

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS  
BILL, 2016

APRIL 24, 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. 2028]

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 .....	.....	5
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil .....	2	11
Investigations .....	2	19
Construction .....	3	27
Mississippi River and Tributaries .....	4	33
Operation and Maintenance .....	4	36
Regulatory Program .....	6	59
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program .....	6	60
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies .....	6	60
Expenses .....	6	61
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) .....	7	62
General Provisions .....	8	62
II. Department of the Interior:		
Central Utah Project .....	12	63
Central Utah Project Completion Account .....	12	63
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Water and Related Resources .....	13	65

	<i>Page Number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
Central Valley Project Restoration Fund .....	14	74
California Bay-Delta Restoration .....	15	75
Policy and Administration .....	15	75
Administrative Provision .....	16	76
General Provisions .....	16	76
III. Department of Energy:		
Introduction .....		76
Committee Recommendations .....		81
Energy Programs:		
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy .....	20	82
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability .....	21	89
Nuclear Energy .....	21	92
Fossil Energy Research and Development .....	22	95
Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves .....	22	99
Strategic Petroleum Reserve .....	23	99
Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve .....	23	100
Energy Information Administration .....	23	100
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup .....	23	100
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund .....	24	102
Science .....	24	103
Nuclear Waste Disposal .....	25	109
Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy .....	25	109
Title 17 Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program .....	26	110
Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program .....	27	110
Departmental Administration .....	27	111
Office of the Inspector General .....	28	112
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:		
National Nuclear Security Administration:		
Weapons Activities .....	28	113
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation .....	29	121
Naval Reactors .....	30	124
Federal Salaries and Expenses .....	30	125
Environmental and Other Defense Activities .....	30	125
Defense Environmental Cleanup .....	30	125
Defense Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning .....	31	129
Other Defense Activities .....	31	129
Power Marketing Administrations:		
Bonneville Power Administration .....	32	131
Southeastern Power Administration .....	32	131
Southwestern Power Administration .....	34	131
Western Area Power Administration .....	35	132
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund .....	37	132
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission .....	38	133
Committee Recommendation .....		133
General Provisions .....	39	170
IV. Independent Agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	49	170
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	50	171
Delta Regional Authority .....	50	172
Denali Commission .....	50	172
Northern Border Regional Commission .....	51	173
Southeast Crescent Regional Commission .....	51	173
Nuclear Regulatory Commission .....	51	173
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	53	176
Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects .....	54	176

	<i>Page Number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
V. General Provisions		
House of Representatives Report Requirements .....	.....	177

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	29,012,069	+1,095,272	-1,515,067
Title IV, Independent Agencies.....	268,980	280,910	297,785	+28,805	+16,875
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 \$29,012,069,000 for the Department of Energy, \$1,095,272,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$1,515,067,000 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 \$10,324,007,000, \$91,265,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$1,230,957,000 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 \$297,785,000 for several Independent Agencies, \$28,805,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$16,875,000 above the budget request. Net funding for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is \$140,959,000, \$23,101,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$20,811,000 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	FEASIBILITY
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	FEASIBILITY
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, except that the Chief shall no longer be required to submit annual reports on the backlog of projects.

*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
MCCELLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,662	5,662
OOLOGAH 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
<b>TENNESSEE</b>		
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
<b>TEXAS</b>		
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.

*Navigation safety and efficiency.*—Modifications to deep draft high commercial use channels, including bends and entrances, are sometimes necessary to ensure safety of navigation and efficient operations. The Corps is strongly encouraged to use existing au-

thorities, such as 33 U.S.C. 562, or to make recommendations for appropriate new or modified authorizations to address such safety and efficiency issues in a timely manner.

