



THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR FEDERAL POLICY RESEARCH
419 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, D.C. 20003 202-546-3700
Fax: 202-546-2390 E-mail: randsell@calinst.org Web: <http://www.calinst.org>

SPECIAL REPORT: Energy & Water Appropriations for FY 2005 (House Version) and California Implications – *November 2004*

On June 25, 2004, the House passed its FY2005 Energy and Water Appropriations bill (H.R. 4614) by a vote of 370-60. The Committee Report to accompany the bill is H.Rpt. 108-554. The Senate has not acted on its version of the bill, and the Energy and Water Appropriations are expected to be included in the Omnibus Appropriations bill that will be considered by Congress.

The House FY05 bill totals \$27,988,000 for Energy and Water Appropriations. This is \$49,618,000 above the President's budget request, and \$734,537,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004.

The following represents a quick analysis of the bill from a California perspective as prepared by the California Institute. We apologize for any errors or omissions in our discussion of these documents, and would appreciate any input/feedback/corrections. The ordering of items generally reflects their presence in the bill and does not mean to imply any relative importance.

This appropriations analysis is available on the California Institute web site at <http://www.calinst.org/pubs/ew05h.htm>, and a printable Adobe Acrobat ("pdf") version is available at <http://www.calinst.org/pubs/ew05h.pdf>.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVILIAN - U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The bill provides \$4,823,280,000 for the programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, an increase of \$242,900 over fiscal year 2004 and \$703,280,000 over the budget request of \$4,120,000,000. The Committee Report states: "Due to constrained budgets in recent years, the Committee elects to concentrate on protecting existing infrastructure and completing ongoing projects and does not include new project study or construction starts or new project authorizations in fiscal year 2005." The Committee also adopted several priorities to guide its funding decisions for FY05, with the top priority being "to protect the investment already made in major water infrastructure in this country."

General Investigations (In Thousands of Dollars)

	Request		Recommend	
	Inv.	Plng.	Inv.	Plng.
Aliso Creek Mainstem	265	—	265	—
American River Watershed	—	415	—	—
Arana Gulch Watershed	100	—	100	—
Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration	—	—	200	—

Ballona Creek Ecosystem Restoration	—	—	200	—
Bolinas Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration	—	—	—	100
Calaveras County Watersheds	—	—	500	—
California Coastal Sediment Master Plan	32	—	200	—
City of San Bernardino	—	—	150	—
Coast of California, Los Angeles County	—	—	400	—
Coyote Dam	200	—	200	—
Estudillo Canal, San Leandro	—	—	57	—
Grayson & Murderer's Creeks, Walnut Creek Basin	300	—	400	—
Humboldt Bay Long Term Shoal Mgmt	—	—	45	—
Laguna Creek Watershed	—	—	57	—
Laguna De Santa Rosa	200	—	200	—
Llagas Creek Flood Protection Project	—	—	—	400
Los Angeles County Drainage Area, Cornfields	32	—	57	—
Los Angeles County	630	—	630	—
Los Angeles River Watercourse, Headworks Area	—	—	200	—
Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, Woodland & Vicinity	—	300	—	300
Lower Mission Creek (Flood Control & Creek Rehab)	—	—	—	200
Malibu Creek Watershed	325	—	325	—
Marina Del Ray & Ballona Creek	175	—	175	—
Matilija Dam	375	—	400	—
Morro Bay Estuary	—	—	100	—
Mugu Lagoon	140	—	228	—
Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration	—	—	—	250
Napa Valley Watershed Mgmt	200	—	200	—
Newport Bay LA-3 Site Designation	—	—	200	—
Newport Bay, San Diego Creek Watershed	—	—	86	—
Ocean Beach	200	—	200	—
Orange County Special Area Mgmt Plan	—	—	200	—
Pajaro River at Watsonville	—	400	—	400
Poso Creek	200	—	200	—
Riverside County Special Area Mgmt Plan	—	—	400	—
Russian River Ecosystem Restoration	200	—	300	—
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	200	—	200	—
Sacramento & San Joaquin Comprehensive Basin Study	500	—	1,500	—
San Bernardino County	100	—	100	—
San Clemente Shoreline	178	—	178	—
San Diego County Shoreline	—	—	250	—
San Diego County Special Area Mgmt Plan	—	—	250	—
San Francisquito Creek	—	—	100	—
San Joaquin RB, West Stanislaus County, Orestimba Creek	200	—	200	—
San Joaquin River Basin, Frazier Creek	130	—	130	—
San Joaquin River Basin, Tuolumne Creek	200	—	200	—
San Juan Creek, S. Orange County	—	—	35	—
San Pablo Bay Watershed	300	—	400	—
Santa Ana River & Tributaries, Big Bear Lake	1,000	—	1,000	—
Santa Clara River, City of Santa Clarita	—	—	300	—
Santa Rosa Creek Ecosystem Restoration	500	—	550	—
Solana Beach/Encinitas Shoreline Protection Study	—	—	121	—

