8,258 | 8,258 |
| OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH | 38,310 | 38,310 |
| OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH | 2,977 | 2,977 |
| R D BAILEY LAKE, WV | 2,266 | 2,266 |
| STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV | 1,160 | 1,160 |
| SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV | 2,432 | 2,432 |
| SUTTON LAKE, WV | 2,412 | 2,412 |
| TYGART LAKE, WV | 2,397 | 2,397 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| WISCONSIN | | |
| EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI | 808 | 808 |
| FOX RIVER, WI | 2,489 | 2,489 |
| GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI | 2,885 | 2,885 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI | 52 | 52 |
| KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI | 15 | 15 |
| MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI | 845 | 845 |
| MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI | 1,600 | 1,600 |
| PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI | 304 | 304 |
| STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI | 19 | 19 |
| SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI | 567 | 567 |
| WYOMING | | |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS, WY | 12 | 12 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY | 74 | 74 |
| JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY | 2,104 | 2,104 |
| SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY | 234 | 234 |
| SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS LISTED UNDER STATES | 2,523,734 | 2,523,734 |
| REMAINING ITEMS | | |
| ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK | | |
| NAVIGATION MAINTENANCE | | |
| DEEP-DRAFT HARBOR AND CHANNEL | --- | 234,000 |
| INLAND WATERWAYS | --- | 42,000 |
| SMALL, REMOTE, OR SUBSISTENCE NAVIGATION | --- | 42,500 |
| OTHER AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES | --- | 35,100 |
| 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 |
| CIVIL WORKS WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CWWMS) | 15,000 | 5,000 |
| COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM | 2,700 | 2,700 |
| COASTAL OCEAN DATA SYSTEM (CODS) | 3,000 | 5,400 |
| 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 |

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

| | BUDGET REQUEST | HOUSE RECOMMENDED |
|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| FACILITY PROTECTION | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| FISH & WILDLIFE OPERATING FISH HATCHERY REIMBURSEMENT | 4,700 | 4,700 |
| GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL | 600 | 600 |
| HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION | 795 | 795 |
| INLAND WATERWAY NAVIGATION CHARTS | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| INSPECTION OF COMPLETED FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS | 28,000 | 28,000 |
| INTERAGENCY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TASK FORCE/HURRICANE PROTECTION DECISION- | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| MONITORING OF COMPLETED NAVIGATION PROJECTS | 3,300 | 3,300 |
| NATIONAL COASTAL MAPPING PROGRAM | 6,300 | 6,300 |
| NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM (PORTFOLIO RISK ASSESSMENT) | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP) | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| NATIONAL (LEVEE) FLOOD INVENTORY | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| NATIONAL (MULTIPLE PROJECT) NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT FOR REALLOCATIONS | 1,071 | 1,071 |
| PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL SUPPORT | 1,481 | 1,481 |
| RECREATIONONESTOP (R1S) NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION SERVICE | 65 | 65 |
| REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHAB. | 300 | 300 |
| RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AT CORPS PROJECTS | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| REVIEW OF NON-FEDERAL ALTERATIONS OF CIVIL WORKS PROJECTS (SECTION 408) | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS | 4,669 | 4,669 |
| WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) | 500 | 2,500 |
| SUBTOTAL, REMAINING ITEMS | 186,266 | 534,266 |
| TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | 2,710,000 | 3,058,000 |

Emerging Harbor Projects.—The recommendation includes funding for individual projects defined as emerging harbor projects (in section 210(f)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986) that exceeds the funding levels envisioned in section 210(c)(3) and 210(d)(1)(ii) of WRDA 1986.

Great Lakes Navigation System.—The recommendation includes funding for individual projects within this System that exceeds the funding level envisioned in section 210(d)(1)(B)(ii) of WRDA 1986.

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; and

—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 notes that the budget request for this category of projects has increased over the past few years and urges the Corps to continue this effort to provide a reasonable and equitable allocation under this account.

Water Operations Technical Support (WOTS).—Funding in addition to the budget request is included to continue research into atmospheric rivers first funded in fiscal year 2015.

Dredged Material Disposal.—The Corps is directed to review its policies regarding dredged material disposal to determine whether these policies continue to be the most appropriate given changing

economic and environmental realities. The review shall include, at a minimum, policy limitations in the study phase, including limitations on analyzing confined disposal facilities not yet in operation, even if use of those facilities would save the Federal government money over the long term; the sequencing of dredged material disposal sites and individual project efforts; cost share policies, including the roles and responsibilities relative to non-Federal sponsors; changing environmental considerations, including any challenges to the Federal standard for in-water disposal; and long-term capacity concerns, including any increases due to anticipated harbor improvements. In conducting this review, the Corps shall solicit and incorporate the views of interested stakeholders and other parties independent of the Administration. The Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than nine months after the enactment of this Act a report describing the results of this review, including detailed recommendations for any changes to Federal dredged material disposal policies necessary to responsibly address the maintenance of Federal navigation channels.

Ririe Reservoir, Idaho.—The Committee appreciates the cooperation to date of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to allow limited increases in the amount of water carried over through the winter flood season without increasing flood risk. Water users are interested in additional winter water storage, however, but the potential paths forward are not clear. The Corps and Reclamation are directed to work together to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 21 days after the enactment of this Act a single report describing options the water users could pursue for additional water carryover. The report should detail for each option the roles and responsibilities of each federal agency as well as the water users, including funding requirements, process challenges to be addressed, an approximate schedule through implementation, any policy or statutory changes necessary, and other relevant information the water users would need to make an informed decision on whether and how they might wish to proceed.

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.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$200,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 205,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 200,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -5,000,000 |

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 2015 and \$5,000,000 below the budget request. The funding increase proposed in the budget request is described as necessary to support Clean Water Act rulemaking activities and rule implementation related to proposed revisions to the definition of waters of the United States. Since the Committee includes legislative language prohibiting the Corps from carrying out these activities, the associated funding increase is unnecessary. The funding provided is therefore sufficient to maintain, at a minimum, staffing needs and scientific and technological support for traditional program activities such as processing permit applications and conducting the work necessary to reissue the Nationwide permits in 2017.

In fiscal year 2014 and again in fiscal year 2015, the Committee raised a concern with the Corps' changed interpretation of Clean Water Act requirements related to the identification of a specified end-user. Congress rejected the new interpretation. Unfortunately, the Committee continues to hear concerns on this issue. The Committee again directs the Corps to ensure that all field offices adhere in all instances to the interpretations directed by the Congress. The previous 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 organizations 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.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$101,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 104,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 104,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +2,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (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 \$104,000,000, \$2,500,000 above fiscal year 2015 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, 2015 | \$28,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 34,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 34,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +6,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 \$34,000,000 for this account, \$6,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

EXPENSES

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$178,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 180,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 180,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +2,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 \$180,000,000, \$2,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

The Committee reiterates direction provided in fiscal year 2015 regarding implementation of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) of 2014.

Public-Private Partnership Program.—The Committee is aware of the strong support of many Members of the House of Representatives for the public-private partnership (P3) program authorized in section 5014 of WRRDA 2014. As part of its Civil Works Transformation initiative, the Corps has been discussing for several years the idea of public-private partnerships as a project delivery tool to help sustain the performance of existing infrastructure and construct new infrastructure more quickly. Water resource projects are different from more traditional P3 projects in key ways, however, and these issues need to be addressed before a P3 program could be viable. The Corps is directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act a report detailing any work to date on developing public-private partnerships generally and on implementing section 5014 specifically (including a schedule for issuing implementation guidance). The report also shall include a list of any demonstration projects being evaluated and a detailed description of the goals, advances, and remaining challenges for each such demonstration project.

Flood Damage Reduction Projects on Federal Lands.—The Committee is aware that some locally owned and operated flood damage reduction projects are located, at least in part, on federal land. One such project is the R-616 levee, a portion of which is physically located on Offutt Air Force Base. Local entities can find it challenging to try to determine what assistance might be available in situations involving multiple federal agencies with multiple programs and authorities, especially when property is owned by multiple entities. To help minimize this challenge, the Corps is directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act a report describing existing programs, authorities, and funding options available to assist local sponsors with existing flood damage reduction projects located at least in part on federal land. The report shall include overall programmatic findings, as well as findings specific to the R-616 project. The Corps shall work with the other relevant federal agencies to describe available options specific to the R-616 project.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR CIVIL WORKS

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$3,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 5,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 4,750,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +1,750,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -250,000 |

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 \$4,750,000, \$1,750,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$250,000 below the budget request.

In the explanatory statement accompanying the fiscal year 2015 Act, the Committee detailed serious concerns about the breakdown in traditional roles and responsibilities between the White House, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASA(CW)), and the Corps headquarters. Unfortunately, to date, the Committee has not noticed significant improvements nor heard from the ASA(CW) regarding steps taken to address the issues raised. The Committee eagerly awaits that information.

The recommendation includes legislative language restricting the availability of 75 percent of the funding provided in this account until such time as at least 95 percent of the additional funding provided in each account has been allocated to specific programs, projects, or activities. As of the writing of this report—almost three months after the initial work plan submission—a significant portion of the additional funding provided in fiscal year 2015 remains unallocated, including 39 percent of the Investigations funding and 22 percent of the Construction funding. The Administration has not shown any sense of urgency to allocate this remaining funding even after repeated inquiries from this Committee. The legislative provision is intended to impress upon the Administration the importance the Committee places on the prudent and expeditious allocation of additional funding provided in fiscal year 2016.

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

The bill continues a provision prohibiting the use of funds to require permits for the discharge of dredged or fill material for certain agriculture activities. Identical language was included in the fiscal year 2015 Act. As articulated in report language in fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Committee has been concerned that the Corps has changed its interpretation of the Clean Water Act to significantly reduce the application of the statutory exemptions included in the Act. Since the Corps made no improvements to implementation in response to the report language, the Committee included statutory language in the fiscal year 2015 Act to prohibit the Corps from requiring permits for the specified activities without exception. Unfortunately the Administration misinterpreted that language, as well, and issued implementation guidance asserting that the fiscal year 2015 Act language simply reinforced current practice. The Corps is directed to implement the provision in this bill as it is intended—as a complete prohibition on requiring permits for the specified activities; the so-called “recapture provision” shall not apply to these activities.

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

The bill includes a provision regarding certain dredged material disposal activities.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$9,874,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 7,300,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 9,874,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +2,574,000 |

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

The Committee recommendation 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 the same as fiscal year 2015 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.

WESTERN DROUGHT

Extensive and exceptional drought continues to plague the Western United States. The U.S. Drought Monitor for March 31, 2015, shows that Montana is the only Reclamation state that is virtually drought free. All or significant portions of eleven Reclamation states are suffering from severe to exceptional drought. California has entered a fourth consecutive year of drought.

Drought conditions are difficult to address at the time the drought is occurring, but there are some things that can be done to stretch available water supplies. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior are encouraged to use all of the flexibility and tools available to mitigate the impacts of this drought.

The only way to mitigate the effects of future droughts, however, is through a strategy of providing a combination of additional storage, improved conveyance, and increased efficiencies in the uses of water both for agriculture and potable purposes. As the West has consistently been the fastest growing part of the country, it is incumbent on Reclamation, as the leading water purveyor in the West, to lead the way in increasing the water that is available from one year to the next and to research and develop more efficient uses of the water that is available.

California.—The Committee notes that, with last year's passage of California's Proposition 1, the California Water Commission is expected to begin in early 2017 allocating \$2,700,000,000 in funding for the public benefits of water storage projects. Reclamation,

in consultation with other relevant federal agencies, is encouraged to review planned activities, including schedules, to ensure that federal actions do not needlessly inhibit the ability of local entities to compete for these state funds.

FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET REQUEST AND COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATION

The fiscal year 2016 budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation totals \$1,098,668,000. The Committee recommendation totals \$1,094,668,000, \$35,458,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$4,000,000 below the budget request.

A table summarizing the fiscal year 2015 enacted appropriation, the fiscal year 2016 budget request, and the Committee recommendation is provided below:

(Dollars in thousands)

| Account | FY 2015 enacted | FY 2016 request | Cmte rec. |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Water and Related Resources | \$978,131 | \$805,157 | \$948,640 |
| Central Valley Project Restoration Fund | 56,995 | 49,528 | 49,528 |
| California Bay-Delta Restoration | 37,000 | 37,000 | 37,000 |
| Policy and Administration | 58,500 | 59,500 | 59,500 |
| Indian Water Rights Settlements | --- | 112,483 | --- |
| San Joaquin River Restoration Fund | --- | 35,000 | --- |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation | 1,130,626 | 1,098,668 | 1,094,668 |
| Rescission | -500 | --- | --- |
| Net Appropriation, Bureau of Reclamation | 1,130,126 | 1,098,668 | 1,094,668 |

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$978,131,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 805,157,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 948,640,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | -29,491,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +143,483,000 |

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 2016, the Committee recommends \$948,640,000, \$29,491,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$143,483,000 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 \$4,000,000 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 | | TOTAL |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------|
| | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES OM&R | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES OM&R | |
| FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT - ARKANSAS VALLEY CONDUIT | 500 | --- | 500 | --- | 500 |
| GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II | 603 | 2,606 | 603 | 2,606 | 3,209 |
| LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT | --- | 1,958 | --- | 1,958 | 1,958 |
| MANICOS PROJECT | 95 | 188 | 95 | 188 | 283 |
| NARROWS UNIT, P-SMBP | --- | 36 | --- | 36 | 36 |
| PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II | 1,293 | 2,679 | 1,293 | 2,679 | 3,972 |
| PINE RIVER PROJECT | 194 | 299 | 194 | 299 | 493 |
| SAN LOUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN | 307 | 3,637 | 307 | 3,637 | 3,944 |
| SAN LOUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CONEJOS DIVISION | 16 | 40 | 16 | 40 | 56 |
| UNCOMPAGRE PROJECT | 849 | 193 | 849 | 193 | 1,042 |
| UPPER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM | 270 | --- | 270 | --- | 270 |
| IDAHO | | | | | |
| BOISE AREA PROJECTS | 2,880 | 2,029 | 2,880 | 2,029 | 4,909 |
| COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT | 18,000 | --- | 18,000 | --- | 18,000 |
| LEWISTON ORCHARDS PROJECTS | 617 | 25 | 617 | 25 | 642 |
| MINIDOKA-AREA PROJECTS | 2,435 | 2,183 | 2,435 | 2,183 | 4,618 |
| PRESTON BENCH PROJECT | 4 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 12 |
| KANSAS | | | | | |
| ALMENA UNIT, P-SMBP | 40 | 496 | 40 | 496 | 536 |
| BOSTWICK UNIT, P-SMBP | 372 | 882 | 372 | 882 | 1,254 |
| CEDAR BLUFF UNIT, P-SMBP | 35 | 547 | 35 | 547 | 582 |
| GLEN ELDER UNIT, P-SMBP | 66 | 1,158 | 66 | 1,158 | 1,224 |
| KANSAS RIVER UNIT, P-SMBP | --- | 100 | --- | 100 | 100 |
| KIRWIN UNIT, P-SMBP | 36 | 408 | 36 | 408 | 444 |
| WEBSTER UNIT, P-SMBP | 12 | 1,629 | 12 | 1,629 | 1,641 |
| WICHITA PROJECT - CHENEY DIVISION | 88 | 426 | 88 | 426 | 514 |
| WICHITA PROJECT - EQUUS BEDS DIVISION | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MONTANA | | | | | |
| CANYON FERRY UNIT, P-SMBP | 246 | 6,268 | 246 | 6,268 | 6,514 |
| EAST BENCH UNIT, P-SMBP | 202 | 661 | 202 | 661 | 863 |
| FORT PECK RESERVATION / DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM | 3,700 | --- | 3,700 | --- | 3,700 |
| HELENA VALLEY UNIT, P-SMBP | 19 | 164 | 19 | 164 | 183 |
| HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT | --- | 422 | --- | 422 | 422 |
| HUNTLEY PROJECT | 12 | 45 | 12 | 45 | 57 |
| LOWER MARIAS UNIT, P-SMBP | 102 | 1,613 | 102 | 1,613 | 1,715 |

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | | | HOUSE RECOMMENDED | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------|
| | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES ON&R | TOTAL | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES ON&R | TOTAL |
| LOWER YELLOWSTONE PROJECT | 364 | 16 | 380 | 364 | 16 | 380 |
| MILK RIVER PROJECT | 548 | 1,487 | 2,035 | 548 | 1,487 | 2,035 |
| MISSOURI BASIN O&M, P-SMBP | 1,028 | 269 | 1,297 | 1,028 | 269 | 1,297 |
| ROCKY BOYS/NORTH CENTRAL MT RURAL WATER SYSTEM | 4,625 | --- | 4,625 | 4,625 | --- | 4,625 |
| SUN RIVER PROJECT | 153 | 253 | 406 | 153 | 253 | 406 |
| YELLOWTAIL UNIT, P-SMBP | 22 | 7,067 | 7,089 | 22 | 7,067 | 7,089 |
| NEBRASKA | | | | | | |
| AINSWORTH UNIT, P-SMBP | 64 | 115 | 179 | 64 | 115 | 179 |
| FRENCHMAN-CAMBRIDGE UNIT, P-SMBP | 335 | 2,065 | 2,400 | 335 | 2,065 | 2,400 |
| MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT | 13 | 110 | 123 | 13 | 110 | 123 |
| NORTH LOUP UNIT, P-SMBP | 89 | 142 | 231 | 89 | 142 | 231 |
| NEVADA | | | | | | |
| HALFWAY WASH PROJECT STUDY | | | | | | |
| LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT | 6,325 | 3,476 | 9,801 | 6,325 | 3,476 | 9,801 |
| LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 115 | --- | 115 | 115 | --- | 115 |
| LAKE MEAD /LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM | 700 | --- | 700 | 700 | --- | 700 |
| NEW MEXICO | | | | | | |
| CARLSBAD PROJECT | 2,812 | 1,327 | 4,139 | 2,812 | 1,327 | 4,139 |
| EASTERN NEW MEXICO RURAL WATER SUPPLY | 47 | --- | 47 | 47 | --- | 47 |
| MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT | 12,878 | 11,113 | 23,991 | 12,878 | 11,113 | 23,991 |
| RIO GRANDE PROJECT | 1,374 | 6,032 | 7,406 | 1,374 | 6,032 | 7,406 |
| RIO GRANDE PUEBLOS PROJECT | 300 | --- | 300 | 300 | --- | 300 |
| TUCUMCARI PROJECT | 17 | 9 | 26 | 17 | 9 | 26 |
| NORTH DAKOTA | | | | | | |
| DICKINSON UNIT, P-SMBP | 212 | 393 | 605 | 212 | 393 | 605 |
| GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP | 16,406 | 6,743 | 23,149 | 16,406 | 6,743 | 23,149 |
| HEART BUTTE UNIT, P-SMBP | 82 | 1,196 | 1,278 | 82 | 1,196 | 1,278 |
| OKLAHOMA | | | | | | |
| ARBuckle PROJECT | 67 | 207 | 274 | 67 | 207 | 274 |
| MCGEE CREEK PROJECT | 91 | 851 | 942 | 91 | 851 | 942 |
| MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT | 25 | 587 | 612 | 25 | 587 | 612 |

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | | | HOUSE RECOMMENDED | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|--------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------|
| | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES OM&R | TOTAL | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES OM&R | TOTAL |
| OREGON | | | | | | |
| NORMAN PROJECT | 48 | 303 | 351 | 48 | 303 | 351 |
| WASHITA BASIN PROJECT | 160 | 1,083 | 1,243 | 160 | 1,083 | 1,243 |
| W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT | 59 | 629 | 688 | 59 | 629 | 688 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | | | | | | |
| CROOKED RIVER PROJECT | 286 | 506 | 792 | 286 | 506 | 792 |
| DESCHUTES PROJECT | 372 | 211 | 583 | 372 | 211 | 583 |
| EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS | 511 | 751 | 1,262 | 511 | 751 | 1,262 |
| KLAMATH PROJECT | 13,379 | 4,621 | 18,000 | 13,379 | 4,621 | 18,000 |
| ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION | 2,645 | 426 | 3,071 | 2,645 | 426 | 3,071 |
| TUALATIN PROJECT | 172 | 252 | 424 | 172 | 252 | 424 |
| UMATILLA PROJECT | 528 | 2,462 | 2,990 | 528 | 2,462 | 2,990 |
| TEXAS | | | | | | |
| ANGOSTURA UNIT, P-SMBP | 249 | 750 | 999 | 249 | 750 | 999 |
| BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP | 270 | 1,006 | 1,276 | 270 | 1,006 | 1,276 |
| KEYHOLE UNIT, P-SMBP | 198 | 569 | 767 | 198 | 569 | 767 |
| LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM | 2,774 | --- | 2,774 | 2,774 | --- | 2,774 |
| MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT | --- | 15 | 15 | --- | 15 | 15 |
| MNI WIGONI PROJECT | --- | 12,000 | 12,000 | --- | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| OAHE UNIT, P-SMBP | 36 | 58 | 94 | 36 | 58 | 94 |
| RAPID VALLEY PROJECT | --- | 69 | 69 | --- | 69 | 69 |
| RAPID VALLEY UNIT, P-SMBP | --- | 195 | 195 | --- | 195 | 195 |
| SHADEHILL UNIT, P-SMBP | 75 | 469 | 544 | 75 | 469 | 544 |
| UTAH | | | | | | |
| BALMORHEA PROJECT | 26 | 14 | 40 | 26 | 14 | 40 |
| CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT | 84 | 87 | 171 | 84 | 87 | 171 |
| LOWER RIO GRANDE WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM | 50 | --- | 50 | 50 | --- | 50 |
| INJECES RIVER PROJECT | 88 | 824 | 912 | 88 | 824 | 912 |
| SAN ANGELO PROJECT | 38 | 552 | 590 | 38 | 552 | 590 |
| UTAH | | | | | | |
| HYRUM PROJECT | 178 | 177 | 355 | 178 | 177 | 355 |
| MOON LAKE PROJECT | 9 | 86 | 95 | 9 | 86 | 95 |
| NEWTON PROJECT | 50 | 75 | 125 | 50 | 75 | 125 |
| OGDEN RIVER PROJECT | 218 | 266 | 484 | 218 | 266 | 484 |

