

## SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

## Section 2851—Availability of Community Planning Assistance Relating to Encroachment of Civilian Communities on Military Facilities Used for Training by the Armed Forces

This section would amend section 2391 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of grants for the purposes of addressing encroachment of state-owned and operated national guard facilities that are subject to significant training use by the armed forces.

## Section 2852—Prohibitions Against Making Certain Military Airfields or Facilities Available for Use by Civil Aircraft

This section would prohibit the regular use of property at, or conveyance of property for, the civil aviation purposes at Marine Corps Air Station and Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, and Naval Air Station North Island, California.

## Section 2853—Naming Housing Facility at Fort Carson, Colorado, in Honor of Joel Hefley, a Member of the House of Representatives

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to designate one of the military family housing areas or facilities constructed for Fort Carson, Colorado, using housing privatization authorities provided by subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code in honor of Representative Joel Hefley.

## Section 2854—Naming Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center at Rock Island, Illinois, in Honor of Lane Evans, a Member of the House of Representatives

This section would designate the Navy and Marine Corps reserve center at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois as the “Lane Evans Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center.”

## Section 2855—Naming of Research Laboratory at Air Force Rome Research Site, Rome, New York, in Honor of Sherwood L. Boehlert, a Member of the House of Representatives

This section would designate the new laboratory building at the Air Force Rome Research Site, Rome, New York as the “Sherwood L. Boehlert Engineering Center.”

**DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS****TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

## OVERVIEW

The budget request contained \$15.8 billion for atomic energy defense activities and energy supply of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2007. Of this amount, \$9.3 billion is for the programs

of the National Nuclear Security Administration, \$6.5 billion is for environmental and other defense activities, and \$6.0 million is for energy supply. The committee recommends \$15.8 billion, the amount of the request.

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>National Nuclear Security Administration:</b>					
<b>Weapons Activities</b>					
<b>Directed stockpile work (DSW)</b>					
Life extension programs					
B61 life extension program.....	58,934				58,934
W76 life extension program.....	151,684				151,684
W80 life extension program.....	102,044				102,044
Subtotal, Life extension programs.....	312,662				312,662
Stockpile systems.....					
B61 stockpile systems.....	63,782				63,782
W62 stockpile systems.....	3,738				3,738
W76 stockpile systems.....	56,174				56,174
W78 stockpile systems.....	50,662				50,662
W80 stockpile systems.....	27,230				27,230
B83 stockpile systems.....	23,365				23,365
W84 stockpile systems.....	1,465				1,465
W87 stockpile systems.....	59,333				59,333
W88 stockpile systems.....	39,796				39,796
Subtotal, Stockpile systems.....	325,545				325,545
Reliable replacement warhead program.....	27,707				27,707
Weapons Dismantlement and Disposition.....	75,000				75,000
Stockpile services.....					
Production support.....	236,115				236,115
Research & development support.....	63,948				63,948
Research & development certification and safety.....	194,199				194,199
Management, technology and production.....	159,662				159,662
Responsive Infrastructure.....	15,430				15,430

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
Subtotal, Stockpile services.....	669,354				669,354
Program increase (QMU study).....			[2,000]		[2,000]
<b>Total, Directed stockpile work.....</b>	<b>1,410,268</b>				<b>1,410,268</b>
<b>Science campaign</b>					
Primary assessment technologies.....	50,527				50,527
Test readiness.....	14,757				14,757
Dynamic materials properties.....	80,727				80,727
Advanced radiography.....	36,745				36,745
Secondary assessment technologies.....	81,006				81,006
<b>Total, Science campaigns.....</b>	<b>263,762</b>				<b>263,762</b>
<b>Engineering campaign</b>					
Enhanced surety.....	26,731				26,731
Weapons systems engineering assessment technology.....	21,156				21,156
Nuclear survivability and effects.....	14,973				14,973
Enhanced surveillance.....	86,526				86,526
Microsystems and engineering sciences (MESA) and OPC.....	4,613				4,613
MESA application construction (01-D-108).....	6,920				6,920
<b>Total, Engineering campaign.....</b>	<b>160,919</b>				<b>160,919</b>
<b>Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign</b>					
Ignition.....	79,763				79,763
Support of other stockpile programs.....	5,872				5,872
NIF diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support.....	45,959				45,959
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion.....	10,603				10,603
University grants/other IFC support.....	8,903				8,903
Facility operations and target production.....	43,021				43,021

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Inertial fusion technology.....</b>					
NIF demonstration program.....	143,438				143,438
High-energy petawatt laser development.....	2,213				2,213
NIF construction (96-D-111).....	111,419				111,419
Program increase (NIF target production).....		10,000	10,000		10,000
<b>Total, inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign.....</b>	<b>451,191</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>		<b>461,191</b>
<b>Advanced simulation and computing campaign</b>					
Integrated codes	155,247				155,247
Physics and engineering models	66,566				66,566
Computational systems and software environment	178,445				178,445
Facility operation and user support	165,559				165,559
Verification and validation.....	52,138				52,138
Subtotal, Advanced simulation and computing.....	617,955				617,955
Reduction for cost growth.....					
<b>Total, Advanced simulation and computing campaign.....</b>	<b>617,955</b>				<b>617,955</b>
<b>Pit manufacturing and certification campaign.....</b>					
Pit manufacturing.....	147,658				147,658
Pit certification.....	56,605				56,605
Pit manufacturing capability.....	33,335				33,335
Modem pit facility.....					
Pit campaign support activities at NTS.....					
<b>Total, Pit manufacturing and certification campaign.....</b>	<b>237,598</b>				<b>237,598</b>
<b>Readiness Campaign</b>					
Stockpile readiness.....	17,576				17,576
High explosives and weapon operations.....	17,188				17,188

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
Non-nuclear readiness.....	31,171				31,171
Advanced design & production technologies.....	53,645				53,645
Tritium readiness.....	86,385				86,385
Tritium readiness construction (98-D-125).....					
<b>Total, Readiness campaign.....</b>	<b>205,965</b>				<b>205,965</b>
<b>Total, Campaigns.....</b>	<b>1,937,390</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>		<b>1,947,390</b>
<b>Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)</b>					
<b>Operations of facilities</b>					
Kansas City Plant.....	[1,203,786]				96,057
LLNL.....	98,057				96,906
LANL.....	96,906				306,258
Nevada Test Site.....	306,258				67,687
Pantex Plant.....	67,687				96,124
Sandia National Laboratories.....	96,124				163,627
Savannah River Site.....	163,627				100,013
Y-12 National Security Complex.....	100,013				191,092
Institutional site support.....	191,092				84,022
Program readiness.....	84,022				75,167
Special projects.....	75,167				
Material recycle and recovery.....					
Y-12.....	69,962	2,000	2,000		69,962
Containers.....					2,000
Storage.....	20,130				20,130
Repair and replacement-Pantex.....	35,285				35,285
Repair and replacement-Y-12.....		17,000	17,000		17,000
Subtotal, operations & maintenance.....	1,404,350	15,000	15,000		15,000
<b>Construction:</b>	<b>[281,422]</b>	<b>34,000</b>	<b>34,000</b>		<b>1,438,350</b>