Sonoma Creek & Tributaries	274	—	274	—
South San Francisco Shoreline Study	—	—	350	—
Southern California Wetlands Restoration	100	—	100	—
Sun Valley Watershed	—	—	75	—
Sutter County	275	—	275	—
Tijuana River Environmental Restoration	—	—	75	—
Upper Penitencia Creek	46	—	500	—
Ventura Harbor Sand Bypass	—	—	300	—
Westminster, Coyote & Carbon Canyon Creek Watersheds	122	—	122	—
Westminster, East Garden Grove	416	—	416	—
White River & Deer Creek	100	—	100	—
Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks	100	—	100	—
Yuba River Basin	—	100	—	600

The Committee Report states that funds for the American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Mini-Raise project) are shown in the Construction, General account.

Construction

	Budget Request (In Thousands)	House Recommended (In Thousands)
American River Wtrshd (Flsm Dam Mini-Raise)	---	8,000
American Rvr. Wtrshd (Folsom Dam Mod.)	6,175	7,175
American River Wtrshd	5,000	5,000
City of Inglewoods	---	500
City of Norwalk	---	160
Cambria Seawater Desalinization Infrastructure	---	350
City of Santa Clarita	---	400
City of Santa Clarita (Perchlorate)	---	350
Corte Madera Creek Flood Control	---	200
Coyote and Berryessa Creek	---	300
Desert Hot Springs	---	200
Farmington Grndwtr Recharge Demonstration Prjct	—	2,000
Guadalupe River	6,000	6,000
Hamilton Airfield Wetlands Restoration	5,100	6,100
Harbor/S. Bay Wtr Recycling Prjct, Los Angeles	---	2,000
Kaweah River	5,624	5,624
LA County Drainage Area (Stormwater Mgmt)	—	250
LA Harbor Main Channel Deepening	23,000	23,000
Marysville/Yuba City Levee Reconstruction	3,686	3,686
Merced County Streams	---	500
Mid-Valley Area Levee Reconstruction	2,300	2,300
Murrieta Creek	---	3,000
Napa River	7,000	20,000
N. Valley Rgnl Wtr Infrstrctr (City of Los Angeles)	---	3,500
Oakland Harbor (50 Foot Project)	20,000	35,000
Petaluma River	3,404	1,000

Sacramento Area	---	3,500
Sacramento River Bank Protection Project	1,000	2,500
Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel ---		750
Santa Ana River Mainstem	13,200	20,500
San Lorenzo River	---	2,019
San Francisco Bay to Stockton	---	500
San Ramon Valley Recycled Water Project	---	750
South Perris (Water Supply Desalination)	---	500
South Sacramento County Streams	1,000	3,500
Stockton Metropolitan Flood Cntrl Reimbursmnt	—	5,000
Success Dam, Tule River (Dam Safety)	4,000	4,000
Tule River	3,500	3,500
Upper Newport Bay Ecosystem Restoration	---	500
Upper Sacramento Area Levee Reconstruction	2,400	2,400

The Committee Report includes the following:

American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Mini-Raise) -- Within funds provided for the American River Watershed (Folsom Dam Mini-Raise) project, the Corps is directed to continue design to the Folsom Dam replacement road and permanent bridge to assure their completion at the earliest possible date consistent with the pace of the Mini-Raise project as a whole. The Committee includes language directing the Corps of Engineers to expend its full capability, up to \$5,000,000, to advance the permanent bridge to replace Folsom Bridge Dam Road, Folsom, California, as authorized by the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108–137) with all remaining funds devoted to the Mini-Raise. The Committee is aware of reports that there have been attempts to place obstacles in the way of this work, and insists that it be allowed to proceed, unimpeded.

Sacramento Area -- The bill includes \$3,500,000 for the Sacramento Area project authorized by section 502 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. The amount provided includes funding for the water meter retrofit program in the City of Roseville; the Placer County Water Agency meter replacement, water line replacement, and canal lining project; hydraulic improvements at the San Juan District water treatment plant; the redundant water supply intake at Folsom Reservoir; and the San Juan Water District, groundwater well development for conjunctive use program.

Santa Ana River Mainstem -- The Committee recommends \$20,500,000 for continued construction of the Santa Ana River Mainstem project, including \$7,500,000 for the continuation of work on the San Timoteo Creek element.

Small Navigation Projects

Oyster Point Harbor Breakwater, \$125,000
 San Diego Harbor Deepening, \$750,000

Small Flood Control Projects

Tehama Flood Reduction Project, \$500,000
 Yucca Valley, West Burnt Mountain Basin, \$300,000

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Projects

(In Thousands)

(Section 206)

English Creek Aquatic Restoration	100
St. Helena Napa River Restoration	600
Sweetwater Ecosystem Restoration	180
Thompson Creek	300
Upper York Creek Dam Removal and Restoration	400

Operation and Maintenance

	Budget Request (In Thousands)	House Recommended (In Thousands)
Black Butte Lake	1,882	1,882
Buchanan Dam. HB Eastman Lake	1,958	1,958
Channel Islands Harbor	4,985	4,985
Coyote Valley Dam, Lake Mendocino	4,348	4,348
Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel	4,779	5,779
Farmington Dam	526	526
Hidden Dam, Hensley Lake	1,828	1,828
Humboldt Harbor and Bay	2,864	2,864
Inspection of Completed Works	1,271	1,271
Isabella Lake	2,080	2,080
Los Angeles - Log Beach Harbor Model	175	175
Los Angeles County Drainage Area	5,376	5,376
Merced County Streams	292	292
Mojave River Dam	328	328
Morro Bay Harbor	---	578
Moss Landing Harbor	—	500
New Hogan Lake	2,044	2,044
New Melones Lake, Downstream Channel	1,335	1,335
Oakland Harbor	7,098	7,098
Oceanside Harbor	1,110	1,110
Pillar Point Harbor	---	250
Pine Flat Lake	2,941	2,941
Port Hueneme, Ventura County	---	500
Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo County	---	1,000
Project Condition Surveys	2,173	2,173
Redwood City Harbor	—	1,000
Richmond Harbor	7,572	7,572
Sacramento River (30 Foot Project)	2,745	2,745
Sacramento River and Tributaries (Debris Control)	1,246	1,246
Sacramento River Shallow Draft Channel	145	145
San Francisco Bay Long Term Mngmt Strategy	---	1,250
San Francisco Bay, Delta Model Structure	1,270	1,100
San Francisco Bay Harbor and Bay (Drift Removal)	2,674	3,300
San Francisco Harbor	2,255	2,250

San Joaquin River, Port of Stockton	---	3,800
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait	---	1,000
Santa Ana River Basin	4,023	4,023
Santa Barbara Harbor	---	2,090
Scheduling Reservoir Operations	1,285	1,285
Success Lake	2,007	2,007
Suisun Bay Channel	4,559	4,559
Terminus Dam, Lake Kaweah	2,268	2,268
Ventura Harbor	2,910	2,910
Yuba River	126	126

Los Angeles County Drainage Area -- The Committee urges that the Corps of Engineers remove all debris dumped by the Corps into the Hansen Dam Lower Lakes in 2003 and undertake all appropriate mitigation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

The funds provided in the bill for the Bureau of Reclamation include the following accounts: Water and Related Resources, the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program, the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, California Bay-Delta Restoration, and Policy and Administration. The Committee recommendation provides a total of \$968,153,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation in fiscal year 2005, an increase of \$25,477,000 over fiscal year 2004 and \$45,829,000 over the request.