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES
(AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS)

| | BUDGET REQUEST | | HOUSE RECOMMENDED | |
|---|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES OMB&R | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES OMB&R |
| | TOTAL | TOTAL | TOTAL | TOTAL |
| PROVO RIVER PROJECT | 1,285 | 453 | 1,285 | 453 |
| SANPETE PROJECT | 60 | 10 | 60 | 10 |
| SCOFIELD PROJECT | 609 | 84 | 609 | 84 |
| STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT | 830 | 930 | 830 | 100 |
| WEBER BASIN PROJECT | 972 | 1,150 | 972 | 1,150 |
| WEBER RIVER PROJECT | 60 | 88 | 60 | 88 |
| | 14,810 | 10,610 | 14,810 | 10,610 |
| WASHINGTON | | | | |
| COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT | 4,200 | 10,610 | 4,200 | 10,610 |
| WASHINGTON AREA PROJECTS | 415 | 60 | 415 | 60 |
| YAKIMA PROJECT | 787 | 6,784 | 787 | 6,784 |
| YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT | 12,811 | --- | 12,811 | --- |
| | 2,059 | 1,828 | 2,059 | 1,828 |
| WYOMING | | | | |
| BOYSEN UNIT, P-SMBP | 231 | 32 | 231 | 32 |
| BUFFALO BILL DAM DAM MODIFICATION, P-SMBP | 32 | 2,669 | 32 | 2,669 |
| KENDRICK PROJECT | 107 | 4,547 | 107 | 4,547 |
| NORTH PLATTE PROJECT | 205 | 1,190 | 205 | 1,190 |
| NORTH PLATTE AREA, P-SMBP | 111 | 5,012 | 111 | 5,012 |
| OWL CREEK UNIT, P-SMBP | 6 | 96 | 6 | 96 |
| RIVERTON UNIT, P-SMBP | 12 | 651 | 12 | 651 |
| SHOSHONE PROJECT | 72 | 729 | 72 | 729 |
| | 190,940 | 286,948 | 190,940 | 286,948 |
| | 477,888 | 477,888 | 477,888 | 477,888 |
| SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS | | | | |
| REGIONAL PROGRAMS | | | | |
| ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK: | | | | |
| RURAL WATER | --- | --- | 28,750 | --- |
| WATER CONSERVATION AND DELIVERY | --- | 14,170 | 2,250 | --- |
| COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE II | 8,423 | --- | 8,423 | --- |
| COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT (CRSP), SECTION 5 | 3,936 | 5,735 | 3,936 | 5,735 |
| COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT (CRSP), SECTION 8 | 2,250 | --- | 2,250 | --- |
| COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT | 620 | --- | 620 | --- |
| DAM SAFETY PROGRAM: | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM | --- | 1,300 | --- | 1,300 |
| INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION | --- | 66,500 | --- | 66,500 |
| SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS | --- | 20,284 | --- | 20,284 |

| | BUDGET REQUEST | | HOUSE RECOMMENDED | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES OM&R | RESOURCES MANAGEMENT | FACILITIES OM&R |
| EMERGENCY PLANNING & DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM | --- | 1,250 | --- | 1,250 |
| ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM | 24,351 | --- | 24,351 | --- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION | 1,720 | --- | 1,720 | --- |
| EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES | --- | 8,809 | --- | 8,809 |
| GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES | 2,000 | --- | 2,000 | --- |
| INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS: | | | | |
| AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT | --- | --- | 6,000 | --- |
| CROW TRIBE RIGHTS | --- | --- | 12,772 | --- |
| NAVAJO-GALLUP | --- | --- | 89,663 | --- |
| TAOS PUEBLO | --- | --- | 4,048 | --- |
| LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM | 9,188 | --- | 9,188 | --- |
| LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM | 28,345 | --- | 28,345 | --- |
| MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS | --- | 817 | --- | 817 |
| NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM | --- | --- | 10,925 | --- |
| NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING | 1,728 | --- | 1,728 | --- |
| OPERATION & PROGRAM MANAGEMENT | 962 | 1,547 | 962 | 1,547 |
| POWER PROGRAM SERVICES | 2,391 | 307 | 2,391 | 307 |
| PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM | 596 | 206 | 596 | 206 |
| RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION | 2,323 | --- | 2,323 | --- |
| RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION | 2,202 | --- | 2,202 | --- |
| RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: | | | | |
| DESALINATION AND WATER PURIFICATION PROGRAM | 2,305 | 1,150 | 2,305 | 1,150 |
| SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM | 16,565 | --- | 16,565 | --- |
| SITE SECURITY ACTIVITIES | --- | 26,220 | --- | 26,220 |
| UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES - TECHNICAL SUPPORT | 90 | --- | 90 | --- |
| WATERSMART PROGRAM: | | | | |
| WATERSMART GRANTS | 23,365 | --- | 23,365 | --- |
| WATER CONSERVATION FIELD SERVICES PROGRAM | 4,239 | --- | 4,239 | --- |
| COOPERATIVE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT | 250 | --- | 250 | --- |
| BASIN STUDIES | 5,200 | --- | 5,200 | --- |
| DROUGHT RESPONSE & COMPREHENSIVE DROUGHT PLANS | 2,500 | --- | 2,500 | --- |
| RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS | --- | 2,500 | --- | 2,500 |
| TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE PROGRAM | 20,000 | --- | 20,000 | --- |
| SUBTOTAL, REGIONAL PROGRAMS | 176,474 | 150,795 | 319,957 | 150,795 |
| TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES | 367,414 | 437,743 | 805,157 | 437,743 |
| TOTAL | | | | |
| | | | | 948,640 |

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 five 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, San Luis Unit, California.—The Committee is aware that Reclamation and the Western Area Power Administration are evaluating the possible construction of a transmission line to directly serve the San Luis Unit from the Central Valley Project system as an alternative to receiving service under the California Independent System Operator's (CAISO) Tariff. If this alternative is selected, the agencies are directed to work together and with the affected Central Valley Project water contractors to ensure the most efficient and cost-effective process for implementation.

Ririe Reservoir, Idaho.—The Committee appreciates the cooperation to date of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to allow limited increases in the amount of water carried over through the winter flood season without increasing flood risk. Water users are interested in additional winter water storage, however, but the potential paths forward are not clear. Reclamation and the Corps are directed to work together to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 21 days after the enactment of this Act a single report describing options the water users could pursue for additional water carryover. The report should detail for each option the roles and responsibilities of each federal agency as well as the water users, including funding requirements, process challenges to be addressed, an approximate schedule through implementation, any policy or statutory changes necessary, and other relevant information the water users would need to make an informed decision on whether and how they might wish to proceed.

Mni Wiconi Project, South Dakota.—Reclamation is encouraged to continue working with the Tribes and relevant Federal agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to coordinate use of all existing authorities and funding sources to finish needed community system upgrades and connections as quickly as possible.

Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project Integrated Plan, Washington.—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.

WaterSMART Program, Interagency Partnerships.—The Committee notes the work being undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation and United States Department of Agriculture’s Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to coordinate the water use efficiency assistance authorized under the Secure Water Act and the on-farm water conservation assistance provided through the NRCS Environmental Quality Incentives Program. This partnership began in 2011 with attention focused in California, but has since expanded beyond this area. The Committee encourages Reclamation to continue working with the NRCS to identify and implement ways within existing authorities to extend the benefits of this collaborative effort throughout the West.

WaterSMART Program, Title XVI Water Reclamation/Reuse Projects.—The Committee has heard from numerous stakeholders who believe the program’s effectiveness could be enhanced through expanding the pool of projects eligible to compete for funding for planning, design, or construction activities. The Committee encourages Reclamation to develop and propose to the authorizing committees of both Houses of Congress recommendations for improvements, which may include programmatic changes and project-specific authorizations.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$56,995,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 49,528,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 49,528,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | – 7,467,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | – – – |

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 2016, the Committee recommends \$49,528,000, \$7,467,000 below fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. Within this amount, the Committee provides funding for programs and activities according to the Administration’s request. The Committee notes that the decrease 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.

The Committee has heard from Members of the House of Representatives and affected stakeholders concerned with the effectiveness of the funds expended, as well as progress made towards the activities and goals delineated in the Act. The Committee notes these concerns have been expressed repeatedly even though Reclamation makes an annual report available to the public. The Committee welcomes a discussion on ways to make Reclamation’s explanation of its work under this program more accessible and meaningful for all interested stakeholders.

Anadromous Fish Screen Program.—The Committee notes the progress being made to screen the high priority unscreened diversions on the Sacramento River under the Bureau of Reclamation’s Anadromous Fish Screen Program. The Committee encourages Reclamation to continue its focus on screening of the remaining high priority diversions from within funds made available under the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund in future budget requests.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$37,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 37,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 37,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 2016, the Committee recommends \$37,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2015 and the budget request.

The Committee notes that with the passage last year of California’s Proposition 1, the California Water Commission is expected to begin in early 2017 allocating \$2,700,000,000 for the public benefits of water storage projects. To ensure that the CALFED water supply projects are able to compete for the available State funding, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to complete each of these feasibility studies, and associated environmental impact statements, as soon as practicable. At a minimum, publicly available drafts of such studies and environmental reviews should be completed no later than December 1, 2016. The Committee also directs Reclamation to take whatever steps necessary to submit any final project recommendations to the appropriate committees of Congress for authorization.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$58,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 59,500,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 59,500,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +1,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 2016, the Committee recommends

\$59,500,000, \$1,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

The recommendation includes legislative language restricting the availability of 75 percent of this funding until such time as Reclamation complies with congressional and statutory direction related to the Technical Memorandum on buried metallic water pipe and the associated pipeline reliability study.

With the notable exception of the issue of buried metallic water pipe, Reclamation's responsiveness to congressional direction and Committee information requests has improved significantly since last year. The Committee appreciates Reclamation's efforts.

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 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 Federal Salaries and Expenses), Defense Environmental Cleanup, Defense Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning, Other Defense Activities, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Department of Energy has requested a total budget of \$30,527,136,000, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, in fiscal year 2016 to fund programs in its four primary mission areas: science, energy, environment, and national security. The Department of Energy budget request is \$2,610,339,000 above fiscal year 2015.

The Committee's recommendation 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 existing forms of energy production and to develop new and innovative forms of energy for the nation's long-term energy independence and prosperity.

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 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 AND MANAGEMENT

The Department is still not in full compliance with its statutory requirement to submit to Congress, at the time that the President's budget request is submitted, a future-years energy program that covers the fiscal year of the budget submission and the four succeeding years, as directed in the fiscal year 2012 Act. Development and submission of a five-year budget is an important step in enhancing the Department's ability to conduct long-term planning and to understand issues that might impact the affordability of certain proposals. The Department is directed to submit not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a report on a plan to become fully compliant with this requirement.

The Committee continues to be concerned about the Department's management of its prior-year carryover funds and the build-up of excessive prior-year balances that are greater than five years old. Retaining these old balances places a cumbersome administrative burden on DOE programs and makes the Department's financial management processes inefficient and unnecessarily complex. Last year, the Committee directed the Department to consider all balances greater than five years old effectively expired and to submit all remaining unexpended balances greater than five years old as an offset to its annual budget request. The Department proposed a limited amount of funding in certain accounts to offset the fiscal year 2016 budget request, but did not submit any requests to retain specific prior-year funds. The Committee will monitor the monthly financial reports provided by the Department to ensure that these funds are eliminated during budget execution. The Committee will consider any additional amounts that have not been spent by the end of fiscal year 2015 to be available for offset, unless a specific request is received to retain those balances. The Committee will continue to consider all Department of Energy programs under a five year period of availability in future years.

The Committee is also concerned that the Department is failing in its responsibility to ensure that DOE contracts with incurred costs valued at billions of dollars per year are audited in a timely manner. The DOE Inspector General recently investigated cost audit coverage of non-maintenance and operating contracts and found that the current cost audit coverage was insufficient because the Department primarily utilizes the Defense Contract Audit Agency and that agency has been unable to perform many of its audits on a timely basis. The Department is directed to submit not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a plan to improve cost audit coverage, with clear milestones and performance measures.

Alleviation of Poverty. —The Secretary of Energy is directed to provide not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act a report detailing all domestic and international projects and programs within its jurisdiction that contribute to the alleviation of poverty.

MANAGEMENT OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL AND DEFENSE WASTE

Despite the DC Circuit Court of Appeals ruling that the Administration's refusal to finish the Yucca Mountain license application was illegal, the Administration continues to disregard current law regarding Yucca Mountain. These actions to stop the development of the Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Repository have delayed the federal government from fulfilling the legal requirement to take responsibility for civilian spent nuclear fuel, increasing the financial penalties taxpayers must bear. The remaining liability is currently estimated to be \$22,600,000,000. Under current law, any damages or settlements in this litigation will be paid out of the Judgment Fund. 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 Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has completed the Safety Evaluation Report for the project finding no substantive reasons that the Yucca Mountain Site cannot be completed. In Volume 2 which covers safety before permanent closure, the NRC concludes that with reasonable assurance, subject to proposed conditions, the Department's application meets the NRC regulatory requirements. The NRC has also begun preparing a supplement to the Department's environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain in Nevada. Previously, the NRC staff found the EIS prepared by the Department did not adequately address all of the repository-related effects on groundwater, or from surface discharges of groundwater. In 2013, the Commission asked the Department to prepare a supplement. Rather than comply with the Court Order, the Department updated its analysis of potential groundwater impacts after closure of a repository at the site, and in February 2015 the Commission directed the NRC staff to prepare the supplement. The NRC staff will use the Department's analysis in preparing the supplement, which is expected to be completed in the Spring of 2016.

Nevertheless, the Administration's fiscal year 2016 budget request once again attempts to fund unauthorized alternatives for used nuclear fuel disposition instead of moving forward with Yucca Mountain. It 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 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.

To address the Administration's failure to execute current law, the recommendation provides \$150,000,000 within Nuclear Waste Disposal to support the Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Geologic Repository and \$50,000,000 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 remains concerned with the Department's continual proposals to establish new research centers reliant on out-year funding commitments subject to future appropriations. In fiscal year 2016, the Department proposed funding two new Clean Energy Manufacturing Innovation Institutes, in addition to providing continued funding for the existing four Institutes funded in prior years. In last year's Act, two Energy Innovation Hubs were renewed in for another five-year term while funds were provided to support continued operations at the other two existing Hubs. Furthermore, the Department is requesting continued funding for the BioEnergy Research Centers and additional funds for the Energy Frontier Research Centers. The funding of institutes constitutes a growing portion of the Department's budget and represents a significant out-year investment.

While the fiscal year 2016 request provided more detail than before for the establishment of new research centers, the Committee expects the Department to provide a more detailed analysis in future requests. The Committee continues to support the ongoing review of all existing research centers and urges the Department to take a critical look at its portfolio to determine where improvements can be made in its existing inventory of research centers.

The Committee reiterates its previous direction for the Department to explicitly include in future budget justifications for all centers, hubs, institutes, facilities, and any other persistent, location-based grantees; their current and proposed funding levels; expected

out-year commitments; and details on their programmatic and technical goals.

COMMONLY RECYCLED PAPER

The Department shall not expend funds for projects that knowingly use as a feedstock commonly recycled paper that is segregated from municipal solid waste or collected as part of a collection system that commingles commonly recycled paper with other solid waste at any point from the time of collection through materials recovery.

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSITIONS

The Committee acknowledges the Department's efforts to expand the commercial impact of its research activities in creating the Office of Technology Transitions. As one of the largest providers of basic and applied research in the nation, the Department is at the forefront of innovation. The scientific and technical capabilities of the Department's research centers and the National Laboratories have been an essential component in many technological breakthroughs. The Committee supports the continued efforts of the Department in assisting the transfer of federally funded research from the laboratory to the commercial sector. However, the Committee expects that these technology transfer efforts will receive equal treatment across each of the Department's research activities. In carrying out the activities of the Office of Technology Transitions, the Department is directed to use funding taken from individual applied research offices on projects within the purview of that same applied research office. The Committee directs the Department to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act a report on the activities of the Office of Technology Transitions and provide a table tracking the usage of the Energy Technology Commercialization Fund to specific technology transfer and partnership activities.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The Department is prohibited from funding fellowship and scholarship programs in fiscal year 2016 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 2016 must be detailed in the fiscal year 2016 budget justifications. This direction shall be followed in future fiscal years unless contradicted by the Committee.

REPROGRAMMING AND TRANSFER GUIDELINES

The Committee requires the Department to inform the Committee promptly and fully when a change in program execution and funding is required during the fiscal year. 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.

Definition.—A reprogramming includes the reallocation of funds from one activity to another within an appropriation. The recommendation includes a general provision providing internal re-

programming 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 table detailing the Committee's recommendations for the Department's various accounts. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction 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 both Houses of Congress 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 which 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 both Houses of Congress in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees.

Transfers.—As in fiscal year 2015, funding actions into or out of accounts funded by this Act may only be made by transfer authorities provided by this or other Appropriations Acts.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations for Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 2016 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, 2015 | \$1,923,935,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 2,722,987,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 1,657,774,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | – 266,161,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | – 1,065,213,000 |

Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) programs include research, development, demonstration, and deployment ac-

tivities 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 hydrogen 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 \$1,657,774,000 for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, \$266,161,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$1,065,213,000 below the budget request.

For the purposes of allocating funding, the Committee encourages the Department to examine the feasibility of ultra conductive 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.

The Department is directed to end the practice of taking a small fraction of annual funding within EERE technology offices to fund incubator programs.

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 \$514,783,000 for Sustainable Transportation, \$87,217,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$278,217,000 below the budget request.

Vehicle Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$255,400,000 for Vehicle Technologies, \$24,600,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$188,600,000 below the budget request. The Committee acknowledges the success of the SuperTruck I program in improving freight and heavy-duty vehicle efficiency. Within available funds, the recommendation includes \$8,000,000 for the SuperTruck II program to further improve the efficiency of heavy-duty class 8 long- and regional-haul vehicles through multi-year awards subject to future availability of funds. The Department is directed to provide maximum funding flexibility needed to achieve the program’s objectives. Additionally, the Department should consider industry-wide impacts when making these awards.

The recommendation provides \$95,000,000 for Batteries and Electric Drive Technology, of which \$40,800,000 is for advanced battery development, including up to \$6,000,000 to continue national laboratory performance testing and life cycle diagnostic assessment activities that validate and verify advanced battery performance.

The recommendation provides \$25,900,000 for Outreach and Development, of which \$24,000,000 is for the Clean Cities program. No funding is provided for Advanced Vehicle Competitions or the Alternative Fuel Vehicle Community Partner projects. The Committee urges the Department to support training and outreach, including to small repair shops, related to diesel to natural gas retrofits.

For other subprograms within Vehicle Technologies, the recommendation provides \$34,500,000 for Vehicle and Systems Simulation and Testing; \$47,000,000 for Advanced Combustion Engines; \$32,500,000 for Materials Technology; and \$22,500,000 for Fuels Technology.

The Committee encourages Vehicle Technologies to further address the need to overcome the barriers to widespread adoption of lightweight designs that include mixed materials such as magnesium alloys, aluminum alloys, high-strength steels, and fiber-reinforced polymer composites. Applied research is needed to develop coatings, adhesives, high-strength fiber glass, and other advanced materials to effectively join mixed materials, prevent corrosion, reduce costs, and address consumer requirements such as noise mitigation and appearance.

The Committee also encourages the Department to work with the natural gas vehicle industry to identify needs and develop solutions for additional engines and emissions control technologies in order to obtain the emission advantages when using natural gas in high efficiency engines.

Bioenergy Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$165,300,000 for Bioenergy Technologies, \$59,700,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$80,700,000 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; \$75,500,000 for Conversion Technologies; \$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 Cross-Cutting Sustainability.

The Committee directs the Department to develop a comprehensive list of existing demonstration and pilot-scale multi-user facilities for bio-based products, chemicals, and intermediates, including synthesis gas, hydrogen, and methane, assess the gaps and needs of such inventory, and report to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$94,083,000 for Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technologies, \$2,917,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$8,917,000 below the budget request.

Within available funds, the recommendation includes \$7,000,000 for Technology Validation, of which \$5,000,000 is to continue 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.

The Committee recognizes the achievements of the Fuel Cell Technologies program, and expresses its continued support for fuel cell and hydrogen energy systems for stationary, vehicle, motive and portable power applications. Through the Market Transformation program, the Department should engage in cost-shared deployments to encourage expanding state-related activities including, but not limited to: tri-generation facilities, ground support equipment for aviation and maritime ports, hybrid-vehicle range extenders, energy storage projects to support base load renewable energy projects, and microgrid deployments to improve resiliency. Additionally, the Department should work with states to overcome challenges associated with deployment of 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 \$326,750,000 for Renewable Energy, \$129,250,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$318,450,000 below the budget request.

Solar Energy.—The Committee recommends \$151,600,000 for Solar Energy, \$81,400,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$185,100,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$32,000,000 for Concentrating Solar Power; \$33,000,000 for Photovoltaic Research and Development; \$39,500,000 for Systems Integration; and \$23,000,000 for Innovations in Manufacturing Competitiveness, of which no funding is included for the SUNPATH III program.

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 efforts, 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.

Wind Energy.—The Committee recommends \$90,450,000 for Wind Energy, \$16,550,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$55,050,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$37,000,000 for the Offshore Wind Advanced Technology Demonstration Project; \$2,000,000 to continue research and development in support of the offshore demonstration project; \$10,000,000 for the Mitigate Market Barriers program, of which \$4,500,000 is for the research initiative focused on Eagle Impact

Mitigation Technologies; and \$1,000,000 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 \$38,700,000 for Water Power, \$22,300,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$28,300,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$21,280,000 for marine and hydrokinetic technologies and \$16,720,000 for conventional hydropower, of which \$3,960,000 is for the purposes of Section 242 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

The Committee recognizes the Department's funding of marine hydrokinetic power research and understands the Department's basis for past allocation of funding between the various sources of marine hydrokinetic power. The Committee also understands that locations for harnessing various forms of marine hydrokinetic power are located closer to major population centers, which could utilize the power created by marine hydrokinetic power technologies. The Committee directs the Department to allocate the current fiscal year funding to marine hydrokinetic power based on the Department's comprehensive resource assessments and industry and stakeholder input, allowing for the further development of marine hydrokinetic power technologies.

Geothermal Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$46,000,000 for Geothermal Technologies, \$9,000,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$50,000,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$27,000,000 for Enhanced Geothermal Systems, of which \$21,000,000 is for ongoing 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 \$617,562,000 for Energy Efficiency, \$24,438,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$412,025,000 below the budget request.

Advanced Manufacturing.—The Committee recommends \$205,000,000 for Advanced Manufacturing, \$5,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$199,000,000 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 proc-

esses; 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 \$79,000,000 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 \$106,500,000 for Advanced Manufacturing Research and Development Facilities, of which \$25,000,000 is for the fifth 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 \$70,000,000 is for five 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 recommendation supports the establishment of one new CEMI Institute in fiscal year 2016, in addition to the four established using fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015 funding. Should the Department propose 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 recognizes the significant outcomes from partnering with industry to create American jobs and strengthen the U.S. manufacturing base and encourages an applied research funding opportunity announcement as a part of the Process intensification applied research portfolio which includes innovative approaches to low-thermal budget process heating and thermally activated chemical reactions to reduce industrial energy intensity. Suitable approaches might include novel applications of electromagnetic energy, such as microwave or radio frequency, and novel materials that require less energy to heat or chemically react.

The Committee also recognizes the importance of the textile sector and believes that federal support for advanced textile research is essential to maintaining the competitiveness of the domestic textile and apparel industry. The Committee believes that advanced textile research can develop more sustainable manufacturing processes and technologies that will benefit producers, foster the reshoring of textile jobs to the United States, and reduce the global environmental impact of textile manufacturing. The Committee therefore encourages the Department to consider the need for competitively-funded advanced textile manufacturing process research.

The Committee is aware that the U.S. represents the largest market for lithium metal, a near critical material with national se-

curity and advanced manufacturing applications. 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. Assuring domestic production of lithium metal is critical to many investments made across the Department. The Committee directs the Department to analyze the impact federal investment may have in strengthening the availability and usage of lithium, including low-sodium lithium metal, and issue not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act a report on the Department's capabilities to increase U.S. domestic supply.

Building Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$150,362,000 for Building Technologies, \$21,638,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$113,638,000 below the budget request.

Within available funds, 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 \$21,000,000 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 requirements; \$41,000,000 for Equipment and Buildings Standards; and \$23,000,000 for Residential Buildings Integration.

Commercial buildings account for 19 percent of the energy consumed in the United States. In order to improve energy efficiency within this important market, a national program to improve the energy efficiency of small- and medium-sized commercial buildings is needed. Within available funds, up to \$10,000,000 is to support a competitive funding opportunity for proposals that would achieve deeper energy efficiency improvements in small- and medium-sized commercial buildings.

The Committee recognizes that adaptive, automated, and learning building technologies offer new opportunities for energy savings in residential and commercial buildings. The Committee encourages the Department to support collaborative research with industry and demonstration of the energy savings potential of adaptive connected equipment and responsive building technologies.

Consistent with current policy, of the funds made available for Building Technologies, 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.

Furthermore, the Committee encourages the Department to ensure consideration of states and localities' priorities when developing a program for the Building Energy Codes Program.

The Committee directs the Department to work with its partner agencies, industry, and relevant university programs to initiate not

later than eight months after the enactment of this Act a study of the potential benefits of “smart home” electronics. The study should include, but not be limited to: consumer control of energy sources in the home from remote locations outside the home, compatible appliance availability, control of compatible appliances from remote locations outside the home, energy demand and load data capture and reporting, automation of energy monitoring and reduced consumption, and cost-effective technologies that could further save consumers money and reduce the energy consumption in homes, and an evaluation of research and development approaches for increasing energy efficiency of home energy consumption.

Additionally, the Committee encourages the Department to continue to consider energy savings from increased energy efficiency of consumer electronics.

Federal Energy Management Program.—The Committee recommends \$18,800,000 for the Federal Energy Management Program, \$8,200,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$24,288,000 below the budget request.

Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs.—The Committee recommends \$243,400,000 for Weatherization and Intergovernmental Programs, \$400,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$75,099,000 below the budget request.

The recommendation provides \$190,000,000 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 competitive awards within the Weatherization Assistance Program to develop and test financing models to support energy efficiency retrofits.

The Secretary shall report not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act on the use of solar and other renewable energy measures and systems in the Weatherization Assistance Program and include an analysis of any requirements of law or regulation or any policies of the Department which result in making the installation of solar energy systems less likely than other measures of comparable cost and benefit that are installed by the program.