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 applica-

tions, 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		
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	TOTAL
ARIZONA									
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	---	15,341	15,341	---	15,341	15,341	---	15,341	15,341
COLORADO RIVER BASIN - CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT	6,620	458	7,078	6,620	458	7,078	6,620	458	7,078
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	2,303	---	2,303	2,303	---	2,303	2,303	---	2,303
SALT RIVER PROJECT	649	250	899	649	250	899	649	250	899
SAN CARLOS APACHE TRIBE WATER SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	150	---	150	150	---	150	150	---	150
SIERRA VISTA SUBWATERSHED FEASIBILITY STUDY	2	---	2	2	---	2	2	---	2
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,324	24,640	25,964	1,324	24,640	25,964	1,324	24,640	25,964
CALIFORNIA									
CACHUMA PROJECT	647	674	1,321	647	674	1,321	647	674	1,321
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECTS:									
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, FOLSOM DAM UNIT/MORMON ISLAND	1,577	9,138	10,715	1,577	9,138	10,715	1,577	9,138	10,715
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	35	2,184	2,219	35	2,184	2,219	35	2,184	2,219
DELTA DIVISION	5,718	5,511	11,229	5,718	5,511	11,229	5,718	5,511	11,229
EAST SIDE DIVISION	1,290	2,772	4,062	1,290	2,772	4,062	1,290	2,772	4,062
FRIANT DIVISION	2,192	3,401	5,593	2,192	3,401	5,593	2,192	3,401	5,593
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	7,596	454	8,050	7,596	454	8,050	7,596	454	8,050
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, AND EXTRAORDINARY MAINT. PROGRAM	---	20,262	20,262	---	20,262	20,262	---	20,262	20,262
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	1,307	944	2,251	1,307	944	2,251	1,307	944	2,251
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	372	75	447	372	75	447	372	75	447
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	52	---	52	52	---	52	52	---	52
SHASTA DIVISION	720	8,658	9,378	720	8,658	9,378	720	8,658	9,378
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	12,309	5,177	17,486	12,309	5,177	17,486	12,309	5,177	17,486
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	4,389	10,393	14,782	4,389	10,393	14,782	4,389	10,393	14,782
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	10,457	6,043	16,500	10,457	6,043	16,500	10,457	6,043	16,500
ORLANDO PROJECT	---	930	930	---	930	930	---	930	930
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	300	---	300	300	---	300	300	---	300
SOLANO PROJECT	1,329	2,367	3,696	1,329	2,367	3,696	1,329	2,367	3,696
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT	313	33	346	313	33	346	313	33	346
COLORADO									
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	949	1,943	2,892	949	1,943	2,892	949	1,943	2,892
ARMEL UNIT, P-SMBP	5	377	382	5	377	382	5	377	382
COLLURAN PROJECT	237	1,684	1,921	237	1,684	1,921	237	1,684	1,921
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	707	13,230	13,937	707	13,230	13,937	707	13,230	13,937
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	103	136	239	103	136	239	103	136	239
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	295	11,729	12,024	295	11,729	12,024	295	11,729	12,024

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
<b>OREGON</b>						
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
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>						
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
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>						
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
<b>TEXAS</b>						
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
<b>UTAH</b>						
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 OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
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
TOTAL	1,738	1,738	1,738	1,738
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	---
TOTAL	14,810	14,810	14,810	14,810
WYOMING				
BOYSEN UNIT, P-SMBP	231	1,828	231	1,828
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
TOTAL	1,901	2,869	1,901	2,869
SUBTOTAL, PROJECTS				
	190,940	286,948	190,940	286,948
REGIONAL PROGRAMS				
ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR ONGOING WORK:				
RURAL WATER	---	---	28,750	---
WATER CONSERVATION AND DELIVERY	---	---	2,250	---
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE I	---	14,170	---	---
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TITLE II	8,423	---	8,423	14,170
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
TOTAL	---	---	---	---
TOTAL	477,888	477,888	477,888	477,888

	BUDGET REQUEST		HOUSE RECOMMENDED	
	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R	RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	FACILITIES OM&R
	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
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
				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.

*Water Supply Authorities.*—Reclamation is directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act a report detailing the authorizations (including specific statutory citations) currently available to provide additional water supply to drought prone areas; an assessment of opportunities to accelerate actions to provide water supply; and research and development investments that could expand or maximize existing supplies through water quality improvements such as addressing Colorado River Salinity or impaired water.