Water and Related Resources

(In Thousands)

	Request		Recommended	
	Res.Mgmt	FacOM&R	Res.Mgmt	FacOM&R
Cachuna Project	939	822	939	822
				2
				2
California Investigations Programs	300	—	300	—
Calleguas Mun. Water Dis. Recycling Project	1,000	—	1,000	—
Central Valley Project:				
American River Division	1,867	7,499	4,867	7,499
Auburn-Folsom South Unit	6,397	125	6,397	125
Delta Division	7,262	6,372	8,762	6,372
East Side Division	1,548	2,455	1,548	2,455
Friant Division	1,955	3,970	3,955	3,970
Miscellaneous Project Programs	13,324	1,210	19,287	1,210
Replacement Adds. & Extraordinary Maint.	—	23,200	—	23,200
Sacramento River Division	3,337	1,689	5,337	1,689
San Felipe Division	969	—	969	—
San Joaquin Division	295	—	295	—
Shasta Division	1,110	7,171	1,110	7,171
Trinity River Division	6,641	3,100	6,641	3,100

Water and Power Operations	1,900	9,724	1,900	9,724
West San Joaquin Div., San Luis Unit	41,484	7,766	8,484	7,766
Yield Feasibility Investigation	500	—	500	—
Long Beach Area Water Reclamation & Reuse Proj.	1,000	—	500	—
Long Beach Desalination Project	—	—	1,500	—
Napa-Sonoma Marin Agric. Reuse Project	—	—	250	—
N. San Diego Co. Area Water Recycling Proj.	2,000	—	3,000	—
Orange Co. Reg. Water Reclam. Proj. Phase 1	2,000	—	3,000	—
Orland Project	40	547	40	547
Sacramento River Diversion Study	—	—	1,000	—
Salton Sea Research Project	1,000	—	3,500	—
San Diego Area Water Reclamation Proj.	3,500	—	3,500	—
San Gabriel Basin Project	500	—	9,000	—
Santa Margarita River Conjunctive Use Proj.	—	—	500	—
Solano Project	1,576	2,677	1,576	2,677
Southern California Investigations Program	740	—	1,240	—
Ventura River Project	524	—	524	—
Watsonville Area Water Recycling Project	—	—	1,000	—

Colorado River Front Work and Levee System, Arizona and California – The Committee recommends an additional \$700,000 to continue planning and design of regulating reservoirs near the All-American Canal.

Central Valley Project, American River Division – Within the funds provided for the Central Valley Project, American River Division, \$3,000,000 is for the continuation of the design for the El Dorado Irrigation District temperature control device at Folsom Dam and Reservoir.

Central Valley Project, Auburn/Folsom South Unit – The Report states: “The Committee is aware that, when the Bureau of Reclamation closed the road on Folsom Dam to public traffic in February 2003, it did so out of a genuine concern for public security and safety. However, many responsible people in the community, in the Congress, and elsewhere believe this closure, with its attendant impact on the commuters and businesses of the region, was precipitous and unwise. The Committee is also aware that the Bureau is exploring the possibility of a limited re-opening of the Dam Road, and urges that this be given the highest possible priority and accomplished at the earliest possible date, if it may be done within acceptable limits when all risk factors are considered.”

Central Valley Project, Delta Division -- The Committee recommends an additional \$1,000,000 to continue work on the Delta Mendota Canal-California Aqueduct Intertie project, and an additional \$500,000 for Reclamation to continue participation in planning and study activities associated with enlarging Los Vaqueros reservoir.