Social Cost of Carbon.—The Department should not promulgate any regulations in fiscal year 2016 using the May 2013 estimates for the social cost of carbon until a new working group is convened. The working group should include the relevant agencies and affected stakeholders, re-examine the social cost of carbon using the best available science, and revise the estimates using an accurate discount rate and domestic estimate in accordance with Executive Order 12866 and OMB Circular A–4. To increase transparency, the working group should solicit public comment prior to finalizing any updates.

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, \$19,000,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$37,200,000 below the budget request.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommends \$150,000,000 for Program Direction, \$10,000,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$15,330,000 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.

Use of Prior-Year Balances.—The recommendation includes the use of \$19,321,000 in prior-year balances, to be taken from Solar Energy Program Direction.

ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$147,306,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 270,100,000 |
| Recommended, 2015 | 160,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +12,694,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -110,100,000 |

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 2015 and \$110,100,000 below the budget request.

Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Research and Development.—The Committee recommends \$113,000,000 for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Research and Development, \$5,300,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$40,000,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$31,000,000 for Clean Energy Transmission and Reliability, of which \$5,000,000 is for the Energy Systems Predictive Capability activity; \$20,000,000 for Smart Grid; \$15,000,000 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.

The Committee recognizes that our nation’s highly integrated electrical grid is a target of cyber-attacks, and it is imperative that we fully understand the complexity of the interdependencies between information technology, operational technology, and physical security. In this environment, the Department’s programs to

strengthen the security and resilience of the nation's electricity grid against cyber, physical, and human risks must be closely coordinated, and the agency must work with energy sector owners and operators to address these risks and develop comprehensive mitigation strategies. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report, not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, with the following: (1) the Department's plans to better understand and respond to the full-range of energy sector threats through enhanced engagement with private sector owners and operators of such infrastructure; (2) recommendations to provide consideration to owners of energy delivery systems for services and hardware incurred in the act of information sharing, analyzing, or exercising with any DOE agency or instrument regarding energy sector systems protection as referenced in this paragraph; and (3) an assessment of the need for a revised organizational structure to better align the agency's energy sector systems protection activities across cyber, physical, and human risks, including those protecting government facilities and networks.

Within Smart Grid Research and Development, the Committee encourages the Department to accelerate the deployment of community-scale power microgrids that improve local energy reliability and resilience through technologies such as on-site generation and storage. This includes investments in system enhancements necessary to facilitate the integration of new technologies. The potential grid enhancements could include developing microgrid systems that can be customized to connect distributed generation and enhance reliability and power quality depending on customer needs.

The Committee supports the Department's efforts to improve electricity reliability and grid integration initiatives. Accordingly, the Committee encourages the Department to establish one or more grid integration demonstration modules. These projects should include a utility that has experienced some reliability problems in the past and serves a large population; industrial and academic partners with appropriate engineering capabilities in grid and energy storage technologies in an area that could incorporate opportunities to include solar and wind elements; and national laboratories involved in the grid integration consortium.

The Committee continues to support the Department's research activities to ensure transmission reliability. Recent weather-related events, however, have reinforced the need for integration of local, regional, and national weather into transmission reliability and resiliency modeling and simulation activities to support the utility industry and emergency response. The Committee encourages the Department to partner with universities, national laboratories, and industry when issuing competitively-awarded research and development activities to ensure regional weather and related environmental variables are accounted for in advanced grid modeling research.

The Committee recognizes the Department's efforts in advancing the state of power management in the grid using advanced semiconductor technology. This technology has the potential for increasing transmission efficiency and grid reliability, and reducing the need for construction of additional power lines. The Committee encourages the Department to continue this support by investing in additional research and development of cost competitive, lateral,

normally-off gallium nitride on silicon based power electronic devices with increased voltage and current handling capability appropriate for electric grid applications. This will result in lower power costs to the consumer and higher reliability of the transmission and distribution infrastructure.

Within available funds for Energy Storage, the Committee encourages the Department to support utility-sponsored and operated energy storage test facilities that are capable of performance-driven data in a utility environment.

Furthermore, the Committee understands that through using support of the electric grid, we can achieve capabilities unmatched by any other approach for the storage, transmission, and distribution offered by the natural gas grid. In recognition of this need, the Committee encourages the Energy Storage program to solicit a demonstration of utility-scale energy storage, utilizing existing pipeline infrastructure to store renewable natural gas.

The Committee recognizes that further investment is needed to maintain and expand power and energy education programs, and secure industry partnerships to facilitate the development of a highly skilled next-generation technical and engineering workforce for the electric power sector. Therefore, the Committee encourages the Department to prioritize its research and development investments so that they engage and further develop the capabilities of university undergraduate and graduate programs in power and energy.

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. In last year's House Report, the Committee directed the Department to contract with an appropriate organization to conduct a national level comprehensive study on the future resiliency and reliability of the nation's electric power transmission and distribution system. The Committee looks forward to the results of this ongoing study.

Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration (ISER).—The Committee recommends \$14,000,000 for Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration, \$8,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. The Department was directed to use \$8,000,000 in 2015 for the Operational Energy and Resilience program to support the construction of the Operations Center within the Department's Headquarters. It is the Committee's understanding that the Department has chosen not to build out this Operations Center. Not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, the Department shall report on plans for meeting the requirement for a functional Operations Center that meets the needs articulated by the Department in last year's budget request.

The Committee directs the Department of Energy to submit not later than 6 months after the enactment of this Act a report on the vulnerability of the grid to an electromagnetic pulse event and the potential impact on reliability and delivery of electric power. At a minimum, the report should address protective and mitigative measures for these vulnerabilities, including hardening of infrastructure, blocking of induced currents and voltages, stocking and prepositioning of spare parts, and operational and emergency planning. The Department is encouraged to coordinate with the Federal

Energy Regulatory Commission and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) to provide an analysis of: (1) the actions taken by NERC to set standards for owners and operators of electric utilities; and (2) whether such standards are sufficient to harden the grid against severe space weather and other electromagnetic events.

State Energy Reliability and Assurance Grants.—The Committee recommends no funds for this new activity.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$833,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 907,574,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 936,161,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +102,661,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +28,587,000 |

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 \$936,161,000 for Nuclear Energy, \$102,661,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$28,587,000 above the budget request.

Spent Fuel Plans.—The Committee directs the Department to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act on how, under current law, the proximity to reservations of federally recognized Indian tribes, or lands owned by the United States in trust for the benefit of any Indian tribe, impacts the prioritization for disposal of spent nuclear fuel.

NUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee provides \$504,618,000 for Nuclear Energy Research and Development, \$6,118,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$21,831,000 above the budget request.

Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies.—The Committee recommends \$111,600,000 for Nuclear Energy Enabling Technologies, \$10,600,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$25,213,000 above the budget request, of which not less than \$4,000,000 shall be for knowledge and validation work; not less than \$4,000,000 shall be for integrated energy systems; and not less than \$2,000,000 for nuclear cyber activities. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$17,000,000 for Crosscutting Technology Development; \$27,200,000 for Nuclear Energy Advanced Modeling and Simulation, of which funding above the request is for additional support for TREAT modeling and simulation activities; \$24,300,000 for the second year of the second five-year term of the Energy Innovation Hub for Modeling and Simulation; \$2,000,000 for Nuclear Energy Traineeships; and \$41,100,000 for the National Science User Facility, of which funding above the request is to expand user facility

capabilities and collaborations, including up to \$2,000,000 to support high performance computing activities.

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 \$62,500,000 for SMR Licensing Technical Support, \$8,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. The Committee directs that all fiscal year 2016 funding within this program is to support the second award for an SMR design. The Committee is aware that the need for fiscal year 2016 funding for the SMR Licensing Technical Support program may change throughout the year and will consider additional funding according to developments.

In fiscal year 2014 the Department approved a second award which allowed support of advanced innovative technology. At that time, the Department's main focus was on advanced safety innovation, and thus the Department did not require a utility partner or a near term commercialization date. There is now a utility partner and an earlier target commercialization date of 2023 for the second award. The Committee expects DOE will submit adequate budget requests to fully support a completed design certification from the NRC and standard plant design work, as well as a combined construction and operation license from NRC for its utility partner. The utility partner identified for a previous award may continue with site permitting activities and combined construction and operation license activities.

Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration.—The Committee recommends \$141,718,000 for Reactor Concepts Research, Development, and Demonstration, \$8,718,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$33,578,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$40,000,000 for Light Water Reactor Sustainability, of which \$14,000,000 is to support advanced safety methods development and the risk informed safety margin characterization methodology; and \$99,718,000 for Advanced Reactor Concepts to consist of the following activities: \$33,000,000 is for research of the fuel and graphite qualification program for the High Temperature Gas Reactor; \$17,500,000 is for the continued development of two performance-based advanced reactor concepts, of which \$11,500,000 is follow-on funding for the industry-only competition of two performance-based advanced reactor concepts held in fiscal year 2015 and \$6,000,000 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 recommendation funds other activities within Advanced Reactor Concepts at the requested level. As the nation's leading sponsor of research in advanced reactor concepts, the Department plays an important role in propelling nuclear energy innovation. The Committee encourages the Department to develop a plan for demonstrating a new advanced reactor by 2035.

Fuel Cycle Research and Development.—The Committee recommends \$175,800,000 for Fuel Cycle Research and Development, \$21,200,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$41,960,000 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 \$17,000,000 is for additional support of feasibility studies for accident tolerant light water reactor fuels and \$4,000,000 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), \$16,500,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$53,360,000 below the budget request. The recommendation provides \$55,000,000 for UNFD research and development activities, \$6,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$20,360,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$6,000,000 to support activities to design and certify a rail car or cars for use with licensed and anticipated transportation casks; and \$7,000,000 to support preparation activities for testing of high burnup fuel. 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. No funding is provided for integrated waste management system activities or new activities related to Department of Energy-Managed High Level Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel.

RADIOLOGICAL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends \$6,800,000 for Radiological Facilities Management, \$18,200,000 below fiscal year 2015 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 \$218,582,000 for Idaho Facilities Management, \$12,582,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$6,756,000 above the budget request.

INL Operations and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends \$216,582,000 for INL Operations and Infrastructure, \$15,951,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$6,756,000 above the budget request. Of the funds provided above the budget request, the recommendation provides an additional \$6,000,000 for control system modernization at the Advanced Test Reactor Critical Facility. Ensuring continued safe operation of the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) is a high priority for the Committee. Naval Reactors and the Office of Nuclear Energy are working together to identify upgrades that are needed to ensure the safe and reliable operation of ATR until at least 2050. However, the Committee is concerned that the period of time that has passed since these planning activities were first initiated is resulting in an extended schedule for completion. Continued delays will only serve to increase costs and risks. The Committee directs Naval Reactors and the Office of Nuclear Energy to expedite resolution of any remaining issues and to provide an update of progress as soon as possible.

Construction.—The Committee recommends \$2,000,000 for Construction, \$3,369,000 below fiscal year 2015 and the same as the request, to commence preliminary design activities of the Sample Preparation Laboratory.

IDAHO SITEWIDE SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends \$126,161,000 for Idaho Sitewide Safeguards and Security, \$22,161,000 above fiscal year 2015 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 \$5,000,000 for the Supercritical Transformational Electric Power (STEP) Generation Initiative, the same as fiscal year 2015 and 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.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$571,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 560,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 605,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +34,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +45,000,000 |

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, 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 \$605,000,000 for Fossil Energy Research and Development, \$34,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$45,000,000 above the budget request.

Even with the enormous increases shown to almost every account within the Department, the budget request once again proposes reductions to the Office of Fossil Energy. Nearly 66 percent of electricity generated in the United States comes from coal and natural gas. Fossil fuels will continue to be a critical source of energy many years into the future. In order to ensure the efficient use of existing fossil energy resources and to deliver safe and responsible uses of untapped domestic resources, the Office of Fossil Energy must remain one of the highest priorities of the Department. The Department's past research and development efforts have helped usher in

technological developments responsible for the production increases seen today. The Committee recommendation increases funding in these areas to ensure these technological advances continue to occur and help American industry maintain leadership in the global marketplace for fossil energy technologies.

COAL—CCS AND POWER SYSTEMS

The Committee recommends \$423,900,000 for Coal Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) and Power Systems, \$23,900,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$54,543,000 above the budget request. 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.

Carbon Capture.—The Committee recommends \$97,800,000 for Carbon Capture, \$9,800,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$18,831,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$12,000,000 for pre-combustion capture systems and \$85,800,000 for post-combustion capture systems.

Carbon Storage.—The Committee recommends \$104,000,000 for Carbon Storage, \$4,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$4,768,000 below 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 \$70,000,000 for Storage Infrastructure, of which funding above the request is for additional support of detailed site assessments for potential storage sites.

The Committee encourages the Department to expand its support for carbon dioxide enhanced oil recovery 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 \$105,000,000 for Advanced Energy Systems, \$2,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$65,615,000 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 projects that show dramatic improvements in combustion capabilities, and pressure gain combustion, chemical looping, and pressurized combustion technologies projects; \$25,000,000 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.

Within available funds for Gasification Systems, the Department is encouraged to support projects near completion.

Crosscutting Research.—The Committee recommends \$52,100,000 for Crosscutting Research, \$3,100,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$858,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$25,000,000 for Coal Utilization Science; \$1,500,000 for Energy Analyses; \$3,000,000 for University Training and Research; and \$21,500,000 for Plant Optimization Technologies, of which \$9,000,000 is for the Advanced Ultrasupercritical Program to identify, test, qualify, and develop domestic suppliers capable of producing components from high temperature materials and \$6,000,000 is for water management research and development.

The Committee is concerned with the public safety implications of the transportation of crude oil and directs the Department to examine methods to reduce its volatility prior to shipment.

National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) Coal Research and Development.—The Committee recommends \$50,000,000 for NETL Coal Research and Development, the same as fiscal year 2015 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 expand its external agency activities to develop and test commercially viable advanced separation technologies at proof-of-concept or pilot scale that can be deployed near term for the extraction and recovery of rare earth elements and minerals from U.S. coal and coal byproduct source shaving the highest potential for success. The Committee encourages the Department to leverage the capabilities of outside applied researchers in implementing these activities.

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 \$5,000,000 for the Office of Nuclear Energy to support the technology development of supercritical carbon dioxide-based power conversion from nuclear energy.

NATURAL GAS TECHNOLOGIES

The Committee recommends \$21,200,000 for Natural Gas Technologies, \$3,921,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$22,800,000 below the budget request.

Research.—The Committee recommends \$21,200,000 for Natural Gas Technologies Research. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$12,500,000 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 \$3,500,000 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. The Committee directs no funding for the \$10,000,000 budget request proposal to quantify emissions from natural gas infrastructure.

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 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.

UNCONVENTIONAL FOSSIL ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

The Committee recommends \$13,000,000 for Unconventional Fossil Energy Technologies, \$8,500,000 above fiscal year 2015 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.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$19,950,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 17,500,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 17,500,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | -2,450,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 retained one Naval Petroleum Reserve property, the Naval Petroleum Reserve 3 (NPR-3) in Wyoming (Teapot Dome field). The Department issued a disposition plan for NPR-3 in June 2013 and began implementation of the plan in fiscal year 2014. Transfer of NPR-3 to a new owner occurred in fiscal year 2015.

The fiscal year 2016 budget request supports post-sale legacy environmental clean-up and remediation at NPR-1 and the completion of the NPR-3 disposition plan, with activities related to remediation of the landfill and the closeout of the Casper office.

The Committee recommendation for the operation of the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves is \$17,500,000, \$2,450,000 below fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$200,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 257,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 212,030,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +12,030,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -44,970,000 |

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 112 days of net import protection for the United States economy.

The Committee recommendation for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is \$212,030,000, \$12,030,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$44,970,000 below the budget request. The funding increase above fiscal year 2015 is primarily for the major maintenance program, to address aging infrastructure and deferred maintenance backlog.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$1,600,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 7,600,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 7,600,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +6,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 Home 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), which is the equivalent of three to four days of emergency stocks in the Northeast.

The Committee recommendation for the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve is \$7,600,000, \$6,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. After accounting for a rescission of \$6,000,000 of prior-year unobligated balances in fiscal year 2015, the fiscal year 2016 program level is the same as fiscal year 2015 and the budget request.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$117,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 131,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 117,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - 14,000,000 |

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 \$117,000,000 for the Energy Information Administration, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$14,000,000 below the budget request.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$246,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 220,185,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 229,193,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | - 16,807,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +9,008,000 |

Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup includes funds to manage and remediate sites used for civilian, energy research, and non-defense related activities. These past activities resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination that requires remediation, stabilization, or some other action. The Committee recommends \$229,193,000 for Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup, \$16,807,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$9,008,000 above the budget request.

Small Sites.—The Committee recommends \$61,715,000, \$18,334,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$7,708,000 above the budget request. Within this amount, \$9,500,000 is provided to commence a pilot project to decommission and decontaminate the Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor, as authorized by the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The Department recently conducted an assessment of the hazards and costs of decontaminating the site that indicates costs could reach as much as \$80,400,000 depending on the extent of cleanup performed. The report further indicated that there is considerable uncertainty regarding the desired end state for the site and the Department is not a party to the resolution of such matters. Nevertheless, the costs and hazards associated with maintaining this vintage reactor site will continue to grow. To meet the intent of the authorized project while containing costs within the authorized amount of \$16,000,000, the Department is directed to utilize innovative contracting strategies to demolish, dismantle, and dispose of contaminated above-grade structures for the purposes of minimizing annual site maintenance requirements until such time as the regulatory end state for the site is fully resolved by the responsible local stakeholders.

The Committee commends the Department for its work to preserve cultural and sacred sites at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory in California and encourages the Department to continue working with the community and other federal, state, and local agencies to ensure that this portion of the property is preserved for future generations.

Mercury Storage Facility.—The Committee recommends \$1,300,000 for project planning, engineering, and design of a facility for the long-term storage of elemental mercury, as required by the Mercury Export Ban Act (MEBA) of 2008. MEBA required the Department of Energy to designate at least one facility capable of the long-term management and storage of domestic elemental mercury, but the Department has not met the deadlines required by the Act. The amounts provided allow the Department to perform the requisite environmental reviews and conduct other design and planning activities as needed to produce a record of decision. The Department is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act a report on its preferred alternative, other alternatives that were considered, a rough order of magnitude cost estimate for new construction of a mercury storage facility if new construction is a feasible alternative, and an estimated fee structure to recover the costs of operations and/or construction of such facility. The report shall also identify whether there are any potential conflicts that may be encountered regarding competition with private sector disposal and storage facilities.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING
FUND

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$625,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 542,289,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 625,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | — — — |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +82,711,000 |

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 \$625,000,000 for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$82,711,000 above the budget request.

Oak Ridge.—The Committee recommends \$163,946,000, \$3,952,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$9,711,000 above the budget request.

Paducah.—The Committee recommends \$193,652,000, \$13,563,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$25,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee supports prompt development of a long-term strategy to decontaminate and decommission the Paducah gaseous diffusion plant. The Committee provides funding above the budget request to expedite deactivation activities that will minimize operating and maintenance costs while developing those end state plans.

Portsmouth.—The Committee recommends \$213,417,000, \$607,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$48,000,000 above the budget request.

Title X Uranium/Thorium Reimbursements.—The Committee recommends \$32,959,000 to reimburse private licensees for the cost of cleaning up uranium and thorium processing sites in accordance with Title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, \$22,959,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. The budget request included funding for Title X activities for the first time since fiscal year 2008, despite escalating unpaid claims. Fulfilling the obligation to fully reimburse licensees is important to the health and safety of the affected communities. Moving forward, the Committee expects the Department to continue to provide sufficient resources within future budgets to reimburse licensees for approved claim balances.

Uranium Transfers.—The Department has been considering ways to alternatively assess the impact of its uranium transfers to meet legislative requirements. Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Department shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a report that includes all reports, analyses, data, and methodologies used to arrive at the latest Secretarial determination; any additional information that the Department determines should be considered when evaluating the impacts of its uranium transfers; a description of the legal authorities under which the Secretary transferred uranium in fiscal year 2015; and recommendations to minimize the impact of uranium transfers on the domestic uranium mining, conversion, and enrichment industries, including any actions that would require new authority for the Department to implement.

SCIENCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$5,071,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 5,339,794,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 5,100,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +29,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -239,794,000 |

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 in fiscal year 2016, 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 \$5,100,000,000 for the Office of Science, \$29,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$239,794,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recognizes the importance of workplace diversity in the Department of Energy's National Laboratories. The Committee encourages the Department to continue to develop and broaden partnerships with minority serving institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). In particular, the Committee encourages programs involving undergraduate research experiences, high speed computing access and education, nonproliferation studies, and research inclusive of the social sciences.

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 \$537,539,000 for Advanced Scientific Computing Research, \$3,461,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$83,455,000 below 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. However, the Committee is aware that many challenges still remain towards the development of exascale computing machines. The Department is directed to deliver to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act a report on the plan for delivering exascale capabilities within the Office of Science. At a minimum, the report shall include an assessment of the technical challenges of exascale computing architecture and develop a plan for address-

ing these issues. The plan should take into account various budget scenarios when developing funding profiles.

The Committee encourages the Department to support Highly Integrated Photonics to accelerate computing research leading to exascale computing while reducing computing energy consumption by a factor of 100 or more. The program is encouraged to work with small business entities to support these needed technology applications.

The recommendation includes \$99,000,000 for exascale activities within the Office of Science.

High Performance Computing and Network Facilities.—In addition to the long-term exascale initiative, 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 \$77,000,000 for the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility; \$101,000,000 for the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility; and \$76,000,000 for the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Within available funds, the recommendation includes \$8,000,000 for the Computational Science Graduate Fellowship Program.

Brain Initiative.—The Committee encourages the Department to work with the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health on a national brain observatory to leverage its high performance computing capabilities in order to advance a deeper understanding of the brain and how it works. This collaboration will lead to novel brain imaging technologies and brain inspired computing applications that will improve the Department's high performance computing capabilities and expertise.

For mathematical, computational, and computer sciences research, the recommendation includes not less than \$175,503,000.

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 \$1,770,306,000 for Basic Energy Sciences, \$37,106,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$78,994,000 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 \$1,578,440,000 for Basic Energy Sciences research, \$16,060,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$70,560,000 below the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$97,800,000 for Energy Frontier Research Centers.

For materials science and engineering research, the recommendation includes \$377,085,000, of which \$14,355,000 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 \$24,137,000 for the fourth year of the Batteries and Energy Storage Innovation Hub.

For chemical sciences, geosciences, and biosciences, the recommendation includes \$305,974,000. The recommendation includes the requested level of \$15,000,000 for the Fuels from Sunlight Innovation Hub, which begins the first year of its second five-year term in fiscal year 2016.

For scientific user facilities, the recommendation includes \$895,381,000, of which \$32,168,000 is for research; and \$35,500,000 is for major items of equipment. The recommendation includes \$797,049,000 for facilities operations of the nation's synchrotron radiation light sources, high flux neutron sources, and nanoscale science research centers, of which \$245,419,000 is for the High-Flux Neutron Sources and \$443,150,000 is for the Synchrotron Radiation Light Sources.

Construction.—The Committee recommends \$191,866,000 for Basic Energy Sciences construction, \$53,166,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$8,434,000 below the budget request.

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 \$538,000,000 for Biological and Environmental Research, \$54,000,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$74,400,000 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, 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 fourth year of the second five-year term of the three Bioenergy Research Centers, the same as fiscal year 2015 and the budget request.

The Committee supports the Department's funding for academia to perform climate model studies that include the collection and evaluation of atmospheric data from satellite observations obtained in cooperation with NASA. Satellite observations of the atmosphere within the context of the Earth as a global system provide information that is critical in the interpretation of earth-based observations.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Fusion Energy Sciences program supports basic research and experimentation aiming to harness nuclear fusion for energy production. The Committee recommends \$467,600,000 for Fusion Energy Sciences, \$100,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$47,600,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation provides not less than \$69,500,000 for the National Spherical Torus Experiment (NSTX); not less than \$80,000,000 for DIII-D; and not less than \$18,000,000 for Alcator C-Mod.

Research.—The Committee recommends \$317,600,000 for the domestic fusion program, \$100,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$47,600,000 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 ITER project.

For the science subprogram, which advances the predictive understanding of plasma confinement, dynamics, and interactions with surrounding materials, the recommendation provides \$188,860,000, of which \$35,000,000 is for DIII-D Research; \$6,145,000 is for Alcator C-Mod research; \$12,000,000 is for International Research; \$30,500,000 is for NSTX research; \$17,500,000 is for High Energy Density Laboratory Plasmas; \$25,000,000 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 \$101,330,000, of which \$45,000,000 is for DIII-D; \$39,000,000 is for NSTX operations; and \$11,855,000 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 \$27,410,000, of which \$14,000,000 is for Materials Research.

