106TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { 106–286

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

AUGUST 3, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2684]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

58–337

Summary of the Bill

The Committee recommends $89,890,156,000 in new budget (obligational) authority for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and 17 independent agencies and offices. This is $2,227,303,000 below the 1999 appropriations level.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the appropriations for fiscal year 1999 and budget estimates for fiscal year 2000.

SUMMARY OF BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
American Battle Monuments Commission	26,431	26,467	28,467	+2,036	+2,000
Cemeterial Expenses, Army	11,666	12,473	12,473	+807	....
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	6,500	7,500	9,000	+2,500	+1,500
Community Development Financial Institutions	95,000	125,000	70,000	-25,000	-55,000
Consumer Information Center Fund	2,619	2,622	2,622	+3	....
Consumer Product Safety Commission	47,000	50,500	47,000	....	-3,500
Corporation for National and Community Service	438,500	548,500	3,000	-435,500	-545,500
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,675	3,020	2,827	+152	-193
Department of Housing and Urban Development	24,079,378	28,052,478	26,057,049	+1,977,671	-1,995,429
Department of Veterans Affairs	42,625,039	42,538,434	44,149,241	+1,524,202	+1,610,807
Environmental Protection Agency	7,590,352	7,206,646	7,312,557	-277,795	+105,911
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (transfer)	(34,666)	(33,666)	(33,666)	(-1,000)	....
Federal Emergency Management Agency	2,870,254	3,401,725	880,737	-1,989,517	-2,520,988
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	13,665,000	13,578,400	12,653,800	-1,011,200	-924,600
National Credit Union Administration	2,000	....	1,000	-1,000	+1,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(600,000)	(600,000)	....	(-600,000)	(-600,000)
National Science Foundation	3,671,200	3,921,450	3,646,825	-24,375	-274,625
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	90,000	90,000	80,000	-10,000	-10,000
Office of Science and Technology Policy	5,026	5,201	5,108	+82	-93
Selective Service System	24,426	25,250	7,000	-17,426	-18,250
Tennessee Valley Authority Borrowing Authority	....	....	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims	10,195	11,450	11,450	+1,255	....
Budget scorekeeping adjustments	-3,145,802	-6,294,000	-2,090,000	+1,055,802	+4,204,000
Grand total	92,117,459	93,313,116	89,890,156	-2,227,303	-3,422,960

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$43,449,241,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	42,625,039,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	42,538,434,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+824,202,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+910,807,000

The Department of Veterans Affairs is the third largest Federal agency in terms of employment with an average employment of approximately 198,000. It administers benefits for more than 25,000,000 veterans, and 44,000,000 family members of living veterans and survivors of deceased veterans. Thus, close to 70,000,000 people, comprising about 26 percent of the total population of the United States, are potential recipients of veterans benefits provided by the Federal Government.

A total of $43,449,241 in new budget authority is recommended by the Committee for the Department of Veterans Affairs programs in fiscal year 2000. The funds recommended provide for compensation payments to 2,568,254 veterans and survivors of deceased veterans with service-connected disabilities; pension payments for 648,940 non-service-connected disabled veterans, widows and children in need of financial assistance; educational training and vocational assistance to 404,726 veterans, servicepersons, and reservists, and 45,600 eligible dependents of deceased veterans or seriously disabled veterans; housing credit assistance in the form of 280,000 guaranteed loans provided to veterans and servicepersons; administration or supervision of life insurance programs with 4,486,887 policies for veterans and active duty servicepersons providing coverage of $459,619,000,000; inpatient care and treatment of beneficiaries in 172 medical centers; 40 domiciliaries, 132 nursing homes and 811 outpatient clinics which includes independent, satellite, community-based, and rural outreach clinics involving 40,227,000 visits; and the administration of the National Cemetery Administration for burial of eligible veterans, servicepersons and their survivors.

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$21,568,364,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	21,857,058,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	21,568,364,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−288,694,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	....

This appropriation provides funds for service-connected compensation payments to an estimated 2,568,254 beneficiaries and pension payments to another 648,940 beneficiaries with non-service-connected disabilities. The average cost per compensation case in 2000 is estimated at $7,296, and pension payments are projected at a unit cost of $4,808. The estimated caseload and cost by program for 1999 and 2000 are as follows:

	1999	2000	Difference
Caseload:			
Compensation:			
Veterans	2,273,901	2,267,620	−6,281
Survivors	302,748	300,001	−2,747
Children	633	633	0
Clothing allowance (non-add)	(76,627)	(76,416)	+211
Pensions:			
Veterans	387,952	380,995	−6,957
Survivors	282,715	267,945	−14,770
Minimum income for widows (non-add)	(675)	(670)	+5
Vocational training (non-add)	(15)	(8)	+7
Burial allowances	92,310	91,380	−930
Funds:			
Compensation:			
Veterans	$14,796,699,000	$15,119,868,000	+$323,169,000
Survivors	3,470,343,000	3,570,531,000	+100,188,000
Children	7,463,000	7,684,000	+221,000
Clothing allowance	40,494,000	40,382,000	−112,000
Payment to GOE (Public Laws 101–508 and 102–568)	1,419,000	1,388,000	−31,000
Medical exams pilot program (Public Law 104–275)	17,152,000	20,147,000	+2,995,000
Pensions:			
Veterans	2,366,613,000	2,419,078,000	+52,465,000
Survivors	717,596,000	697,470,000	−20,126,000
Minimum income for widows	3,429,000	3,479,000	+50,000
Vocational training	42,000	23,000	−19,000
Payment to GOE (Public Laws 101–508, 102–568, and 103–446)	9,552,000	9,344,000	−208,000
Payment to medical care (Public Laws 101–508 and 102–568)	6,793,000	7,200,000	+407,000
Payment to medical facilities	4,676,000	2,436,000	−2,240,000
Burial benefits	126,793,000	120,077,000	−6,716,000
Other assistance	2,466,000	2,466,000	
Contingency			
Unobligated balance and transfers	285,527,000	−453,208,000	−738,735,000
Total appropriation [1]	21,857,058,000	21,568,365,000	−288,694,000

[1] Totals do not add down due to rounding.

The Administration has again proposed dividing the compensation and pensions appropriation into three separate accounts: compensation, pensions, and burial benefits and miscellaneous assistance. The Committee has again disapproved this proposal and recommends a single compensation and pensions appropriation in fiscal year 2000.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee is recommending the budget estimate of $21,568,364,000 for compensation and pensions. The bill also includes requested language reimbursing $17,932,000 to the general operating expenses account ($10,732,000) and the medical care account ($7,200,000) for administrative expenses of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, Public Law 101–508, the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992, Public Law 102–568, and the Veterans' Benefits Improvements Act of 1994, Public Law 103–446. These cost savings provisions include verifying pension income against Internal Revenue Service and Social Security Administration (SSA) data; establishing a match with the SSA to obtain verification of Social Security numbers; and the $90 monthly VA pension cap for Medicaid-eligible single veterans and surviving spouses alone in Medicaidcovered nursing homes. Also, the bill includes requested language permitting this appropriation to reimburse such sums as may be necessary to the medical facilities revolving fund to help defray the operating expenses of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners.

The Administration has proposed language that would provide indefinite 2000 supplemental appropriations for compensation and pension payments. The Committee believes the current funding procedures are adequate and has not included the requested language in the bill. The Committee recognizes that additional funding may be necessary when the final disposition of proposed legislation is known.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$1,469,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	1,175,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,469,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+294,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

This appropriation finances the education and training of veterans and servicepersons whose initial entry on active duty took place on or after July 1, 1985. These benefits are included in the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program. Eligibility to receive this assistance began in 1987. Basic benefits are funded through appropriations made to the readjustment benefits appropriation and transfers from the Department of Defense. Supplemental benefits are also provided to certain veterans through transfers from the Department of Defense. This law also provides education assistance to certain members of the Selected Reserve and is funded through transfers from the Departments of Defense and Transportation. In addition, certain disabled veterans are provided with vocational rehabilitation, specially adapted housing grants, and automobile grants with approved adaptive equipment. This account also finances educational assistance allowances for eligible dependents of those veterans who died from service-connected causes or have a total and permanent service-connected disability as well as dependents of servicepersons who were captured or missing-in-action.

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $1,469,000,000 for readjustment benefits in fiscal year 2000. The estimated number of trainees and costs by program for 1999 and 2000 are as follows:

	1999	2000	Difference
Number of trainees:			
Education and training: dependents	44,100	45,600	+1,500
All-Volunteer Force educational assistance:			
Veterans and servicepersons	289,000	281,000	−8,000
Reservists	74,200	73,000	−1,200
Vocational rehabilitation	51,440	50,726	−714
Total	458,740	450,326	−8,414
Funds:			
Education and training: dependents	$132,182,000	$136,574,000	+$4,392,000
All-Volunteer Force educational assistance:			
Veterans and servicepersons	904,665,000	896,804,000	−7,861,000

	1999	2000	Difference
Reservists	105,876,000	107,986,000	+2,110,000
Vocational rehabilitation	403,206,000	405,855,000	+2,649,000
Housing grants	19,373,000	19,373,000	0
Automobiles and other conveyances	6,494,000	6,494,000	0
Adaptive equipment	26,600,000	31,700,000	−5,100,000
Work-study	34,500,000	39,900,000	+5,400,000
Payment to States	13,000,000	13,000,000	0
Reporting fees	0	3,600,000	+3,600,000
Unobligated balance and other adjustments	−470,896,000	−192,286,000	+278,610,000
Total appropriation	1,175,000,000	1,469,000,000	+294,000,000

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$28,670,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	46,450,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	28,670,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−17,780,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The veterans insurance and indemnities appropriation is made up of the former appropriations for military and naval insurance, applicable to World War I veterans; national service life insurance (NSLI), applicable to certain World War II veterans; servicemen's indemnities, applicable to Korean conflict veterans; and the veterans mortgage life insurance, applicable to individuals who have received a grant for specially adapted housing.

The budget estimate of $28,670,000 for veterans insurance and indemnities in fiscal year 2000 is included in the bill. The amount provided will enable VA to transfer more than $20,415,000 to the service-disabled veterans insurance fund and transfer $8,360,000 in payments for the 3,472 policies under the veterans mortgage life insurance program. These policies are identified under the veterans insurance and indemnity appropriation since they provide insurance to service-disabled veterans unable to qualify under basic NSLI.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$282,342,000	$300,000	$156,958,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	300,266,000	300,000	159,121,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	282,342,000	300,000	156,958,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−17,924,000	0	−2,163,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0	0	0

The purpose of the VA home loan guaranty program is to facilitate the extension of mortgage credit on favorable terms by private lenders to eligible veterans. This appropriation provides for all costs, with the exception of the native American veteran housing loan program, of VA's direct and guaranteed loans programs. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 requires budgetary resources to be available prior to incurring a direct loan obligation or a loan guarantee commitment. In addition, the Act requires all administrative expenses of a direct or guaranteed loan program to be funded through a program account.