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>07-D-140 PED, VL</b>	<b>4,977</b>				<b>4,977</b>
07-D-220 RLW treatment facility, LANL	14,828				14,828
06-D-140 Project engineering design, VL	51,577				51,577
06-D-402, NTS Replace fire stations #1 and #2, NSO	13,919				13,919
06-D-403, Tritium facility modernization, LLNL	7,810				7,810
05-D-140, Project engineering and design, VL	9,615				9,615
05-D-402 Beryllium capability project, Y-12	5,084				5,084
04-D-125 CMRR replacement, LANL	112,422				112,422
04-D-128 Criticality Experiments Facility, LANL/NTS	24,197				24,197
03-D-103 Project engineering and design, VL	14,161				14,161
01-D-103 Project engineering and design, VL	1,565				1,565
01-D-124 HEU materials facility, Y-12	21,267				21,267
Subtotal, Construction	281,422				281,422
<b>Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities</b>	<b>1,685,772</b>	<b>34,000</b>	<b>34,000</b>		<b>1,719,772</b>
<b>Secure transportation asset</b>					
Operations and equipment	130,484				130,484
Program direction	78,780				78,780
Subtotal, Secure transportation asset	209,264				209,264
Use of prior year balances					
<b>Total, Secure transportation asset</b>	<b>209,264</b>				<b>209,264</b>
<b>Nuclear weapons incident response</b>					
Emergency response	118,555				118,555
Emergency management	7,366				7,366
Operations support	9,433				9,433
<b>Total, nuclear weapons incident response</b>	<b>135,354</b>				<b>135,354</b>

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program</b>					
<b>Operations and maintenance.....</b>					
Recapitalization.....	192,649				192,649
Facility disposition.....	25,000				25,000
Infrastructure planning.....	27,634				27,634
Program increase.....					
Subtotal, operations & maintenance.....	245,283				245,283
<b>Construction:</b>					
07-D-253 TA-1 Heating System	14,500				14,500
06-D-160, FIRP PED, VL	2,700				2,700
06-D-601, Electrical distribution system upgrade, PX	6,429				6,429
06-D-602, Gas main and distribution system upgrade, PX	3,145				3,145
06-D-603, Steam plant life extension, Y-12	17,811				17,811
05-D-160 FIRP PED, VL.....	648				648
05-D-601 Compressed air upgrades project, Y-12.....	702				702
Subtotal, Construction.....	45,935				45,935
<b>Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program.....</b>	<b>291,218</b>				<b>291,218</b>
<b>Environmental projects and operations</b>					
Long term response actions	17,211				17,211
<b>Total, Environmental projects and operations</b>	<b>17,211</b>				<b>17,211</b>
<b>Safeguards and security (Defense nuclear security)</b>					
<b>Operations and maintenance</b>					
Pantex unfunded safeguards and security		8,000	8,000		8,000
Y-12 unfunded safeguards and security		8,000	8,000		8,000
Subtotal, operations and maintenance.....	665,701				665,701
<b>Construction:</b>					

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Subtotal, Construction.....</b>					
Cyber security (Homeland security).....	88,711				88,711
<b>Subtotal, Safeguards and security.....</b>	<b>754,412</b>	16,000	16,000		<b>770,412</b>
Offset for S&S Work for Others.....	(33,000)				(33,000)
<b>Total, Safeguards and security.....</b>	<b>721,412</b>	16,000	16,000		<b>737,412</b>
<b>Subtotal, Weapons Activities.....</b>	<b>6,407,889</b>	60,000	60,000		<b>6,467,889</b>
<b>Adjustments</b>					
Use of prior year balances.....					
Less security charge for reimbursable work.....	[-32000]				
<b>Total, Adjustments.....</b>					
<b>Total, Weapons Activities.....</b>	<b>6,407,889</b>	60,000	60,000		<b>6,467,889</b>
<b>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>					
<b>Nonproliferation and verification R&amp;D</b>					
Operations and maintenance.....					
Proliferation detection.....	148,204				148,204
Nuclear explosion monitoring.....	106,601				106,601
Supporting activities.....	6,162				6,162
Program increase.....					
<b>Subtotal, O&amp;M.....</b>	<b>260,967</b>				<b>260,967</b>
Construction.....					
06-D-180 Physical sciences facility, PNNL	3,700				3,700
07-SC-05 Physical sciences facility, PNNL	4,220				4,220
<b>Subtotal, Construction</b>	<b>7,920</b>				<b>7,920</b>
<b>Total, Nonproliferation and verification R&amp;D</b>	<b>268,887</b>				<b>268,887</b>

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Nonproliferation and international security.....</b>					
Dismantlement and transparency.....	38,967				38,967
Global security engagement and cooperation.....	50,232				50,232
International regimes and agreements.....	31,787				31,787
Treaties and agreements.....	1,995				1,995
International emergency management and cooperation.....	4,430				4,430
<b>Total, Nonproliferation and international security.....</b>	<b>127,411</b>				<b>127,411</b>
<b>International nuclear materials protection and cooperation (MPC&amp;A)</b>					
Navy complex.....	17,300				17,300
Strategic rocket forces.....	129,245				129,245
Rosatom weapons complex.....	56,505				56,505
Civilian nuclear sites.....	21,200				21,200
Material consolidation and conversion.....	16,828	5,000	5,000		21,828
National programs and sustainability in Russian Federation.....	48,131				48,131
Second line of defense-Megaports.....	123,973	15,000	15,000		138,973
<b>Total, International nuclear materials protection and cooperation</b>	<b>413,182</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>		<b>433,182</b>
<b>Elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production (EWGPP)....</b>					
Seversk Pu production elimination.....	84,730				84,730
Zheleznogorsk Pu production elimination.....	119,924				119,924
Crosscutting and technical support activities.....	2,000				2,000
<b>Total, EWGPP.....</b>	<b>206,654</b>				<b>206,654</b>
<b>Fissile materials disposition</b>					
US surplus materials disposition.....					
Operations and maintenance.....	[235,051]				