Construction.—The Committee recommends \$150,000,000 for the U.S. contribution to the ITER project, the same as fiscal year 2015 and the budget request.

The Committee continues to believe the ITER project represents an important step forward for energy sciences and has the potential to revolutionize the current understanding of fusion energy. In 2013, the third biennial management assessment report identified eleven management challenges that threaten the success of the ITER project. The Committee recognizes the continued efforts of the ITER organization in responding to these recommendations and expects that ITER's new leadership will implement reforms in a timely manner. The success of ITER depends on making continued project management progress and the Committee includes funding for the ITER Council to continue its implementation efforts. Should the ITER Council fail to reform the project management culture, the Committee will be forced to reconsider its support for the international project.

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 \$776,000,000 for High Energy Physics, \$10,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$12,000,000 below the budget request.

Within available funds, the recommendation includes \$22,000,000 for the Long Baseline Neutrino Facility (LBNF) and its alternatives, to include \$4,000,000 for research and development and \$18,000,000 for project engineering and design activities. 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 LBNF construction must be affordable under existing budgetary constraints.

Research.—The Committee recommends \$717,900,000 for High Energy Physics research, \$11,100,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$14,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee strongly supports the Department's efforts to advance the recommendations of the Particle Physics Prioritization Panel and urges the Department to maintain a careful balance among competing priorities and among small, medium, and large scale projects.

For energy frontier experimental physics, the recommendation provides \$154,555,000. The recommendation funds all activities within energy frontier experimental physics at the requested level.

For intensity frontier experimental physics, the recommendation provides \$246,196,000. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$55,924,000 for research; \$157,572,000 for facility operations and experimental support, of which \$135,100,000 is for Fermi Complex Operations and \$15,000,000 is for Homestake Mine; and \$32,700,000 for Projects, of which \$10,200,000 is for the Muon $g-2$ Experiment and \$18,500,000 is for Future Projects research and development.

For cosmic frontier experimental physics, the recommendation provides \$119,325,000. Within available funds, the recommendation provides \$50,079,000 for Research; \$10,545,000 for Facility Operations and Experimental Support; and \$58,701,000 for Projects, of which \$40,800,000 is for the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope Camera and \$15,800,000 is for the Second Generation Dark Matter experiments.

For other subprograms that comprise the high energy physics program, the recommendation provides \$60,317,000 for theoretical and computational physics; \$115,369,000 for advanced technology research and development, of which \$39,924,000 is for General Accelerators; and not less than \$5,000,000 for Accelerator Stewardship.

Construction.—The Committee recommends \$58,100,000 for High Energy Physics construction, \$21,100,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$2,000,000 above the budget request. Within available funds, the recommendation includes \$40,100,000 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 \$616,165,000 for Nuclear Physics, \$20,665,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$8,435,000 below the budget request.

Operations and Maintenance.—The Committee recommends \$510,665,000 for Nuclear Physics Operations and Maintenance, \$21,665,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$6,435,000 below the budget request. For medium energy nuclear physics, the recommendation provides \$158,062,000, of which \$100,170,000 is for operations at Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility to support runtime at the 12GeV Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility. The Committee remains supportive of the advanced nuclear physics occurring at the facility and encourages a quick transition to operations once the detector upgrades are complete. For heavy ion nuclear physics, the recommendation provides \$204,931,000, of which \$168,500,000 is for operations at Brookhaven National Lab to support 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 \$105,500,000 for Nuclear Physics construction, \$1,000,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$2,000,000 below the request. The recommended level of funding includes \$98,000,000 for the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS AND SCIENTISTS

The Committee recommends \$20,500,000 for workforce development for teachers and scientists, \$1,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

SCIENCE LABORATORIES INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends \$89,890,000 for Science Laboratories Infrastructure, \$10,290,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$23,710,000 below the budget request.

Construction.—The Committee recommends \$60,000,000 for Science Laboratories Infrastructure construction, \$6,010,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$8,910,000 below the request.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends \$103,000,000 to meet safeguards and security requirements at Office of Science facilities, \$10,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

SCIENCE PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends \$181,000,000 for Science Program Direction, \$2,700,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$6,400,000 below the request.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$- -- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -- -- |
| Recommended, 2016 | 150,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +150,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +150,000,000 |

The Committee recommendation includes \$150,000,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal, \$150,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 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 capability to respond to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission during the adjudicatory process, and to otherwise fully support the Yucca Mountain licensing process. The recommendation includes support for affected units of local government who have formally consented to host Yucca Mountain.

The Committee reiterates that the Administration’s repeated statements that Yucca Mountain is not a “workable option” ignores both the consent of the host community and the expressed intent of Congress.

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$280,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 325,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 280,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | -- -- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - 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 2015 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, 2015 | \$42,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 42,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 42,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$ - 25,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - 25,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | - 25,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

NET APPROPRIATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$17,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 17,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 17,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

The Committee recommends administrative expenses of \$42,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2015 and 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.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$4,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 6,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 6,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +2,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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

The Committee recommends \$6,000,000 for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program, \$2,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. The funds provided support administrative operations only.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$245,142,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 270,682,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 247,420,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +2,278,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -23,262,000 |

REVENUES

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$-119,171,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -117,171,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | -117,171,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +2,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - - - |

NET APPROPRIATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$125,971,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 153,511,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 130,249,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +4,278,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -23,262,000 |

The Committee recommendation for Departmental Administration is \$247,420,000, \$2,278,000 more than fiscal year 2015 and \$23,262,000 less than the budget request. The recommendation for revenues is \$117,171,000 as requested, resulting in a net appropriation of \$130,249,000. 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 Indian Energy Policy and Programs.—The Committee recommends \$16,000,000, 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.

Economic Impact and Diversity.—The recommendation includes \$10,000,000 for Economic Impact and Diversity, \$3,800,000 more than fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

International Affairs.—The recommendation includes \$13,000,000 for International Affairs, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$10,600,000 less than the budget request.

Office of Management.—The recommendation includes \$64,598,000 for the Office of Management. The recommendation includes an increase of \$1,652,000 for cost estimating.

Office of Energy Policy and Systems Analysis.—The recommendation includes \$31,297,000, \$3,703,000 less than the budget request. The Committee includes requested funding to support the Quadrennial Energy Review.

Working Capital Fund.—The Committee is concerned that the Department is not clearly reporting which programs, projects, or activities are paying into the Working Capital Fund. The Com-

mittee already provides funding for the Working Capital Fund within funds for program direction in various accounts and is concerned that the practice of charging additional costs beyond those reported is duplicative, not transparent, and may not meet the intended purpose for which those funds were appropriated. Not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, the Department shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a report of charges to each appropriation by program, project, or activity in fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016 for the Working Capital Fund. The report shall detail the Department's existing legal authorities and enabling statutes that permit the Department to pay these expenses from the particular programs, projects, or activities identified.

Renewable Fuel Standard.—Under section 211(o)(9)(B) of the Clean Air Act, a small refinery may petition the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator for an exemption from the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) on the basis that the refinery experiences a “disproportionate economic hardship” under the RFS. When evaluating a petition, the Administrator consults with the Secretary of Energy to determine whether a “disproportionate economic hardship” exists. According to the Department of Energy’s March 2011 Small Refinery Exemption Study, a “disproportionate economic hardship must encompass two broad components: a high cost of compliance relative to the industry average, and an effect sufficient to cause a significant impairment of the refinery operations.” The Committee directs the Secretary of Energy to clarify that if either of these two components exists, the Department shall at a minimum recommend to EPA a 50 percent waiver of RFS requirements for the petitioner. The Committee also directs the Secretary to seek small refinery comment before making changes to its scoring metrics for small refinery petitions for RFS waivers.

Support for Ukraine.—In consideration of Russian aggression in Ukraine, the Committee directs the Department of Energy to examine the potential for leveraging its expertise in support of energy-related issues in Ukraine. Not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, the Department shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress on what technical assistance the Department could provide to Ukraine.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$40,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 46,424,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 46,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +5,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | – 424,000 |

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

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

The Committee recommendation is \$46,000,000, \$5,500,000 more than fiscal year 2015 and \$424,000 less than the budget request.

To the extent possible, the Inspector General shall ensure the findings of its investigative reports are made available to the Committee and the public, particularly where revised versions of its reports may be required in order to protect privacy or remove other pieces of protected information that would otherwise limit distribution to internal Official Use Only.

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 Federal Salaries and Expenses; outside of the NNSA, these include Defense Environmental Cleanup, Defense Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning, 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 National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), a semi-autonomous agency within the Department, carries out these responsibilities. Established in March 2000 pursuant to Title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, the NNSA is responsible for the management and operation of the nation's nuclear weapons complex, naval reactors, and nuclear nonproliferation activities.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$8,186,657,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 8,846,948,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 8,713,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +526,343,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -133,948,000 |

Weapons Activities provides funding to ensure the safety, security, reliability, and effectiveness of the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile without nuclear testing. The Committee's recommendation simplifies the budget structure for Weapons Activities into four main elements: Directed Stockpile Work; Research, Development, Technology and Engineering; Infrastructure and Operations; and Security. The Committee recommends a fiscal year 2016 level of \$8,713,000,000 for Weapons Activities, \$526,343,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$133,948,000 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 \$3,354,296,000 for Directed Stockpile Work, \$661,708,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$167,037,000 above the budget request.

Life Extension Programs.—The Committee recommends full funding for the NNSA’s life extension programs, including the ongoing refurbishment efforts for the B61, W76, and W88 warheads. The Committee also recommends initiating a new life extension program for the W80 that will support development of a Long Range Standoff Missile (LRSO). While the Committee has not established a formal definition of what constitutes a “life extension program” compared to other major refurbishment efforts, the Committee will consider refurbishment work with the purpose of extending the life of an existing warhead with a total cost of greater than \$1,000,000,000 to be a life extension program. The Committee is concerned about the aggressive schedule to accomplish the delivery of concurrent life extension programs for the B61 and W88 in the 2020–2025 timeframe. Such peaks in the NNSA’s production lines are difficult and expensive to manage. The Committee encourages the NNSA to investigate work levelling strategies for the W88 that would help alleviate these pressures.

W88 Life Extension Program.—The Committee recommends \$220,176,000, \$54,776,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 2015, initial development work for this program was funded under the title “W88 Alt 370”. While the NNSA requested to continue designating this program as the W88 Alt 370, the size and scope of the work now planned for the W88 merits increased transparency and integrated management as part of a formal acquisition program. The NNSA is directed to integrate the costs of replacing limited life components concurrently with other refurbishment activities in its selected acquisition reports for the W88 life extension program.

W80–4 Life Extension Program.—The Committee recommends \$195,037,000, the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 2015, initial conceptual work for this program was funded at \$9,418,000 under the title “Cruise Missile Warhead Life Extension Study”. While the recommendation provides the full funding amount requested for the W80–4, continued support for the NNSA’s requested schedule is contingent on the ability of the NNSA to meet the Committee-directed reporting requirements in a timely manner and on the synchronization of this work with the schedule for the LRSO in the budget for the Department of Defense.

The Committee is concerned that the NNSA has already settled on two alternatives for the W80–4 that are more expensive than the B61 life extension program and will require funding peaks that will compete with other planned major multi-year programs and projects. The NNSA has a history of spending large amounts of funding to develop alternatives that are tabled in order to pursue a more affordable option. The NNSA must demonstrate it is able to overcome these past failures by changing the way it conducts its alternative analyses. To provide enhanced accountability for the alternatives being pursued and to ensure that other options were not prematurely excluded, the Committee directs the NNSA to task the JASONs Defense Advisory Group or another independent group to perform a red team assessment of the NNSA’s alternatives selected for the W80–4 life extension program. Not later than 180 days

after the enactment of this Act, the red team should provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress that identifies whether additional alternatives exist that might improve the affordability of the program and reduce overall programmatic risks.

Research and Development Support.—The Committee recommends \$41,059,000, \$15,559,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$6,900,000 above the budget request. The recommendation includes funding above the budget request for maintenance of the nuclear testing heritage as requested within Program Readiness.

Strategic Materials.—The Committee recommends \$589,176,000, \$589,176,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$174,217,000 above the budget request. The recommendation for Strategic Materials includes funding for uranium, plutonium and tritium sustainment activities that were requested as “Nuclear Materials Commodities”. The recommendation further expands the request to specify funds for the management of nuclear materials to other materials of strategic significance by including funding requested for Material Recycling and Recovery, Storage, Nuclear Materials Integration, and other planning efforts within Strategic Materials Sustainment.

Domestic Uranium Enrichment.—The Committee recommends \$50,000,000, \$47,200,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$50,000,000 below the budget request. The bill contains a provision that provides special reprogramming authority of an additional \$50,000,000 subject to the Committee’s normal notification guidelines. The Committee is awaiting the results of a directed interagency study that will revalidate the tritium and low enriched uranium requirements to meet national security needs and that will identify a preferred approach to meeting those requirements. However, the goals of the demonstration project have been successfully met and there is little value to indefinitely operating the centrifuges if the Department cannot identify a near-term need to construct a national security train of centrifuges. The recommendation will provide flexibility to meet national security needs should decisive near-term needs with a clear funding strategy be identified.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TECHNOLOGY, AND ENGINEERING

The NNSA’s Research, Development, Technology, and Engineering (RDT&E) activities focus on the development and maintenance of critical capabilities, tools, and processes that support science-based stockpile stewardship and continued certification of the stockpile in the absence of underground nuclear testing. For RDT&E, the Committee recommends \$1,774,174,000, \$7,983,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$2,329,000 below the budget request.

The Committee supports maintaining a robust scientific enterprise that leverages the unique attributes of the national security laboratories as the foundation of a science-based stockpile stewardship program. The NNSA reduced funding for science and engineering activities in its budget request and the Committee is concerned that undercutting funding for such activities could undermine the long-term capability of the NNSA to maintain an aging nuclear stockpile. The NNSA is pursuing several unconventional and complex options for stockpile stewardship that will present significant certification challenges. Based on an independent review of these approaches that was directed by the Committee, it is apparent

there are still significant scientific and engineering hurdles to overcome before such approaches can be adopted. The Committee will continue to favor stockpile proposals that are conservative and well understood in order to minimize the introduction of unnecessary risks into the stockpile. Nevertheless, the Committee supports continued funding to pursue experimental activities that will improve the basic fundamentals of weapons physics and advance concepts to improve safety, security, or maintainability.

Science.—The Committee recommends \$412,947,000, \$856,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$23,333,000 above the budget request. Within this amount, the recommendation provides increases above the request for Advanced Certification to better understand the properties of plutonium and to advance concepts for pit reuse. Within funding for Primary Assessment Technologies, the recommendation includes funding to expand predictive science capabilities to designs outside those in the current U.S. stockpile to enhance U.S. capabilities to assess foreign state weapons activities. Within Advanced Radiography, the recommendation includes no funding for new radiography capabilities at U1a. The NNSA did not provide a project data sheet with a multi-year funding plan as required by the Committee.

Academic Alliances and Partnerships.—The Committee recommends \$49,800,000 for Academic Alliances and Partnerships. Funding for these activities was requested within the Science and Site Stewardship programs. Within this amount, \$33,300,000 is provided for the Stewardship Science Academic Alliance Program. The NNSA reduced funding for its university partnership program in its budget request by 7.5 percent. Undercutting these foundational partnerships will ultimately weaken the scientific base upon which the NNSA relies to certify the nuclear stockpile. Also within this amount, \$16,500,000 is provided for the Minority Serving Institution Partnerships 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.

Inertial Confinement Fusion and High Yield.—The Committee recommends \$511,050,000, \$1,845,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$8,600,000 above the budget request. Within these funds, \$68,000,000 is for the OMEGA Laser Facility at the University of Rochester, \$322,500,000 is for the National Ignition Facility, and \$7,000,000 is for the Naval Research Laboratory.

Advanced Simulation and Computing.—The Committee recommends \$605,000,000, \$7,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$18,006,000 below the budget request.

Advanced Manufacturing.—The Committee recommends \$113,800,000, \$6,600,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$16,256,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, \$16,000,000 is provided for Additive Manufacturing. The budget request applied development of additive manufacturing capabilities holistically across the enterprise, but the Committee is concerned that such an approach reduces transparency into how well and how fast the NNSA is developing these advanced production technologies. In addition,

the NNSA must apply a certain degree of integrated management to these efforts to promote a domestic contractor supplier base. The recommendation does not preclude the use or development of additive production technologies within funds for life extension programs or other areas where those costs are appropriately attributed to that effort. In addition, the Committee is concerned that the full scope of work requested within Advanced Manufacturing did not meet Congressional intent of the program. This activity is not intended to fund the production readiness costs of life extension programs that are in phase 6.3 and higher. Such costs should be managed and fully accounted for as part of the appropriate life extension program.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND OPERATIONS

Infrastructure and Operations (formerly Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities) provides consolidated funding for the operations, maintenance, and recapitalization of NNSA facilities and infrastructure. The Committee recommends \$2,228,164,000 for Infrastructure and Operations, \$194,764,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$1,173,683,000 above the budget request.

The recommendation eliminates duplication by consolidating the budget request for three separate infrastructure accounts (Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities, Infrastructure and Safety, and Site Stewardship) within the recommendation for Infrastructure and Operations. The recommendation further simplifies the budget structure by combining separately-identified funding lines for certain activities that did not have clear infrastructure-based performance goals. The Committee does not support changing the budget structure each year to conform to internal organizational changes and views this matter to be largely one of agency budget execution that has no relationship to the purpose for which funds are appropriated by the Congress. The Committee's continued support for budget flexibility for maintenance and operations across the NNSA sites and for recapitalization projects is contingent on the NNSA's willingness to provide the Committee with the information it needs to conduct proper oversight of these activities.

Safety and Environmental Operations.—The Committee recommends \$107,701,000 for the Nuclear Criticality Safety Program, Nuclear Safety Research and Development, Containers, and Long-Term Stewardship activities. The NNSA is directed to provide a funding table that details the funding amounts to be provided to each of these four program elements in future budget requests.

Maintenance and Repair of Facilities.—The Committee recommends \$277,000,000. The recommendation includes \$50,000,000 above the budget request to address the backlog of deferred maintenance across the NNSA's nuclear security enterprise. Within this amount, \$25,000,000 is for maintenance of the NNSA's High-Risk Excess Facilities to improve the transparency of how much is being spent to indefinitely maintain these deteriorating facilities and to allow the Committee to better conduct oversight of the adequacy of the NNSA's maintenance program. The NNSA is directed to provide a funding table that details the site splits for maintenance in future budget requests.

Recapitalization.—The Committee recommends \$352,524,000. Within this amount, \$253,724,000 is provided for basic infrastruc-

ture projects to be executed by the Office of Infrastructure and Safety and \$98,800,000 is provided for capability-based investments to be executed by the Office of Defense Programs. As a result of progress in establishing a planning basis to formulate and execute its recapitalization efforts, the Committee recommendation does not designate specific funding by individual recapitalization projects. Funding for Recapitalization is intended for projects that are clearly defined and ready to be executed. The recommendation does not include funds requested for “reserves” and “contingency” purposes since funds to meet emergent needs are provided within Operation of Facilities and Maintenance and Repair of Facilities.

Construction.—The Committee recommends \$660,149,000, \$235,149,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$41,000 below the budget request. The Committee is concerned that there is little accountability for advancing construction projects at the early design stages and that advance funds are being requested to initiate new construction without providing the cost and schedule projections for which the NNSA is accountable. Without this information, the Committee cannot determine whether the projects requested are affordable and are being managed appropriately so that it may approve new start authority. Previously, the Committee funded initial project engineering and design (PED) in a separate project and then considered new start authority to proceed to construction at a later date when more information was available. In order to preserve the Committee’s ability to approve new start authority, the recommendation provides funds separately for PED and directs the NNSA to request funds separately for PED in future budget requests. The Committee will consider a request to initiate a new construction start when the Department is prepared to provide an accurate multi-year cost and schedule estimate with its budget request.

16-D-140 Project Engineering and Design, Various Locations.—The Committee recommends \$34,103,000. Within this amount, \$18,105,000 is for Transuranic Liquid Waste Facility Design, \$13,998,000 is for TA-55 Reinvestment Phase 3, and \$2,000,000 is for the Y-12 Emergency Operations Center. The Committee shall consider separate new start authority to commence construction on these projects upon submission of a request that details the multi-year cost and schedule projections for each project.

16-D-621 TA-3 Substation Replacement, LANL.—The Committee recommends \$25,000,000, the same as the budget request. No funding is available for construction until the NNSA provides the details of its cost and schedule performance baseline. The recommendation for substation construction at Los Alamos National Laboratory does not constitute a new start for a similar planned replacement at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the NNSA should request separate funding for this project in a future budget request.

11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment Project, Phase 2, LANL.—The Committee recommends \$3,903,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee notes that full funding was provided for this project in fiscal year 2015 and the funds requested in the fiscal year 2016 budget request are due to cost growth associated with project bids being significantly higher than the NNSA’s initial estimates.

07-D-220 Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility, LANL.—The Committee recommends \$11,533,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee notes that costs have grown to \$82,694,000, an increase of \$15,481,000 or 23 percent, since construction funds for the Low Level Liquid Waste Facility portion of this project were first requested and provided. The NNSA spent \$28,443,000 advancing a design concept for this project that was determined to be unaffordable several years later. Furthermore, the Committee is concerned about this and other projects at Los Alamos because the NNSA's contractor does not have a certified earned value management system against which performance can be appropriately tracked and managed. The NNSA is directed to provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act a report on the root causes of the cost growth of this project.

06-D-141, Uranium Processing Facility (UPF), Y-12.—The Committee recommends \$430,000,000, \$95,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. Within this amount, \$289,128,000 is for Project Engineering and Design and \$140,872,000 is for Site Preparation. None of these funds shall be available for Site Preparation or other construction activities until the NNSA submits an independently-verified cost estimate for the entire scope of the project that details the cost and schedule targets for each planned subproject to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

The Committee is concerned that the NNSA has not fully addressed the root causes of its past project management failures for major construction projects. Few details have been solidified on the UPF project and the NNSA's inability to lay out any of its plans in its budget request is indicative of the challenges that the NNSA faces in delivering this facility. The NNSA is deviating from the formal processes set out in DOE Order 413.3B for the reaffirmation of critical decision-1 and the project plans show significant funds being spent for construction activities before the project baseline is set and without formal approval from the acquisition executive, in this case the Deputy Secretary of Energy. Further, the NNSA conducted an internal peer review that indicated a potential for cost growth above the \$6,500,000,000 cost target. The Committee will continue to closely monitor progress on the project to ensure these and other issues are being addressed.

04-D-125, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research (CMR) Replacement Project, LANL.—The Committee recommends \$155,610,000. Within this amount, \$117,000,000 is provided for the RLUOB Equipment Installation, Phase 2 subproject and \$38,610,000 is provided for the PF-4 Equipment Installation subproject.

SECURITY

Defense Nuclear Security.—The Committee recommends \$682,891,000 for Defense Nuclear Security, \$46,768,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$50,000,000 above the budget request.

The recommendation provides additional funding above the budget request to meet the lifecycle need to replace security cameras and to meet shortfalls anticipated in funding for protective forces at Y-12 and other NNSA sites. The NNSA shall keep the Com-

mittee informed as it analyzes the changes to its cost accounting structures for the combined contract at Y-12 and Pantex.

Security Improvements Program.—The Committee recommends \$35,000,000 to commence a Security Improvements Program that is intended to address the backlog of security projects that must be performed over the next several years. The NNSA has identified over \$2,000,000,000 in security infrastructure upgrades that are needed, but the NNSA has not adequately prioritized these upgrades in its budget request. The Committee's recommendation enhances the visibility of these efforts and ensures funding is available to meet these additional costs that are above and beyond the base operating and maintenance costs of the NNSA's physical security program. To the extent possible, the NNSA should establish clear scope, cost, and schedule requirements by performing work as discrete projects. Projects with a total project cost greater than \$10,000,000 that represent capability upgrades and new construction shall be performed as line-item construction in accordance with existing statutory requirements. Projects that are needed to replace, maintain, and improve the reliability of aging systems shall be conducted as operating projects to expedite delivery and reduce overall costs.

The Committee is concerned that the NNSA terminated the Y-12 Security Improvements Project without completing the full scope of work planned. The budget request also defers improvements that are needed at the Pantex Plant. The NNSA shall ensure that these investments are prioritized in developing its multi-year plans for its Security Improvements Program.