VA loan guaranties are made to servicemembers, veterans, reservists and unremarried surviving spouses for the purchase of homes, condominiums, manufactured homes and for refinancing loans. VA guarantees part of the total loan, permitting the purchaser to obtain a mortgage with a competitive interest rate, even without a downpayment if the lender agrees. VA requires that a downpayment be made for a manufactured home. With a VA guaranty, the lender is protected against loss up to the amount of the guaranty if the borrower fails to repay the loan.

The Committee recommends the budget requests of such sums as may be necessary (estimated to be $282,342,000) for funding subsidy payments, $300,000 for the limitation on direct loans, and $156,958,000 to pay administrative expenses. The appropriation for administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the general operating expenses account.

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$1,000	$3,000	$214,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	1,000	3,000	206,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,000	3,000	214,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0	0	+8,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0	0	0

This appropriation covers the cost of direct loans for eligible dependents and, in addition, it includes administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 requires budgetary resources to be available prior to incurring a direct loan obligation. In addition, the Act requires all administrative expenses of a direct loan program to be funded through a program account.

The bill includes the budget requests of $1,000 for funding subsidy program costs, $3,000 as the limitation on direct loans, and $214,000 for administrative expenses. The appropriation for administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the general operating expenses account.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$57,000	$2,531,000	$415,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	55,000	2,401,000	400,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	57,000	2,531,000	415,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+2,000	+130,000	+15,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0	0	0

This appropriation covers the cost of direct loans for vocational rehabilitation of eligible veterans and, in addition, it includes administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program. Loans of up to $827 (based on indexed chapter 31 subsistence allowance rate) are available to service-connected disabled veterans enrolled in vocational rehabilitation programs when the veteran is temporarily in need of additional assistance. Repayment is made in 10 monthly installments, without interest, through deductions from future payments of compensation, pension, subsistence allowance, educational assistance allowance, or retirement pay. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 requires budgetary resources to be available prior to incurring a direct loan obligation. In addition, the Act requires all administrative expenses of a direct loan program to be funded through a program account.

The bill includes the budget requests of $57,000 for funding subsidy program costs and $415,000 for administrative expenses. The administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the general operating expenses account. In addition, the bill includes requested language limiting program direct loans to $2,531,000. It is estimated that VA will make 4,600 loans in fiscal year 2000, with an average amount of $550.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Administrative expenses:	
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$520,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	515,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	520,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+5,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

This program is testing the feasibility of authorizing VA to make direct home loans to native American veterans who live on U.S. trust land. This is a pilot program which began in 1993 and expires on December 31, 2001. The bill includes the budget request of $520,000 for administrative expenses, which may be transferred to and merged with the general operating expenses account.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$19,006,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	17,306,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	17,306,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+1,700,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+1,700,000,000

The Department of Veterans Affairs operates the largest Federal medical care delivery system in the country, with 172 medical centers, 40 domiciliaries, 132 nursing homes, and 811 outpatient clinics which includes independent, satellite, community-based, and rural outreach clinics.

This appropriation provides for medical care and treatment of eligible beneficiaries in VA hospitals, nursing homes, domiciliaries and outpatient facilities; contract hospitals; State domiciliaries, nursing homes and hospitals; contract community nursing homes; and outpatient programs on a fee basis. Hospital and outpatient care are also provided by the private sector for certain dependents and survivors of veterans under the civilian health and medical programs for the Department of Veterans Affairs. Funds are also used to train medical residents, interns, and other professional, paramedical and administrative personnel in health-science fields to support VA's medical programs.

The VA is requesting an appropriation of $17,306,000,000 for medical care in fiscal year 2000, the same as the enacted level. In addition, the Administration's budget assumes $749,141,000 will be available from the Medical Care Collections Fund (MCCF).

The Committee notes that the Congressional Budget Office estimates $608,000,000 from the MCCF in fiscal year 2000. The VA believes that increased collections will occur in fiscal year 2000 through efforts such as implementing billing rates based on reasonable charges and the incentive of allowing medical centers to retain the funds collected. The Committee expects the VA to take all actions possible to increase the amount of funds collected and thus available for the medical treatment of veterans. The VA should reduce the amount of funds necessary for the administrative costs of collecting these funds including consolidation of billing operations.

The bill provides $19,006,000,000 for medical care in fiscal year 2000. The total of these amounts is $1,700,000,000 over the President's budget and the FY 1999 level. The bill also includes language as proposed by the President delaying the availability of $635,000,000 requested for the equipment and land and structures object classifications until August 1, 2000.

The bill includes requested language in the "Compensation and pension" appropriation reimbursing $7,200,000 for administrative expenses of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992. The bill also includes requested language providing reimbursement authority for services rendered of up to $27,907,000–$26,111,000 for ORM and up to $1,796,000 for OEDCA.

The budget proposes bill language permitting two-year spending availability for $833,550,000 of the medical care appropriation. The bill does not include the requested language. The Committee notes that more limited flexibility is provided with the extended availability of equipment and land and structures funds, and that medical care collection funds are available until expended.

The Committee directs the VA to provide a report, by VISN, uniformly describing how each VISN allocated the funds available by facility and health care network for FY 1999 and FY 2000. This report is due to the Committee by March 31, 2000.

No specific dollar amount is provided for the treatment of hepatitis C (HCV). The Committee reiterates its concern regarding the high prevalence of HCV among veterans. The HCV infection rate among veterans is substantially higher than among the general population, and this will lead to significantly greater VA health care program costs unless the VA pursues a vigorous program of testing and treatment. Therefore, the Committee urges the VA to make testing for HCV broadly available to veterans, and to use all available therapies in the most clinically appropriate and cost effective manner. The Committee also advises the VA to be aware of the article in the New England Journal of Medicine (January 29, 1998) regarding hepatitis A and hepatitis B.

Legislation to establish a pilot program permitting Medicare reimbursements to VA hospitals for care provided to certain Medicare-eligible veterans over the age of 65 is still under consideration. This concept, often referred to as Medicare subvention, would increase alternative revenue sources as the VA medical system enrolls more Medicare-eligible veterans who are seeking services for non-service connected conditions. The VA has repeatedly demonstrated a capacity to treat patients at a lower cost than most Medicare providers while producing better health outcomes. The Committee urges the committees of jurisdiction to act expeditiously to provide this authority, especially in light of recent commitments by the President and Congress to ensure affordable health care for all older Americans.

The budget estimates that 3,644,624 unique patients will receive health care treatment in 2000, an increase of 213,231 above the number treated in 1998 and 53,588 above the number estimated for 1999. However, the Department estimates eliminating between 7,000 to 8,000 full time equivalent positions in VHA in fiscal year 2000. The Committee is concerned that under the budget proposed by the President, the VA would have to reduce the numbers of health care providers to a level where patient care is in danger. The Committee directs the VA in the future to submit a budget that will provide adequate funding for patient care.

In addition to the increase in the medical care appropriation, the VA should continue its various reengineering and reorganization efforts to increase efficiency and effectiveness and continue its transition from an acute-care, hospital-based system to one that focuses on primary care in an outpatient setting. Consolidating and closing underutilized services will permit a more effective and efficient use of resources.

The Committee has learned that the VA sent letters to thousands of veterans nationally (primarily category 7 veterans) stating that they may be ineligible to receive care in VA facilities after September 30, 1999. Many of these veterans have been receiving care at VA facilities for years. The Committee is concerned that in light of constrained budgets and the lack of legislative authorization for Medicare subvention, which would increase funds to the Medical care collections fund, the VA is not able to fulfill the goal of 30–20–10. The VA's inability to increase third party collections added to an increased patient population, primarily category 7 veterans, is straining the resources available for medical services. So that the VA can better meet the general goal of improving overall health care to veterans, the Committee directs the VA re-examine its objective to increase the number of unique patients by 20% and any activities underway to increase unique patient visits. The Committee directs VA to continue providing medical care for all upper category veterans and those veterans already enrolled with the VA health care system.

Community based outpatient clinics have been established across the country. These clinics bring primary and mental health care providers closer to where veterans live. The Committee encourages the VA to provide the networks with the necessary support to further expand the number of community based outpatient clinics. The Committee urges the VA to consider establishing community based outpatient clinics in Morris County, New Jersey, Louisville, Kentucky, Sioux City, Iowa, and Fort Dodge, Iowa.

Last year's report contained language directing the VA to contract with the National Institute of Medicine to study the costs of the National Drug Formulary and to compare the VA's formulary to formularies in other private and governmental plans. The Committee learned, to its great dismay, that the directed six month study was not begun until six months after the VA–HUD bill was signed into law. The Committee directs the VA to stop any formulary classification or evaluation activities until the above mentioned report is submitted to the Committee.

The Committee is concerned that mental health services for chronically mentally ill veterans are not being adequately provided. The Committee is encouraged by Directive 99–030 signed by the Undersecretary for Health on June 30, 1999, which provides guidelines for the VA to examine and ensure the availability of mental health services at VA medical facilities. The Committee suggests the VA expand case management programs (such as the VA's Intensive Psychiatric Community Care Programs) to provide services with similar scope and intensity equivalent to case management services available to patients with similar diagnoses in state public mental health systems.

The Committee directs the VA to submit a comprehensive report no later than March 31, 2000, uniformly by each VISN, addressing how dollars saved from reduced resources in inpatient psychiatric facilities since fiscal year 1996 have been, and will be reinvested in alternative community-based mental health services, including prescription drugs.

The Committee encourages the VA to consider extending the Secretary's moratorium on medical staff RIFs in Montana until 2002, or until a contract provider network is in place in eastern Montana, whichever is soonest.

The Committee recommends that the VA extend for no more than 18 months the lease arrangement with California State University, Monterey Bay for space at the VA clinic in Marina, California.

The Committee directs the VA to submit a report by January 1, 2000 addressing mental health services at the Louisville VAMC and the Lexington VAMC. The report must provide the number of patients receiving treatment for mental illnesses at each medical center, the proximity of each medical center to the population it serves, and the number of staff providing mental health services at each medical center. The Committee expects the VA to keep mental health services in proximity to those patients seeking treatment.

In each of the past two fiscal years the Congress has provided funding from within the VISN 8 allocation for a demonstration program to study the cost-effectiveness of contracting inpatient health care services with local East Central Florida hospitals. Based on the success of the program, the Committee would expect its continuation in fiscal year 2000. The Committee directs the VA to submit a report by April 1, 2000 addressing the costs and benefits of this program and the applicability of expanding this program to other parts of the country.

The Committee encourages the VA and VISN 7 to examine a proposal developing telemedicine technologies linking the Birmingham VA Medical Center, UAH School of Medicine, Tut Fann State Veterans Nursing Home, and VA community-based outpatient clinics in Florence, Alabama and Huntsville, Alabama via the Internet. The VA shall report its findings, including costs, back to the Committee no later than March 1, 2000.