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
US plutonium disposition.....	132,900				132,900
US uranium disposition.....	86,898				86,898
Supporting activities.....	15,253				15,253
Construction.....	(368,210)				
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, SRS.....	78,700				78,700
99-D-143 Mixed oxide (MOX) fuel fabrication facility, SRS.....	289,510	(115,305)		(115,305)	174,205
US surplus materials disposition, subtotal.....	<b>603,261</b>	<b>(115,305)</b>		<b>(115,305)</b>	<b>487,956</b>
Russian surplus materials disposition.....	34,695	(34,695)		(34,695)	
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition.....	637,956	(150,000)		(150,000)	487,956
Less use of prior year appropriations.....	(34,695)				(34,695)
<b>Total, Fissile materials disposition.....</b>	<b>603,261</b>	<b>(150,000)</b>		<b>(150,000)</b>	<b>453,261</b>
<b>Global threat reduction Initiative.....</b>					
Program increase for activities outside the U.S.....		15,000	15,000		15,000
Reduced enrichment for research and test reactors.....	32,096				32,096
Russian research reactor fuel return.....	30,025				30,025
Kazakhstan spent fuel.....	3,934				3,934
Foreign research reactor SNF acceptance.....	6,340				6,340
US radiological threat reduction.....	9,441				9,441
International radiological threat reduction.....	18,299	5,000	5,000		23,299
Emerging threats and gap materials.....	5,683				5,683
Global research reactor study.....	1,000				1,000
<b>Total, Global threat reduction Initiative.....</b>	<b>106,618</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>		<b>126,618</b>
<b>Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.....</b>	<b>1,726,213</b>	<b>(110,000)</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>(150,000)</b>	<b>1,616,213</b>
<b>Adjustments:</b>					
Use of prior year balances.....					

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Total, Adjustments.....</b>	<b>1,726,213</b>	<b>(110,000)</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>(150,000)</b>	<b>1,816,213</b>
<b>Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.....</b>					
<b>Naval Reactors</b>					
<b>Naval reactors development</b>					
Operation and maintenance.....	761,176				761,176
Construction:					
07-D-190 PED materials research technology complex.....	1,485				1,485
05-D-900 Materials development facility.....	1,287				1,287
Subtotal, Construction.....	2,772				2,772
Program direction.....	31,185				31,185
<b>Total, Naval reactors development.....</b>	<b>795,133</b>				<b>795,133</b>
<b>Total, Naval Reactors</b>	<b>795,133</b>				<b>795,133</b>
<b>Office Of The Administrator</b>					
Office of the Administrator.....	386,576				386,576
<b>Total, Office of the Administrator.....</b>	<b>386,576</b>				<b>386,576</b>
<b>Total, National Nuclear Security Administration.....</b>	<b>9,315,811</b>	<b>(50,000)</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>(150,000)</b>	<b>9,265,811</b>
<b>II Environmental &amp; Other Defense Activities:</b>					
<b>Defense Environmental Cleanup</b>					
<b>Closure Sites</b>					
Ashtabula	295				295
Administration	25,896				25,896
Columbus					

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Fernald</b>	<b>258,877</b>				<b>258,877</b>
Miamisburg	34,869				34,869
Rocky Flats	1,000				1,000
<b>Total, Closure sites</b>	<b>320,937</b>				<b>320,937</b>
<b>Hanford Site</b>					
2012 Completion projects.....	423,618				423,618
2035 Completion projects.....	381,098				381,098
<b>Total, Hanford site.....</b>	<b>804,716</b>				<b>804,716</b>
<b>Idaho National Laboratory.....</b>					
Operating.....	481,604				481,604
Construction.....					
06-D-401 Sodium bearing waste treatment project, INL.....	31,000				31,000
<b>Total, Idaho National Lab.....</b>	<b>512,604</b>				<b>512,604</b>
<b>NNSA Sites.....</b>					
California Site Support.....	370				370
Kansas City Plant.....					
Lawrence Livermore NL.....	11,580				11,580
Los Alamos NL.....	90,602				90,602
Nevada Off-Sites.....					
Nevada.....	79,668				79,668
NNSA Service Center.....	26,122				26,122
Pantex.....					
Sandia NL.....	23,726				23,726
<b>Total, NNSA Sites.....</b>	<b>232,068</b>				<b>232,068</b>

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Oak Ridge</b>	<b>159,882</b>				<b>159,862</b>
<b>Office of River Protection</b>					
Tank farm activities	274,127				274,127
Waste treatment and immobilization plant construction 01-D-16	[690,000]				[690,000]
Low activity waste facility	77,800				77,800
Analytical lab	21,800				21,800
Balance of facilities	48,900				48,900
High level waste facility	253,700				253,700
Pretreatment facility	287,800				287,800
Subtotal, Construction	690,000				690,000
<b>Total, Office of River Protection</b>	<b>964,127</b>				<b>964,127</b>
<b>Savannah River Site</b>					
2012 Completion projects					
Operating	211,897				211,897
Construction	[24,235]				2,935
04-D-414 PED: 3013 container surveillance in 235-F	2,935				21,300
04-D-423 3013 container surveillance in 235F	21,300				236,132
Subtotal, 2012 Completion projects	236,132				277,338
2035 Completion projects	277,338				507,724
Tank farm activities	507,724				[63,200]
Operating	63,200				37,500
Construction	37,500				25,700
03-D-414 PED Salt waste processing facility alternative	25,700				570,924
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility	570,924				30,000
Subtotal, Tank farm activities	30,000				30,000
Site increase for cleanup activities					

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Total, Savannah River Site.....</b>	<b>1,084,394</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>		<b>1,114,394</b>
<b>Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.....</b>	<b>213,278</b>				<b>213,278</b>
<b>Program Support.....</b>					
Headquarters.....	37,881				37,881
Rocky Flats.....	37,881				37,881
<b>Total, Program Support.....</b>	<b>291,216</b>				<b>291,216</b>
<b>Safeguards and Security.....</b>	<b>295,840</b>				<b>295,840</b>
<b>Technology Development and Deployment.....</b>	<b>21,389</b>				<b>21,389</b>
<b>Federal Contribution to the Uranium D&amp;D Fund.....</b>	<b>452,000</b>				<b>452,000</b>
<b>EM Increase (tank waste cleanup R&amp;D).....</b>		<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>		<b>20,000</b>
<b>Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup.....</b>	<b>5,380,312</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>		<b>5,440,312</b>
<b>Other Defense Activities</b>					
<b>Security and safety performance assurance</b>					
Nuclear safeguards and security.....	182,548				182,548
Security investigations.....	40,000				40,000
Program direction.....	75,949				75,949
<b>Total, Energy security and assurance.....</b>	<b>298,497</b>				<b>298,497</b>