14-D-710 Device Assembly Facility Argus Installation Project.—The Committee recommends \$13,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Information Technology and Cyber Security.—The Committee recommends \$157,588,000 for Information Technology and Cyber Security, \$22,058,000 below fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

Secure Transportation Asset.—The Committee recommends \$232,000,000 for Secure Transportation Asset, \$13,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$19,610,000 below the budget request. The budget request included a significant ramp up in the size of the federal workforce, but the NNSA has not provided any information to justify such an increase and reductions in the planned transport of mixed oxide feedstock will reduce requirements.

LEGACY CONTRACTOR PENSIONS

The Committee provides \$283,887,000 for payments into the legacy University of California contractor employee defined benefit pension plans, \$23,171,000 below fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$1,616,638,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 1,940,302,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 1,907,606,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +290,968,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - 32,696,000 |

The Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account provides funding to programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration that prevent, counter, and respond to global nuclear threats, according to a revised budget structure for fiscal year 2016. The Committee's recommendation for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation is \$1,907,606,000, \$290,968,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$32,696,000 below the budget request. The recommended amount includes a rescission of \$10,394,000 in prior-year unobligated balances. As requested, the recommendation includes funding for Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response activities that were funded within Weapons Activities in fiscal year 2015. After accounting for this programmatic shift, the recommendation is \$52,598,000 above the comparative level for these activities in fiscal year 2015.

Continuing U.S. Nonproliferation Activities in Russia.—As in fiscal year 2015, the Committee recommendation provides no new funds to enter into contracts and agreements with Russia in fiscal year 2016.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Funding for the Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation is provided across five new programmatic areas: Global Material Security, Material Management and Minimization, Nonproliferation and Arms Control, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D, and Nonproliferation Construction.

Global Material Security.—The Committee recommends \$422,949,000 for Global Material Security, \$3,802,000 below the budget request. The NNSA is directed to report separate funding for its domestic and international radiological material programs in its budget request. While the recommendation for Radiological Security provides funding for domestic and international activities within one reprogramming control point, continued support for this flexibility is contingent on the transparency of these activities in the NNSA's budget justifications.

Material Management and Minimization.—The Committee recommends \$310,584,000 for Material Management and Minimization, \$1,000,000 below the budget request. The recommendation does not include \$1,000,000 for Russian Surplus Materials Disposition that is requested within International Plutonium Disposition. The NNSA should identify additional funding needed to close out these activities when submitting a Secretarial waiver for enduring nonproliferation activities in Russia. The Committee is concerned that the U.S. is subsidizing the cost of removing materials from high-income nations that do not need financial assistance to enhance the security of their nuclear materials. While there may be circumstances where it is in the national security interest to pro-

vide incentives for the removal of materials from high-income nations, the NNSA must improve the justification for such actions. The Committee is also concerned that foreign nuclear materials for which the U.S. has no direct responsibility are being transported to the U.S. without consideration of the full costs of management, storage, and eventual disposition. As requested, the recommendation includes \$21,000,000 for material removal from high-income nations due to the unique security concerns associated with these particular materials. However, the NNSA is directed to offset the costs of removing these materials from prior-year balances of lower priority activities. The Committee cautions the NNSA in requesting funding for additional material removals without better accounting for the full costs of managing these materials and identifying a disposal path.

Nonproliferation and Arms Control.—The Committee recommends \$130,203,000 for Nonproliferation and Arms Control, \$3,500,000 above the budget request. Additional funding above the budget request is provided to expedite processing of export applications. The current slow process for approving Part 810 specific authorization applications puts U.S. firms at a competitive disadvantage to nuclear exporters from other countries, diminishes U.S. influence on nuclear safety, security, and nonproliferation practices, and ultimately costs American jobs. Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the NNSA shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a report on its Part 810 Process Improvement Program that details its strategy for driving efficiencies within the U.S. interagency process for approving Part 810 specific authorizations. The report shall identify a goal for the timeframe in which a typical Part 810 specific authorization is processed, shall outline the implementation schedule for the Process Improvement Program, shall identify a funding plan to successfully implement the Process Improvement Program, shall include relevant data on the average timeframes achieved for Part 810 specific authorizations during each of the past five years, and shall identify metrics that can be used to determine whether the program is achieving meaningful progress in reducing specific authorization processing times.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Research and Development.—The Committee recommends \$419,333,000 for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Research and Development, \$25,932,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. The Committee supports maintaining a vigorous research and development base at the national laboratories to further U.S. nonproliferation objectives.

Nonproliferation Construction.—The Committee recommends \$345,000,000 for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility project, the same as fiscal year 2015 and the budget request. The recommendation provides sufficient funding to sustain the current pace of construction on the MOX facility in fiscal year 2016 and includes a provision that prohibits the use of MOX funding to place the project in cold standby. The Committee is awaiting a report on the independently-verified life cycle cost estimates for the MOX and downblending alternatives that would meet U.S. commitments under the Plutonium Management Disposition Agreement. If the MOX program should be continued, the Committee encourages ex-

ploring options for cost-sharing with other responsible international partners.

NUCLEAR COUNTERTERRORISM AND INCIDENT RESPONSE

The NNSA's Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response programs respond to and mitigate nuclear and radiological incidents worldwide in order to defend the nation from the threat of nuclear terrorism. These activities were funded within Nuclear Counterterrorism Incident Response and Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation within Weapons Activities in fiscal year 2015. The Committee recommendation supports the request to align all NNSA funding to prevent, counter, and respond to nuclear proliferation and terrorism in one appropriation. The Committee recommends \$234,390,000, \$10,357,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

LEGACY CONTRACTOR PENSIONS

The Committee provides \$94,617,000 for payments into the legacy University of California contractor employee defined benefit pension plans, \$8,292,000 below fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

Rescissions.—The Committee rescinds \$10,394,000 in unobligated prior-year balances that the Department reports will remain unobligated in fiscal year 2015 apportionment restrictions related to NNSA prior-year pensions funding.

Use of prior-year balances.—The Committee directs the use of \$18,076,000 in prior-year balances to offset the fiscal year 2016 needs, as requested. The Committee further directs the use of an additional \$21,000,000 in prior-year balances to offset the costs of the removal of nuclear materials from high-income nations.

NAVAL REACTORS

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$1,234,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 1,375,496,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 1,320,394,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +86,394,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | −55,102,000 |

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's recommendation for Naval Reactors is \$1,320,394,000, \$86,394,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$55,102,000 below the budget request. The Committee's 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.

Ohio-Replacement Reactor Systems Development.—The Committee recommends \$186,800,000, \$30,700,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

S8G Prototype Refueling.—The Committee recommends \$133,000,000, \$6,600,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

NR Development.—The Committee recommends \$414,642,000, \$3,462,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$29,758,000 below the budget request.

Advanced Test Reactor.—Within the amounts for NR Development, \$71,200,000 is provided for the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) at Idaho National Laboratory. Ensuring continued safe operation of ATR is a high priority for the Committee. Naval Reactors and the Office of Nuclear Energy are working together to identify upgrades that are needed to ensure the safe and reliable operation of ATR until at least 2050. However, the Committee is concerned that the period of time that has passed since these planning activities were first initiated is resulting in an extended schedule for completion. Continued delays will only serve to increase costs and risks. The Committee directs Naval Reactors and the Office of Nuclear Energy to expedite resolution of any remaining issues and to provide an update of progress as soon as possible.

Advanced Fuel Systems.—Naval Reactors is directed to develop and provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress an outline of a conceptual research and development program for an advanced fuel system that could use low enriched uranium (LEU) fuel. Successful development of an LEU advanced fuel system could address several national-security concerns, including the continued supply of highly enriched uranium (HEU) dedicated for naval fuel that the Department of Energy says is sufficient until 2064. Potential conversion to LEU fuel in future generations of U.S. nuclear naval vessels could also reduce global risks of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism by helping promote worldwide HEU minimization, a longstanding U.S. nonproliferation policy objective. The report should describe the goals, timeline, and annual budget requirements, including fuel fabrication and test irradiation requirements, for carrying out such a development program.

NR Operations and Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends \$424,452,000, \$34,452,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$20,744,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, no less than \$138,670,000 is provided for Research Reactor Facility Operations and Maintenance.

Construction.—The Committee recommends \$118,000,000, \$4,680,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$3,100,000 below the budget request. No funding is provided 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 Department of Energy responsibility. Further, the Navy has alternative options available to meet its training needs that do not require new facility construction at Department of Energy facilities. If new construction at a Department of Energy site is preferred, NR is directed to seek out an appropriate investment arrangement with the Navy that will permit DOE facilities to be constructed to perform Navy missions on a reimbursable basis.

Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project.—The Committee recommends \$86,000,000, \$16,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

FEDERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$370,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 402,654,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 388,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +18,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -14,654,000 |

The Federal Salaries and Expenses account 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 \$388,000,000, \$18,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$14,654,000 below the budget request.

Corporate Project Management.—The Committee recommends \$9,863,000, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$2,036,000 below the budget request. The NNSA should expedite establishing permanent federal capabilities for cost estimating and project management instead of relying on support service contracts to conduct its project oversight.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$5,000,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 5,055,550,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 5,055,550,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +55,550,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

The Defense Environmental Cleanup account provides funding 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 \$5,055,550,000, \$55,550,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. Within the amounts provided, the Department is directed to fund hazardous waste worker training at \$10,000,000.

The Committee encourages the Department to move forward with plans to establish the Manhattan Project National Park as outlined in Section 3039 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2015.

Hanford Site.—The Committee recommends \$2,190,711,000, \$37,711,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$67,126,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, the Committee recommends \$922,711,000 for the Richland site office, \$18,289,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$78,874,000 above the budget request. The Department has made considerable progress cleaning up the River Corridor and reducing the overall footprint at Hanford. While the budget request proposes to reduce funds for Richland, the Committee is concerned that the Department's strategy represents a change in the cleanup plans that have not been fully explained to stakeholders and that delays indefinitely the completion of some high hazard projects. Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Department shall report to the Committees on Ap-

appropriations of both Houses of Congress on its plans for the Hanford site that clearly delineates goals and milestones over the next five years and that explains any deviations from agreements or other commitments previously made to the state and other stakeholders.

For the Office of River Protection, the Committee recommends \$1,268,000,000, \$56,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$146,000,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, \$578,000,000 is provided for Tank Farm Activities, \$56,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$71,000,000 below the budget request. The recommendation includes \$41,000,000 for vapor implementation activities and \$52,000,000 to meet milestones for single shell tank retrievals and installation of rainwater barriers. The recommendation defers funding for modifications needed for direct feed of the Waste Treatment Plant until the Department has provided more clarity on its multi-year cost and schedule plans.

Waste Treatment Plant.—The recommendation provides \$690,000,000 for construction of the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) within three reprogramming controls for Subprojects A-D, the Pretreatment Facility, and the Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System project, a new facility that is part of the direct feed modifications to the WTP. Though the Department has made progress in resolving the WTP's design problems through its proposal for direct feed, the Committee is concerned that the Department still does not have an overarching programmatic strategy to deliver the WTP, does not have a project baseline that is aligned with the contract structure, and has limited ability to monitor project performance because the contractor is no longer reporting earned value management system data against a resource-loaded schedule. The Committee does not support increasing the overall annual amount of funding for WTP construction until the Department has provided the Committee with a cost estimate to begin processing liquid waste and a clear schedule to accomplish that goal. In addition, the Department must account for its maintenance and operating costs and continued design and testing activities that are needed for the portions of the project that are delayed due to unresolved safety-related design issues. The Committee supports continued flat funding for the period of time that the Department needs to better refine its cost and schedule plans and provide those details to the Congress.

Idaho National Laboratory.—The Committee recommends \$390,783,000, \$10,580,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$30,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee is concerned that the budget request relies on a highly optimistic schedule for processing waste through the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit and is inadequate to support full tank waste processing operations through fiscal year 2016. While the Committee supports the Department's decision to undertake a safe and careful approach to starting the facility, timely startup remains a high priority. The recommendation includes an additional \$30,000,000 above the budget request to maintain funding for radioactive liquid tank waste disposition slightly below the fiscal year 2015 level while meeting other clean-up funding needs at the site.

NNSA Sites.—The Committee recommends \$246,251,000, \$12,367,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$8,625,000 below the budg-

et request. The recommendation makes use of high prior-year carryover that is a result of a halt in transuranic waste operations at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee encourages the Department to expeditiously implement its new contract and federal oversight strategies to prevent further delays in coming to agreement on a cleanup plan for the laboratory.

Oak Ridge Reservation.—The Committee recommends \$197,953,000, \$25,097,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$20,600,000 above the budget request.

U-233 Disposition Program.—The Committee recommends \$35,895,000, \$35,895,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$9,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee remains concerned about the safety and security of legacy materials in Building 3019, an aging facility in the heart of the science campus. Progress on dispositioning canisters is stalled and the Department has failed to provide the Committee-directed report on its five-year programmatic plans in a timely manner. These multi-year plans are essential to demonstrating that the Department has prioritized reducing these risks appropriately. The Department should expedite building improvements needed to process these materials as it continues to negotiate plans for direct disposal.

High-Risk Excess Facilities.—The Committee is concerned about the status of high-risk excess facilities at the Y-12 National Security Complex. In January 2015, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) provided a facility disposition report that was directed by the Committee in fiscal year 2012 that identified the NNSA's top-10 high risk facilities. The report indicated that at the top of that list are three 1940's-era facilities located at the Y-12 National Security Complex. The NNSA also reported that while NNSA and EM are working together to monitor the risks, there is no planned disposition date for the Y-12 facilities. EM has included these facilities in its Integrated Facilities Disposition Project (IFDP), but there is no visibility into how the IFDP is being managed and the project is not being conducted in accordance with DOE Order 413.3B. Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Department shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a report that details the programmatic and project management strategy for the IFDP, its multi-year cost and schedule planning projections, and the options available for mercury remediation and waste disposal. The recommendation for Oak Ridge Nuclear Facilities D&D includes \$3,000,000 above the budget request to accomplish these accelerated planning activities.

Mercury Treatment Facility.—The Committee recommends \$9,400,000 for the Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$2,600,000 above the budget request. Completion of this facility is necessary before major decommissioning progress can be made at Y-12 in order to mitigate the potential for additional mercury releases during demolition. The project is estimated to cost up to \$370,000,000 and reducing funding in fiscal year 2016 would lead to further delays and higher costs. The Committee expects the Department to provide an update on its project plans once it awards critical decision-1.

Savannah River Site.—The Committee recommends \$1,191,543,000, \$70,236,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$16,878,000

below the budget request. Within this amount, an increase of \$3,000,000 above the budget request is provided for Risk Management Operations to support the disposition of spent fuel from the High Flux Isotope Reactor.

Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF).—The Committee recommends \$194,000,000, \$59,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. The SWPF represents the critical path for meeting the Department’s long-term cleanup commitments at the site and therefore remains the Committee’s highest priority at Savannah River. The Committee is encouraged by the revision of the performance baseline for the project, which will provide the Department with the management tools it needs to monitor project performance. While the Committee does not endorse nor oppose the particular contracting strategy the Department pursued in its rebaseline negotiations, the Committee remains concerned that the Department was unsuccessful in its efforts to come to an agreement on a revised contract structure that might have reduced the risk of further cost growth and schedule slippage, considering the past problems experienced with keeping the project on track under the current contract. In the past, the Department has been reluctant to fully enforce the requirements of its contracts and has been slow to realize and react to challenges that might have an impact on project performance. Without a revised contract structure, the importance of the Department’s federal managers to utilize current authorities and enforce existing contract requirements becomes more pronounced. The Committee will continue to closely monitor progress of the project and hold the Department accountable for delivering the project on schedule and within budget.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).—The Committee recommends \$285,857,000, \$34,143,000 below fiscal year 2015 and \$42,539,000 above the budget request. While the Department has put together an aggressive plan for resuming waste emplacement operations at WIPP, the Committee is concerned that base funding is severely reduced in the budget request. Safely returning WIPP to full operations is one of the highest priorities for the Committee in the bill. Inadequately funding base operations and maintenance, as well as the transuranic waste operations at the generator sites within the Central Characterization Project, ultimately undermines the Department’s ability to address the root causes of the two incidents leading to the shutdown and to meet its transuranic waste commitments at other sites.

Technology Development and Deployment.—The Committee recommends \$14,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$510,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, \$2,000,000 is provided for the National Spent Fuel Program at Idaho National Laboratory.

DEFENSE URANIUM ENRICHMENT

DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$463,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 471,797,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 471,797,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +8,797,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | — — — |

This account provides for a federal defense contribution into the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund. The Committee recommendation is \$471,797,000, \$8,797,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation does not include authorization of a legislative proposal to reinstate a tax on nuclear utilities.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$754,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 774,425,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 767,570,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +13,570,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - 6,855,000 |

The Other Defense Activities account provides funding for the Office of Environment, Health, Safety and Security; the Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments; the Office of Legacy Management; Specialized Security Activities; Defense Related Administrative Support; and the Office of Hearings and Appeals. The Committee recommendation for Other Defense Activities is \$767,570,000, \$13,570,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$6,855,000 below the budget request.

Environment, Health, Safety and Security.—The Committee recommends \$183,798,000, \$2,800,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

Independent Enterprise Assessments.—The Committee recommends \$73,534,000, the same as fiscal year 2015 and the budget request. 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 continue to provide an annual report of its oversight activities, findings, and recommendations for the previous fiscal year.

Graded Security Posture.—Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Department shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a report that outlines a schedule to update its Graded Security Posture to meet the latest threats. The Department has not yet demonstrated it has implemented the organizational reforms that are needed to provide effective security of special nuclear materials. In particular, the Committee is awaiting the results of a directed investigation of the need for structural reforms for providing security for the National Nuclear Security Administration sites. Reforming security practices continues to be a high priority for the Committee.

Specialized Security Activities.—The Committee recommends \$215,000,000, \$11,848,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$6,855,000 below the budget request. Within this amount, \$2,000,000 is provided for innovative dynamic threat assessments at Idaho National Laboratory.

Legacy Management.—The Office of Legacy Management provides long-term stewardship following site closure. The Committee recommends \$167,180,000, \$4,800,000 below fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. The Committee supports the Office of Legacy’s Managements 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 \$122,558,000, \$3,722,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as 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, the same as fiscal year 2015 and 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

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 Shoshone Paiute Trout Hatchery, the Spokane Tribal Hatchery, and the Snake River Sockeye Weirs.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER
ADMINISTRATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Budget estimate, 2016 | \$ --- |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Recommended, 2016 | --- |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 2016 is \$90,500,000, with \$83,600,000 for purchase power and wheeling and \$6,900,000 for program direction. The purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by collections of \$66,500,000, and annual expenses will be offset by collections of \$6,900,000. Additionally, SEPA has identified \$17,100,000 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, 2015 | \$11,400,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 11,400,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 11,400,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 2016 is \$136,223,000, including \$19,279,000 for operation and maintenance expenses, \$73,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling, \$31,932,000 for program direction, and \$12,012,000 for construction. Offsetting collections total \$98,961,000, including \$6,023,000 for operations and maintenance, \$63,000,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and \$29,938,000 for program direction. Southwestern estimates it will secure alternative financing from customers in the amount of \$25,862,000.

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

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$93,372,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 93,372,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 93,372,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 2016 is recommended at \$941,600,000, which includes \$58,374,000 for construction and rehabilitation, \$80,901,000 for system operation and maintenance, \$565,927,000 for purchase power and wheeling, and \$236,398,000 for program direction. Offsetting collections include \$567,155,000 for purchase power and wheeling and annual expenses, and the use of \$7,344,000 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 \$273,729,000.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$228,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 228,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 228,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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

The budget request includes a proposal for authority to accept contributed funds in fiscal year 2016 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 \$4,950,000, with \$4,262,000 of offsetting collections applied toward annual expenses and \$460,000 of alternative financing.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$304,389,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 319,800,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 319,800,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +15,411,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

REVENUES

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$ - 304,389,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - 319,800,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | - 319,800,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | - 15,411,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

The Committee recommendation for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) is \$319,800,000, the same as the budget request. Revenues for FERC are established at a rate equal to the budget authority, resulting in a net appropriation of \$0.

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 reiterates 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.