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 bill includes a general provision directing the Bureau of Reclamation to complete each of these feasibility studies by a specific date and to submit the completed studies to the appropriate committees of both houses of Congress. The language also requires periodic progress reports.

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 Tech-

nical 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.

The bill includes a provision regarding completion of certain feasibility studies.

### 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 \$25,000,000 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 reprogramming authority to the Department, as long as no program, project, or activity is increased or decreased by more than \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, compared to the levels in the 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 activities advancing energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies, as well as federal energy assistance programs. The EERE program is divided into three portfolios: sustainable transportation, renewable energy, and energy efficiency. The sustainable transportation portfolio, which consists of the vehicles, bioenergy, and 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 effi-

ciencies 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 processes; and not less than \$500,000 to continue efforts furthering improvements in mechanical insulation. The Committee encourages the Department to continue to support technical assistance for combined heat and power demonstrations and deployments that support systems-level optimization, microgrids, and grid integration, as well as research and development into next-generation combined heat and power technologies.

For subprograms within Advanced Manufacturing, the recommendation provides \$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 security 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 .....	187,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2015 .....	+40,194,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	–82,600,000

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 \$187,500,000 for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, \$40,194,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$82,600,000 below the budget request.

*Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Research and Development.*—The Committee recommends \$140,500,000 for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability Research and Development, \$32,800,000 above fiscal year 2015 and \$12,500,000 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 Capa-

bility activity; \$30,000,000 for Smart Grid; \$15,000,000 for Energy Storage; and \$54,500,000 for cyber security for energy delivery systems, of which \$5,000,000 is to continue development of the industry-scale electric grid test bed; and \$10,000,000 for Transformer Resilience and Advanced Components.

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 develop-

ment 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 require-

ment 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 repositioning 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 ad-



ditional 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-de-

fense related activities. These past activities resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination that requires remediation, stabilization, or some other action. The Committee recommends \$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 Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) and 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 addressing 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 Cam-

era 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), and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) 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 infrastructure 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 Committee 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 Department has conducted further analysis of the comparative costs of the MOX and downblending alternatives to dispose of surplus U.S. plutonium. While the costs of constructing the MOX facility appear to be conservatively estimated, that analysis does not provide a full accounting of the lifecycle costs for the alternative option to downblend and dispose

of the material at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) or another disposal facility. For instance, the Department's analysis does not account for the costs of operating and emplacing waste in WIPP for another twenty years beyond its current closure date of 2030. In addition, the Department estimates that, if authorized, the Department would need significant funding above the budget request to cancel the MOX project and pursue the downblending alternative in fiscal year 2016. Considering the high near term costs of either option, more accurate information on the full costs of the downblending option must be developed before such an alternative should be pursued. The Department is directed to conduct a comprehensive programmatic analysis of the full costs of downblending and disposing surplus U.S. plutonium at WIPP or another disposal facility and to provide a report on its findings to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress not less than 18 months after the enactment of this Act. If the MOX program should be continued, the Committee encourages exploring 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 ir-

radiation 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 \$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 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 budget 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 re-baseline 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 con-

struction, 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, Okla-

homa, 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:	190,000	223,999	190,000	---	-33,999
Weatherization assistance program.....	3,000	4,000	3,000	---	-1,000
Training and technical assistance.....					