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Environment, safety &amp; health</b>					
Environment, safety and health (defense).....	60,738				60,738
Program direction.....	20,076				20,076
<b>Total, Environment, safety and health.....</b>	<b>80,814</b>				<b>80,814</b>
<b>Legacy Management</b>					
Legacy management.....	156,790				156,790
Program direction.....	11,061				11,061
<b>Total, Office of Legacy Management.....</b>	<b>167,851</b>				<b>167,851</b>
<b>Nuclear energy</b>					
Infrastructure					
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security.....	75,949				75,949
Subtotal, Nuclear energy.....	75,949				75,949
Less security charge for reimbursable work.....	(3,003)				(3,003)
<b>Total, Nuclear energy.....</b>	<b>72,946</b>				<b>72,946</b>
<b>Defense related administrative support</b>	<b>93,258</b>				<b>93,258</b>
Office of Hearings and Appeals.....	4,422				4,422
<b>Total, Other Defense Activities.....</b>	<b>717,788</b>				<b>717,788</b>
<b>Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal</b>					
Yucca Mountain project.....	345,662				345,662
Transportation.....	42,418				42,418
<b>Total, Defense nuclear waste disposal.....</b>	<b>388,080</b>				<b>388,080</b>
<b>Total, Environmental and ODA.....</b>	<b>6,486,180</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>		<b>6,546,180</b>

**Title XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2007 Authorization Request	Committee Change	Committee Increase	Committee Decrease	FY 2007 Committee Authorization
<b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities Summary</b>					
<b>National Nuclear Security Administration:</b>					
Weapons activities.....	6,407,889	60,000	60,000		6,467,889
Defense nuclear nonproliferation.....	1,726,213	(110,000)	40,000	(150,000)	1,616,213
Naval reactors.....	795,133				795,133
Office of the administrator.....	386,576				386,576
<b>Total, National Nuclear Security Administration.....</b>	<b>9,315,811</b>	<b>(50,000)</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>(150,000)</b>	<b>9,265,811</b>
<b>Environmental and other defense activities:</b>					
Defense environmental cleanup.....	5,390,312	50,000	50,000		5,440,312
Other defense activities.....	717,788				717,788
Defense nuclear waste disposal.....	388,080				388,080
<b>Total, Environmental &amp; ODA.....</b>	<b>6,496,180</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>		<b>6,546,180</b>
<b>Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities.....</b>	<b>15,811,991</b>		<b>150,000</b>	<b>(150,000)</b>	<b>15,811,991</b>
<b>Other activities</b>					
Energy Supply.....	6,000				6,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.....	22,260				22,260
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program - COE.....	(130,000)				
<b>Total, Other activities.....</b>	<b>28,260</b>				<b>28,260</b>
<b>Total, Department of Energy (053).....</b>	<b>15,840,251</b>		<b>150,000</b>	<b>(150,000)</b>	<b>15,840,251</b>

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## National Nuclear Security Administration

## Overview

The budget request contained \$9.3 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2007. The committee recommends \$9.3 billion, a decrease of \$50.0 million.

## Weapons Activities

The budget request contained \$6,407.9 million for Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The committee recommends \$6,467.9 million, an increase of \$60.0 million.

*Directed Stockpile Work*

The budget request contained \$1,410.3 million for Directed Stockpile Work. The committee recommends \$1,410.3 million, the amount of the budget request.

*Reliable Replacement Warhead*

The budget request contained \$27.7 million within Directed Stockpile Work for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program. The committee notes that section 3111 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) established the objectives of the RRW program and established requirements for both an interim report, which the committee has received, and a final report, which is due by March 1, 2007.

The committee notes that elsewhere in this title, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan for the transformation of the nuclear weapons complex. The vision for this plan will necessarily be influenced by the specific design and production capability requirements deemed essential for supporting the RRW program. The committee therefore urges the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to ensure complete transparency between the RRW Project Officer's Group and those National Nuclear Security Administration and Department of Defense personnel working on the nuclear weapons complex transformation plan.

The committee recommends \$27.7 million for the Reliable Replacement Warhead program, the amount of the budget request.

*Responsive Infrastructure*

The budget request contained \$15.4 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) responsive infrastructure.

The committee fully supports the development of the responsive infrastructure and in section 3111 of this title requires the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan for the transformation of the nuclear weapons complex to Congress. The committee encourages NNSA to establish an Office of Transformation within Defense Programs to plan and execute actions to achieve the responsive infrastructure goal.

The committee recommends \$15.4 million, the amount of the budget request, for responsive infrastructure, and authorizes the Administrator of the NNSA to use up to \$15.4 million of the funds

authorized to establish an Office of Transformation. Should the Administrator elect to establish an Office of Transformation, the Administrator shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report stating the specific charter for this new office within 60 days after the establishment of such office.

*Study of Quantification of Margins and Uncertainty Methodology*

Section 3111 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) established the objectives for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program. The RRW program is intended to increase the reliability, safety and security of the nuclear weapons stockpile. One of the key objectives of the program is to further reduce the likelihood of the resumption of underground nuclear weapons testing. This objective is carried out by using designs that are consistent with basic design parameters employed in those nuclear weapons which have undergone testing or by otherwise using components that are well understood or certifiable without the need to resume underground testing.

According to documents accompanying the fiscal year 2007 Department of Energy budget request, the RRW program will rely upon the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) campaigns to assess whether the RRW can be certified without underground nuclear testing. A critical analytic tool employed by the national laboratories in making this determination is the Quantification of Margins and Uncertainties (QMU) methodology. A recent report by the Government Accountability Office found that the QMU methodology, while conceptually well-accepted, is still in its early stages and requires maturation and further refinement.

The committee understands the importance of the QMU methodology in establishing a scientific basis for assessing whether the RRW will be able to be certified without underground nuclear testing. Given the importance of the RRW program and the need to reduce the likelihood of having to conduct an underground nuclear test in order to certify this warhead, the committee believes that an independent review of the NNSA laboratory utilization of QMU methodology is required to gain confidence that the RRW program objectives can be achieved.

Accordingly, the committee directs the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an independent assessment of the QMU methodology employed by the national laboratories and whether this methodology can be used to certify an RRW without underground nuclear testing. The Academy shall ensure that the panel chartered to conduct this review has among its members the following:

- (1) Former weapons designers;
- (2) Individuals well-versed in the underlying science associated with nuclear weapons, including the physics associated with weapon primaries and secondaries; and
- (3) Individuals familiar with the application of QMU principles, including probabilistic risk assessment methods, in industries such as the nuclear power industry.