The Committee expects the VA and VISN 11 to complete the agreed upon review of health care in Southeast Michigan and issue a report of their findings.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$326,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	316,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	316,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+10,000,000

This account includes medical, rehabilitative and health services research. Medical research is an important aspect of VA programs, providing complete medical and hospital service for veterans. The prosthetic research program is also essential in the development and testing of prosthetic, orthopedic and sensory aids for the purpose of improving the care and rehabilitation of eligible disabled veterans, including amputees, paraplegics and the blind. The health service research program provides unique opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the health care delivery system. In addition, budgetary resources from a number of areas including appropriations from the medical care account; reimbursements from the Department of Defense; and grants from the National Institutes of Health, private proprietary sources, and voluntary agencies provide support for VA's researchers.

The Committee recommends $326,000,000 for medical and prosthetic research in fiscal year 2000. This is $10,000,000 over the 1999 level and the budget request.

The Committee recommends $5,500,000 for the purpose of establishing a VA Prostate Imaging Program—a public/private partnership to improve early detection and treatment of prostate cancer, one of the most common diseases of American veterans. This research will support development and feasibility testing of prostate imaging technologies at universities and expedite transfer of promising instrumentation to the VA research facilities for large-scale clinical evaluation in veteran patients. Present diagnostic methods are not reliable for early detection. Current treatment is associated with high costs and many permanent complications. The effort to advance imaging technologies and their integration with clinical diagnosis and treatment will make an important impact on the advancement of prostate cancer care in the veteran community, including reduction of patient suffering, side effects and health care costs.

The Committee encourages the VA to continue conducting cooperative research with the developers of HCV treatments in order to improve the efficacy of existing treatments and perfect their utilization among veterans.

Acute and chronic renal failure currently affects 8,000 veterans and 300,000 patients nationwide. Patients are currently treated with the outmoded, painful, and time-consuming method of kidney dialysis costing the VA $110,000,000 in FY 1998. The Committee encourages the Department's continued support of the innovative research and partnership between the Ann Arbor VAMC and the University of Michigan. This research could ultimately lead to an implantable, bio-artifical kidney. Phase I of this project involves clinical trials at the VA on a device, worn outside the body, to treat acute renal failure. Building on trials, Phase II continues development of an implantable, bio-artifical kidney to treat chronic renal failure. The Committee supports this innovative research and is optimistic that this project could finally eliminate the need for dialysis and recommends $2,000,000 for Phase I and $500,000 for Phase II.

The Committee has been informed of the positive results of recent clinical trials utilizing the telemedicine capabilities of the Joslin Vision Network (JVN) and recommends $2,000,000 for the VA to contribute toward costs involved with the research and the JVN.

The Committee is concerned about reports that some VA medical centers may be discouraging investigators from applying for research project and career development awards due to conflicting constraints between research time and clinical care commitments. The Committee is pleased to learn that VA is developing internal approaches to resolve this issue and encourages VA to continue its efforts to provide physician-investigators with adequate time to conduct VA-approved research.

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Washington, DC VAMC to continue on the application of artificial neural networks to the diagnosis and prognosis of heart disease.

The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for the National Technology Transfer Center (NTTC) to establish a pilot program to assess, market, and license medical technologies researched in VA facilities. The Committee directs the NTTC to report to the Committee no later than July 1, 2000 the status and findings of the pilot.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$61,200,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	63,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	61,200,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−1,800,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

This appropriation provides funds for central office executive direction (Under Secretary for Health and staff), administration and supervision of all VA medical and construction programs, including development and implementation of policies, plans and program objectives.

The Committee recommends the budget request of $61,200,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses in fiscal year 2000.

GENERAL POST FUND, NATIONAL HOMES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$7,000	$70,000	$54,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	7,000	70,000	54,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	7,000	70,000	54,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0	0	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0	0	0

This program provides loans to nonprofit organizations to assist them in leasing housing units exclusively for use as a transitional group residence for veterans who are in (or have recently been in) a program for the treatment of substance abuse. The amount of the loan cannot exceed $4,500 for any single residential unit and each loan must be repaid within two years through monthly installments. The amount of loans outstanding at any time may not exceed $100,000.

The bill includes the budget requests of $7,000 for the estimated cost of providing loans for this program, $54,000 for associated administrative expenses, and a $70,000 limitation on direct loans. The administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the general post fund.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$886,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	855,661,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	912,353,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+30,339,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−26,353,000

The general operating expenses appropriation provides for the administration of non-medical veterans benefits through the Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) and top management direction and support. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 changed the accounting of Federal credit programs and required that all administrative costs associated with such programs be included within the respective credit accounts. Beginning in fiscal year 1992, costs incurred by housing, education, and vocational rehabilitation programs for administration of these credit programs are reimbursed by those accounts. The bill includes the budget requests totalling $158,107,000 in other accounts for these credit programs. In addition, $10,732,000 is transferred from the compensation and pensions account for administrative costs of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992. Section 107 of the administrative provisions provides requested language which permits excess revenues in three insurance funds to be used for administrative expenses. The VA estimates that $36,754,000 will be utilized for such purposes in fiscal year 2000. Prior to fiscal year 1996, such costs were included in the general operating expenses appropriation. Thus, in total, $1,118,060,000 is requested in fiscal year 2000 for administrative costs of non-medical benefits.

The Committee recommends $886,000,000 for general operating expenses in fiscal year 2000. This amount represents an increase of $30,339,000 above the current level and $26,353,000 below the budget request.

The VBA is to be funded at not less than $696,000,000. The Committee is greatly encouraged by the reengineering efforts of VBA to address the delay in claims processing and the need for technology improvements to the system. The Committee appreciates the effort and system-wide cooperation necessary for a large reinvention and applauds the VBA for moving forward with this endeavor.

The Committee notes that various assessments have reported a possible increased cost to the Department of Veterans Affairs if the Benefits Delivery Network Data Processing Center were to be moved from its current location at the Hines Benefits Delivery Center, Hines, Illinois to the Austin Automation Center in Austin, Texas. In addition, the operations at Hines are important to ensuring uninterrupted payment of compensation, pension and education benefits to veterans during the changing millennium. The Committee directs the Secretary not to allocate or expend any appropriated funds during fiscal year 2000 to plan or implement a collocation of functions currently performed at the Hines Benefits Delivery Center with the Austin Automation Center.

From funds in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Intergovernmental Affairs, the Committee urges the VA to work with the Salt Lake Organizing Committee and provide resources to prepare for the 2002 Paralympic Games in Salt Lake City.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$97,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	92,006,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	97,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+4,994,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The National Cemetery Administration was established in accordance with the National Cemeteries Act of 1973. It has a fourfold mission: to provide for the interment in any national cemetery with available grave space the remains of eligible deceased servicepersons and discharged veterans, together with their spouses and certain dependents, and to permanently maintain their graves; to mark graves of eligible persons in national and private cemeteries; to administer the grant program for aid to States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans' cemeteries; and to administer the Presidential Memorial Certificate Program. This appropriation provides for the operation and maintenance of 153 cemeterial installations in 39 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

The fiscal year 1999 appropriation increased 9.3 percent above the fiscal year 1998 amount. The fiscal year 2000 request is 5.9 percent higher than fiscal year 1999 appropriation. These relatively large increases are necessary to provide for the operations of new cemeteries, and to cover increased workloads at existing cemeteries.

The Committee recommends $97,000,000 for the National Cemetery Administration in fiscal year 2000. This funding level is $4,994,000 over the 1999 level and equal to the President's request. The bill also includes requested language providing reimbursement authority for services rendered of up to $117,000—$111,000 for ORM and up to $6,000 for OEDCA.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$38,500,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	36,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	43,200,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+2,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−4,700,000

The Office of Inspector General was established by the Inspector General Act of 1978 and is responsible for the audit, investigation and inspection of all Department of Veterans Affairs programs and operations. The overall operational objective is to focus available resources on areas which would help improve services to veterans and their beneficiaries, assist managers of VA programs to operate economically in accomplishing program goals, and prevent and deter recurring and potential fraud, waste and inefficiencies.

The Committee has provided $38,500,000 for the Office of Inspector General in fiscal year 2000. This amount is an increase of $2,500,000 above the current year appropriation and $4,700,000 below the budget request. Additional funds are not available for the Office to contract the financial statements audit. The bill also includes requested language providing reimbursement authority for services rendered of up to $30,000—$28,000 for ORM and up to $2,000 for OEDCA.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$34,700,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	142,300,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	60,140,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−107,600,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−25,440,000

The construction, major projects appropriation provides for constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the VA, including planning, architectural and engineering services, and site acquisition where the estimated cost of a project is $4,000,000 or more. Emphasis is placed on correction of life/safety code deficiencies in existing VA medical facilities.

A program of $60,140,000 is requested for construction, major projects, in fiscal year 2000. The bill provides $34,700,000 which is $107,600,000 below the 1999 funding level and $25,440,000 below the President's request. The Committee directs that some of the design funds be used for planning national cemeteries in the regions designated by the House Veterans Affairs Committee of Georgia, South Florida, and Northern California.

The specific amounts recommended by the Committee are as follows:

DETAIL OF BUDGET REQUEST

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and description	Available through 1999	2000 request	House recommendation
Medical Program:			
Clinical improvements:			
Kansas City, MO, Surgical suite	0	13,000	0
Tampa, FL, Spinal cord injury center	24,000	17,500	17,500
Patient environment: Murfreesboro, TN, Psychiatric patient privacy	1,300	12,700	12,700
Advance planning fund: Various stations	0	2,970	2,430
Asbestos abatement: Various stations	0	1,000	1,000
Design fund: Various stations	0	1,000	750
Less: Design fund	0	−650	−650
Subtotal	25,300	47,520	33,730
Veterans Benefits Administration: Advance planning fund	0	225	225
National Cemetery Program:			
Leavenworth, KS, Facility right-sizing/gravesite development	0	11,900	0
Advance planning fund: Various stations	0	500	750
Less: Design fund	0	−595	−595
Subtotal	0	11,805	155
Claims Analyses: Various stations	0	590	590
Total construction, major projects	25,300	60,140	34,700

The Committee has yet to see the initial plans for a national cemetery in Eastern Kentucky due March 31, 1999. The Committee strongly urges the Department to submit the requested plans by January 1, 2000.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$102,300,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	175,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	175,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−72,700,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−72,700,000

The construction, minor projects appropriation provides for constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the VA, including planning, architectural and engineering services, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is less than $4,000,000. Program focus is placed on outpatient care projects.

The Committee recommends $102,700,000 for the construction, minor projects appropriation in fiscal year 2000. The amount recommended is $72,700,000 below the budget request.