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
<b>ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY</b>					
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	30,000	+14,561	---
Cyber security for energy delivery systems.....	45,999	52,000	54,500	+8,501	+2,500
Energy storage.....	12,000	21,000	15,000	+3,000	-6,000
Transformer resilience and advanced components.....	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Subtotal.....	107,700	153,000	140,500	+32,800	-12,500
National electricity delivery.....	6,000	7,500	6,000	---	-1,500
Infrastructure security and energy restoration.....	6,000	14,000	14,000	+8,000	---
State energy reliability and assurance.....	---	63,000	---	---	-63,000
Program direction.....	27,606	32,600	27,000	-606	-5,600
<b>TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY</b>	<b>147,306</b>	<b>270,100</b>	<b>187,500</b>	<b>+40,194</b>	<b>-82,600</b>
<b>NUCLEAR ENERGY</b>					
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 R&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 statewide 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.....	48,000	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.....	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 landlord.....	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	25,000	---	---	-25,000	---
improvements, PPPL.....	11,920	---	---	-11,920	---
12-SC-70 Science and user support building, SLAC	66,010	68,910	60,000	-6,010	-8,910
Subtotal.....	79,600	113,600	89,890	+10,290	-23,710
Subtotal, Science Laboratories infrastructure...					
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
<b>ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PGM</b>					
Administrative expenses.....	4,000	6,000	6,000	+2,000	---
<b>TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM.....</b>					
	4,000	6,000	6,000	+2,000	---
<b>CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY (RESCISSION).....</b>					
	-6,600	---	---	+6,600	---
<b>DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION</b>					
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).....	19,812	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	10,324,007	+91,265	-1,230,957
=====					
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
<b>Stockpile systems:</b>					
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	---
<b>Weapons dismantlement and disposition.....</b>	50,000	48,049	48,049	-1,951	---
<b>Stockpile services:</b>					
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.....	180,000	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
<b>Strategic materials:</b>					
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 (RDT&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	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, RDT&E.....	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-O-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 RLUOB 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
<b>Construction:</b>					
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
<b>Total, Infrastructure and safety.....</b>					
	---	1,466,134	---	---	-1,466,134
<b>Site stewardship.....</b>					
	76,531	36,595	---	-76,531	-36,595
<b>Defense nuclear security:</b>					
Defense nuclear security.....	636,123	619,891	634,891	-1,232	+15,000
Security improvements program.....	---	---	35,000	+35,000	+35,000
<b>Construction:</b>					
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
<b>Information technology and cyber security.....</b>					
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	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:					
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 Engine 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, KS0.....	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	---	---
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
<b>Construction:</b>					
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
<b>Office of River Protection:</b>					
<b>Construction:</b>					
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
<b>Tank farm activities:</b>					
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
<b>Idaho National Laboratory:</b>					
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.....	203,152	221,855	215,000	+11,848	-6,855
Office of Legacy Management:					
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.....	118,836	122,558	122,558	+3,722	---
Office of hearings and appeals.....	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
<b>WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION</b>					
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).....					
Less alternative financing (for Construction).....	-5,197	-1,757	-1,757	+3,440	---
Less alternative financing (for Program Dir.).....	-74,448	-53,585	-53,585	+20,863	---
Less alternative financing (for PPW).....	-5,300	-5,273	-5,273	+27	---
Offsetting collections (for program direction).....	-180,713	-213,114	-213,114	-32,401	---
Offsetting collections (for O&M).....	-174,285	-177,697	-177,697	-3,412	---
Offsetting collections (P.L. 108-477, P.L. 109-103).....	-36,745	-36,645	-36,645	+100	---
Offsetting collections (P.L. 98-381).....	-260,510	-352,813	-352,813	-92,303	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	-7,161	-7,344	-7,344	-183	---
<b>FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND</b>					
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	29,012,069	+1,095,272	-1,515,067
(Total amount appropriated)	(28,152,876)	(30,527,136)	(29,063,318)	(+910,442)	(-1,463,818)
(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	187,500	+40,194	-82,600
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
<b>Total Summary of Accounts, Department of Energy...</b>	<b>27,916,797</b>	<b>30,527,136</b>	<b>29,012,069</b>	<b>+1,095,272</b>	<b>-1,515,067</b>

(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 .....	1,003,233,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2015 .....	0
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	-16,886,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2015 .....	\$-885,375,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	-899,971,000
Recommended, 2016 .....	-862,274,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2015 .....	+23,101,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	+37,697,000

## NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2015 .....	\$117,858,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	120,148,000
Recommended, 2016 .....	140,959,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2015 .....	+23,101,000
Budget estimate, 2016 .....	+20,811,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2016 is \$1,003,233,000, the same as fiscal year 2015 and \$16,886,000 below the budget request. The total amount of budget authority is offset by estimated revenues of \$862,274,000. Including revenues, the net appropriation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is \$140,959,000.