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 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| ENERGY PROGRAMS | | | | | |
| ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY | | | | | |
| Sustainable Transportation: | | | | | |
| Vehicle technologies..... | 280,000 | 444,000 | 255,400 | -24,600 | -188,600 |
| Bioenergy technologies..... | 225,000 | 246,000 | 165,300 | -59,700 | -80,700 |
| Hydrogen and fuel cell technologies..... | 97,000 | 103,000 | 94,083 | -2,917 | -8,917 |
| Subtotal, Sustainable Transportation..... | 602,000 | 793,000 | 514,783 | -87,217 | -278,217 |
| Renewable Energy: | | | | | |
| Solar energy..... | 233,000 | 336,700 | 151,600 | -81,400 | -185,100 |
| Wind energy..... | 107,000 | 145,500 | 90,450 | -16,550 | -55,050 |
| Water power..... | 61,000 | 67,000 | 38,700 | -22,300 | -28,300 |
| Geothermal technologies..... | 55,000 | 96,000 | 46,000 | -9,000 | -50,000 |
| Subtotal, Renewable Energy..... | 456,000 | 645,200 | 326,750 | -129,250 | -318,450 |
| Energy Efficiency: | | | | | |
| Advanced manufacturing..... | 200,000 | 404,000 | 205,000 | +5,000 | -199,000 |
| Building technologies..... | 172,000 | 264,000 | 150,362 | -21,638 | -113,638 |
| Federal energy management program..... | 27,000 | 43,088 | 18,800 | -8,200 | -24,288 |
| Weatherization and intergovernmental: Weatherization: Weatherization assistance program..... Training and technical assistance..... | 190,000 3,000 | 223,999 4,000 | 190,000 3,000 | --- | -33,999 -1,000 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| NREL Site-Wide Facility Support..... | --- | 400 | 400 | +400 | --- |
| Subtotal, Weatherization..... | 193,000 | 228,399 | 193,400 | +400 | -34,999 |
| State energy program grants..... | 50,000 | 70,100 | 50,000 | --- | -20,100 |
| Local technical assistance program..... | --- | 20,000 | --- | --- | -20,000 |
| Subtotal, Weatherization and intergovernmental program..... | 243,000 | 318,499 | 243,400 | +400 | -75,099 |
| Subtotal, Energy Efficiency..... | 642,000 | 1,029,587 | 617,562 | -24,438 | -412,025 |
| Corporate Support: Facilities and infrastructure: National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)..... | 56,000 | 62,000 | 56,000 | --- | -6,000 |
| Program direction..... | 160,000 | 165,330 | 150,000 | -10,000 | -15,330 |
| Strategic programs..... | 21,000 | 27,870 | 12,000 | -9,000 | -15,870 |
| Subtotal, Corporate Support..... | 237,000 | 255,200 | 218,000 | -19,000 | -37,200 |
| Subtotal, Energy efficiency and renewable energy.. | 1,937,000 | 2,722,987 | 1,677,095 | -259,905 | -1,045,892 |
| Use of Prior Year Balances..... | --- | --- | -19,321 | -19,321 | -19,321 |
| Rescissions..... | -13,065 | --- | --- | +13,065 | --- |
| TOTAL, ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY..... | 1,923,935 | 2,722,987 | 1,657,774 | -266,161 | -1,065,213 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY | | | | | |
| Research and development: | | | | | |
| Clean energy transmission and reliability..... | 34,262 | 40,000 | 31,000 | -3,262 | -9,000 |
| Smart grid research and development..... | 15,439 | 30,000 | 20,000 | +4,561 | -10,000 |
| Cyber security for energy delivery systems..... | 45,999 | 52,000 | 47,000 | +1,001 | -5,000 |
| Energy storage..... | 12,000 | 21,000 | 15,000 | +3,000 | -6,000 |
| Transformer resilience and advanced components..... | --- | 10,000 | --- | --- | -10,000 |
| Subtotal..... | 107,700 | 153,000 | 113,000 | +5,300 | -40,000 |
| National electricity delivery..... | | | | | |
| Infrastructure security and energy restoration..... | 6,000 | 7,500 | 6,000 | --- | -1,500 |
| State energy reliability and assurance..... | 6,000 | 14,000 | 14,000 | +8,000 | --- |
| Program direction..... | --- | 63,000 | --- | --- | -63,000 |
| | 27,606 | 32,600 | 27,000 | -606 | -5,600 |
| TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY | 147,306 | 270,100 | 160,000 | +12,694 | -110,100 |
| NUCLEAR ENERGY | | | | | |
| Research and development: | | | | | |
| Integrated university program..... | 5,000 | --- | 5,000 | --- | +5,000 |
| STEP R&D..... | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | --- | --- |
| Small modular reactor licensing technical support... | 54,500 | 62,500 | 62,500 | +8,000 | --- |
| Nuclear energy enabling technologies..... | 101,000 | 86,387 | 111,600 | +10,600 | +25,213 |
| Reactor concepts RD&D..... | 133,000 | 108,140 | 141,718 | +8,718 | +33,578 |
| Fuel cycle research and development..... | 197,000 | 217,760 | 175,800 | -21,200 | -41,960 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| International nuclear energy cooperation..... | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 498,500 | 482,787 | 504,618 | +6,118 | +21,831 |
| Infrastructure: | | | | | |
| Radiological facilities management: | | | | | |
| Space and defense infrastructure..... | 20,000 | --- | --- | -20,000 | --- |
| Research reactor infrastructure..... | 5,000 | 6,800 | 6,800 | +1,800 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 25,000 | 6,800 | 6,800 | -18,200 | --- |
| INL facilities management: | | | | | |
| INL operations and infrastructure..... | 200,631 | 209,826 | 216,582 | +15,951 | +6,756 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 16-E-200 Sample preparation laboratory..... | --- | 2,000 | 2,000 | +2,000 | --- |
| 13-D-905 Remote-handled low level waste disposal project, INL..... | 5,369 | --- | --- | -5,369 | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 5,369 | 2,000 | 2,000 | -3,369 | --- |
| Subtotal, INL facilities management..... | 206,000 | 211,826 | 218,582 | +12,582 | +6,756 |
| Subtotal, Infrastructure..... | 231,000 | 218,626 | 225,382 | -5,618 | +6,756 |
| Idaho sitewide safeguards and security..... | 104,000 | 126,161 | 126,161 | +22,161 | --- |
| Program direction..... | 80,000 | 80,000 | 80,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Nuclear Energy..... | 913,500 | 907,574 | 936,161 | +22,661 | +28,587 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Rescission..... | -80,000 | --- | --- | +80,000 | --- |
| TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY..... | 833,500 | 907,574 | 936,161 | +102,661 | +28,587 |
| ===== | | | | | |
| FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT | | | | | |
| Coal CCS and power systems: | | | | | |
| Carbon capture..... | 88,000 | 116,631 | 97,800 | +9,800 | -18,831 |
| Carbon storage..... | 100,000 | 108,768 | 104,000 | +4,000 | -4,768 |
| Advanced energy systems..... | 103,000 | 39,385 | 105,000 | +2,000 | +65,615 |
| Cross cutting research..... | 49,000 | 51,242 | 52,100 | +3,100 | +858 |
| NETL coal research and development..... | 50,000 | 34,031 | 50,000 | --- | +15,969 |
| STEP (Supercritical CO2)..... | 10,000 | 19,300 | 15,000 | +5,000 | -4,300 |
| Subtotal, CCS and power systems..... | 400,000 | 369,357 | 423,900 | +23,900 | +54,543 |
| Natural Gas Technologies: | | | | | |
| CCS demonstrations: | | | | | |
| Natural gas carbon capture and storage..... | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Research..... | 25,121 | 44,000 | 21,200 | -3,921 | -22,800 |
| Subtotal, Natural Gas Technologies..... | 25,121 | 44,000 | 21,200 | -3,921 | -22,800 |
| Unconventional fossil energy technologies from petroleum - oil technologies..... | | | | | |
| Program direction..... | 4,500 | --- | 13,000 | +8,500 | +13,000 |
| Plant and capital equipment..... | 119,000 | 114,202 | 120,000 | +1,000 | +5,798 |
| Fossil energy environmental restoration..... | 15,782 | 18,044 | 18,003 | +2,221 | -41 |
| | 5,897 | 8,197 | 8,197 | +2,300 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Super computer..... | --- | 5,500 | --- | --- | -5,500 |
| Special recruitment programs..... | 700 | 700 | 700 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT..... | 571,000 | 560,000 | 605,000 | +34,000 | +45,000 |
| NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES..... | 19,950 | 17,500 | 17,500 | -2,450 | --- |
| ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND..... | 15,580 | --- | --- | -15,580 | --- |
| STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE..... | 200,000 | 257,000 | 212,030 | +12,030 | -44,970 |
| NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE | | | | | |
| NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE..... | 7,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | -6,000 | --- | --- | +6,000 | --- |
| TOTAL, NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE..... | 1,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 | +6,000 | --- |
| ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION..... | | | | | |
| ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION..... | 117,000 | 131,000 | 117,000 | --- | -14,000 |
| NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP | | | | | |
| Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility (WA)..... | 2,562 | 2,562 | 2,562 | --- | --- |
| Gaseous Diffusion Plants..... | 104,403 | 104,403 | 104,403 | --- | --- |
| Small sites..... | 80,049 | 54,007 | 61,715 | -18,334 | +7,708 |
| West Valley Demonstration Project..... | 58,986 | 59,213 | 59,213 | +227 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Construction: | | | | | |
| Mercury storage facility..... | --- | --- | 1,300 | +1,300 | +1,300 |
| TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP..... | 246,000 | 220,185 | 229,193 | -16,807 | +9,008 |
| | ===== | ===== | ===== | ===== | ===== |
| URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND | | | | | |
| Oak Ridge..... | 167,898 | 154,235 | 163,946 | -3,952 | +9,711 |
| Paducah: | | | | | |
| Nuclear facility D&D, Paducah..... | 198,729 | 167,456 | 192,456 | -6,273 | +25,000 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-U-407 On-site waste disposal facility, Paducah. | 8,486 | --- | --- | -8,486 | --- |
| 16-U-401 Solid waste management units 5&6..... | --- | 1,196 | 1,196 | +1,196 | --- |
| Total, Paducah..... | 207,215 | 168,652 | 193,652 | -13,563 | +25,000 |
| Portsmouth: | | | | | |
| Nuclear facility D&D, Portsmouth..... | 209,524 | 131,117 | 156,117 | -53,407 | +25,000 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-U-408 On-site waste disposal facility, Portsmouth..... | 4,500 | 34,300 | 57,300 | +52,800 | +23,000 |
| Total, Portsmouth..... | 214,024 | 165,417 | 213,417 | -607 | +48,000 |
| Pension and community and regulatory support..... | 25,863 | 21,026 | 21,026 | -4,837 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Title X uranium/thorium reimbursement program..... | 10,000 | 32,959 | 32,959 | +22,959 | --- |
| TOTAL, UED&D FUND..... | 625,000 | 542,289 | 625,000 | --- | +82,711 |
| ===== | | | | | |
| SCIENCE | | | | | |
| Advanced scientific computing research..... | 541,000 | 620,994 | 537,539 | -3,461 | -83,455 |
| Basic energy sciences: | | | | | |
| Research..... | 1,594,500 | 1,649,000 | 1,578,440 | -16,060 | -70,560 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 13-SC-10 LINAC coherent light source II, SLAC... | 138,700 | 200,300 | 191,866 | +53,166 | -8,434 |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 138,700 | 200,300 | 191,866 | +53,166 | -8,434 |
| Subtotal, Basic energy sciences..... | 1,733,200 | 1,849,300 | 1,770,306 | +37,106 | -78,994 |
| Biological and environmental research..... | 592,000 | 612,400 | 538,000 | -54,000 | -74,400 |
| Fusion energy sciences: | | | | | |
| Research..... | 317,500 | 270,000 | 317,600 | +100 | +47,600 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 14-SC-60 ITER..... | 150,000 | 150,000 | 150,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Fusion energy sciences..... | 467,500 | 420,000 | 467,600 | +100 | +47,600 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| High energy physics: | | | | | |
| Research..... | 729,000 | 731,900 | 717,900 | -11,100 | -14,000 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 11-SC-40 Project engineering and design (PED) long baseline neutrino experiment, FNAL..... | 12,000 | 16,000 | 18,000 | +6,000 | +2,000 |
| 11-SC-41 Muon to electron conversion experiment, FNAL..... | 25,000 | 40,100 | 40,100 | +15,100 | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 37,000 | 56,100 | 58,100 | +21,100 | +2,000 |
| Subtotal, High energy physics..... | 766,000 | 788,000 | 776,000 | +10,000 | -12,000 |
| Nuclear physics: | | | | | |
| Operations and maintenance..... | 489,000 | 517,100 | 510,665 | +21,665 | -6,435 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 14-SC-50 Facility for rare isotope beams, Michigan State University..... | 90,000 | 100,000 | 98,000 | +8,000 | -2,000 |
| 06-SC-01 12 GeV continuous electron beam facility upgrade, TJNAF..... | 16,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | -9,000 | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 106,500 | 107,500 | 105,500 | -1,000 | -2,000 |
| Subtotal, Nuclear physics..... | 595,500 | 624,600 | 616,165 | +20,665 | -8,435 |
| Workforce development for teachers and scientists..... | 19,500 | 20,500 | 20,500 | +1,000 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Science laboratories infrastructure: | | | | | |
| Infrastructure support: | | | | | |
| Payment in lieu of taxes..... | 1,713 | 1,713 | 1,713 | --- | --- |
| Oak Ridge landford..... | 5,777 | --- | 6,177 | +400 | +6,177 |
| Facilities and infrastructure..... | 6,100 | 30,977 | 10,000 | +3,900 | -20,977 |
| Oak Ridge nuclear operations..... | --- | 12,000 | 12,000 | +12,000 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 13,590 | 44,690 | 29,890 | +16,300 | -14,800 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-SC-78 Integrative genomics building, LBNL..... | 12,090 | 20,000 | 16,000 | +3,910 | -4,000 |
| 15-SC-77 Photon science laboratory building, SLAC..... | 10,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | +15,000 | --- |
| 15-SC-76 Materials design laboratory, ANL..... | 7,000 | 23,910 | 19,000 | +12,000 | -4,910 |
| 15-SC-75 Infrastructure and operational improvements, PPPL..... | 25,000 | --- | --- | -25,000 | --- |
| 12-SC-70 Science and user support building, SLAC | 11,920 | --- | --- | -11,920 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 66,010 | 68,910 | 60,000 | -6,010 | -8,910 |
| Subtotal, Science laboratories infrastructure... | 79,600 | 113,600 | 89,890 | +10,290 | -23,710 |
| Safeguards and security..... | 93,000 | 103,000 | 103,000 | +10,000 | --- |
| Science program direction..... | 183,700 | 187,400 | 181,000 | -2,700 | -6,400 |
| TOTAL, SCIENCE..... | 5,071,000 | 5,339,794 | 5,100,000 | +29,000 | -239,794 |
| NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL..... | --- | --- | 150,000 | +150,000 | +150,000 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 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 | | | | | |
| Program direction..... | --- | 3,510 | --- | --- | -3,510 |
| Tribal energy program..... | --- | 16,490 | --- | --- | -16,490 |
| TOTAL, INDIAN ENERGY PROGRAMS..... | --- | 20,000 | --- | --- | -20,000 |
| TITLE 17 - INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PGM | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses..... | 42,000 | 42,000 | 42,000 | --- | --- |
| Offsetting collection..... | -25,000 | -25,000 | -25,000 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, TITLE 17 - INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM..... | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | --- | --- |
| TRIBAL INDIAN ENERGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM | | | | | |
| Loan guarantee credit subsidy costs..... | --- | 9,000 | --- | --- | -9,000 |
| Administrative operations..... | --- | 2,000 | --- | --- | -2,000 |
| TOTAL, TRIBAL INDIAN ENERGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM | --- | 11,000 | --- | --- | -11,000 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------|---------------------|---------------------|
| ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PGM | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses..... | 4,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | +2,000 | --- |
| TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM..... | 4,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | +2,000 | --- |
| CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY (RESCISSION)..... | -6,600 | --- | --- | +6,600 | --- |
| DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Administrative operations: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary: | | | | | |
| Program direction..... | 5,008 | 5,300 | 5,008 | --- | -292 |
| Chief Financial Officer..... | 47,000 | 50,182 | 47,000 | --- | -3,182 |
| Management..... | 62,946 | 76,227 | 64,598 | +1,652 | -11,629 |
| Chief human capital officer..... | 24,500 | 25,400 | 24,500 | --- | -900 |
| Chief Information Officer..... | 33,188 | 30,988 | 30,988 | -2,200 | --- |
| Office of Indian energy policy and programs..... | 16,000 | --- | 16,000 | --- | +16,000 |
| Congressional and intergovernmental affairs..... | 6,300 | 6,300 | 6,300 | --- | --- |
| Office Of Small and disadvantaged business utilization..... | 2,253 | 3,000 | 3,000 | +747 | --- |
| Economic impact and diversity..... | 6,200 | 10,000 | 10,000 | +3,800 | --- |
| General Counsel..... | 33,000 | 33,000 | 33,000 | --- | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Energy policy and systems analysis..... | 31,181 | 35,000 | 31,297 | +116 | -3,703 |
| International Affairs..... | 13,000 | 23,600 | 13,000 | --- | -10,600 |
| Public affairs..... | 3,431 | 3,431 | 3,431 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Salaries and expenses..... | 284,007 | 302,428 | 288,122 | +4,115 | -14,306 |
| Program support: | | | | | |
| Economic impact and diversity..... | 2,800 | --- | --- | -2,800 | --- |
| Policy analysis and system studies..... | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Environmental policy studies..... | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Climate change technology program (prog. supp)..... | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cybersecurity and secure communications..... | 21,364 | 21,006 | 21,006 | -358 | --- |
| Corporate IT program support (CIO)..... | 19,612 | 27,806 | 20,850 | +1,238 | -6,956 |
| Subtotal, Program support..... | 43,776 | 48,812 | 41,856 | -1,920 | -6,956 |
| Subtotal, Administrative operations..... | 327,783 | 351,240 | 329,978 | +2,195 | -21,262 |
| Strategic partnership projects (SPP)..... | 42,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | -2,000 | --- |
| Subtotal, Departmental administration..... | 369,783 | 391,240 | 369,978 | +195 | -21,262 |
| Use of prior-year balances..... | -5,805 | -2,000 | --- | +5,805 | +2,000 |
| Digital service team - CIO..... | --- | 4,000 | --- | --- | -4,000 |
| Funding from other defense activities..... | -118,836 | -122,558 | -122,558 | -3,722 | --- |
| Total, Departmental administration (gross)..... | 245,142 | 270,682 | 247,420 | +2,278 | -23,262 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Miscellaneous revenues..... | -119,171 | -117,171 | -117,171 | +2,000 | --- |
| TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)..... | 125,971 | 153,511 | 130,249 | +4,278 | -23,262 |
| OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL | | | | | |
| Office of the inspector general..... | 40,500 | 46,424 | 46,000 | +5,500 | -424 |
| TOTAL, ENERGY PROGRAMS..... | 10,232,742 | 11,554,964 | 10,296,507 | +63,765 | -1,258,457 |
| ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES | | | | | |
| NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| WEAPONS ACTIVITIES | | | | | |
| Directed stockpile work: | | | | | |
| B61 Life extension program..... | 643,000 | 643,300 | 643,300 | +300 | --- |
| W76 Life extension program..... | 259,168 | 244,019 | 244,019 | -15,149 | --- |
| W88 Life extension program..... | 165,400 | 220,176 | 220,176 | +54,776 | --- |
| Cruise missile warhead life extension study..... | 9,418 | --- | --- | -9,418 | --- |
| W80-4 Life extension program..... | --- | 195,037 | 195,037 | +195,037 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 1,076,986 | 1,302,532 | 1,302,532 | +225,546 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Stockpile systems: | | | | | |
| B61 Stockpile systems..... | 109,615 | 52,247 | 52,247 | -57,368 | --- |
| W76 Stockpile systems..... | 45,728 | 50,921 | 50,921 | +5,193 | --- |
| W78 Stockpile systems..... | 62,703 | 64,092 | 64,092 | +1,389 | --- |
| W80 Stockpile systems..... | 70,610 | 68,005 | 68,005 | -2,605 | --- |
| B83 Stockpile systems..... | 63,136 | 42,177 | 42,177 | -20,959 | --- |
| W87 Stockpile systems..... | 91,255 | 89,299 | 89,299 | -1,956 | --- |
| W88 Stockpile systems..... | 88,060 | 115,685 | 115,685 | +27,625 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 531,107 | 482,426 | 482,426 | -48,681 | --- |
| Weapons dismantlement and disposition..... | 50,000 | 48,049 | 48,049 | -1,951 | --- |
| Stockpile services: | | | | | |
| Production support..... | 350,942 | 447,527 | 447,527 | +96,585 | --- |
| Research and Development support..... | 25,500 | 34,159 | 41,059 | +15,559 | +6,900 |
| R and D certification and safety..... | 160,000 | 192,613 | 185,000 | +25,000 | -7,613 |
| Management, technology, and production..... | 226,000 | 264,994 | 258,527 | +32,527 | -6,467 |
| Plutonium sustainment..... | 132,000 | --- | --- | -132,000 | --- |
| Tritium readiness..... | 140,053 | --- | --- | -140,053 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 1,034,495 | 939,293 | 932,113 | -102,382 | -7,180 |
| Strategic materials: | | | | | |
| Uranium sustainment..... | --- | 32,916 | 32,916 | +32,916 | --- |
| Plutonium sustainment..... | --- | 174,698 | 174,698 | +174,698 | --- |
| Tritium sustainment..... | --- | 107,345 | 107,345 | +107,345 | --- |
| Domestic uranium enrichment..... | --- | 100,000 | 50,000 | +50,000 | -50,000 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Strategic materials sustainment..... | --- | --- | 224,217 | +224,217 | +224,217 |
| Subtotal..... | --- | 414,959 | 589,176 | +589,176 | +174,217 |
| Subtotal, Directed stockpile work..... | 2,692,588 | 3,187,259 | 3,354,296 | +661,708 | +167,037 |
| Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RD&E): Science: | | | | | |
| Advanced certification..... | 58,747 | 50,714 | 58,747 | --- | +8,033 |
| Primary assessment technologies..... | 109,000 | 98,500 | 104,100 | -4,900 | +5,600 |
| Dynamic materials properties..... | 109,000 | 109,000 | 100,400 | -8,600 | -8,600 |
| Advanced radiography..... | 47,000 | 47,000 | 27,000 | -20,000 | -20,000 |
| Secondary assessment technologies..... | 88,344 | 84,400 | 72,900 | -15,444 | -11,500 |
| Academic alliances and partnerships..... | --- | --- | 49,800 | +49,800 | +49,800 |
| Subtotal..... | 412,091 | 389,614 | 412,947 | +856 | +23,333 |
| Engineering: | | | | | |
| Enhanced surety..... | 52,003 | 50,821 | 50,821 | -1,182 | --- |
| Weapons system engineering assessment technology | 20,832 | 17,371 | 17,371 | -3,461 | --- |
| Nuclear survivability..... | 25,371 | 24,461 | 24,461 | -910 | --- |
| Enhanced surveillance..... | 37,799 | 38,724 | 38,724 | +925 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 136,005 | 131,377 | 131,377 | -4,628 | --- |
| Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield: Ignition..... | 77,994 | 73,334 | 76,334 | -1,660 | +3,000 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill Enacted | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Support of other stockpile programs..... | 23,598 | 22,843 | 22,843 | -755 | --- |
| Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support..... | 61,297 | 58,587 | 58,587 | -2,710 | --- |
| Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion..... | 5,024 | 4,963 | 4,963 | -61 | --- |
| Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas..... | 9,100 | 8,900 | 8,900 | -200 | --- |
| Facility operations and target production..... | 335,882 | 333,823 | 339,423 | +3,541 | +5,600 |
| Subtotal..... | 512,895 | 502,450 | 511,050 | -1,845 | +8,600 |
| Advanced simulation and computing..... | 598,000 | 623,006 | 605,000 | +7,000 | -18,006 |
| Advanced manufacturing development: | | | | | |
| Additive manufacturing..... | 12,600 | --- | 16,000 | +3,400 | +16,000 |
| Component manufacturing development..... | 75,000 | 112,256 | 80,000 | +5,000 | -32,256 |
| Process technology development..... | 19,600 | 17,800 | 17,800 | -1,800 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 107,200 | 130,056 | 113,800 | +6,600 | -16,256 |
| Subtotal..... | 1,766,191 | 1,776,503 | 1,774,174 | +7,983 | -2,329 |
| Infrastructure and Operations (formerly RTBF): | | | | | |
| Operations of facilities: | | | | | |
| Kansas City Plant..... | 125,000 | --- | 100,250 | -24,750 | +100,250 |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory..... | 71,000 | --- | 70,671 | -329 | +70,671 |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory..... | 198,000 | --- | 196,460 | -1,540 | +196,460 |
| Nevada Test Site..... | 89,000 | --- | 89,000 | --- | +89,000 |
| Pantex..... | 75,000 | --- | 58,021 | -16,979 | +58,021 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Sandia National Laboratory..... | 106,000 | --- | 115,300 | +9,300 | +115,300 |
| Savannah River Site..... | 81,000 | --- | 80,463 | -537 | +80,463 |
| Y-12 National Security Complex..... | 151,000 | --- | 120,625 | -30,375 | +120,625 |
| Subtotal..... | 896,000 | --- | 830,790 | -65,210 | +830,790 |
| Program readiness..... | 68,000 | 75,185 | --- | -68,000 | -75,185 |
| Material recycle and recovery..... | 126,000 | 173,859 | --- | -126,000 | -173,859 |
| Containers..... | 26,000 | --- | --- | -26,000 | --- |
| Storage..... | 40,800 | 40,920 | --- | -40,800 | -40,920 |
| Safety and environmental operations..... | --- | --- | 107,701 | +107,701 | +107,701 |
| Maintenance and repair of facilities: | | | | | |
| Maintenance and repair of facilities..... | 227,000 | --- | --- | -227,000 | --- |
| Site maintenance..... | --- | --- | 252,000 | +252,000 | +252,000 |
| High-risk excess facilities..... | --- | --- | 25,000 | +25,000 | +25,000 |
| Subtotal, Maintenance and repair of facilities..... | 227,000 | --- | 277,000 | +50,000 | +277,000 |
| Recapitalization: | | | | | |
| Recapitalization..... | 224,600 | 104,327 | --- | -224,600 | -104,327 |
| Infrastructure and safety..... | --- | --- | 253,724 | +253,724 | +253,724 |
| Capability based investments..... | --- | --- | 98,800 | +98,800 | +98,800 |
| Subtotal, Recapitalization..... | 224,600 | 104,327 | 352,524 | +127,924 | +248,197 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 16-D-140 Project engineering and design, various Locations..... | --- | --- | 34,103 | +34,103 | +34,103 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 16-D-621 TA-3 Substation replacement, LANL..... | --- | --- | 25,000 | +25,000 | +25,000 |
| 15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12..... | 2,000 | --- | --- | -2,000 | --- |
| 15-D-301 HE Science & Engineering Facility, PX..... | 11,800 | --- | --- | -11,800 | --- |
| 15-D-302 TA-55 Reinvestment project III, LANL..... | 16,062 | 18,195 | --- | -16,062 | -18,195 |
| 12-D-301 TRU waste facility project, LANL..... | 6,938 | --- | --- | -6,938 | --- |
| 11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project II, LANL..... | 10,000 | 3,903 | 3,903 | -6,097 | --- |
| 07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility, LANL..... | --- | 11,533 | 11,533 | +11,533 | --- |
| 07-0-220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL..... | 7,500 | 40,949 | --- | -7,500 | -40,949 |
| Uranium processing facility (UPF): | | | | | |
| 06-D-141 Uranium Processing Facility, Y-12..... | 335,000 | 430,000 | --- | -335,000 | -430,000 |
| Project engineering and design, UPF..... | --- | --- | 289,128 | +289,128 | +289,128 |
| 06-D-141-02 Site preparation, UPF..... | --- | --- | 140,872 | +140,872 | +140,872 |
| Subtotal, UPF..... | 335,000 | 430,000 | 430,000 | +95,000 | --- |
| Chemistry and metallurgy replacement (CMRR): | | | | | |
| 04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy replacement project, LANL..... | 35,700 | 155,610 | --- | -35,700 | -155,610 |
| 04-D-125-04 RL00B equipment installation, phase 2. | --- | --- | 117,000 | +117,000 | +117,000 |
| 04-D-125-05 PF-4 equipment installation..... | --- | --- | 38,610 | +38,610 | +38,610 |
| Subtotal, CMRR..... | 35,700 | 155,610 | 155,610 | +119,910 | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 425,000 | 660,190 | 660,149 | +235,149 | -41 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Subtotal, Infrastructure and Operations..... | 2,033,400 | 1,054,481 | 2,228,164 | +194,764 | +1,173,683 |
| Secure transportation asset: | | | | | |
| Operations and equipment..... | 121,882 | 146,272 | 140,000 | +18,118 | -6,272 |
| Program direction..... | 97,118 | 105,338 | 92,000 | -5,118 | -13,338 |
| Subtotal, Secure transportation asset..... | 219,000 | 251,610 | 232,000 | +13,000 | -19,610 |
| Nuclear counterterrorism incident response..... | 177,940 | --- | --- | -177,940 | --- |
| Counterterrorism and counterproliferation programs..... | 46,093 | --- | --- | -46,093 | --- |
| Infrastructure and safety | | | | | |
| Operations of facilities | | | | | |
| Kansas City Plant..... | --- | 100,250 | --- | --- | -100,250 |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory..... | --- | 70,671 | --- | --- | -70,671 |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory..... | --- | 196,460 | --- | --- | -196,460 |
| Nevada National Security Site..... | --- | 89,000 | --- | --- | -89,000 |
| Pantex..... | --- | 58,021 | --- | --- | -58,021 |
| Sandia National Laboratory..... | --- | 115,300 | --- | --- | -115,300 |
| Savannah River Site..... | --- | 80,463 | --- | --- | -80,463 |
| Y-12 National security complex..... | --- | 120,625 | --- | --- | -120,625 |
| Total, Operations of facilities..... | --- | 830,790 | --- | --- | -830,790 |
| Safety operations..... | --- | 107,701 | --- | --- | -107,701 |
| Maintenance..... | --- | 227,000 | --- | --- | -227,000 |
| Recapitalization..... | --- | 257,724 | --- | --- | -257,724 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 16-D-621 Substation replacement at TA-3, LANL..... | --- | 25,000 | --- | --- | -25,000 |
| 15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12..... | --- | 17,919 | --- | --- | -17,919 |
| Total, Construction..... | --- | 42,919 | --- | --- | -42,919 |
| Total, Infrastructure and safety..... | | | | | |
| | --- | 1,466,134 | --- | --- | -1,466,134 |
| Site stewardship..... | | | | | |
| | 76,531 | 36,595 | --- | -76,531 | -36,595 |
| Defense nuclear security: | | | | | |
| Defense nuclear security..... | 636,123 | 619,891 | 634,891 | -1,232 | +15,000 |
| Security improvements program..... | --- | --- | 35,000 | +35,000 | +35,000 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 14-D-710 Device assembly facility argus installation project, NV..... | --- | 13,000 | 13,000 | +13,000 | --- |
| Subtotal, Defense nuclear security..... | 636,123 | 632,891 | 682,891 | +46,768 | +50,000 |
| Information technology and cyber security: | | | | | |
| Legacy contractor pensions..... | 179,646 | 157,588 | 157,588 | -22,058 | --- |
| Domestic uranium enrichment..... | 307,058 | 283,887 | 283,887 | -23,171 | --- |
| | 97,200 | --- | --- | -97,200 | --- |
| Subtotal, Weapons Activities..... | 8,231,770 | 8,846,948 | 8,713,000 | +481,230 | -133,948 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill Enacted | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Rescission..... | -45,113 | --- | --- | +45,113 | --- |
| TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES..... | 8,186,657 | 8,846,948 | 8,713,000 | +526,343 | -133,948 |
| ===== | | | | | |
| DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION | | | | | |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs: | | | | | |
| Global material security: | | | | | |
| International nuclear security..... | --- | 130,527 | 130,527 | +130,527 | --- |
| Radiological security..... | --- | 153,749 | 153,749 | +153,749 | --- |
| Nuclear smuggling detection..... | --- | 142,475 | 138,673 | +138,673 | -3,802 |
| Subtotal, Global material security..... | --- | 426,751 | 422,949 | +422,949 | -3,802 |
| Material management and minimization: | | | | | |
| HEU reactor conversion..... | --- | 115,000 | 115,000 | +115,000 | --- |
| Nuclear material removal..... | --- | 114,000 | 114,000 | +114,000 | --- |
| Material disposition..... | --- | 82,584 | 81,584 | +81,584 | -1,000 |
| Subtotal, Material management and minimization..... | --- | 311,584 | 310,584 | +310,584 | -1,000 |
| Nonproliferation and arms control..... | | | | | |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation R&D..... | 393,401 | 126,703 | 130,203 | +130,203 | +3,500 |
| Nonproliferation construction: | --- | 419,333 | 419,333 | +25,932 | --- |
| 99-D-143 Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, SRS..... | --- | 345,000 | 345,000 | +345,000 | --- |
| Subtotal, Nonproliferation construction..... | --- | 345,000 | 345,000 | +345,000 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Global threat reduction initiative: | | | | | |
| HEU reactor conversion..... | 119,383 | --- | --- | -119,383 | --- |
| International nuclear and radiological material removal and protection..... | 117,737 | --- | --- | -117,737 | --- |
| Domestic radiological material removal and protection..... | 88,632 | --- | --- | -88,632 | --- |
| Subtotal, Global threat reduction initiative.... | 325,752 | --- | --- | -325,752 | --- |
| Nonproliferation and international security..... | 141,359 | --- | --- | -141,359 | --- |
| International materials protection and cooperation.... | 270,911 | --- | --- | -270,911 | --- |
| Fissile materials disposition: | | | | | |
| U.S. plutonium disposition..... | 60,000 | --- | --- | -60,000 | --- |
| U.S. uranium disposition..... | 25,000 | --- | --- | -25,000 | --- |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC..... | 345,000 | --- | --- | -345,000 | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 345,000 | --- | --- | -345,000 | --- |
| Total, Fissile materials disposition..... | 430,000 | --- | --- | -430,000 | --- |
| Legacy contractor pensions..... | 102,909 | 94,617 | 94,617 | -8,292 | --- |
| Nuclear counterterrorism and incident response program | --- | 234,390 | 234,390 | +234,390 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Use of prior-year balances..... | -22,963 | -18,076 | -39,076 | -16,113 | -21,000 |
| Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation..... | 1,641,369 | 1,940,302 | 1,918,000 | +276,631 | -22,302 |
| Rescission..... | -24,731 | --- | -10,394 | +14,337 | -10,394 |
| TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION..... | 1,616,638 | 1,940,302 | 1,907,606 | +290,968 | -32,696 |
| NAVAL REACTORS | | | | | |
| Naval reactors development..... | 411,180 | 444,400 | 414,642 | +3,462 | -29,758 |
| OHIO replacement reactor systems development..... | 156,100 | 186,800 | 186,800 | +30,700 | --- |
| S8G Prototype refueling..... | 126,400 | 133,000 | 133,000 | +6,600 | --- |
| Naval reactors operations and infrastructure..... | 390,000 | 445,196 | 424,452 | +34,452 | -20,744 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3..... | 400 | 900 | 900 | +500 | --- |
| 15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade..... | 600 | 600 | 600 | --- | --- |
| 15-D-902 KS Engineer room team trainer facility..... | --- | 3,100 | --- | --- | -3,100 |
| 14-D-902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL..... | --- | 30,000 | 30,000 | +30,000 | --- |
| 14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF..... | 70,000 | 86,000 | 86,000 | +16,000 | --- |
| 13-D-905 Remote-handled low-level waste disposal project, INL..... | 14,420 | --- | --- | -14,420 | --- |
| 13-D-904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO..... | 20,100 | --- | --- | -20,100 | --- |
| 10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL..... | 7,400 | 500 | 500 | -6,900 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 08-D-190 Expended Core Facility M-290 recovering discharge station, NRF, ID..... | 400 | --- | --- | -400 | --- |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 113,320 | 121,100 | 118,000 | +4,680 | -3,100 |
| Program direction..... | 41,500 | 45,000 | 43,500 | +2,000 | -1,500 |
| Subtotal, Naval Reactors..... | 1,238,500 | 1,375,496 | 1,320,394 | +81,894 | -55,102 |
| Rescission..... | -4,500 | --- | --- | +4,500 | --- |
| TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS..... | 1,234,000 | 1,375,496 | 1,320,394 | +86,394 | -55,102 |
| FEDERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES..... | 370,000 | 402,654 | 388,000 | +18,000 | -14,654 |
| TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION..... | 11,407,295 | 12,565,400 | 12,329,000 | +921,705 | -236,400 |
| DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP | | | | | |
| Closure sites..... | 4,889 | 4,889 | 4,889 | --- | --- |
| Hanford site: | | | | | |
| Richland: | | | | | |
| River corridor and other cleanup operations..... | 377,788 | 196,957 | 275,831 | -101,957 | +78,874 |
| Central plateau remediation..... | 497,456 | 555,163 | 555,163 | +57,707 | --- |
| RL community and regulatory support..... | 19,701 | 14,701 | 14,701 | -5,000 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-D-401 Containerized sludge removal annex, RL..... | 46,055 | 77,016 | 77,016 | +30,961 | --- |
| Subtotal, Richland..... | 941,000 | 843,837 | 922,711 | -18,289 | +78,874 |
| Office of River Protection: | | | | | |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-D-409 Low activity waste pretreatment system, ORP..... | 23,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | +52,000 | --- |
| 01-D-16 A-D, Waste treatment and immobilization plant, ORP..... | 563,000 | 595,000 | 545,000 | -18,000 | -50,000 |
| 01-D-16 E, Waste treatment and immobilization plant, Pretreatment facility, ORP..... | 104,000 | 95,000 | 70,000 | -34,000 | -25,000 |
| Total, Construction..... | 690,000 | 765,000 | 690,000 | --- | -75,000 |
| Tank farm activities: | | | | | |
| Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition..... | 522,000 | 649,000 | 578,000 | +56,000 | -71,000 |
| Subtotal, Office of river protection..... | 1,212,000 | 1,414,000 | 1,268,000 | +56,000 | -146,000 |
| Subtotal, Hanford site..... | 2,153,000 | 2,257,837 | 2,190,711 | +37,711 | -67,126 |
| Idaho National Laboratory: Idaho cleanup and waste disposition..... | 377,293 | 357,783 | 387,783 | +10,490 | +30,000 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Idaho community and regulatory support..... | 2,910 | 3,000 | 3,000 | +90 | --- |
| Total, Idaho National Laboratory..... | 380,203 | 360,783 | 390,783 | +10,580 | +30,000 |
| NNSA sites and Nevada offsites: | | | | | |
| Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory..... | 1,366 | 1,366 | 1,366 | --- | --- |
| Nevada..... | 64,851 | 62,385 | 62,385 | -2,466 | --- |
| Sandia National Laboratory..... | 2,801 | 2,500 | 2,500 | -301 | --- |
| Los Alamos National Laboratory..... | 185,000 | 188,625 | 180,000 | -5,000 | -8,625 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-D-406 Hexavalent chromium Pump and Treatment facility, LANL..... | 4,600 | --- | --- | -4,600 | --- |
| Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites..... | 258,618 | 254,876 | 246,251 | -12,367 | -8,625 |
| Oak Ridge Reservation: | | | | | |
| OR Nuclear facility D&D..... | 73,155 | 75,958 | 84,958 | +11,803 | +9,000 |
| U233 disposition program..... | --- | 26,895 | 35,895 | +35,895 | +9,000 |
| OR cleanup and waste disposition..... | 131,930 | 60,500 | 60,500 | -71,430 | --- |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-D-405 Sludge processing facility buildouts... | 4,200 | --- | --- | -4,200 | --- |
| 14-D-403 Outfall 200 mercury treatment facility... | 9,400 | 6,800 | 9,400 | --- | +2,600 |
| Subtotal, Construction..... | 13,600 | 6,800 | 9,400 | -4,200 | +2,600 |
| OR community & regulatory support..... | 4,365 | 4,400 | 4,400 | +35 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| OR Technology development and deployment..... | --- | 2,800 | 2,800 | +2,800 | --- |
| Total, Oak Ridge Reservation..... | 223,050 | 177,353 | 197,953 | -25,097 | +20,600 |
| Savannah River Site: | | | | | |
| SR site risk management operations..... | 397,976 | 386,652 | 389,652 | -8,324 | +3,000 |
| SR community and regulatory support..... | 11,013 | 11,249 | 11,249 | +236 | --- |
| SR radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition..... | 547,318 | 581,878 | 562,000 | +14,682 | -19,878 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-D-402 Saltstone disposal Unit #6, SRS..... | 30,000 | 34,642 | 34,642 | +4,642 | --- |
| 05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, SRS..... | 135,000 | 194,000 | 194,000 | +59,000 | --- |
| Total, Savannah River Site..... | 1,121,307 | 1,208,421 | 1,191,543 | +70,236 | -16,878 |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Plant: | | | | | |
| Waste Isolation Pilot Plant..... | 304,000 | 212,600 | --- | -304,000 | -212,600 |
| Operations and maintenance..... | --- | --- | 116,800 | +116,800 | +116,800 |
| Recovery activities..... | --- | --- | 87,000 | +87,000 | +87,000 |
| Central characterization project..... | --- | --- | 35,000 | +35,000 | +35,000 |
| Transportation..... | --- | --- | 16,339 | +16,339 | +16,339 |
| Construction: | | | | | |
| 15-D-411 Safety significant confinement ventilation system, WIPP..... | 12,000 | 23,218 | 23,218 | +11,218 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 15-D-412 Exhaust shaft, WIPP..... | 4,000 | 7,500 | 7,500 | +3,500 | --- |
| Total, Waste isolation pilot plant..... | 320,000 | 243,318 | 285,857 | -34,143 | +42,539 |
| Program direction..... | 280,784 | 281,951 | 281,951 | +1,167 | --- |
| Program support..... | 14,979 | 14,979 | 14,979 | --- | --- |
| Safeguards and Security..... | 240,000 | 236,633 | 236,633 | -3,367 | --- |
| Technology development..... | 14,000 | 14,510 | 14,000 | --- | -510 |
| Subtotal, Defense Environmental Cleanup..... | 5,010,830 | 5,055,550 | 5,055,550 | +44,720 | --- |
| Rescission..... | -10,830 | --- | --- | +10,830 | --- |
| TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN UP..... | 5,000,000 | 5,055,550 | 5,055,550 | +55,550 | --- |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup (Legislative proposal)..... | --- | 471,797 | --- | --- | -471,797 |
| DEFENSE URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING..... | 463,000 | --- | 471,797 | +8,797 | +471,797 |
| OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES | | | | | |
| Environment, health, safety and security: | | | | | |
| Environment, health, safety and security..... | 118,763 | 120,693 | 120,693 | +1,930 | --- |
| Program direction..... | 62,235 | 63,105 | 63,105 | +870 | --- |
| Subtotal, Environment, Health, safety and security | 180,998 | 183,798 | 183,798 | +2,800 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Independent enterprise assessments: | | | | | |
| Independent enterprise assessments..... | 24,068 | 24,068 | 24,068 | --- | --- |
| Program direction..... | 49,466 | 49,466 | 49,466 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal, Independent enterprise assessments..... | 73,534 | 73,534 | 73,534 | --- | --- |
| Specialized security activities: | | | | | |
| Office of Legacy Management..... | 203,152 | 221,855 | 215,000 | +11,848 | -6,855 |
| Legacy management..... | 158,639 | 154,080 | 154,080 | -4,559 | --- |
| Program direction..... | 13,341 | 13,100 | 13,100 | -241 | --- |
| Subtotal, Office of Legacy Management..... | 171,980 | 167,180 | 167,180 | -4,800 | --- |
| Defense related administrative support: | | | | | |
| Office of hearings and appeals..... | 118,836 | 122,558 | 122,558 | +3,722 | --- |
| | 5,500 | 5,500 | 5,500 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES..... | 754,000 | 774,425 | 767,570 | +13,570 | -6,855 |
| TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES..... | 17,624,295 | 18,867,172 | 18,623,917 | +999,622 | -243,255 |
| POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS (1) | | | | | |
| SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance: | | | | | |
| Purchase power and wheeling..... | 89,710 | 83,600 | 83,600 | -6,110 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Program direction..... | 7,220 | 6,900 | 6,900 | -320 | --- |
| Subtotal, Operation and maintenance..... | 96,930 | 90,500 | 90,500 | -6,430 | --- |
| Less alternative financing (PPW)..... | -16,131 | -17,100 | -17,100 | -969 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (for PPW)..... | -73,579 | -66,500 | -66,500 | +7,079 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (PD)..... | -2,220 | -6,900 | -6,900 | -4,680 | --- |
| Use of prior-year balances..... | -5,000 | --- | --- | +5,000 | --- |
| TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION..... | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance: | | | | | |
| Operating expenses..... | 15,174 | 19,279 | 19,279 | +4,105 | --- |
| Purchase power and wheeling..... | 63,000 | 73,000 | 73,000 | +10,000 | --- |
| Program direction..... | 31,089 | 31,932 | 31,932 | +843 | --- |
| Construction..... | 13,403 | 12,012 | 12,012 | -1,391 | --- |
| Subtotal, Operation and maintenance..... | 122,666 | 136,223 | 136,223 | +13,557 | --- |
| Less alternative financing (for O&M)..... | -5,934 | -8,288 | -8,288 | -2,354 | --- |
| Less alternative financing (for PPW)..... | -10,000 | -10,000 | -10,000 | --- | --- |
| Less alternative financing (Const)..... | -7,492 | -7,574 | -7,574 | -82 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (PD)..... | -29,402 | -29,938 | -29,938 | -536 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (for O&M)..... | -5,438 | -6,023 | -6,023 | -585 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (for PPW)..... | -53,000 | -63,000 | -63,000 | -10,000 | --- |
| TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION..... | 11,400 | 11,400 | 11,400 | --- | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance: | | | | | |
| Construction and rehabilitation..... | 86,645 | 58,374 | 58,374 | -28,271 | --- |
| Operation and maintenance..... | 81,958 | 80,901 | 80,901 | -1,057 | --- |
| Purchase power and wheeling..... | 441,223 | 565,927 | 565,927 | +124,704 | --- |
| Program direction..... | 227,905 | 236,398 | 236,398 | +8,493 | --- |
| Subtotal, Operation and maintenance..... | 837,731 | 941,600 | 941,600 | +103,869 | --- |
| Less alternative financing (for O&M)..... | -5,197 | -1,757 | -1,757 | +3,440 | --- |
| Less alternative financing (for Construction)..... | -74,448 | -53,585 | -53,585 | +20,863 | --- |
| Less alternative financing (for Program Dir.)..... | -5,300 | -5,273 | -5,273 | +27 | --- |
| Less alternative financing (for PPW)..... | -180,713 | -213,114 | -213,114 | -32,401 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (for program direction)..... | -174,285 | -177,697 | -177,697 | -3,412 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (for O&M)..... | -36,745 | -36,645 | -36,645 | +100 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (P.L. 108-477, P.L. 109-103)..... | -260,510 | -352,813 | -352,813 | -92,303 | --- |
| Offsetting collections (P.L. 98-381)..... | -7,161 | -7,344 | -7,344 | -183 | --- |
| TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION..... | 93,372 | 93,372 | 93,372 | --- | --- |
| FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance..... | 5,529 | 4,950 | 4,950 | -579 | --- |
| Offsetting collections..... | -4,499 | -4,262 | -4,262 | +237 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Less alternative financing..... | -802 | -460 | -460 | +342 | --- |
| TOTAL, FALCON AND AMISTAD O&M FUND..... | 228 | 228 | 228 | --- | --- |
| TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS..... | 105,000 | 105,000 | 105,000 | --- | --- |
| ===== | | | | | |
| FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION | | | | | |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission..... | 304,389 | 319,800 | 319,800 | +15,411 | --- |
| FERC revenues..... | -304,389 | -319,800 | -319,800 | -15,411 | --- |
| ===== | | | | | |
| General Provisions | | | | | |
| Title III Rescissions: | | | | | |
| Department of Energy: | | | | | |
| Energy Efficiency and Energy Reliability..... | -9,740 | --- | -16,677 | -6,937 | -16,677 |
| Science..... | -3,262 | --- | -4,717 | -1,455 | -4,717 |
| Nuclear Energy..... | -121 | --- | -1,665 | -1,544 | -1,665 |
| Fossil Energy Research and Development..... | -10,413 | --- | -12,064 | -1,651 | -12,064 |
| Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability..... | -331 | --- | -900 | -569 | -900 |
| Advanced Research Projects Agency - Energy..... | -18 | --- | --- | +18 | --- |
| Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.. | -1,632 | --- | -4,832 | -3,200 | -4,832 |
| Weapons activities (050) (rescission)..... | -6,298 | --- | --- | +6,298 | --- |
| Office of the Administrator (050) (rescission)..... | -413 | --- | --- | +413 | --- |
| Departmental Administration..... | -928 | --- | --- | +928 | --- |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup (050)..... | -9,983 | --- | --- | +9,983 | --- |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (050) | -1,390 | --- | --- | +1,390 | --- |
| Naval Reactors (050) | -160 | --- | --- | +160 | --- |
| Other Defense Activities (050) | -551 | --- | --- | +551 | --- |
| Total, General Provisions | -45,240 | --- | -40,855 | +4,385 | -40,855 |
| ===== | | | | | |
| GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | 27,916,797 | 30,527,136 | 28,984,569 | +1,067,772 | -1,542,567 |
| (Total amount appropriated) | (28,152,876) | (30,527,136) | (29,035,818) | (+892,942) | (-1,491,318) |
| (Rescissions) | (-236,079) | --- | (-51,249) | (+184,830) | (-51,249) |
| ===== | | | | | |