Of the amount provided, the Committee directs $150,000 for "mothballing" four historic buildings at the Dayton Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Dayton, Ohio, $3,000,000 for renovations of the research building at the Bronx Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Bronx, New York, and $500,000 for preparation of the satellite site at the National Cemetery at Salisbury, North Carolina. The Committee also requests a study to examine and design a relocated entrance to the West Virginia National Cemetery in Grafton, West Virginia.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

This appropriation provides funds for the construction, alteration, and acquisition (by purchase or lease) of parking garages at VA medical facilities. The Secretary is required under certain circumstances to establish and collect fees for the use of such garages and parking facilities. Receipts from the parking fees are to be deposited in the revolving fund and can be used to fund future parking garage initiatives.

No new budget authority is requested for the parking revolving fund in fiscal year 2000. Leases will be funded from parking fees collected. The bill includes the requested language permitting operation and maintenance costs of parking facilities to be funded from the medical care appropriation.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$80,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	90,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	40,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+40,000,000

This program provides grants to assist States to construct State home facilities for furnishing domiciliary or nursing home care to veterans, and to expand, remodel or alter existing buildings for furnishing domiciliary, nursing home or hospital care to veterans in State homes. A grant may not exceed 65 percent of the total cost of the project. Grants for State nursing facilities may not provide for more than four beds per thousand veterans in any State.

The Committee recommends $80,000,000 for grants for construction of State extended care facilities in fiscal year 2000. This amount represents an increase of $40,000,000 above the budget request and is provided to address the high demand from States for this important program.

The Committee encourages the Department to work with West Virginia, Colorado and Louisiana as those states apply for state home grants.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$11,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	10,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	11,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+1,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

Public Law 105–368, amended title 38 U.S.C. 2408, which established authority to provide aid to States for establishment, expansion, and improvement of State veterans' cemeteries which are operated and permanently maintained by the States. This amendment increased the maximum Federal Share from 50 percent to 100 percent in order to fund construction cost and the initial equipment expenses when the cemetery is established. The states remain responsible for providing the land and for paying all costs related to the operation and maintenance of the state cemeteries, including the costs for subsequent equipment purchases.

The Committee recommends the budget request of $11,000,000 for grants for the construction State veterans cemeteries in fiscal year 2000. This amount is $1,000,000 over the 1999 level.

The Committee encourages the Department to work with Kentucky and California as those states apply for state cemetery grants.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING THE TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The bill continues the existing eight administrative provisions as proposed in the budget. The budget proposes bill language to fund the new Office of Resolution Management (ORM) and Office of Employment Discrimination Compliant Adjudication (OEDCA) on a reimbursable basis from other VA appropriations in fiscal year 2000. The Committee agrees with need for these offices, but does not agree with this method of financing as it permits unlimited funding of these administrative functions. To provide definite levels of funding for these offices, as in the case with other administrative functions, language limiting the amounts to be reimbursed from "Medical care" ($27,907,000—$26,111,000 for ORM and $1,796,000 for OEDCA), "National cemetery administration" ($117,000—$111,000 for ORM and $6,000 for OEDCA), and "Office of inspector general" ($30,000—$28,000 for ORM and $2,000 for OEDCA) appropriations have been included in the bill. In addition, up to $2,068,000 ($1,888,000 for ORM and $180,000 for OEDCA) may be reprogrammed within "General operating expenses" for service rendered.

The Committee expects the VA to examine the issue of capital asset planning. While the Act does not specifically provide funds for the proposed Capital Asset Fund, the Committee does expect that the VA will start undertaking activities to address the capital assets issues posed by GAO and the House Committee on Veterans Affairs. The Committee also expects that if a realignment or reinvestment process is underway at the VA, the VA will include the Committee as one of its stakeholders in the process and provide information to the Committee in a timely manner.

The bill includes an administrative provision allowing $11,500,000, originally appropriated in fiscal year 1998 to renovate Building 9 at the VAMC in Waco, Texas, to instead be used for renovation and construction of a joint venture cardiovascular institute at the Olin E. Teague Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Temple, Texas.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$26,057,049,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	24,079,378,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	[1]28,052,478,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+1,977,671,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−1,995,429,000

[1] Amount includes $4,200,000,000 in an advance appropriation as proposed in the President's Budget request.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was established by the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–174). HUD is the principal Federal agency responsible for administering and regulating programs and industries concerned with the Nation's housing needs, economic and community development, and fair housing opportunities.

In carrying out the mission of serving the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and of the people who live and work in them, HUD administers mortgage and loan insurance programs, rental and homeownership subsidy programs for low-income families, neighborhood rehabilitation programs, and community development programs.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $26,057,049,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a decrease of $1,995,429,000 below the request and an increase of $1,977,671,000 above the fiscal year 1999 appropriation.

Public and Indian Housing

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$10,540,135,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	10,326,542,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	[2]11,522,095,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+213,593,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−981,960,000

[2] Amount includes $4,200,000,000 in an advance appropriation as proposed in the President's Budget request.

The Housing Certificate Fund provides funding for the renewal of expiring section 8 contracts, for section 8 enhanced vouchers, for the administration of section 8 contracts, and for relocation assistance in both the Housing and Public Housing programs.

The Committee recommends $10,540,135,000 for the Housing Certificate Fund. Of the amount appropriated, $25,000,000 is provided for section 8 tenant-based rental assistance for disabled families who choose to move from public housing complexes designated for elderly-only residents. Though requested by the Administration, funds are not provided for the following requests: (1) $20,000,000 for regional opportunity counseling; (2) $144,400,000 for welfare to work vouchers; and, (3) $366,560,000 for incremental vouchers. For fiscal year 2000, language is included in the bill to precluding HUD from paying $6,000,000 in increased administrative fee costs in the tenant-based section 8 program due to enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998.

At the request of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), HUD included a $4,200,000,000 advance appropriation in the section 8 contract renewal account, even though it was not submitted in HUD's budget request to OMB, or included in the Administration's Fiscal Year 2000 Budget Passback. The Committee has not included the advance appropriation in its recommendation.

HUD is directed to establish, maintain, and publish annually, an inventory of all housing that is designated in whole or in part for occupancy by elderly families, disabled families, or both. The inventory shall include, but not be limited to, the number of apartments in buildings designated for occupancy only by elderly families, the number of apartments in buildings designated for occupancy only by disabled families, and the number of apartments in buildings with special features designed to accommodate disabled persons. HUD is directed to work with the Committee in developing this inventory, and to complete and publish it no later than March 1, 2000.

The Fiscal Year 1997 VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act created a special section 8 enhanced voucher to provide a higher subsidy for residents in properties where an owner prepays the mortgage and then charges a higher rent. When this language was included, the Committee intended that it cover initial rent increases, as well as subsequent rent increases, where the rent is reasonable according to the public housing authority. The Administration, however, has chosen to interpret the law to cover only one rent increase rather than subsequent increases. To clarify any ambiguity, language is included in the Administrative provisions to ensure that subsequent rent increases, if reasonable, are covered by the enhanced voucher.

Finally, the Committee is aware of legislation, under consideration by the House Banking Committee, to mitigate the loss of affordable housing when owners of assisted housing choose not to renew their section 8 project-based contracts, and looks forward to considering appropriating funds for it.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$2,555,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	3,000,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,555,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−445,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The Public Housing Capital Fund provides funding for all public housing capital programs. Examples include public housing development, modernization, and amendments. Various levels of repair and modernization are eligible activities, for example, rehabilitation, new construction, replacing appliances, and non-routine maintenance that has become substantial in scope. Examples of capital modernization projects include replacing roofs and windows, physical improvements to common spaces, improving electrical and plumbing systems, and renovating the interior of an apartment.

The Committee recommends funding this program at the request of $2,555,000,000, which is $445,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. Of the amount provided, no more than $10,000,000 may be used for technical assistance, contract expertise, training, interventions in troubled authorities, independent physical inspections, and management improvements in support of Management 2020. Pursuant to the Administration's request, there is no set-aside for the Tenant Opportunity Program (TOP).

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$2,818,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	2,818,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,003,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−185,000,000

Operating subsidies are provided to public housing authorities to supplement tenant rental contributions and other income for the purpose of paying for the ordinary daily costs of operating a public housing authority (PHA). These costs include utility, security, and insurance bills, and the salaries of public housing employees. Operating subsidy amounts are determined by formula grants.

The Committee recommends funding operating subsidies at the fiscal year 1999 level of $2,818,000,000, a decrease of $185,000,000 from the level requested by the Administration.

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$290,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	310,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	310,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−20,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−20,000,000

Drug Elimination Grants funds are provided to public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities to eliminate drug-related crime in housing developments. Funds may be used to pay for law enforcement personnel and investigators, to provide for physical improvements that enhance security, to support tenant patrols and initiatives, and to develop drug abuse prevention programs.

The Committee recommends funding this program at $290,000,000, a decrease of $20,000,000 below the request and below the level appropriated in fiscal year 1999. Of the level provided, $10,000,000 is set-aside for Operation Safe Home administered by the HUD Inspector General, $10,000,000 is for the Inspector General for other Operation Safe Home activities and $5,000,000 is for technical assistance. Though requested by the Administration, funds are not provided for the New Approach Anti Drug Program or the Youth Anti-Drug Diversion Program.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$575,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	625,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	625,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−50,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−50,000,000

The Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing program, also known as HOPE VI, provides grants to competing public housing authorities, thereby enabling them to revitalize entire neighborhoods adversely impacted by the presence of badly deteriorated public housing projects. In addition to developing and constructing new affordable apartments, the program provides PHAs with the authority to demolish obsolete projects and to provide self-sufficiency services for families who reside in and around the facility.

The Committee recommends funding HOPE VI at $575,000,000, a decrease of $50,000,000 below the request and the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. Like last year, the bill includes language that directs HUD to provide relocation vouchers, which HUD estimates will cost approximately $30,000,000, from the Housing Certificate Fund.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$620,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	620,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	620,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The Native American Housing Block Grants program provides funds to Indian tribes and their tribally-designated housing entities (TDHEs) to help them address housing needs within their communities. The block grant is designed to fund operating requirements and capital needs.

The Committee recommends funding this program at the request of $620,000,000, which is the same level as the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. Of the amount provided $6,000,000 is set-aside for the section 601 Loan Guarantee Program, $6,000,000 is set-aside for inspections, training, travel costs and technical assistance, and $1,000,000 is set-aside for the purpose of conducting a study, described below, on unmet housing needs of tribes assisted with these grants.

HUD uses U.S. Decennial Census data to determine current housing conditions, including housing needs, for Native Americans and Alaska Natives. This information also drives the NAHASDA formula funding allocation. Therefore, it is critical to collect Native American and Alaska Native housing needs data as determined by the tribes. Although some tribes do collect this data, it is only available to HUD when a tribe challenges its formula data. Furthermore, the information is critical to evaluate the accuracy of housing needs data by comparing Indian Housing Plan data against census data to develop a better picture of the number of substandard housing units, housing in need of rehabilitation, and new housing needs. The NAHASDA Annual Performance Report should also be analyzed to determine the extent to which NAHASDA is addressing the needs.