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 provides \$25,000,000 for the adjudication of the Yucca Mountain license application. 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 \$25,000,000 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 Commis-

sion 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 in fiscal year 2016 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.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Department of the Interior, section 203, regarding completion of certain feasibility studies.

### 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, the Committee notes that the accompanying bill does not propose to repeal or amend a statute or part thereof.

#### APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized:

(thousand dollars)				
Agency/Program	Last Year of Authorization	Authorization Level	Appropriation in Last Year of Authorization	Net Appropriation in this Bill
Corps FUSRAP				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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) Allocation		This Bill	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Mandatory .....	n.a.	n.a.	0	<sup>1</sup> 0
Discretionary .....	35,403	36,186	35,403	36,182

<sup>1</sup> Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

## FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

Pursuant to section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the following table contains five-year projections prepared by the Congressional Budget Office of outlays associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

[In millions of dollars]

Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:	
2016 .....	<sup>1</sup> 20,605
2017 .....	10,115
2018 .....	3,461
2019 .....	770
2020 and future years .....	395

<sup>1</sup> Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

## ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Pursuant to section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amount of financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Budget Authority .....	108
Outlays .....	<sup>1</sup> 22

<sup>1</sup> Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 1

Date: April 22, 2015

Measure: Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, FY 2016

Motion by: Ms. Kaptur

Description of Motion: To strike five provisions prohibiting funding to implement new regulations on fill material and waters of the U.S., to require permits for certain agricultural activities to restrict firearms on Army Corps of Engineers land, and to implement the National Ocean Policy.

Results: Defeated 18 yeas to 31 nays.

*Members Voting Yea*

Ms. DeLauro  
Mr. Farr  
Mr. Fattah  
Mr. Honda  
Mr. Israel  
Ms. Kaptur  
Mr. Kilmer  
Ms. Lee  
Mrs. Lowey  
Ms. McCollum  
Ms. Pingree  
Mr. Price  
Mr. Quigley  
Ms. Roybal-Allard  
Mr. Ruppertsberger  
Mr. Ryan  
Mr. Serrano  
Mr. Visclosky

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
Mr. Amodei  
Mr. Bishop  
Mr. Calvert  
Mr. Carter  
Mr. Cole  
Mr. Crenshaw  
Mr. Cuellar  
Mr. Culberson  
Mr. Dent  
Mr. Diaz-Balart  
Mr. Fleischmann  
Mr. Fortenberry  
Mr. Frelinghuysen  
Ms. Granger  
Mr. Graves  
Dr. Harris  
Ms. Herrera Beutler  
Mr. Jenkins  
Mr. Jolly  
Mr. Joyce  
Mr. Palazzo  
Mr. Rigell  
Mrs. Roby  
Mr. Rogers  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. Stewart  
Mr. Valadao  
Mr. Womack  
Mr. Yoder  
Mr. Young

**FULL COMMITTEE VOTES**

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 2

Date: April 22, 2015

Measure: Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, FY 2016

Motion by: Ms. DeLauro

Description of Motion: To prohibit the use of funds to enter into a contract with a corporation incorporated in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands that was previously incorporated in the United States.

Results: Defeated 24 yeas to 26 nays.

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Bishop  
 Mr. Cuellar  
 Ms. DeLauro  
 Mr. Farr  
 Mr. Fattah  
 Mr. Fortenberry  
 Ms. Herrera Beutler  
 Mr. Honda  
 Mr. Israel  
 Ms. Kaptur  
 Mr. Kilmer  
 Ms. Lee  
 Mrs. Lowey  
 Ms. McCollum  
 Ms. Pingree  
 Mr. Price  
 Mr. Quigley  
 Mr. Rooney  
 Ms. Roybal-Allard  
 Mr. Ruppertsberger  
 Mr. Ryan  
 Mr. Serrano  
 Mr. Visclosky  
 Mr. Yoder