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTS

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Energy efficiency and renewable energy | 1,923,935 | 2,722,987 | 1,657,774 | -266,161 | -1,065,213 |
| Electricity delivery and energy reliability | 147,306 | 270,100 | 160,000 | +12,694 | -110,100 |
| Nuclear energy | 833,500 | 907,574 | 936,161 | +102,661 | +28,587 |
| Fossil Energy Research and Development | 571,000 | 560,000 | 605,000 | +34,000 | +45,000 |
| Naval Petroleum & Oil Shale Reserves | 19,950 | 17,500 | 17,500 | -2,450 | --- |
| Elk Hills School Lands Fund | 15,580 | --- | --- | -15,580 | --- |
| Strategic petroleum reserves | 200,000 | 257,000 | 212,030 | +12,030 | -44,970 |
| Northeast home heating oil reserve | 1,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 | +6,000 | --- |
| Energy Information Administration | 117,000 | 131,000 | 117,000 | --- | -14,000 |
| Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup | 246,000 | 220,185 | 229,193 | -16,807 | +9,008 |
| Uranium enrichment D&D fund | 625,000 | 542,289 | 625,000 | --- | +82,711 |
| Nuclear Waste Disposal | --- | --- | 150,000 | +150,000 | +150,000 |
| Science | 5,071,000 | 5,339,794 | 5,100,000 | +29,000 | -239,794 |
| Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy | 280,000 | 325,000 | 280,000 | --- | -45,000 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Departmental administration..... | 125,971 | 153,511 | 130,249 | +4,278 | -23,262 |
| Indian energy program..... | --- | 20,000 | --- | --- | -20,000 |
| Office of the Inspector General..... | 40,500 | 46,424 | 46,000 | +5,500 | -424 |
| Tribal Indian Energy Loan Guarantee Program..... | --- | 11,000 | --- | --- | -11,000 |
| Title 17 Innovative technology loan guarantee program..... | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | --- | --- |
| Advanced technology vehicles manufacturing loan pgm..... | 4,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | +2,000 | --- |
| Clean coal technology..... | -6,600 | --- | --- | +6,600 | --- |
| Atomic energy defense activities: | | | | | |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | | | | | |
| Weapons activities..... | 8,186,657 | 8,846,948 | 8,713,000 | +526,343 | -133,948 |
| Defense nuclear nonproliferation..... | 1,616,638 | 1,940,302 | 1,907,606 | +290,968 | -32,696 |
| Naval reactors..... | 1,234,000 | 1,375,496 | 1,320,394 | +86,394 | -55,102 |
| Federal Salaries and Expenses..... | 370,000 | 402,654 | 388,000 | +18,000 | -14,654 |
| Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Admin..... | 11,407,295 | 12,565,400 | 12,329,000 | +921,705 | -236,400 |
| Defense environmental cleanup..... | 5,000,000 | 5,055,550 | 5,055,550 | +55,550 | --- |
| Defense environmental cleanup (legislative proposal) | --- | 471,797 | --- | --- | -471,797 |
| Defense uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning..... | 463,000 | --- | 471,797 | +8,797 | +471,797 |
| Other defense activities..... | 754,000 | 774,425 | 767,570 | +13,570 | -6,855 |
| Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities..... | 17,624,295 | 18,867,172 | 18,623,917 | +999,622 | -243,255 |

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Power marketing administrations (1): | | | | | |
| Southeastern Power Administration..... | 11,400 | 11,400 | 11,400 | --- | --- |
| Southwestern Power Administration..... | 93,372 | 93,372 | 93,372 | --- | --- |
| Western Area Power Administration..... | 228 | 228 | 228 | --- | --- |
| Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund... | | | | | |
| Total, Power Marketing Administrations..... | 105,000 | 105,000 | 105,000 | --- | --- |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 304,389 | 319,800 | 319,800 | +15,411 | --- |
| Revenues..... | -304,389 | -319,800 | -319,800 | -15,411 | --- |
| General Provisions..... | -45,240 | --- | -40,855 | +4,385 | -40,855 |
| Total Summary of Accounts, Department of Energy... | 27,916,797 | 30,527,136 | 28,984,569 | +1,067,772 | -1,542,567 |

(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 continues 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 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 continues a provision restricting certain activities in the Russian Federation.