The Committee directs HUD to contract for a study on any unmet housing needs of the tribes. As part of the review and analysis, consideration should be given to what data elements may be more appropriate for use in revising the current Indian Housing Block Grant formula to allocate NAHASDA appropriations. Additionally, by January 15, 2000, HUD is directed to provide a plan to the Committees on Appropriations that includes performance goals and objectives for the Indian Housing Program.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$6,000,000	$71,956,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	6,000,000	68,881,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	6,000,000	71,956,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0	0

Section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 establishes a loan guarantee program for Native Americans to build or purchase homes on trust land. This program provides access to sources of private financing for Indian families and Indian housing authorities that otherwise cannot acquire financing because of the unique legal status of Indian trust land. This financing vehicle enables approximately 20,000 families to construct new homes or purchase existing properties on reservations.

The Committee recommends funding this program at the request of $6,000,000, which is the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Community Planning and Development

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	0
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	25,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	20,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−25,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−20,000,000

The Committee has not provided funds for this account. The Committee recommends providing $10,000,000 for this program as a set-aside in the CDBG account. The Administration requested $20,000,000 and the fiscal year 1999 appropriation was $25,000,000.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$215,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	225,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	240,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−25,000,000

The Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program is authorized by the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Act. The program provides states and localities with resources and incentives to devise long term comprehensive strategies for meeting the housing needs of persons with HIV/AIDS and their families. Government recipients must have a HUD-approved Comprehensive Plan/Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS). Funds are allocated among eligible grantees pursuant to section 854(c) of the National Affordable Housing Act.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends $215,000,000, which is $10,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 appropriation, and $25,000,000 below the request.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$4,500,200,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	4,750,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	4,775,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−249,800,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−274,800,000

Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, authorizes the Secretary to make grants to units of general local government and states for local community development programs. The primary objective of the block grant program is to develop viable urban communities and to expand economic opportunities, principally for persons of low- and moderate-income.

The Committee recommends appropriating $4,500,200,000 for community development grants in fiscal year 2000, which is $249,800,000 below the level appropriated in fiscal year 1999, and $274,800,000 below the President's request. Overall, set-asides are $266,550,000 lower than in fiscal year 1999. Therefore, despite the decrease in the appropriation, funds for the entitlement communities and small cities programs will be greater than in fiscal year 1999. Set-asides within the CDBG account include $67,000,000 for Native Americans, $55,000,000 for the Resident Opportunity and Social Services (ROSS) program, $3,000,000 for the Housing Assistance Council, $3,000,000 for the National American Indian Housing Council, $15,000,000 for the Self-Help Housing Opportunity Program (SHOP), $18,750,000 for the National Community Development Initiative (NCDI) including a set-aside of $3,750,000 for Habitat for Humanity International (HFHI) for its capacity building activities, $20,000,000 for the Neighborhood Initiatives program, $20,000,000 for Economic Development Initiative grants, $10,000,000 for the Rural Housing and Economic Development program and $42,500,000 for Youthbuild. Language is included providing Youthbuild with authority to make a grant of not less than $2,500,000 to Youthbuild USA for capacity building activities. Since receiving capacity building funds in fiscal year 1997, HFHI has utilized the funds primarily for the purpose of providing salaries for executive directors and construction managers of Habitat affiliates. The Committee is concerned with this approach to capacity building, and directs HFHI to reconsider its program so that operational costs are not paid for through this program. The Committee understands that the funding for the ROSS program is sufficient to fund renewals of service coordinators and congregate services.

Additionally, $30,000,000 is provided for section 107 grants. Of this amount, $2,000,000 is for community development work study, $6,500,000 is for historically black colleges and universities, $6,500,000 is for Hispanic-serving institutions assisting communities, $8,000,000 is for Community Outreach Partnerships, and $7,000,000 is for Insular areas. Unlike past years, funds are not provided for technical assistance or information systems. Though requested by the President, neither the Regional Connections program nor the Homeownership Zone program is funded.

The Neighborhood Initiatives Program was created in fiscal year 1998 as an innovative program to encourage local governments, non-profits and for-profit organizations and businesses, and financial institutions to work cooperatively with each other to create new and exciting plans for revitalizing a discrete neighborhood. Additionally, the initiative sought to merge, if not eliminate, the boundaries that exist between HUD's core programs. A further intent was to explore whether time delays could be avoided by requiring applicants to provide plans that were complete in substantial measure. Several committees have begun to implement their plans. The Committee commends HUD for working with these communities as they establish their various initiatives, and looks forward to understanding more about their experiences as plans are implemented. HUD is encouraged to follow each community's progress, and to require them to document their experiences so that other organizations and communities can benefit from any lessons learned.

To promote equity in the use of Federal housing and community development funds. The Committee recommends that HUD issue written guidance to housing officials encouraging participation in the Consolidated Plan process by people with disabilities and their advocates.

The Committee recommends that the Secretary give special attention to making available to fledgling community development organizations training to advance skills of individuals and organizations. This training can best be provided and delivered on site at and by experienced community based organizations and a pilot effort should be initiated through the New Communities Corporation of Newark, New Jersey.

Finally, the commitment level for the section 108 Loan Guarantee program is reduced to $1,087,000,000, with a credit subsidy of $25,000,000, which is $4,000,000 below the President's request and the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. As requested by the Administration, $1,000,000 is provided for Administrative expenses.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$1,580,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	1,600,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,610,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−20,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−30,000,000

The HOME Investment Partnerships program provides grants to states, units of local government, Indian tribes and insular areas, through formula allocation, for the purpose of expanding the supply of affordable housing in the jurisdiction. Upon receipt, state and local governments develop a comprehensive housing affordability strategy that enables them to acquire, rehabilitate, or construct new affordable housing, or to provide rental assistance to eligible families.

The Committee recommends appropriating $1,580,000,000, which is $20,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 level, and $30,000,000 below the request. Of the amount appropriated, $7,500,000 is for Housing Counseling, which is $10,000,000 below the 1999 fiscal year appropriation and $12,500,000 below the President's request.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

The Brownfields Redevelopment program provides competitive economic development grants in conjunction with section 108 loan guarantees for qualified brownfield projects. Grants are made in accordance with section 108(q) selection criteria. The goal of the program is to return contaminated sites to productive and employment-generating uses with an emphasis on creating substantial numbers of jobs for lower-income people in physically and economically distressed neighborhoods.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$970,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	975,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,020,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−50,000,000

The Homeless Assistance Grants account provides funding for four homeless programs under title IV of the McKinney Act: (1) the emergency shelter grants program; (2) the supportive housing program; (3) the section 8 moderate rehabilitation (single room occupancy) program; and (4) the shelter plus care program. This account also supports activities eligible under the innovative homeless initiatives demonstration program.

The Committee recommends funding homeless programs at $970,000,000, a decrease of $50,000,000 below the request, and $5,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. Language is provided allowing HUD to use up to one percent of the funds appropriated for technical assistance and systems support.

As required in the report accompanying the fiscal year 1999 appropriation measure, HUD has begun to automate and aggregate previous grantee reports (APRs) and to revise the APR so that the adequacy of the response to homelessness can better be analyzed. The Committee encourages HUD to aggressively pursue this task. HUD is directed to report to Congress on this data within nine months of enactment. The report should include the number of homeless assistance projects it funds by jurisdiction, type of program, activity, and demographics of clients served.

The Committee is concerned about the lack of progress on another Committee directive to work with a representative sample of jurisdictions to collect data on homeless clients. This information is critical to answer questions about the effectiveness of federal homeless assistance and changes in the need for such assistance. The Committee directs HUD to document, within 90 days of enactment, its progress in establishing a relationship with a representative sample of approximately ten jurisdictions which can collect, at a minimum, the following information: unduplicated count of clients served; client characteristics such as age, race, sex disability status; units (days) and type of housing received (shelter, transitional, or permanent); services rendered, and outcome information such as housing stability, income, and health status.

Finally, in deference to the Banking Committee which is working on bipartisan legislation to reauthorize Homeless programs, the Committee has not included in the bill, language creating a 30% set-aside for permanent supportive housing or requiring a 25% match requirement for supportive services. The Committee reserves the right, however, to revisit these issues at Conference, and hopes to work with the Banking Committee in moving this very important legislation.

Housing Programs

HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$854,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	854,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	854,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The Housing for Special Populations program provides eligible private, non-profit organizations with capital grants which are used to finance the acquisition, rehabilitation or construction of housing intended for elderly people or people with disabilities. Twenty-five percent of the funding for supportive housing for the disabled is available for tenant-based assistance under section 8 to increase flexibility.

The Committee recommends funding the section 202 housing for the elderly program at $660,000,000, which is the same as the request and the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. The Committee recommends funding the section 811 housing for the disabled program at $194,000,000, which is the same as the request and the fiscal year 1999 appropriation.

The Committee notes a looming crisis in senior citizen housing. The United States will go through an unprecedented demographic shift over the next fifty years: by 2050, the elderly population will more than double to 80 million, with people 85 years of age and over making up almost one quarter of that population. Recent studies indicate that one and a half million elderly already pay more than 50 percent of their income in rent or live in substandard housing.

In this context, the committee notes that the Administration has proposed expansion of the Service Coordinator program to ensure that low-income and frail elderly people receive the services they need. The Administration also proposed the conversion of certain 202 projects into assisted living facilities in order to allow residents to remain in their homes as they age rather than be forced to move. The Committee believes that this Continuum of Care approach has merit in creating a range of options that will enable low-income and frail elderly to obtain decent housing and services they require.

The Committee continues to be concerned by HUD's proposal to expand the percentage of section 811 funding directed to tenant based rental assistance. While tenant based assistance is critically important to people with disabilities, it is not the only answer. For example, it is not an effective strategy in small towns and rural areas that lack decent and reasonably priced rental housing. Housing produced using section 811 funds ensures that sufficient options exist for people with disabilities in communities without an adequate supply of rental housing stock. The Committee therefore, directs that no more than 25 percent of section 811 funding be used for tenant based assistance. In addition, the Committee is pleased that the Secretary used his waiver authority last year to permit no-profit disability organizations to apply directly to HUD for section 811 tenant based assistance. The Committee directs the Secretary to continue the use of his wavier authority.

Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that HUD's current practice of converting section 811 tenant based rental assistance funds to section 8 tenant based rental assistance may discourage non-profit disability organizations from administering tenant based rental assistance. Therefore, the Committee recommends that the Secretary refrain from converting section 811 appropriations to section 8 rent subsidies. The Committee also directs the Secretary to issue a joint NOFA for both capital advance/project-based rental assistance and the tenant based rental assistance components of the section 811 program.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 authorized HUD to establish a revolving fund into which rental collections in excess of the established basic rents for units in section 236 subsidized projects are deposited. Subject to approval in appropriations Acts, the Secretary is authorized under the Housing and Community Development Amendment of 1978 to transfer excess rent collections received after 1978 to the Troubled Projects Operating Subsidy program, renamed the Flexible Subsidy Fund.