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
 Mr. Amodei  
 Mr. Calvert  
 Mr. Carter  
 Mr. Cole  
 Mr. Crenshaw  
 Mr. Culberson  
 Mr. Dent  
 Mr. Diaz-Balart  
 Mr. Fleischmann  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen  
 Ms. Granger  
 Mr. Graves  
 Dr. Harris  
 Mr. Jenkins  
 Mr. Jolly  
 Mr. Joyce  
 Mr. Palazzo  
 Mr. Rigell  
 Mrs. Roby  
 Mr. Rogers  
 Mr. Simpson  
 Mr. Stewart  
 Mr. Valadao  
 Mr. Womack  
 Mr. Young

## FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLL CALL NO. 3

Date: April 22, 2015

Measure: Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, FY 2016

Motion by: Mr. Farr

Description of Motion: To strike the prohibition on the use of funds to implement the National Ocean Policy.

Results: Defeated 20 yeas to 29 nays.

*Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Bishop  
Mr. Cuellar  
Ms. DeLauro  
Mr. Farr  
Mr. Fattah  
Mr. Honda  
Mr. Israel  
Ms. Kaptur  
Mr. Kilmer  
Ms. Lee  
Mrs. Lowey  
Ms. McCollum  
Ms. Pingree  
Mr. Price  
Mr. Quigley  
Ms. Roybal-Allard  
Mr. Ruppertsberger  
Mr. Ryan  
Mr. Serrano  
Mr. Visclosky

*Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
Mr. Amodei  
Mr. Calvert  
Mr. Carter  
Mr. Cole  
Mr. Culberson  
Mr. Dent  
Mr. Diaz-Balart  
Mr. Fleischmann  
Mr. Fortenberry  
Mr. Frelinghuysen  
Ms. Granger  
Mr. Graves  
Dr. Harris  
Ms. Herrera Beutler  
Mr. Jenkins  
Mr. Jolly  
Mr. Joyce  
Mr. Palazzo  
Mr. Rigell  
Mrs. Roby  
Mr. Rogers  
Mr. Rooney  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. Stewart  
Mr. Valadao  
Mr. Womack  
Mr. Yoder  
Mr. Young

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....	5,454,500	4,732,000	5,596,750	+142,250	+864,750
Appropriations.....	(5,482,500)	(4,732,000)	(5,596,750)	(+114,250)	(+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
<b>TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>					
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	187,500	+40,194	-82,600
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	10,324,007	+91,265	-1,230,957
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	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....	17,624,295	18,867,172	18,623,917	+999,622	-243,255
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
<b>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	304,389	319,800	319,800	+15,411	---
Revenues applied.....	-304,389	-319,800	-319,800	-15,411	---
<b>General Provisions</b>					
<b>Title III Rescissions:</b>					
<b>Department of Energy:</b>					
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	29,012,069	+1,095,272	-1,515,067
Appropriations	(28,152,876)	(30,527,136)	(29,063,318)	(+910,442)	(-1,463,818)
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	1,003,233	---	-16,886
Revenues	-885,375	-899,971	-862,274	+23,101	+37,697
Subtotal	117,858	120,148	140,959	+23,101	+20,811
=====					

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	143,035	+23,205	+20,811
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	297,785	+28,805	+16,875
Appropriations.....	(268,980)	(280,910)	(297,785)	(+28,805)	(+16,875)
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



## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF NITA LOWEY AND MARCY KAPTUR

The President has requested a robust increase for this bill in Fiscal Year 2016, calling on Congress to provide the critical investments necessary to accelerate and sustain economic growth. His overall budget calls for investments in research, education, training, and infrastructure—all vitally important and all interconnected.

The President has also called for the end of the mindless austerity of sequestration, urging this Congress to replace it with more targeted spending cuts, program integrity measures, and the closure of some outdated tax loopholes. The effects of sequestration were immense, and are still being felt. Critical training was postponed; investments were put-off; and research abruptly halted. It was a worst-case scenario that never should have happened and absolutely should never be repeated.