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

The bill includes a provision that permits the reprogramming of funds.

The bill includes a provision rescinding unobligated balances.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$90,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 95,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 95,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +5,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 \$95,000,000, \$5,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as 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.

Within available funds, the Committee directs \$15,000,000 for activities in support of the POWER+ Plan.

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, 2015 | \$28,500,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 29,150,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 29,900,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +1,400,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +750,000 |

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 2016 is \$29,900,000, \$1,400,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$750,000 above the budget request.

In addition to its statutory responsibilities for providing independent advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy, the DNFSB plays a vital role in ensuring that issues of public health and safety at the Department of Energy's defense nuclear facilities are disclosed to the Congress and the public. The DNFSB remains a small organization with only limited resources to investigate all potential matters of concern. In recent years, the DNFSB has ramped up work for reviewing new nuclear facility construction. The Committee commends the DNFSB for performing its reviews early on in the design process, a practice that will reduce costs.

The recommendation includes funding above the budget request so that the DNFSB may conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the radioactive liquid waste tank and processing infrastructure and the tank maintenance and operating programs at Hanford and Savannah River to identify any safety issues that must be resolved to support extended operations. The Committee is concerned about

the status of those systems in light of the indefinite delays in completing construction of the Waste Treatment Plant at Hanford and the new missions under consideration at Savannah River that will involve processing nuclear materials for an extended time. The Department of Energy has provided few details on its plans and strategies to safely operate those systems beyond the timeframes previously planned. The DNFSB is directed to provide a report on its findings and recommendations to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 360 days after the enactment of this Act.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$12,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 14,936,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 12,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -2,936,000 |

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 earmarked for transportation and basic infrastructure improvements.

For fiscal year 2016, the Committee recommends \$12,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$2,936,000 below the budget request.

DENALI COMMISSION

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$10,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 10,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 10,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 2016, the Committee recommends \$10,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2015 and the budget request.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$5,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 5,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 3,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | -2,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -2,000,000 |

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 2016, \$2,000,000 below fiscal year 2015 and the budget request.

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$250,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |
| Recommended, 2016 | 250,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | --- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +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 2016, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$250,000 above the budget request.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$1,003,233,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 1,020,119,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 1,053,233,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +50,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +33,114,000 |

REVENUES

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$ - 885,375,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - 899,971,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | - 884,774,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +601,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +15,197,000 |

NET APPROPRIATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$117,858,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 120,148,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 168,459,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +50,601,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | +48,311,000 |

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2016 is \$1,053,233,000, \$50,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$33,114,000 above the budget request. The total amount of budget authority is offset by estimated revenues of \$884,774,000. Including revenues, the net appropriation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is \$168,459,000.

The recommendation does not support the increase for salaries and expenses proposed in the budget request. The Committee directed the use of anticipated carryover balances in fiscal year 2015 as the first step in returning the NRC to a budget that is more aligned with current regulatory and licensing needs. The fiscal year 2016 recommendation accelerates the “right-sizing” proposed by the Project AIM report and, with the exception of providing additional funds for the adjudication of the Yucca Mountain license application, maintains the salaries and expenses account at the fiscal year 2015 appropriation level. The Committee directs that NRC apply any reduction in available resources to corporate support.

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 benefit 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 recommendation directs \$50,000,000 to continue adjudication of the Yucca Mountain license application. The Committee reiterates that the Administration’s refusal to move forward with the Yucca Mountain license application ignores current law and does not advance the Nation’s need for a permanent repository. The recommendation continues language prohibiting the Chairman of the NRC from terminating any program, project, or activity without the approval of a majority of the Commissioners. The NRC is directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, not later than January 5, 2017, on the plan to complete the license application and additional funding needs as necessary. In addition, the recommendation requires the NRC to notify and report to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress on the use of emergency functions.

NRC Right-Sizing.—The Committee is aware that the Commission is in the process of reviewing the recommendations of the both the Project AIM report and the independent review of corporate

support directed by Congress. The Committee urges the Commission to seek the input of key stakeholders in order to ensure that the NRC is structured in a way that ensures safety, is well-defined, reasonable, and able to adapt to changing realities, particularly the demands of emerging technologies and license application. The Committee directs the Commission to accelerate the schedule for the recommendations addressing planning and budgeting, to include any actions proposed to reduce the cost of corporate support. The NRC will report quarterly to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress on all approved recommendations and the implementation actions undertaken.

Rulemaking.—The Committee directs the Commission to reestablish the pre-2006 rulemaking process. The Commission's decision to streamline the rulemaking process in fiscal year 2006 advances rulemaking farther than is appropriate prior to obtaining a decision from the Commission. The lack of early Commission engagement causes unnecessary expenditure of resources and limits the Commission's ability to prioritize rulemaking activities, identify the cumulative effect of regulations, and evaluate the impact on licensees. In particular, the Commission should not waive the development and submission of rulemaking plans, the review by the Committee to Review Generic Requirements, and the review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. Additionally, the Commission should not delegate Commission rulemaking responsibilities to NRC staff. The Committee directs the NRC to report on the actions taken to restore rulemaking discipline by January 5, 2016. The Committee further directs the NRC to list all rulemaking activities planned, to include their priority and schedule, in the annual budget request and the semi-annual report to Congress on licensing and regulatory activities.

Budget Justifications.—The Committee directs that future budget justifications provide the following: previous fiscal year data based on the enacted level for that fiscal year not the level proposed in the previous year's budget request; carryover balances spent in previous fiscal years and estimates for the current year.

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.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$12,071,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 12,136,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 12,136,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +65,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

REVENUES

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$ - 10,099,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | - 10,060,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | - 10,060,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +39,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

NET APPROPRIATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$1,972,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 2,076,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 2,076,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +104,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

The Committee recommends \$12,136,000, \$65,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request. Given the formula for fee recovery, the revenue estimate is \$10,060,000, resulting in a net appropriation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Inspector General of \$2,076,000.

The Committee has included \$958,000 within this 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, 2015 | \$3,400,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 3,600,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 3,600,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +200,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | --- |

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 \$3,600,000 for the NWTRB.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS
TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Appropriation, 2015 | \$- -- |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | 1,000,000 |
| Recommended, 2016 | 1,000,000 |
| Comparison: | |
| Appropriation, 2015 | +1,000,000 |
| Budget estimate, 2016 | -- -- |

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 Committee recommends \$1,000,000 for the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects, \$1,000,000 above fiscal year 2015 and the same as the budget request.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

The bill continues a provision requiring the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to fully comply with Congressional requests for information.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

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 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 the 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 that prohibits the use of funds to further implementation of components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

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", \$22,000 is available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and \$5,899,000 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.

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, 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 104, prohibiting certain actions related to the definition of fill material or discharge of fill material for purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 105, 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 106, prohibiting requirement of a permit for the discharge of dredged or fill material under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for certain activities.

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.

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Provisions, section 108, regarding certain dredged material disposal activities.

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, 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 inquiries, 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 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 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 offsetting 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 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 offset 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 offset 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 Non-proliferation for the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses.

Language has been included under Defense Nuclear Non-proliferation restricting the use of funds provided for a specific project.

Language has been included under Defense Nuclear Non-proliferation 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 Federal Salaries and Expenses 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 offsetting 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 offsetting 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 offsetting 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 offsetting 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 offsetting 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 offsetting 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 offsetting 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 2016 until enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

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, 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 307, prohibiting nonproliferation activities in the Russian Federation until certain reporting requirements are met.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 308, prohibiting funds for certain activities related to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve without prior notification to the Congress and limiting the authority of the Secretary of Energy to establish regional petroleum product reserves.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, section 310, rescinding certain funds that were not designated by the Congress as emergency funding.

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, United 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 Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects making funds received pursuant to section 802 of Public Law 110–140 in excess of the amount specified unavailable for obligation until appropriated.

Language has been included under Independent Agencies, General Provisions, section 401, 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 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 503, prohibiting funds in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994, regarding environmental justice.

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 504, 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 505, prohibiting the use of funds to further implementation of components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

Language has been included under General Provisions, section 506, 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, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

[INSERT FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL]

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:

| (thousand dollars) | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Agency/Program | Last Year of Authorization | Authorization Level | Appropriation in Last Year of Authorization | Net Appropriation in this Bill |
| Corps FUSRAP | | | 1 | 104,000 |
| EERE Program Direction | 2006 | 110,500 | 164,198 | 150,000 |
| EERE Weatherization Activities | 2012 | 1,400,000 | 68,000 | 193,000 |
| EERE State Energy Programs | 2012 | 125,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Nuclear Energy | 2009 | 495,000 | 792,000 | 936,161 |
| Fossil Energy | 2009 | 641,000 | 727,320 | 605,000 |
| Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves | 2014 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 17,500 |
| Office of Science | 2013 | 6,007,000 | 4,876,000 | 5,100,000 |
| Advanced Research Projects Agency - Energy | 2013 | 312,000 | 265,000 | 280,000 |
| Advanced Technology Vehicle Manufacturing Program | 2012 | not specified | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup: | | | | |
| West Valley Demonstration | 1981 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 59,213 |
| Departmental Administration | 1984 | 246,963 | 185,682 | 130,249 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities: | | | | |
| National Nuclear Security Administration: | | | | |
| Weapons Activities | 2015 | 8,210,560 | 8,231,770 | 8,713,000 |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 2015 | 1,774,758 | 1,641,369 | 1,918,000 |
| Naval Reactors | 2015 | 1,377,100 | 1,238,500 | 1,320,394 |
| Federal Salaries and Expenses | 2015 | 386,863 | 370,000 | 388,000 |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup | 2015 | 4,884,538 | 5,010,830 | 5,055,550 |
| Other Defense Activities | 2015 | 754,000 | 754,000 | 767,570 |
| 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 | 95,000 |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 2015 | 30,150 | 28,500 | 29,900 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | 1985 | 460,000 | 448,200 | 168,459 |

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:

| <i>Department or Activity</i> | <i>Amount</i> |
|--|---------------|
| Department of Energy: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy | 16,677,000 |
| Department of Energy: Science | 4,717,000 |
| Department of Energy: Nuclear Energy | 1,665,000 |
| Department of Energy: Fossil Energy Research and Development | 12,064,000 |
| Department of Energy: Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability | 900,000 |
| Department of Energy: Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation | 10,394,000 |
| Department of Energy: Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration | 4,832,000 |

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.

[INSERT COMPARISON WITH THE BUDGET RESOLUTION TABLE]

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:

[INSERT FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS TABLE]

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:

[INSERT TABLE]

[In millions of dollars]

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:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | | | |
| Corps of Engineers - Civil | | | | | |
| Investigations..... | 122,000 | 97,000 | 110,000 | -12,000 | +13,000 |
| Construction..... | 1,639,489 | 1,172,000 | 1,631,000 | -8,489 | +459,000 |
| Mississippi River and Tributaries..... | 302,000 | 225,000 | 275,000 | -27,000 | +50,000 |
| Operations and Maintenance..... | 2,908,511 | 2,710,000 | 3,058,000 | +149,489 | +348,000 |
| Regulatory Program..... | 200,000 | 205,000 | 200,000 | --- | -5,000 |
| Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)..... | 101,500 | 104,000 | 104,000 | +2,500 | --- |
| Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies..... | 28,000 | 34,000 | 34,000 | +6,000 | --- |
| Expenses..... | 178,000 | 180,000 | 180,000 | +2,000 | --- |
| Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)..... | 3,000 | 5,000 | 4,750 | +1,750 | -250 |
| General Provisions | | | | | |
| Title I Rescission..... | -28,000 | --- | --- | +28,000 | --- |
| Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil... Appropriations..... | 5,454,500 (5,482,500) | 4,732,000 (4,732,000) | 5,596,750 (5,596,750) | +142,250 (+114,250) | +864,750 (+864,750) |
| Rescissions..... | (-28,000) | --- | --- | (+28,000) | --- |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | | |
| Central Utah Project Completion Account | | | | | |
| Central Utah Project Completion Account..... | 9,874 | 7,300 | 9,874 | --- | +2,574 |
| Bureau of Reclamation | | | | | |
| Water and Related Resources..... | 978,131 | 805,157 | 948,640 | -29,491 | +143,483 |
| Central Valley Project Restoration Fund..... | 56,995 | 49,528 | 49,528 | -7,467 | --- |
| California Bay-Delta Restoration..... | 37,000 | 37,000 | 37,000 | --- | --- |
| Policy and Administration..... | 58,500 | 59,500 | 59,500 | +1,000 | --- |
| Indian Water Rights Settlements..... | --- | 112,483 | --- | --- | -112,483 |
| San Joaquin River Restoration Fund..... | --- | 35,000 | --- | --- | -35,000 |
| Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account (Rescission)..... | -500 | --- | --- | +500 | --- |
| Total, Bureau of Reclamation..... | 1,130,126 | 1,098,668 | 1,094,668 | -35,458 | -4,000 |
| ===== | | | | | |
| Total, title II, Department of the Interior..... | 1,140,000 | 1,105,968 | 1,104,542 | -35,458 | -1,426 |
| Appropriations..... | (1,140,500) | (1,105,968) | (1,104,542) | (-35,958) | (-1,426) |
| Rescissions..... | (-500) | --- | --- | (+500) | --- |
| TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | | | | | |
| Energy Programs | | | | | |
| Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy..... | 1,937,000 | 2,722,987 | 1,657,774 | -279,226 | -1,065,213 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Rescissions..... | -13,065 | --- | --- | +13,065 | --- |
| Subtotal, Energy efficiency..... | 1,923,935 | 2,722,987 | 1,657,774 | -266,161 | -1,065,213 |
| Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability..... | 147,306 | 270,100 | 160,000 | +12,694 | -110,100 |
| Nuclear Energy..... | 805,000 | 772,413 | 810,000 | +5,000 | +37,587 |
| Defense function..... | 108,500 | 135,161 | 126,161 | +17,661 | -9,000 |
| Rescission..... | -80,000 | --- | --- | +80,000 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 833,500 | 907,574 | 936,161 | +102,661 | +28,587 |
| Fossil Energy Research and Development..... | 571,000 | 560,000 | 605,000 | +34,000 | +45,000 |
| Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves..... | 19,950 | 17,500 | 17,500 | -2,450 | --- |
| Elk Hills School Lands Fund..... | 15,580 | --- | --- | -15,580 | --- |
| Strategic Petroleum Reserve..... | 200,000 | 257,000 | 212,030 | +12,030 | -44,970 |
| Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve..... | 7,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 | --- | --- |
| Rescission..... | -6,000 | --- | --- | +6,000 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 1,600 | 7,600 | 7,600 | +6,000 | --- |
| Energy Information Administration..... | 117,000 | 131,000 | 117,000 | --- | -14,000 |
| Non-defense Environmental Cleanup..... | 246,000 | 220,185 | 229,193 | -16,807 | +9,008 |
| Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund..... | 625,000 | 542,289 | 625,000 | --- | +82,711 |
| Science..... | 5,071,000 | 5,339,794 | 5,100,000 | +29,000 | -239,794 |
| 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..... | --- | 20,000 | --- | --- | -20,000 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program. | 42,000 | 42,000 | 42,000 | --- | --- |
| Offsetting collection..... | -25,000 | -25,000 | -25,000 | --- | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | --- | --- |
| Tribal Indian Energy Loan Guarantee Program..... | --- | 11,000 | --- | --- | -11,000 |
| Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loans program..... | 4,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | +2,000 | --- |
| Clean Coal Technology (Rescission)..... | -6,600 | --- | --- | +6,600 | --- |
| Departmental Administration..... | 245,142 | 270,682 | 247,420 | +2,278 | -23,262 |
| Miscellaneous revenues..... | -119,171 | -117,171 | -117,171 | +2,000 | --- |
| Net appropriation..... | 125,971 | 153,511 | 130,249 | +4,278 | -23,262 |
| Office of the Inspector General..... | 40,500 | 46,424 | 46,000 | +5,500 | -424 |
| Total, Energy programs..... | 10,232,742 | 11,554,964 | 10,296,507 | +63,765 | -1,258,457 |
| Atomic Energy Defense Activities | | | | | |
| National Nuclear Security Administration | | | | | |
| Weapons Activities..... | 8,231,770 | 8,846,948 | 8,713,000 | +481,230 | -133,948 |
| Rescission..... | -45,113 | --- | --- | +45,113 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 8,186,657 | 8,846,948 | 8,713,000 | +526,343 | -133,948 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation..... | 1,641,369 | 1,940,302 | 1,918,000 | +276,631 | -22,302 |
| Rescission..... | -24,731 | --- | -10,394 | +14,337 | -10,394 |
| Subtotal..... | 1,616,638 | 1,940,302 | 1,907,606 | +290,968 | -32,696 |
| Naval Reactors..... | 1,238,500 | 1,375,496 | 1,320,394 | +81,894 | -55,102 |
| Rescission..... | -4,500 | --- | --- | +4,500 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 1,234,000 | 1,375,496 | 1,320,394 | +86,394 | -55,102 |
| Federal Salaries and Expenses..... | 370,000 | 402,654 | 388,000 | +18,000 | -14,654 |
| Total, National Nuclear Security Administration..... | 11,407,295 | 12,565,400 | 12,329,000 | +921,705 | -236,400 |
| Environmental and Other Defense Activities | | | | | |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup..... | 5,010,830 | 5,055,550 | 5,055,550 | +44,720 | --- |
| Rescission..... | -10,830 | --- | --- | +10,830 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 5,000,000 | 5,055,550 | 5,055,550 | +55,550 | --- |
| Defense Environmental cleanup (Legislative proposal)... | --- | 471,797 | --- | --- | -471,797 |
| Defense Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning..... | 463,000 | --- | 471,797 | +8,797 | +471,797 |
| Other Defense Activities..... | 754,000 | 774,425 | 767,570 | +13,570 | -6,855 |
| Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities..... | 6,217,000 | 6,301,772 | 6,294,917 | +77,917 | -6,855 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities..... | 17,624,295 | 18,867,172 | 18,623,917 | +999,622 |
| Power Marketing Administrations /1 | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration..... | 7,220 | 6,900 | 6,900 | -320 |
| Offsetting collections..... | -7,220 | -6,900 | -6,900 | +320 |
| Subtotal..... | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration..... | 46,240 | 47,361 | 47,361 | +1,121 |
| Offsetting collections..... | -34,840 | -35,961 | -35,961 | -1,121 |
| Subtotal..... | 11,400 | 11,400 | 11,400 | |
| Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration..... | 304,402 | 307,714 | 307,714 | +3,312 |
| Offsetting collections..... | -211,030 | -214,342 | -214,342 | -3,312 |
| Subtotal..... | 93,372 | 93,372 | 93,372 | |
| Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund..... | 4,727 | 4,490 | 4,490 | -237 |
| Offsetting collections..... | -4,499 | -4,262 | -4,262 | +237 |
| Subtotal..... | 228 | 228 | 228 | |
| Total, Power Marketing Administrations..... | 105,000 | 105,000 | 105,000 | |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses..... | 304,389 | 319,800 | 319,800 | +15,411 | --- |
| Revenues applied..... | -304,389 | -319,800 | -319,800 | -15,411 | --- |
| General Provisions | | | | | |
| Title III Rescissions: | | | | | |
| Department of Energy: | | | | | |
| Energy Efficiency and Energy Reliability..... | -9,740 | --- | -16,677 | -6,937 | -16,677 |
| Science..... | -3,262 | --- | -4,717 | -1,455 | -4,717 |
| Nuclear Energy..... | -121 | --- | -1,665 | -1,544 | -1,665 |
| Fossil Energy Research and Development..... | -10,413 | --- | -12,064 | -1,651 | -12,064 |
| Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability..... | -331 | --- | -900 | -569 | -900 |
| Advanced Research Projects Agency - Energy..... | -18 | --- | --- | +18 | --- |
| Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration.. | -1,632 | --- | -4,832 | -3,200 | -4,832 |
| Weapons activities (050)..... | -6,298 | --- | --- | +6,298 | --- |
| Office of the Administrator (050)..... | -413 | --- | --- | +413 | --- |
| Departmental Administration..... | -928 | --- | --- | +928 | --- |
| Defense Environmental Cleanup (050)..... | -9,983 | --- | --- | +9,983 | --- |
| Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (050)..... | -1,390 | --- | --- | +1,390 | --- |
| Naval Reactors (050)..... | -160 | --- | --- | +160 | --- |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Other Defense Activities (050) | -551 | --- | --- | +551 | --- |
| Subtotal | -45,240 | --- | -40,855 | +4,385 | -40,855 |
| ===== | | | | | |
| Total, title III, Department of Energy | 27,916,797 | 30,527,136 | 28,984,569 | +1,067,772 | -1,542,567 |
| Appropriations | (28,152,876) | (30,527,136) | (29,035,818) | (+882,942) | (-1,491,318) |
| Rescissions | (-236,079) | --- | (-51,249) | (+184,830) | (-51,249) |
| ===== | | | | | |
| TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | |
| Appalachian Regional Commission | 90,000 | 95,000 | 95,000 | +5,000 | --- |
| Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board | 28,500 | 29,150 | 29,900 | +1,400 | +750 |
| Delta Regional Authority | 12,000 | 14,936 | 12,000 | --- | -2,936 |
| Denali Commission | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | --- | --- |
| Northern Border Regional Commission | 5,000 | 5,000 | 3,000 | -2,000 | -2,000 |
| Southeast Crescent Regional Commission | 250 | --- | 250 | --- | +250 |
| ===== | | | | | |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission: | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 1,003,233 | 1,020,119 | 1,053,233 | +50,000 | +33,114 |
| Revenues | -885,375 | -899,971 | -884,774 | +601 | +15,197 |
| Subtotal | 117,858 | 120,148 | 168,459 | +50,601 | +48,311 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2015
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2016
(Amounts in thousands)

| | FY 2015 Enacted | FY 2016 Request | Bill | Bill vs. Enacted | Bill vs. Request |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Office of Inspector General..... | 12,071 | 12,136 | 12,136 | +65 | --- |
| Revenues..... | -10,099 | -10,060 | -10,060 | +39 | --- |
| Subtotal..... | 1,972 | 2,076 | 2,076 | +104 | --- |
| Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission..... | 119,830 | 122,224 | 170,535 | +50,705 | +48,311 |
| Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board..... | 3,400 | 3,600 | 3,600 | +200 | --- |
| Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects..... | --- | 1,000 | 1,000 | +1,000 | --- |
| Total, title IV, Independent agencies..... | 268,980 | 280,910 | 325,285 | +56,305 | +44,375 |
| Appropriations..... | (268,980) | (280,910) | (325,285) | (+56,305) | (+44,375) |
| Grand total..... | 34,780,277 | 36,646,014 | 36,011,146 | +1,230,869 | -634,868 |
| Appropriations..... | (35,044,856) | (36,646,014) | (36,062,395) | (+1,017,539) | (-583,619) |
| Rescissions..... | (-264,579) | --- | (-51,249) | (+213,330) | (-51,249) |

1/ Totals adjusted to net out alternative financing costs, reimbursable agreement funding, and power purchase and wheeling expenditures. Offsetting collection totals only reflect funds collected for annual expenses, excluding power purchase wheeling