Central Valley Project, Friant Division -- The Committee has provided an additional \$2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Upper San Joaquin River Basin storage investigation.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento Division -- The Report states: "Congress has provided a total of \$1,100,000 over the past three fiscal years for the implementation of the Colusa Basin Integrated Resources Management Plan, and the Committee is disturbed at reports alleging that the Bureau has allocated less than half that amount to the program. The Committee directs the Bureau to continue project-level implementation of the Colusa Basin plan in fiscal year 2005. Within the amount made available for the Sacramento River Division, the Committee recommends an additional \$2,000,000 to reimburse the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District for costs associated with the fish passage improvement project."

Sacramento River Diversion Study -- The Committee recommends \$1,000,000 for continuation of the Sacramento River Diversion Study by the Placer County Water Agency, pursuant to Public Law 106-554.

Central Valley Project, West San Joaquin Division -- The Committee recommendation does not provide the funds requested for payment of settlement costs in the case of *Sumner Peck Ranch v. Bureau of Reclamation*. The Committee recommendation includes an additional \$1,000,000 for implementation of the Westside Regional Drainage Plan, which includes the Grassland Area Regional Drainage Plan.

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs -- The Committee recommendation includes an additional \$163,000 to complete the Kaweah River Delta Corridor Enhancement study, an additional \$300,000 for the Mokelumne River Regional Water Storage and Conjunctive Use Appraisal, and an additional \$500,000 for work with the California Agricultural Water Management Council. The Committee also includes an additional \$5,000,000 for the continuation of work on the Natomas Mutual Water Company, Reclamation District 108, and Sutter Mutual Water Company fish screen projects.

Southern California Investigations Program -- The Committee recommends \$1,240,000 for the Southern California Investigations Program, including an additional \$500,000 for the Los Angeles Basin Watershed Water Supply Augmentation study.

Salton Sea Research Project -- The Committee recommends \$3,500,000 for the Salton Sea Research Project, including \$2,000,000 to continue environmental restoration efforts at the New and Alamo Rivers, and for other authorized pilot projects.

Klamath Project, Oregon and California -- The Committee recommends an additional \$4,000,000 for the Klamath Project water bank program within available funds, the Committee includes \$1,000,000 for water quality multi-probe and flow measurement instrumentation.

Title XVI, Water Reclamation and Reuse Program -- The Committee recommends \$2,655,000 for the Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program. Within the amount made available, \$1,000,000 is to continue support to the WaterReuse Foundation's research program and \$125,000 is provided for the Bureau to work with the Mission Springs, California, Water District to evaluate further the possibilities of using recycled water for groundwater recharge or other non-potable uses.

California Bay-Delta Restoration

The Committee Report states: “The purpose of the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration account is to fund the Federal share of ecosystem restoration and other activities being developed for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento- San Joaquin Delta by a State and Federal partnership (CALFED). Federal participation in this program was authorized in the California Bay-Delta Environmental and Water Security Act enacted in the fall of 1996. That Act authorized the appropriation of \$143,300,000 for ecosystem restoration activities in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. Attempts to reauthorize the program have thus far been unsuccessful. Accordingly, no funds were provided in this account for the CALFED effort in fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004. The Committee remains supportive of the efforts that have been taken in the State of California to develop this program, which will provide a safe, clean, and reliable water system for millions of people while improving the environment. However, for fiscal year 2005, the Committee has again recommended no funding in the absence of authorizing legislation for this multi-year, multi-billion dollar effort. Should this program be reauthorized, the Committee will reconsider funding as the bill moves through the appropriations process. Certain elements of the CALFED program which have prior authorizations are funded individually under the Water and Related Resources account.”

Central Valley Project Restoration Fund

The Committee Report states: “The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund was authorized in Title 34 of Public Law 102–575, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. This Fund was established to provide funding from project beneficiaries for habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition, and other fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Central Valley Project area of California. Revenues are derived from payments by project beneficiaries and from donations. Payments from project beneficiaries include several required by the Act (e.g., Friant Division surcharges, higher charges on water transferred to non-CVP users, and tiered water prices) and, to the extent required in appropriations Acts, additional annual mitigation and restoration payments.