Many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have differences with the President on how we get there, but the art of compromise must be achieved again. Even the Republican Budget Resolution acknowledges the need for relief from sequestration, though it does so by using creative accounting and merely aspirational language.

While the Murray-Ryan plan was not perfect, another similar budget deal is essential for FY16 and beyond. Without such an agreement this year, our appropriations process is deeply imperiled. The sequester-level caps also would put discretionary funding at its lowest level, adjusted for inflation, since 2006. We must again act to ensure reasonable allocations for the important programs and investments funded through the appropriations process.

We commend Chairman Rogers and Chairman Simpson for their efforts to assemble this bill in an inclusive manner. The bill funds critical water resource projects, supports science activities necessary for American competitiveness, and contributes to our national defense through vital weapons, naval reactor research, and nonproliferation funding, all priorities that unite rather than divide us. Chairman Simpson has worked hard to incorporate the interests of Members from both parties. As a result, the bill is largely a reflection of priorities from both sides of the aisle.

The subcommittee's allocation is \$35,403,000,000, a decrease of \$633,063,000 from the Administration's budget request and \$1,201,000,000 above the 2015 level. The defense allocation is \$1,040,000,000 above 2015, while the non-defense allocation is \$161,000,000 above 2015. Within the constraints placed on the committee by the overall budget number, the allocation reflects a microcosm of the larger budget question on the appropriate balance between defense and non-defense activities.

We commend the Chairman for increasing Corps of Engineers funding by \$864,750,000 above the President's inadequate request, ensuring that some ongoing projects will continue. The bill also provides approximately \$1,178,000,000 for projects funded from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, approximately \$73,000,000 above 2015. This funding will allow preventive and proactive investments necessary for the economy and the safety of American citizens. As we are reminded often by increasingly common weather events, we must begin adapting to changing conditions in the natural environ-

ment. The funding will also allow investments in the nation's ports and waterways, which are critical to ensuring that American made goods can move to market, both domestically and abroad. We firmly believe that our underinvestment in infrastructure continues to hamper economic gains and prolongs the current employment crisis.

The Corps of Engineers currently has a backlog of authorized projects in excess of \$60,000,000,000, without including the deauthorization of \$18,000,000,000 in the recent Water Resource Reform and Development Act. Limiting the figure to those projects currently budgeted, the balance to complete these ongoing projects is more than \$20,000,000,000. While this bill ensures increased investment beyond that included in the budget request, we should be doing even more to build infrastructure and create jobs, not less. Federal support of water resource projects creates construction jobs and indirect economic benefits that encourage local businesses and individuals to embrace risk and make critical investments in their communities. The bill does not include funding for new projects. We must start investing in projects that meet tomorrow's needs, not yesterday's.

The Science and ARPA-E accounts, critical to the competitiveness of our nation, are \$29,000,000 above and equal to the level of funding provided in 2015 respectively. With a return on investment of 20 to 67 percent, publicly funded research grows our economy and helps the United States maintain its position as the global leader in innovation. If we truly wish to achieve energy independence and tackle the challenges posed by climate change, the federal government must continue to prioritize investments in cutting edge research at our national laboratories and universities along with supporting advancements in high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that are too early for private-sector investment.

With regard to the applied energy programs at the Department of Energy, investments in energy technology programs are once again skewed too heavily toward fossil fuels. We must provide for critical research and development for the nuclear and fossil energy sectors that currently provide the bulk of our current electricity generation, but continued and sustained research and development programs in renewable energy are necessary and appropriate. Renewable energy has achieved cost competitiveness in some areas, yet further investment can drive down the costs of existing technology and provide breakthroughs in others. Investment in portfolio diversity remains necessary for the long term, particularly given the rapidly shifting energy outlook. The dramatic production increases in U.S. natural gas were enabled, in part, by technology developed by the Department of Energy. This expansion in production has resulted in a transformation of the nation's energy exports impossible to foresee when the actual research and development investments were made in horizontal drilling technology. The United States can leverage its strength—innovation—to restore the United States to a position of global leadership in clean energy. This effort is a critical national priority, with implications for our economic competitiveness, national security, and environmental legacy.