The Committee recommends that the account continue to serve as a repository of excess rental charges appropriated from the Rental Housing Assistance Fund. Although these resources will not be used for new reservations, they will continue to offset Flexible Subsidy outlays and other discretionary expenditures.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

FHA-MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of direct loans	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$50,000,000	$140,000,000,000	$328,888,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	100,000,000	110,000,000,000	328,888,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	50,000,000	120,000,000,000	330,888,000
Comparison with 1999 Appropriation	−50,000,000	+30,000,000	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0	+20,000,000	−2,000,000

Beginning in 1992, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) was split into two separate accounts. The first account is the FHA-mutual mortgage insurance program account and includes the mutual mortgage insurance (MMI) and cooperative management housing insurance (CMHI) funds. The second account is the FHA-general and special risk program account and includes the general insurance (GI) and special risk insurance (SRI) funds.

The mutual mortgage insurance program account covers unsubsidized programs, and consists of primarily the single-family home mortgage program, the largest of all the FHA programs. The cooperative housing insurance program provides mortgages for cooperative housing projects of more than five units that are occupied by members of a cooperative housing corporation.

The Committee recommends limiting commitments in the FHA-MMI program account to $140,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, which is $30,000,000 above the fiscal year 1999 level, and is the same level in the Fiscal Year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. The Committee recommends providing the fiscal year 1999 appropriation of $328,888,000 for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, which is $2,000,000 below the Administration's request. Though requested by HUD, the Committee does not recommend providing $2,000,000 to support a data warehouse. Furthermore, though requested by the Administration to comply with credit reform, the Committee does not recommend providing an appropriation of $160,000,000 for administrative contract expenses; rather, the Committee recommends continuing to pay for these expenses from liquidating accounts, as provided for in the National Housing Act. Furthermore, the Committee recommends the request to limit direct loans to $50,000,000, which is $50,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 appropriation.

The Committee understands that funding for the FHA Multifamily Credit Subsidy program in fiscal year 2000 relies solely on reserve funds. In fiscal year 2001, the Committee will re-evaluate the funding source and reinstate funding as an individual line item for the program.

FHA-GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of direct loans	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses	Program costs
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$50,000,000	$18,100,000,000	$64,000,000	0
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	50,000,000	18,100,000,000	211,455,000	81,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	50,000,000	18,100,000,000	64,000,000	0
Comparison with 1999 Appropriation	0	0	−147,455,000	−81,000,000
Comparison with 2000 budget request	0	0	0	0

The general and special risk insurance funds contain the largest number of programs administered by the FHA. The GI funds cover a wide variety of special purpose single and multi-family programs, including loans for property improvements, manufactured housing, multi-family rental housing, condominiums, housing for the elderly, hospitals, group practice facilities and nursing homes. The SRI fund includes insurance programs for mortgages in older, declining urban areas which would not be otherwise eligible for insurance, mortgages with interest reduction payments, and for high-risk mortgagors who would not normally be eligible for mortgage insurance without housing counseling.

The Committee recommends the request to limit loan guarantee commitments for the FHA-general and special risk insurance program account to $18,100,000,000, which is the same level as fiscal year 1999. The Committee recommends the budget request to transfer unobligated balances of $153,000,000 for credit subsidy purposes, and $64,000,000 in new budget authority for administrative expenses. Finally, the Committee recommends the request on limiting direct loans to $50,000,000, which is the same level as the fiscal year 1999 appropriation.

As in the MMI fund, the Administration requested $144,000,000 in new budget authority to pay for non-overhead administrative expenses to comply with credit reform. The Committee has not provided this appropriation and recommends continuing to pay for these expenses from liquidating accounts, as provided for in the National Housing Act.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES

LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$200,000,000,000	$9,383,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	150,000,000,000	9,383,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	200,000,000,000	15,383,000
Comparison with 1999 appropriation	+50,000,000	0
Comparison with 2000 budget request	0	−6,000,000

The Guarantee of Mortgage-backed Securities program facilitates the financing of residential mortgage loans insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Rural Housing Services program. The Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA) guarantees the timely payment of principal and interest on securities issued by private service institutions such as mortgage companies, commercial banks, savings banks, and savings and loan associations which assemble pools of mortgages, and issues securities backed by the pools. In turn, investment proceeds are used to finance additional mortgage loans. Investors include non-traditional sources of credit in the housing market such as pension and retirement funds, life insurance companies and individuals.

As the budget requests, the bill recommends language to limit loan guarantee commitments for mortgage-backed securities of the Government National Mortgage Association to $200,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000, which is $50,000,000 above the fiscal year 1999 level. In addition, the request of $9,383,000 is provided to fund administrative expenses, which is the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Though requested by HUD, the Committee does not recommend providing $6,000,000 to support a data warehouse.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$42,500,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	47,500,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	50,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−7,500,000

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 directs the Secretary to undertake programs of research, studies, testing and demonstrations related to the HUD mission. These functions are carried out internally through contracts with industry, non-profit research organizations, and educational institutions and through agreements with state and local governments and other federal agencies.

The bill includes $42,500,000 for research and technology in fiscal year 2000, a decrease of $7,500,000 below the budget request and a decrease of $5,000,000 below fiscal year 1999. Of this amount, the Committee recommends $35,000,000 for research, technology, and policy analysis and $7,500,000 for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) initiative.

HUD is directed to cooperate fully with the home building industry, and particularly with the National Association of Homebuilders (NAHB) Research Center, which shall coordinate industry participation and research planning for the Partnership. Furthermore, PATH funds shall not be provided to partnership agencies for duplicative program activities. Finally, the PATH Operating Plan is due no later than March 15, 2000. HUD shall include as part of the Plan an explanation of how the technology and research activities of other agencies support PATH operations and goals.

The Committee continues to support the Campus Affiliates Program, a unique partnership between HUD, the Housing Authority of New Orleans, higher education and the private sector. This program has begun to meet the needs of public housing residents in New Orleans by providing assistance and activities that foster self-sufficiency. The Committee expects HUD to continue to participate in this activity.

Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$37,500,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	40,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	47,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−2,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−9,500,000

The Fair Housing Act, title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental and financing of housing and authorizes assistance to state and local agencies in administering the provision of the fair housing law.

The Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP) assists state and local fair housing enforcement agencies that are certified by HUD as “substantially equivalent” to HUD with respect to enforcement policies and procedures. The FHAP is intended to assure prompt and effective processing of complaints filed under title VIII that are within the jurisdiction of state and local fair housing agencies.

The Committee considers FHAP to be an effective program consistent with Congress’ intent that regulatory responsibilities rest with state and local governments wherever appropriate. State and local agencies are best positioned to assess the circumstances surrounding, and take remedial action to address, fair housing complaints within their jurisdictions.

The Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) is intended to alleviate housing discrimination by providing support to private non-profit organizations, state and local government agencies and other nonfederal entities for the purpose of eliminating or preventing discrimination in housing, and to enhance fair housing opportunities.

The Committee is encouraged by HUD's recent testimony stating that the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity does not intend to use FHIP funds to solicit or fund applications that would address enforcement of the Fair Housing Act against property insurers. As the Committee has previously emphasized, given the limited resources available for enforcement of title VIII, it is appropriate that funds should serve the particular purposes expressly identified by the Congress in the statute. The Committee appreciates HUD's acknowledgement of these budgetary priorities and looks forward to the agency's continued cooperation in adhering to them.

The Committee recommends providing $37,500,000; $18,750,000 for FHAP, and $18,750,000 for FHIP. In the FHIP account, $2,000,000 is set-aside to continue a nationwide audit to determine the extent of discrimination in housing rental and sales.

In addition, some fair housing advocates, advocates for the disabled and providers of housing (planners, builders, developers, sellers, renters, architects and building code officials) remain uncertain about some of the Fair Housing Act requirements. The Committee believes there are three areas where HUD could assist in addressing these issues in addition to enforcement of the Act: complete its review of the model building code matrix submitted in December 1997; expand its Fair Housing Act education efforts directed at all organizations involved in the delivery of multi-family housing; and ensure that HUD's enforcement activities be guided by its earlier stated policy as published in the March 6, 1991 Federal Register.

The Committee directs HUD to finalize, and issue a policy statement on its review of the technical matrix comparing FHAG with the accessibility provisions in the model building codes supplied by the Council of American Building Code Officials by December 31, 1999. The Committee directs HUD to work with fair housing advocates, advocates for the disabled and users and providers of multifamily housing (planners, builders, developers, sellers, renters, architects and building code officials) to develop a plan for educating those parties on the requirements of the Fair Housing Act and how the requirements apply to the provision of accessible housing. In addition, the Agency will provide a copy of that plan to the Committee by February 29, 2000. Lastly, the Committee believes enforcement activities should be guided by the entire section entitled "Guidelines as Minimum Requirements" published in its final rule in 1991 when determining compliance with the Fair Housing Act. That section states "compliance with the Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines will provide builders with a safe harbor" and "builders and developers should be free to use any reasonable design that obtains a result consistent with the Act's requirements."

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION PROGRAM AND HEALTHY HOMES INITIATIVE

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$70,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	80,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	80,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−10,000,000

The Lead Hazard Reduction Program, authorized under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (P.L. 102–550) provides grants to state and local governments to perform lead hazard reduction activities in housing occupied by low-income families. The program also provides technical assistance, undertakes research and evaluations of testing and cleanup methodologies, and develops technical guidance and regulations in cooperation with EPA.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $70,000,000 for this program, a decrease of $10,000,000 below the request and the fiscal year 1999 level. Of the amount appropriated, $7,500,000 is provided for the Healthy Homes Initiative, which focuses attention on cost-effective approaches to eliminating environmental health problems created by substandard housing. Funding for the Healthy Homes Initiative is $2,500,000 below the request and the fiscal year 1999 level. Of the total appropriated, $1,000,000 is for CLEARCorp.

The Committee views lead safety as an integral part of rehabilitation in older housing, not as a stand-alone activity. Therefore, $750,000 is provided for grants or contracts to train sampling technicians in lead-safe repainting and remodeling, and $750,000 is provided to expand the National Center evaluation to examine and disseminate innovative, lower cost hazard control and educational strategies, and provide technical assistance for integrating$lead safety into HUD programs. By January 15, 2001, HUD is directed to provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations regarding CLEARCorp's performance and capacity to carry out its contractual obligations to reduce lead hazards.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

		By transfer					
	Appropriation	FHA funds	GNMA funds	CPD	Title VI	Indian housing	Total
FY 2000 recommendation	$456,000,000	$518,000,000	$9,383,000	$1,000,000	$150,000	$200,000	$985,576,000
FY 1999 appropriation	456,000,000	518,000,000	9,383,000	1,000,000	200,000	400,000	985,826,000
FY 2000 budget request	502,000,000	518,000,000	9,383,000	1,000,000	150,000	200,000	1,030,733,000
Comparison with 1999 appropriation	0	0	0	0	−50,000	−200,000	0
Comparison with 2000 budget request	−45,157,000	0	0	0	0	0	−45,157,000

The Administration requests a single appropriation to finance all salaries and related costs associated with administering the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, except the Office of Inspector General and the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight. These activities include housing, mortgage credit, and secondary market programs; community planning and development programs; departmental management; legal services and field direction and administration.