For fiscal year 2005, the Committee recommends \$54,695,000, the same as the budget request and \$15,329,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2004. The Committee again includes language in the bill which provides that none of the funds made available from the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund may be used for the acquisition or leasing of water for in-stream purposes if the water is already committed to in-stream purposes by a court adopted decree or order.

The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to make available the \$5,382,000 for the Anadromous Fish Screen Program to continue work on the American Basin Fish Screen and Habitat Improvement Project (Natomas Mutual Water Company) as well as the fish screen projects being undertaken by the Sutter Mutual Water Company and Reclamation District 108 provided under this heading in fiscal year 2003.”

General Provisions

Language has been included under Construction, General, directing the Corps of Engineers to:

- accept advance funds from the non-Federal sponsor of the Los Angeles Harbor, California, project; and
- proceed with Folsom Bridge Dam Road, California, under certain conditions.

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, directing the use of funds to rehabilitate the existing dredged material disposal site for the Bodega Bay Harbor, California, project to continue maintenance dredging of the Federal channel, and to make excavated material from the site available to the non-Federal sponsor at no cost to the Federal Government for use in development of public facilities.

Language has been included under General Provisions, Section 201, regarding the San Luis Unit and the Kesterson Reservoir in California. This language has been carried in prior appropriations Acts.

The accompanying bill would amend section 301 of Public Law 102–250, the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991, as follows:

Except as otherwise provided in section 2243 of this title (related to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$90,000,000 in total for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds provide for Department of Energy (DOE) programs relating to: Energy Supply, Non-Defense Environmental Management (Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion, Non-Defense Environmental Services, and Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund), Science, Nuclear Waste Disposal, Departmental Administration, the Inspector General, the National Nuclear Security Administration (Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Naval Reactors, and Office of the Administrator), Defense Environmental Management (Defense Site Acceleration Completion, and Defense Environmental Services), Other Defense Activities, Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

The Committee Report states: “Budget constraints limited the Committee’s ability to fully fund the Administration’s budget request for the Department of Energy. In addition, the Committee made a number of adjustments to reflect specific Congressional interests and priorities. Total funding for the Department of Energy is \$22,478,342,000, an increase of \$510,913,000 over fiscal year 2004 and \$669,491,000 less than the budget request.”

Five Year Budget Plans

While discussing Five-Year Budget Plans, the Committee Report states: Inherent in producing five-year budget plans for major programs and the entire Department is the need to define missions and activities, and therefore the future budget requirements, of the various laboratories. The large multi- program labs (i.e., Argonne, Brookhaven, Lawrence Berkeley, Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and Pacific Northwest) have been very aggressive in pursuing a wide range of new missions and funding sources—first climate change, then genomics, then nanotechnology, now advanced computing and proteinomics. And these labs continue to jockey for position at the homeland security funding trough. The Committee recognizes the vast pool of talent present in the labs, and the fact that such talent can be brought to bear on a wide range of problems facing the Nation. However, the Committee also believes that such talent requires more active guidance and supervision from the Headquarters program offices to be sure the labs are using DOE resources to tackle the right problems. In times of limited funding, the question can no longer be “What can the labs do?” but must instead be “What should the labs

do?” Answering this latter question should not be left up to the contractors running the labs; it must be answered by the Federal managers in the Department. The five-year plans prepared by the major program offices, and the comprehensive five-year plan for the Department, should include business plans for each of these laboratories. These business plans should include a clear statement of the primary mission of each laboratory as such mission relates to each lab’s lead program office(s), a clear statement of secondary missions to support other DOE program offices and other Federal agencies, and a five-year plan identifying the research, facilities, and resource requirements necessary to fulfill these primary and secondary missions.”

Non-defense Site Acceleration Completion

The Committee recommendation for Non-Defense Site Acceleration Completion is \$151,850,000, the same as the budget request.