Our nation's chief strategic vulnerability is its dependence on foreign energy imports and our lack of energy independence. The

United States has spent \$2,300,000,000,000 importing foreign petroleum since 2003.

This represents thousands of dollars out of the pockets of every hard-working American spent, not in much-needed American job creation, but overseas, assisting our competitors in developing their economies and their energy futures. Our republic will not compete in the 21st Century and beyond if we further reduce investments in energy technology and innovation arena and cede the energy future to other countries.

Nonproliferation programs are our first line of defense and the most cost-effective way to achieve the urgent goal of securing and reducing the amount of vulnerable bomb-grade material. The bill includes \$1,918,000,000 for these critical programs, approximately \$53,000,000 above 2015 after accounting for the movement of the counterterrorism and incident response program from weapons. The bill correctly prioritizes this funding, particularly in light of the recent suspension of nonproliferation work within Russia and an increase in irresponsible states and transnational actors seeking to harm.

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has been plagued by breathtaking cost overruns and schedule delays, and the Chairman continues the strong oversight of the NNSA. While we understand the need to modernize a complex built substantially in the 1950's, we continue to question whether the organization has the necessary tools and processes to continue to manage large increases to these activities year after year.

We are concerned that the funding the bill includes for Environmental Management (EM) activities is insufficient to meet the federal government's legal obligations to clean up its defense nuclear waste. This program is critical to addressing the environmental legacies of the Cold War and the Manhattan Project. Given that EM's portfolio is one of the nation's largest environmental and financial liabilities, we have the responsibility to address the waste and contamination in the affected communities in a timely and competent manner. While this was driven by a low defense allocation and budget request, the bill includes insufficient funding to meet commitments to the states and localities who provided so much when called upon.

While the funding levels of the bill would be a basis for negotiation, the inclusion of controversial riders is an unnecessary diversion from our primary responsibility—ensuring that taxpayer funds are invested wisely in Federal programs which will contribute to the economic vitality of our Nation. We should not have to remind our Majority colleagues that similar provisions have imperiled passage of this bill in the past. This Administration has already been on record with veto threats over nearly identical language.

Most concerning is the inclusion of four water riders which, taken together, risk protection of the world's most precious resource: water. The first Clean Water Act provision prevents the Corps of Engineers from taking steps to clarify which waters are protected by the Clean Water Act, and keeps in place a widely-acknowledged state of confusion about the scope of the law's pollution control programs. The second prevents the Corps of Engineers from using funds to "develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change" to regulations pertaining to the definitions of the

terms “fill material” or “discharge of fill material” under the Clean Water Act. This rider would lock in industry loopholes, leaving many of our nation’s waterways vulnerable to harmful pollution. Finally, the bill includes provisions regarding agricultural exemptions to the Clean Water Act and a prohibition of activities related to the National Ocean Policy. Including these provisions is a disappointment and does a disservice in our work, particularly given the water challenges facing many parts of our country.

The inclusion of the rider allowing guns to be carried on all Corps of Engineers lands injects into the bill an unnecessarily partisan topic that is unwarranted. We disagree with the notion that reasonable limits on where guns can be carried are an infringement upon the Second Amendment. We see no need to contribute to an environment where guns are commonplace in recreational areas where families are trying to escape the pressures of everyday life.

In spite of these concerns, we would like to reiterate our appreciation for the Chairman’s work with us on many issues, ensuring the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee continues its tradition of bipartisanship—the Subcommittee has operated collaboratively and effectively for many years and, within the constraints facing the bill, it addresses many of the interests we have expressed. Under the current Republican Budget Resolution, the Energy and Water bill’s allocation comes at the expense of critical investments in other Subcommittees. It is our firm hope that the Committee will be provided a sensible overall budget level which will provide a path forward for all of the FY16 Appropriations bills. We look forward to the day when allocations across all Subcommittees are returned to acceptable levels and to working with the Chairman and the members of this Committee to advance the process.

NITA LOWEY.  
MARCY KAPTUR.