Of the amounts made available to the Department of Energy for weapons activities, \$2.0 million shall be available for carrying out this study. The Academy report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2007.

*Transformation Plan for the Nuclear Weapons Complex*

The committee notes that the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review set forth the requirements for a responsive infrastructure within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) weapons complex. Through multiple hearings and briefings before the subcommittee on Strategic Forces, the committee has been informed of initiatives that would modernize the Nuclear Weapons Complex to achieve the desired responsive infrastructure capability while consolidating and disposing of special nuclear material. The committee also notes that section 3111 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) established objectives for the Reliable Replacement Warhead program, an initiative that has the potential to enhance the safety, security and reliability of the nuclear stockpile, while setting the requirements for the capabilities of the responsive infrastructure.

The committee includes a provision (section 3111) that would require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to transform the nuclear weapons complex so as to achieve a responsive infrastructure. This plan shall be submitted to Congress by February 1, 2007, and shall meet certain objectives.

With respect to eliminating duplication of production capability except as necessary to ensure the safety, reliability and security of the stockpile, the committee intends the transformation plan to look at all production functions including but not limited to primary, secondary and non-nuclear production elements. The committee intends that the national security mission continue as the primary mission for the national security laboratories. Other laboratory work (such as work conducted for the Offices of Science or Energy Research within the Department of Energy, the Department of Homeland Security or for the Intelligence Community) should be conducted so as to maintain the primary mission of supporting the nuclear weapons stockpile. The committee encourages the Secretary of Energy in the formulation of this transformation plan to take a long-term strategic view of the desired optimal mix of NNSA primary mission work and other laboratory work to ensure a responsive capability into the future. With respect to both the production plants and the national security laboratories, the committee expects the transformation plan to consider how best to maintain the requisite human capital expertise while transforming to a more efficient complex.

The committee establishes as an objective the elimination of category I and II special nuclear materials from the national security laboratories by 2010. This objective does not preclude the retention of category I and II special nuclear materials at a national security laboratory, if the transformation plan for the nuclear weapons complex envisions a pit production capability at a national security laboratory.

Based on testimony before the subcommittee on Strategic Forces, the committee is aware of NNSA plans to purchase more non-nuclear weapons components from commercial suppliers in the future. While the committee supports those business practices that will lead to a more efficient enterprise, the committee also has some concerns for the security and cost implications of further outsourcing and expects the transformation plan to specifically address these concerns.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is reviewing the military requirements for the W-80 warhead and is considering deferring the planned life extension program (LEP). The committee directs the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration, working with the Nuclear Weapons Council, to prepare a plan for redirecting the human resources and facilities currently required for the W-80 LEP to the Reliable Replacement Warhead program and complex transformation. This plan shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2007.

*Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign*

The budget request contained \$451.2 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign, including \$111.4 million for the National Ignition Facility (NIF) construction and \$143.4 million for the NIF demonstration campaign.

The committee fully supports the NIF program's goal of beginning the initial ignition campaign in 2010 with a series of integrated experiments that would culminate in full energy experiments in 2011. The committee believes that full funding of NIF construction and demonstration programs is essential in order to achieve ignition in 2010. Furthermore, the committee believes that additional investments in ignition target design and testing will enhance project success.

The committee recommends \$461.2 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield Campaign, an increase of \$10.0 million to support enhanced target production and characterization capabilities and for tests on the Omega and Z facilities.

*Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities*

The budget request contained \$1,685.8 million for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

The committee is encouraged by the progress made in the reduction of deferred maintenance backlogs in the defense nuclear complex. In section 3111, the committee requires the Department of Energy and Department of Defense to submit a transformation plan for the nuclear weapons complex to achieve the responsive infrastructure envisioned by the Nuclear Posture Review. Recognizing that this plan may provide for modernization of the Pantex and the Y-12 production plants in Texas and Tennessee, respectively, the committee also recognizes that both facilities need additional infrastructure support as soon as possible.

The committee recommends an additional \$17.0 million for plant infrastructure repair and equipment replacement at Pantex, to be executed in a manner consistent with the priorities of both the 10 year site comprehensive plan and the transformation plan required by this title.

The committee recommends an additional \$17.0 million for the Y-12 complex, to include: \$2.0 million for material recycle and recovery to process materials generated in the Directed Stockpile Work accelerated dismantlement program, and \$15.0 million for plant infrastructure repair and equipment replacement consistent with the priorities of both the 10 year site comprehensive plan and the transformation plan required by this title.

The committee fully supports the efforts of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to reduce safeguards and security costs throughout the complex by consolidating nuclear material storage and by accelerating certain construction projects that will permit even further consolidation of nuclear materials. The transformation plan for the nuclear weapons complex, required by section 3111, should assist NNSA senior managers in ensuring that any maintenance or upgrades to existing facilities or construction of new facilities will be consistent with both the 10 year site comprehensive plans and the transformation plan's vision for the complex of the future.

The committee is also aware of design changes to the Highly Enriched Uranium Material Facility (HEUMF) at Y-12 required by revisions to the design basis threat policy and resulting from construction problems with this new facility. The committee recognizes the importance of the HEUMF project in achieving material consolidation objectives at the Y-12 complex. However, the committee is disappointed with the extent of the problems that have surfaced with a relatively simple project. Should additional funds be required to move forward with the HEUMF facility in fiscal year 2007, the Secretary of Energy shall submit a reprogramming request to the congressional defense committees.

The committee recommends \$1,719.8 million, an increase of \$34.0 million for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

#### *Safeguards and Security*

The budget request contained \$721.4 million for safeguards and security.

The committee continues to be deeply concerned with safeguards and security practices and the costs associated with complying with design basis threat (DBT) requirements throughout the complex. As evidenced by section 3113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), the committee believes that the Department of Energy (DOE) must employ a risk based approach in decision-making associated with DBT compliance. The committee notes with approval the decision by the Department to waive compliance with certain aspects of the DBT at the Y-12 plant in Tennessee pending completion of the Highly Enriched Uranium Material Facility.

The committee is aware that the Department has discussed shifting accounting for security costs from direct to indirect costs. The committee believes that only the use of direct cost accounting for security costs provides the necessary transparency into what it takes to comply with DOE's DBT policy. Accordingly, the committee directs that until directed otherwise by Congress, the Department shall continue to employ direct cost accounting for all security costs.

The committee supports the efforts of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to enhance security practices through consolidation of nuclear material at individual sites and throughout the complex. The committee notes that the nuclear weapons complex transformation plan required in section 3111 should help the Department focus its attention on innovative ways to reduce safeguards and security costs through the consolidation of nuclear material.