Accelerated Completions, 2006

The recommendation provides \$45,435,000, the same as the budget request, including: \$4,070,000 for soil and water remediation at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory; and \$2,500,000 for soil and water remediation at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

Science Accounts

The Science account funds the Department’s work on high energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental sciences, basic energy sciences, advanced scientific computing, maintenance of the laboratories’ physical infrastructure, fusion energy sciences, safeguards and security, science workforce development, and science program direction. The Committee recommendation is \$3,599,964,000, an increase of \$168,246,000 compared to the budget request.

The Committee has provided additional funding for the Office of Science to address the following Committee priorities: high performance computing; additional operating time, equipment upgrades, and staffing to support increased research opportunities at Office of Science user facilities; nanoscale science research; remediation of safety deficiencies at DOE Science laboratories; and restoration of domestic fusion funding displaced by the new international fusion initiative.

High Energy Physics

The Committee recommends a total of \$753,380,000 for high energy physics, an increase of \$16,000,000 over the budget request. The additional funds are provided to meet increased electricity costs at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) and to increase operating time and enhance user support at SLAC and the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory.

Basic Energy Sciences

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is \$1,076,530,000, an increase of \$13,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee Report states that “For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2005, the Department may allocate funding among all operating accounts within Basic Energy Sciences.”

Research - The Committee recommendation includes \$612,228,000 for materials sciences and engineering, and \$232,422,000 for chemical sciences, geosciences, and energy biosciences. The additional \$13,000,000 in these accounts is to fund additional research on nanoscale science.

Construction

The Committee recommendation includes \$231,880,000 for Basic Energy Sciences construction projects, the same as the requested amount. Included within that funding are the following projects:

- \$32,085,000 for the Molecular Foundry (04-R-313) at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;
- \$30,897,000 for the Center for Integrated Nanotechnologies (03-R-313) at Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories; and
- \$20,075,000 for PED (03-SC-002) and \$30,000,000 for long-lead procurements (05-R-320) for the Linac Coherent Light Source at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center.

Campaigns

Campaigns are focused efforts involving the three weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, the weapons production plants, and selected external organizations to address critical capabilities needed to achieve program objectives. The Committee recommendation is \$2,252,048,000, a decrease of \$141,792,000 below the budget request of \$2,393,840,000.

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign

The Committee recommends \$545,034,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, an increase of \$53,000,000 over the budget request of \$492,034,000. The Report states: "The Committee is greatly concerned by the Department's fiscal year 2005 budget justification as it related to the program goals for the National Ignition Facility (NIF). In the budget justification, the NNSA seemed to waiver in its commitment to NIF by delaying the proposed date for achieving ignition from 2010 to 2014. The Committee views ignition as the sole benchmark for success in this program and is very concerned the four-year slip in the ignition milestone buried in the NNSA's budget justification documents represents a change in the Department's commitment to ignition in favor of less challenging goals for the NIF. The Committee's priority is on completion of the project in 2008 and achieving the functional requirement of first ignition in 2010. The Committee directs that no funds be expended, directly or indirectly, for additional capabilities for NIF that are not specified in the current baseline until the NIF project is completed in 2008 and ignition attempted in 2010. Any diversions represent significant risk to a project that has already experienced well-publicized cost and schedule problems."

Construction - The Committee recommendation provides \$130,000,000 for construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF), the same as the budget request.

Fusion Energy Sciences

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is \$276,110,000, an increase of \$12,000,000 over the budget request. The additional \$12,000,000 is to be used to increase the utilization of existing large and small experiments; further work in inertial fusion technology; take advantage of opportunities in High Energy Density Physics, including research on fast ignition, and large-scale scientific computing; and provide for cost-effective construction and development of the National Compact Stellarator Experiment. The Committee notes the delay in site selection for the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) and expects the Department to reduce its planned expenditures on ITER in fiscal year 2005 in consideration of this delay.

California continues to win the lion's share of federal expenditures for fusion energy sciences and inertial confinement fusion programs