The committee recommends \$737.4 million, an increase of \$16.0 million, to include an additional \$8.0 million for Pantex, and an additional \$8.0 million for Y-12 to be used at both sites for unfunded safeguards and security requirements consistent with site safeguards and security priority plans.

#### *Test Readiness*

The budget request contained \$14.8 million within the Science Campaign for test readiness.

Section 3113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) mandated an 18 month readiness posture for the resumption of underground nuclear weapons testing by the United States. While the committee has no indication of the need to resume underground nuclear testing in the near future, it does believe that maintaining the 18 month readiness posture as directed by Congress is important to national security. The committee notes that funding shortfalls have precluded the Department of Energy from achieving the 18 month readiness posture as required by law.

Accordingly, the committee supports full funding of the test readiness capability.

#### Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

The budget request contained \$1,726.2 million for defense nuclear nonproliferation programs.

The committee fully supports the goals of the Department of Energy's nuclear nonproliferation programs but remains concerned with uncosted, uncommitted balances in several of the nonproliferation accounts due to the delays and problems in resolving government to government agreements for critical projects. The committee shifts funds within the nonproliferation account into programs that have experienced greater success or that are viewed as more executable based on the above concerns noted with government to government agreements.

The committee authorizes \$1,616.2 million, a decrease of \$110.0 million.

#### *Global Threat Reduction Initiative*

The budget request contained \$106.8 million for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI).

The committee supports the goals of this program, especially those activities conducted outside the United States.

The committee recommends \$126.8 million, an increase of \$20.0 million as follows: \$5.0 million for international radiological threat reduction and \$15.0 million to be used exclusively for other GTRI activities outside the United States.

#### *International Materials Protection and Cooperation*

The budget request contained \$413.2 million for International Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation (MPC&A), including \$40.1 million for the Second Line of Defense Megaports program.

The committee fully supports the program's emphasis on national programs and sustainability as the way ahead in ensuring that the progress which has been made in the area of upgrades to nuclear warhead and nuclear material security are sustained by

parent countries into the future. The committee also supports the National Nuclear Security Administration's efforts in pursuing cooperation with international partners interested in participating in the Megaports initiative.

The committee recommends \$433.2 million, an increase of \$20.0 million, to include \$5.0 million for material consolidation and conversion and \$15.0 million for the Second Line of Defense Megaports program.

#### *Megaports Program*

In recognition of the Memorandum of Understanding implemented in April 2005 to formalize the ongoing partnership between the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of Homeland Security's Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, the NNSA Megaports initiative is directed to continue to closely coordinate its efforts to install nuclear detection monitors at foreign ports with the Department of Homeland Security's Container Security Initiative. Such coordination shall continue to include, but not be limited to, joint outreach missions and port assessments, the completion of joint agreements with host governments where mutual program interests exist, and on-the-ground collaboration in the ports where the two programs are currently operational.

#### *Radiation Detection Technology*

The committee is concerned with the potential for redundant research and development efforts in radiation detection technology, and notes the concerns of the Department of Energy Inspector General February 2006 audit report entitled "Nuclear Detection Devices," namely that there is a lack of coordination between the Department of Energy and the Department of Homeland Security over accountability for such research efforts. The committee encourages the National Nuclear Security Administration to work closely with the Department of Homeland Security's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office in order to ensure there is no duplication of technology research efforts, but rather a collaborative, complementary approach to research in areas of common interest.

#### *Mixed Oxide Fuel Facility*

The budget request contained \$603.3 million for fissile materials disposition, including \$289.5 million for construction of the U.S. Mixed Oxide (MOX) facility and \$34.7 million for Russian surplus fissile materials disposition.

The committee supports in principle the goals of the September 2000 Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement to dispose of 34 metric tons of surplus weapons grade plutonium as MOX fuel in both the U.S. and Russia on roughly parallel paths. For the past two years, the MOX project has been on hold pending resolution of a liability agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) cut \$250.0 million in funding for the MOX program due to the liability impasse. However, last summer the substantive issues associated with this liability agreement were resolved, pending formal approval between governments.

In a new development arising out of U.S.-Russian negotiations on the plutonium disposition program in February 2006, it appears that Russian interest in the original MOX program may have fundamentally changed. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of State report as of March 2006, that Russia no longer prefers to use light water (VVER-1000) reactors unless the U.S. and the international community bear the full cost of this approach, estimated at \$2.7 billion. Rather, it appears the Russians would like to explore a new two-pillar approach to the MOX program, consisting of limited disposition in an existing BN-600 reactor (disposition in such a reactor was part of the originally envisioned program), and eventually larger-scale disposition in a BN-800 fast reactor. The estimated cost of completing the BN-800 fast reactor by 2012 is \$1.6 billion, yet it is unclear exactly how this project would be funded in terms of Russian expectations for international assistance. The U.S. has not supported the fast reactor (breeder) design due to proliferation concerns, and the BN-800 reactor has never been a method for Russian plutonium disposition in the program of record. Thus, the committee has reservations about Russian intentions to proceed with the program as originally envisioned.

On a separate note, in December 2005, the Department of Energy (DOE) Inspector General (IG) issued a report on "The Status of the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility," which strongly criticized management of the U.S. MOX project, citing significant cost overruns and project management weaknesses. According to the IG, the July 2005 design and construction cost estimate for the U.S. MOX facility exceeded the 2002 estimate by \$2.5 billion. The report points to NNSA efforts to improve MOX facility management; however, the IG concludes that "additional enhancements to the project are needed." In addition to the concerns noted above regarding Russian intentions to comply with the 2000 Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement, the committee is concerned about the ability of the U.S. MOX facility to move ahead at a reasonable pace and cost.

In spite of the concerns noted above, the committee believes that continued storage of weapons grade plutonium at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina, and elsewhere throughout the country at Department of Energy facilities, involves significant security risks and substantial costs for appropriate safeguards. Based on preliminary discussions with the Department of Energy, the committee is operating under the assumption that the Savannah River Site MOX project is a cost-effective and efficient method for the United States to dispose of a significant portion of its plutonium inventory as part of a broader plutonium disposition plan that the committee directs the Department to provide elsewhere in this title. Accordingly, the committee believes that moving forward expeditiously with construction and operation of the U.S. MOX facility will significantly reduce the costs and risks associated with managing domestic weapons-grade plutonium.

Proceeding with construction and operation of the U.S. MOX facility will also underline the United States commitment to fulfilling its obligations under both the 2000 Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement, and under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The committee does not waver from its histor-

ical support for the goals of the 2000 Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement, including support for international contributions towards the Russian plutonium disposition program.

While generally pleased with the progress on DOE programs with the Russian Federation to cooperatively reduce the nuclear threat, the committee is concerned that the current lack of Russian support for funding either a MOX project or other plutonium disposition program, consistent with the 2000 Agreement, may significantly lessen the willingness of other countries to provide funding. The committee firmly believes that the Russian Federation should immediately take positive steps to establish meaningful Russian funding for the construction of a Russian MOX facility or other Russian plutonium disposition facility to meet its obligations under the 2000 Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement. Committee support for the Russian fissile materials disposition program is contingent upon taking such steps.

Based on the lack of certainty over Russia's commitment to funding its domestic plutonium disposition program under the current agreement, the committee recommends no funds for the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program, a reduction of \$34.7 million. Of those funds available from prior fiscal years for the Russian Surplus Fissile Material Disposition program, no more than \$10.0 million shall be available for expenditure until 30 days after the Secretary of Energy has certified to the congressional defense committees that Russia and the United States have reached agreement on a plan for a plutonium disposition program in Russia that is consistent with the intent of the 2000 Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement. The committee also observes that an April 25, 2006, reprogramming notification from the Department of Energy identified \$229.0 million in total obligation authority for the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program available as a funding source for the elimination of weapons grade plutonium production program in Russia due to delays in proceeding with the Russian MOX program. Thus, the committee notes that there already are adequate funds for the Russian Surplus Fissile Materials Disposition program in the event that the Russian Federation comes forward with a renewed commitment for Russian financing of a plutonium disposition program consistent with the 2000 Agreement.

The committee recommends \$174.2 million for construction of the U.S. MOX facility, a reduction of \$115.3 million. Furthermore, no more than \$50.0 million of the funds authorized in fiscal year 2007 for the U.S. MOX construction project shall be available until 30 days after the Secretary of Energy certifies to the congressional defense committees the following:

- (1) Given the sunk costs to date for the U.S. MOX project and an evaluation of other alternatives for plutonium disposition, proceeding with the U.S. MOX project is the most effective means, from both a cost and technical perspective, for managing and disposing of U.S. weapons-grade plutonium; and
- (2) The Department has developed a corrective action plan for addressing the issues raised by the Inspector General concerning the management of the U.S. MOX project.

Should the Secretary make the above certification that the MOX method of plutonium disposition is the most effective, and should

the Department therefore require additional funds in fiscal year 2007 to keep construction of the U.S. MOX facility on track, the Secretary shall submit a reprogramming request to the congressional defense committees.

Along with the above certifications, the Secretary shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2007, providing a detailed plan to include estimated cost and schedule information for management, consolidation and disposition of all weapons-grade plutonium held by the Department of Energy. This report may be combined with the March 1, 2007, report on "off-spec" plutonium required elsewhere in this title.

The committee recommends \$453.3 million, a decrease of \$150.0 million for Fissile Materials Disposition.

*Transfer Authority To Fund New or Emerging Activities Outside the United States Under the Global Threat Reduction Initiative*

The committee fully supports the goals of the Global Threat Reduction Initiative program to identify, secure and remove or dispose of high-risk, vulnerable and radioactive materials around the world that pose a potential threat to the United States and the international community. The committee also notes that while the total costs to secure nuclear materials in a given location may not be significant, that the existing budget process for defense nuclear nonproliferation, and in particular for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, may not be flexible or responsive enough to allow the Department of Energy to take advantage of newly emerging or newly identified opportunities to seize nuclear material. The committee believes that making available reasonable funding from uncosted, uncommitted accounts within defense nuclear nonproliferation but outside of the Global Threat Reduction Initiative program may allow the Department to quickly seize and safeguard nuclear material in a responsive manner.

Therefore, the committee authorizes the Secretary of Energy, from within uncosted, uncommitted balances in defense nuclear nonproliferation accounts in fiscal year 2007, to fund new or emerging activities outside the United States under the Global Threat Reduction Initiative that are not otherwise authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2007. This action does not require a reprogramming request but does require the Secretary, within 15 days of the transfer of such funds, to notify the congressional defense committees of the circumstances surrounding and the justification for each such transfer. Such authority shall be limited to transfers from the uncosted, uncommitted balances of nonproliferation accounts outside the Global Threat Reduction Initiative. In addition, such transfers shall not exceed a total of \$10.0 million or 10 percent of the uncosted, uncommitted account program balance for each occurrence, and only one transfer can be made from any one program. The total amount of such transfers shall not exceed \$30.0 million in fiscal year 2007.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained \$6,496.2 million for environmental and other defense activities.

The committee recommends \$6,546.2 million, an increase of \$50.0 million.

*Disposition of Plutonium Unsuitable for Conversion to Mixed Oxide Fuel*

Since 1990 over four tons of plutonium were transported from Rocky Flats, Colorado to storage at the Savannah River Site in Aiken, South Carolina to expedite closure of the Rocky Flats site. A significant percentage of this material is unlikely to be suitable for conversion to Mixed Oxide (MOX) fuel through the Department of Energy's plutonium disposition program. In addition, at least four tons of plutonium are stored at Hanford, Washington that will not meet the acceptance specifications for conversion to MOX fuel.

In 1997, the Department's Fissile Materials Disposition office down selected a ceramic immobilization technology for disposition of these "off-spec" materials. While this program was cancelled, the committee is concerned that the Department's efforts to dispose of these "off-spec" materials are not receiving sufficient attention and are not taking into account the significant work already invested in evaluating options for disposing of these materials. As a result, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees stating the Department's plans for the disposition of all surplus plutonium within the Department's inventory that is not suitable for conversion to mixed oxide fuel. This report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2007, and shall include a review of the Department's prior plan, as well as a proposed method for disposition and a program plan including a schedule and the estimated cost for implementing the plan.

*Hanford Defense Site Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant*

The budget request contained \$690.0 million for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (Waste Treatment Plant) in Hanford, Washington. It is the largest and most complex nuclear design and construction project in the nation, and is critically important for successful cleanup of the Department of Energy Hanford site. The committee is concerned about rising costs and resolution of technical challenges associated with the design and construction of the Waste Treatment Plant. In order to address these concerns, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) requested two reports from the Army Corps of Engineers, one documenting the cost validation of the estimated cost to complete the project based on both the constrained and unconstrained funding scenarios, and the second report evaluating the baseline ground motion criteria. In addition, industry oversight teams were assembled in 2005 to provide critical independent assessments of the design, cost and schedule estimates for the project. The committee understands that the Department will consider the recommendations of these studies and will develop a revised cost and schedule baseline. Once the Department has determined a path forward, the committee intends to carefully review the revised plans for the Waste Treatment Plant.

The committee is concerned with the Department's management of the Waste Treatment Plant project. Recent investigations have identified failures of management within the Department including

contracting deficiencies, incomplete reporting, insufficient communication between Department of Energy Headquarters and the Office of River Protection, and the lack of ability to provide clear direction to the contractor.

The committee notes that in testimony before the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Appropriations of the House of Representatives in April 2006, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommended the Department discontinue using a fast-track, design-build approach to completing the Waste Treatment Plant and instead consider the feasibility of completing at least 90 percent of the facility design or facility component design before restarting construction. The committee strongly urges the Department to evaluate whether implementing this GAO recommendation might provide for a more disciplined and cost-effective way forward given the significant design problems experienced to date.

The committee is aware that in fiscal year 2007 the Department intends to employ a contractor to serve as the project management agent. The committee is supportive of the Department's efforts to correct management deficiencies and increase oversight; however, the committee is concerned about the potential transfer of project management and accountability to an outside entity. The committee holds the Department accountable for successful management of the Waste Treatment Plant project.

The committee notes that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has experience in evaluating the design of large nuclear projects and that NRC technical experts, who in the near future may be reviewing license applications for new commercial nuclear power plants, could benefit from having the opportunity to be exposed to the technical discussions and design reviews at the Waste Treatment Plant project. The committee encourages the Department to invite technical representatives from the NRC to observe the on-site federal office technical and design review activities at the Waste Treatment Plant. This step, however, does not insert the NRC into any regulatory or project management role for the Waste Treatment Project.

The committee recommends \$690.0 million, the amount of the budget request. None of the funds authorized shall be available for the employment of a contractor to serve as the project management agent.

#### *Savannah River Site Defense Environmental Cleanup*

The budget request contained \$1,084.4 million for defense environmental cleanup at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Energy may not have fully funded its legal and regulatory commitments within the budget request for defense environmental cleanup at the Savannah River Site for fiscal year 2007. The committee is concerned that without sufficient funding the Department may be unable to meet its legal and regulatory obligations under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (42 U.S.C. 6901–6992), the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) (26 U.S.C. 4611–4682), and the Federal Facility Agreement between the Department of Energy, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. The committee recognizes the

need for additional funds to be applied by the Department towards environmental management, and for complying with the Federal Facility Agreement, the RCRA, and the CERCLA. The committee is aware that additional measures may be needed by the Department to meet legal and regulatory obligations, such as workforce restructuring or other adjustments, and the committee fully expects the Department to make any such adjustments.

The committee recommends \$1,114.4 million for environmental management activities at the Savannah River Site, an increase of \$30.0 million for regulatory compliance as noted above.

*Tank Waste Cleanup Research and Development Program*

The budget request contained no funds for research and development in support of Department of Energy efforts to clean up radioactive waste stored in tanks at sites such as Hanford, Savannah River, and the Idaho National Laboratory.

The committee directs the Department to develop a research and development program to support tank waste cleanup activities consistent with recommendations made in a National Research Council report entitled "Tank Waste Retrieval, Processing, and On-site Disposal at Three Department of Energy Sites," published April 4, 2006. The research and development program would be a collaborative effort focused on development and deployment of needed innovative technologies for tank waste retrieval, treatment, closure and disposal. The program would aim to improve current technologies or develop new technologies deployable within 10 years in consideration of the timeline and milestones of DOE tank waste cleanup activities. The committee encourages competition for selection for research and development projects.

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million for research and development in support of the Department's tank waste cleanup activities.

*Yucca Mountain*

The budget request contained \$388.1 million for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, including \$345.7 million for the Yucca Mountain project.

The committee fully supports the need for a permanent deep geologic repository for high level radioactive waste.

The committee recommends \$388.1 million for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the amount of the budget request.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

#### Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2007, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator.

#### Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize funds for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2007.

#### Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for other defense activities for fiscal year 2007.

#### Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal for fiscal year 2007.

#### SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

#### Section 3111—Plan for Transformation of National Nuclear Security Administration Nuclear Weapons Complex

This section would require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to transform the nuclear weapons complex so as to achieve a responsive infrastructure by 2030. This section would also establish objectives for the plan and require a report to Congress.

#### Section 3112—Extension of Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program

This section would extend the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program from 2011 to 2013.

#### Section 3113—Utilization of Contributions to Global Threat Reduction Initiative

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to receive international funding for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative.

#### Section 3114—Utilization of Contributions to Second Line of Defense Program.

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to receive international funding for the Second Line of Defense Program

#### Section 3115—Two-Year Extension of Authority for Appointment of Certain Scientific, Engineering, and Technical Personnel

This section would extend the authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering and technical personnel.

#### Section 3116—National Academy of Sciences Study of Quantification of Margins and Uncertainty Methodology for Assessing and Certifying the Safety and Reliability of the Nuclear Stockpile

This section would require the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the quantification of margins and uncertainty methodology used for assessing and certifying the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile.

Section 3117—Consolidation of Counterintelligence Programs of  
Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Adminis-  
tration

This section would consolidate the counterintelligence programs of the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration under the Department of Energy.

**TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES  
SAFETY BOARD**

**OVERVIEW**

The budget request contained \$22.3 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2007. The committee recommends \$22.3 million, the amount of the budget request.

**ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST**

**Role of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board**

The committee relies heavily on the technical expertise of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (the Board) to ensure that appropriate nuclear safety features are incorporated in the design and construction of defense nuclear facilities. Consistent with their oversight role, recent recommendations made by the Board have had significant impacts on fundamental engineering design aspects of two nuclear waste treatment facilities, the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant at the Hanford Site and the Salt Waste Processing Facility at the Savannah River Site. The committee is also aware of the Board's recently expressed concern with aspects of the design of the proposed Bulk Vitrification Demonstration System at the Hanford Site.

According to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 (PL 100-456), the Board is authorized to make recommendations but the Board has no authority to direct action by the Department of Energy. Furthermore, an action of the Board or a failure to act may not delay or prevent the Secretary of Energy from carrying out the construction of a defense nuclear facility. The committee encourages the Board's involvement in the earliest possible stages of project conception, including identification of design requirements, to enable early identification of potential safety issues and to avoid incurring unnecessary costs and schedule slips. The committee expects full cooperation with the Board from the Secretary, the Department of Energy, contractors, and any other involved parties to ensure that the Board is able to serve in its advisory capacity. The committee also encourages the Board, in addition to identification of problems, to take a constructive role in the problem-solving process by quickly evaluating proposed corrective actions by the Department or project contractors.

**LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS**

**Section 3201—Authorization**

This section would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2007.