The Committee recommends last year's appropriation of $985,826,000, a decrease of $45,157,000 below the request. Transfers include: $518,000,000 from FHA funds; $9,383,000 from GNMA funds; $1,000,000 from Community Planning and Development funds; $150,000 from the title VI Indian Loan Guarantee program; and, $200,000 from Indian housing.

As the country enters the next millennium, the Committee is more aware than ever that the strength of the country lies in its infrastructure. Elements of that infrastructure include the homes in which the nation's citizens reside. To state the obvious, these homes take many forms, including single-family houses, apartment buildings, condominiums and cooperatives, they make up the nation's cities, towns and neighborhoods, and they provide shelter to families of different sizes and income levels. As such, the nation's housing in its various forms should be thought of as assets and treated accordingly.

Therefore, language is included in Administrative provisions that authorizes a Millennial Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing. HUD is directed to provide $2,000,000 for this purpose from the salary and expense account.

The Committee intends that this Commission examine the importance of housing, particularly affordable housing, to the infrastructure of the United States. This examination should consider how the nation's housing assets impact the strength of communities and neighborhoods, as well as the social fabric of our society. Additionally, the Commission should explore the role of the private sector—both for-profits and non-profits—and its role in expanding the supply of affordable housing. Part of this exploration should include increasing the use and creation of new or alternative building technologies that can decrease construction and long term operational costs of the nation's housing. Finally, the Commission should review HUD's existing core programs and make recommendations about how they can better work in conjunction with the private sector and with one another to provide better homes and opportunities for families, including the elderly and disabled, neighborhoods, and urban and rural communities.

Language requires the Commission to conduct hearings and workshops over a two-year period. Following this period, the Commission shall have six months in which to write a report, which shall then be transmitted to the House of Representatives and Senate Committees on Appropriations and Banking and Financial Services.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	FHA funds	Drug elim. grants	Total
FY 2000 recommendation	$40,000,000	$22,343,000	$10,000,000	$72,343,000
FY 1999 appropriation	49,567,000	22,343,000	10,000,000	81,910,000
FY 2000 budget request	38,000,000	22,343,000	10,000,000	70,343,000
Comparison with 1999 appropriation	−9,567,000	0	0	−9,567,000
Comparison with 2000 budget request	+2,000,000	0	0	+2,000,000

The Office of Inspector General provides agency-wide audit and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies that create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste and mismanagement. The audit function provides internal audit, contract audit and inspection services. Contract audits provide professional advice to agency contracting officials on accounting and financial matters relative to negotiation, award, administration, re-pricing and settlement of contracts. Internal audits evaluate all facets of agency operations. Inspection services provide detailed technical evaluations of agency operations. The investigative function provides for the detection and investigation of improper and illegal activities involving programs, personnel and operations.

The Committee recommends the $72,343,000 for the Office of Inspector General, a decrease of $9,567,000 below the fiscal year 1999 level and a $2,000,000 increase above the request. Transfers of $22,343,000 from FHA funds and $10,000,000 from Drug Elimination Grants make up the appropriation.

The Committee continues to be supportive of the Housing Fraud Initiative, which is now operational, and anticipates productive results over the course of the year.

Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$19,493,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	16,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	19,493,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+3,493,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) was established in 1992 to regulate the financial safety and soundness of the two housing government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs)—the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac). The office was authorized in the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, and gave the regulator enhanced authority to enforce these standards. In addition to financial regulation, the OFHEO monitors the GSEs compliance with affordable housing goals that were contained in the Act.

The Committee recommends the request of $19,493,000, an increase of $3,493,000 above the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. Language is included providing OFHEO with $1,000 for a R&R account.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The bill contains a number of administrative provisions.

Section 201 relates to the division of financing adjustment factors.

Section 202 prohibits available funds from being used to investigate or prosecute lawful activities under the Fair Housing Act.

Section 203 extends enhanced disposition authority to fiscal year 2000.

Section 204 corrects an anomaly in the HOPWA formula that results in the loss of funds for a state when the incidence of AIDS in a large city increases.

Section 205 extends the FHA Multifamily Mortgage Credit Demonstration to fiscal year 2000.

Section 206 reprograms funds from a previously appropriated economic development initiative grant.

Section 207 amends section 16 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to allow HUD to permit adjustments for unusually high or low family incomes.

Section 208 authorizes creating a Millennial Blue Ribbon Commission on Housing.

Section 209 is a technical correction which clarifies that the increase for single family loan limits extends to those homes which have two, three, or four units.

Section 210 allows for the reuse of section 8 budget authority.

Section 211 provides for enhanced vouchers.

Section 212 rescinds $74,400,000 from HUD's obligated and unobligated balances.

Section 213 provides $5,000,000 for the National Cities in Schools program.

Section 214 provides $5,000,000 for the Moving to Work program. The Committee assumes that if the Administration fails to request funds for this program as part of the normal budget process in fiscal year 2001, that the Administration opposes the program, and the Committee will not provide funds for the program.

Section 215 repeals section 218 of Public Law 104–204.

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

American Battle Monuments Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$28,467,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	26,431,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	26,467,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+2,036,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+2,000,000

The Commission is responsible for the administration, operation and maintenance of cemetery and war memorials to commemorate the achievements and sacrifices of the American Armed Forces where they have served since April 6, 1917. In performing these functions, the American Battle Monuments Commission maintains twenty-four permanent American military cemetery memorials and thirty-one monuments, memorials, markers and offices in fifteen foreign countries, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the British dependency of Gibraltar. In addition, five memorials are located in the United States: the East Coast Memorial in New York; the West Coast Memorial, The Presidio, in San Francisco; the Honolulu Memorial in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Honolulu, Hawaii; and the American Expeditionary Forces Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC.

The Committee recommends $28,467,000 for fiscal year 2000 to administer, operate and maintain the Commission's monuments, cemeteries, and memorials throughout the world. This amount represents an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget request and is the third increment provided the Commission to reduce the maintenance backlog identified prior to passage of the fiscal 1998 appropriation. The Committee notes and commends the work performed in this regard so far by the Commission, and intends over the next few years that the backlog be further reduced. These actions will ensure that the cemeteries and memorials under ABMC's jurisdiction are maintained at a high standard to reflect the nation's continuing commitment to its Honored War Dead and their families.

Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$9,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	6,500,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	7,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+2,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	+1,500,000

The Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board was authorized by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to investigate accidental releases of certain chemical substances resulting in serious injury, death, or substantial property loss. The Board became operational in fiscal year 1998.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee is recommending $9,000,000, an increase of $2,500,000 above the 1999 funding level and $1,500,000 above the budget request. The Committee believes its funding recommendation is consistent with the oft-stated commitment of the Committee to allow for measured growth in this new agency.

Again this year, bill language has been included which limits the number of career senior executive service positions to three.

Department of the Treasury

Community Development Financial Institutions

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$70,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	95,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	125,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−25,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−55,000,000

The Community Development Financial Institutions fund provides grants, loans, and technical assistance to new and existing community development financial institutions such as community development banks, community development credit unions, revolving loan funds, and micro-loan funds. Recipients must use the funds to support mortgage, small business, and economic development lending in currently underserved, distressed neighborhoods. The CDFI fund also operates as an information clearinghouse for community development lenders.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $70,000,000 for the program in fiscal year 2000. The recommendation is a decrease of $55,000,000 below the budget request and $25,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 appropriation.

The Committee is very pleased with the CDFI Strategic Plan, and the goals, objectives, and strategies it contains, and commends the new management team.

Consumer Product Safety Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$47,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	47,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	50,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−3,500,000

The Consumer Product Safety Act established the Consumer Product Safety Commission, an independent Federal regulatory agency, to reduce unreasonable risk of injury associated with consumer products. Its primary responsibilities and overall goals are: to protect the public against unreasonable risk of injury associated with consumer products; to develop uniform safety standards for consumer products, minimizing conflicting State and local regulations; and to promote research into prevention of product-related deaths, illnesses, and injuries.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $47,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, the same amount provided in fiscal year 1999. The amount provided is a decrease of $3,500,000 from the budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $3,500,000. The budget request included a new applied product hazard research program in fiscal year 2000 at a cost of $1,000,000. The Committee agrees with the goals of such a research program but finds that funding is not available to begin such a program at this time. Therefore, authority to begin this new activity is denied. The remaining $2,500,000 reduction is to be applied by the Commission in an equitable manner rather than applying all of the reduction to only one or two programs.

The Committee notes that the Commission's 1998 Annual Report to the Congress included a statement that certain data derived from death certificates should not be compared with prior year reports because of the inconsistent manner in which the death certificates are acquired or evaluated. The Committee believes that the data should be consistent from year to year so the Report may be used as a guide for the Congress and the Commission on the effectiveness of the programs being funded. The Committee directs the Commission to take steps to ensure that death certificate data is consistent from year to year and further directs that the Commission is to acquire a statistically significant number of death certificates each fiscal year.

The Committee remains concerned about the Consumer Product Safety Commission's position regarding fire safety standards for children's sleepwear. Two GAO reports have found that CPSC data is insufficient to determine whether the number of burns and deaths for children have risen since the relaxation of fire safety standards in 1996. The Committee directs the CPSC to continue to monitor the fire injury data and report to the Committee next year on the number of burns or deaths associated with children's sleepwear. The CPSC should work with interested groups which monitor burn injuries in developing this report. Should these be any increase in burns or injuries among children, the Committee will reconsider this issue in FY01 and is prepared to take appropriate action.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	0
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	435,500,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	545,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−435,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−545,500,000

The Corporation for National and Community Service was established by the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 to enhance opportunities for national and community service and provide national service educational awards. The Corporation makes grants to States, institutions of higher education, public and private nonprofit organizations, and others to create service opportunities for a wide variety of individuals such as students, out-of-school youth, and adults through innovative, full-time national and community service programs. National service participants may receive educational awards which may be used for full-time or part-time higher education, vocational education, job training, or school-to-work programs. Funds for the Volunteers in Service to America and the National Senior Service Corps are provided in the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education Appropriations bill.

The fiscal year 2000 budget request for program and administrative activities of the Corporation for National and Community Service is $545,500,000. Funding for this level of activity is not possible in this fiscal year. The Committee recommendation has provided for termination of the program. The Committee has not included bill language, proposed in the budget request, which would have the effect of establishing new programs for high school age individuals. The Committee believes such an expansion of the program requires authorization by the appropriate Congressional Committee of jurisdiction.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	3,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	3,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The Office of Inspector General is authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended. This Office provides an independent assessment of all Corporation operations and programs, including those of the Volunteers in Service to America and the National Senior Service Corps, through audits, investigations, and other proactive projects.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 1999 appropriation.

COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$11,450,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	10,195,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	11,450,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+1,255,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The Veterans Benefits Administration Adjudication Procedure and Judiciary Review Act established the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims. The Court reviews appeals from Department of Veterans Affairs claimants seeking review of a benefit denial. The Court has the authority to overturn findings of fact, regulations and interpretations of law.

The bill includes the budget request of $11,450,000 for the Court of Veterans Appeals in fiscal year 2000, an increase of $1,255,000 above the current year appropriation. The increase provides funding for one additional law clerk per judge for FY 2000. The additional law clerks are a temporary FTE increase in FY 2000 to assist the Court with the large number of backlogged cases coming from the Department of Veterans Affairs Board of Veterans Appeals.

The bill also includes requested language earmarking $865,000 for the pro bono representation program.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$12,473,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	11,666,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	12,473,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+807,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The Secretary of the Army is responsible for the administration, operation and maintenance of Arlington National Cemetery and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery. At the close of fiscal year 1998, the remains of 272,195 persons were interred/inured in these cemeteries. Of this total, 233,747 persons were interred and 23,809 remains inured in the Columbarium in Arlington National Cemetery, and 14,639 remains were interred in the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery. There were 3,604 interments and 2,034 inurnments in fiscal year 1998. It is projected that there will be 3,600 interments and 2,100 inurnments in fiscal year 1999; and 3,700 interments and 2,150 inurnments in fiscal year 2000. In addition to its principal function as a national cemetery, Arlington is the site of approximately 2,700 nonfuneral ceremonies each year and has approximately 4,000,000 visitors annually.

The Committee recommends the budget request of $12,473,000 and 102 full-time equivalents to administer, operate, maintain and provide ongoing development at the Arlington National and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemeteries in fiscal year 2000.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$7,312,557,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	7,590,352,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	7,206,646,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−277,795,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+105,911,000

The Environmental Protection Agency was created by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, which consolidated nine programs from five different agencies and departments. Major EPA programs include air and water quality, drinking water, hazardous waste, research, pesticides, radiation, toxic substances, enforcement and compliance assurance, pollution prevention, oil spills, Superfund and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) program. In addition, EPA provides Federal assistance for wastewater treatment, drinking water facilities, and other water infrastructure projects. The agency is responsible for conducting research and development, establishing environmental standards through the use of risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis, monitoring pollution conditions, seeking compliance through a variety of means, managing audits and investigations, and providing technical assistance and grant support to states and tribes, which are delegated authority for actual program implementation. Finally, the Agency participates in some international environmental activities.

Among the statutes for which the Environmental Protection Agency has sole or significant oversight responsibilities are:

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended.

Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended.

Oil Pollution Act of 1990

Public Health Service Act (Title XIV), as amended.

Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended.

Clean Air Act, as amended.

Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended.

Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986.

Pollution Prevention Act of 1990.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee has recommended a total program and support level of $7,312,557,000, a decrease of $277,795,000 below last year's appropriated level and an increase of $105,911,000 above the budget request.

Of the amounts approved in the following appropriations accounts, the Agency must limit transfers of funds between objectives to not more than $500,000, except as specifically noted, without prior approval of the Committee. No changes may be made to any account or objective, except as approved by the Committee, if it is construed to be policy or a change in policy. Any activity or program cited in the report shall be construed as the position of the Committee and should not be subject to reductions or reprogramming without prior approval of the Committee. It is the intent of the Committee that all carryover funds in the various appropriations accounts are subject to the normal reprogramming requirements outlined above. The Agency is expected to comply with all normal rules and regulations in carrying out these directives. Finally, the Committee wishes to continue to be notified regarding reorganizations of offices, programs, or activities prior to the planned implementation of such reorganizations.

For the Science and Technology, Environmental Programs and Management, and Office of Inspector General accounts, bill language has been included at the request of the President which provides that sums necessary for liquidating obligations made in fiscal years 1999 and 2000 are available through September 30, 2007, and that sums necessary for liquidating obligations made in fiscal years 2000 and 2001 are available through September 30, 2008.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation [1]	$645,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	660,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	642,483,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−15,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+2,517,000

[1] Total does not include transfer of $35,000,000 from the Hazardous Substance Superfund.

The Science and Technology account funds all Environmental Protection Agency research (including Hazardous Substances Superfund research activities) carried out through grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, states, universities, and private business, as well as on an in-house basis. This account also funds personnel compensation and benefits, travel, supplies and operating expenses for all Agency research. Research addresses a wide range of environmental and health concerns across all environmental media and encompasses both long-term basic and near-term applied research to provide the scientific knowledge and technologies necessary for preventing, regulating, and abating pollution, and to anticipate merging environmental issues.

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $645,000,000 for Science and Technology for fiscal year 2000, a decrease of $15,000,000 below last year's spending level, and an increase of $2,517,000 above the budget request.

The Committee's recommended appropriation includes the following increases to the budget request:

1. +$1,250,000 for continuation and California. Regional PM 10 and 2.5 air quality study.
2. +$2,500,000 for EPSCoR.
3. +$700,000 for continuation of study of livestock and agricultural pollution abatement at Tarleton State University.
4. +$3,000,000 for Water Environmental Research Foundation.
5. +$1,000,000 for continued research on urban waste management at the University of New Orleans.

6. +$1,000,000 for continued perchlorate research through the East Valley Water District.

7. +$2,000,000 for the Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxics Research Center.

8. +$4,000,000 for the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, including $1,000,000 for continued research on arsenic.

9. +$2,000,000 for the National Decentralized Water Resource Capacity Development Project, in coordination with EPA, for continued training and research and development program.

10. +$750,000 for the Integrated Petroleum Environmental Consortium project.

11. +$1,000,000 for the National Center for Atlantic and Caribbean Reef Research.

12. +$800,000 for the University of New Hampshire's Bedrock Bioremediation Center research project.

13. +$750,000 for the Lovelace National Environmental Respiratory Center.

14. +$500,000 for the development, design, and implementation of a research effort on tributyltin based ship bottom paints at Old Dominion Univ.

15. +$1,000,000 for research of advanced vehicle design, advanced transportation systems, vehicle emissions, and atmospheric pollution at the University of Riverside CE–CERT facility.

16. +$1,500,000 for the Environmental Technology Commercialization Center (ETC2) in Cleveland, Ohio.

17. +$1,000,000 for continued research of the Salton Sea at the University of Redlands.

18. +$750,000 for the final phase of research conducted through the Institute for Environmental and Industrial Science in San Marcos, Texas.

19. +$1,000,000 for the Center for Estuarine Research at the University of South Alabama for research on the environmental impact of human activities on water quality and habitat loss in an estuarine environment.

20. +$700,000 to develop and maintain an information repository of water related materials for research and conflict resolution at the Water Resources Institute at California State University, San Bernardino.

21. +$300,000 for environmental remanufacturing research at the Rochester Institute of Technology.

22. +$2,000,000 for the Fresh Water Institute to extend and expand acid deposition research.

23. +$5,000,000 for endocrine disrupter research.

24. +$2,000,000 for assessing and mitigating the impact of exposure to multiple indoor contaminants on human health through the Metropolitan Development Association of Syracuse and Central New York.

25. +$2,000,000 to establish a regional environmental data center and coordinated information system in the Mid-Atlantic Highlands, in coordination with the Federal Geographic Data Committee and the National Spatial Data Infrastructure.

26. +$2,000,000 for the Center for the Engineered Conservation of Energy in Alfred, New York to conduct environmental performance and resource conservation research.

27. +$1,000,000 for the National Center for Animal Waste management Technologies at Purdue University.

28. +$1,000,000 for analysis and research of the environmental and public health impacts associated with pollution sources, including waste transfer stations, in the South Bronx, New York, to be conducted by New York University.

29. +$1,000,000 for research associated with the restoration and enhancement of Manchac Swamp conducted by Southeastern Louisiana at the Turtle Cover Research Station.

Other Science and Technology program levels include:

1. CCTI Transportation research is funded at the 1999 level of $27,000,000.
2. Global Change research is funded at $17,051,000, slightly above the 1999 level.
3. The new Coastal Environmental Monitoring program has not been funded.
4. Project EMPACT is funded at the 1999 level of $6,400,000.
5. Clean Water Action Plan related research is funded at $1,800,000, an increase of $400,000 above the 1999 level.

For Science and Technology, no general reduction is proposed.

In addition to the funds provided through appropriations directly to this account, the Committee has recommended that $35,000,000 be transferred to "Science and Technology" from the "Hazardous Substance Superfund" account for ongoing research activities consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended.

Again this year, the Committee notes that the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) is designed to improve the scientific and technological capacity of states with less developed research infrastructure. Developed with NASA and the National Science Foundation as partners, the Committee has provided EPA with $2,500,000 for its continued participation in this program.

The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 for endrocrine disrupter research, bringing the total funding level to $17,700,000. The Committee expects these funds to be used by the Office of Research and Development in conjunction with the Endocrine Disrupter Screening Program to improve, standardize and validate the recommended Tier I screens and Tier II tests to appropriately protect public health and reduce the instances of false positives. For the public to have confidence in information developed under the EDSP, the screens and tests must produce credible, replicable results.

The Committee is aware of the potential of carbon sequestration through proper application of agricultural conservation practices to show or reduce the build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, and has collateral benefits of erosion abatement and increased soil fertility. The Agency is thus strongly encouraged to provide up to $1,000,000 from within available funds to create the databases and analysis necessary to help establish programs and technologies to achieve an effective carbon sequestration program.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$1,850,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	1,846,700,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,046,993,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+3,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−196,993,000

The Environmental Programs and Management account encompasses a broad range of abatement, prevention, and compliance, and personnel compensation, benefits, travel, and expenses for all programs of the Agency except Science and Technology, Hazardous Substance Superfund, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund, Oil Spill Response, and the Office of Inspector General.

Abatement, prevention, and compliance activities include setting environmental standards, issuing permits, monitoring emissions and ambient conditions and providing technical and legal assistance toward enforcement, compliance, and oversight. In most cases, the states are directly responsible for actual operation of the various environmental programs. In this regard, the Agency's activities include oversight and assistance in the facilitation of the environmental statutes.

In addition to program costs, this account funds administrative costs associated with the operating programs of the Agency, including support for executive direction, policy oversight, resources management, general office and building services for program operations, and direct implementation of all Agency environmental programs—except those previously mentioned—for Headquarters, the ten EPA Regional offices, and all non-research field operations.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee has recommended $1,850,000,000 for Environmental Programs and Management, an increase above last year's level of $3,300,000, and a decrease from the budget request of $196,993,000. This account encompasses most of those activities previously conducted through the Abatement, Control and Compliance and Program and Research Operations accounts. In 1996, these accounts, except for certain research operations and the state categorical grant program, were merged in order to provide greater spending flexibility for the Agency. Bill language is included which makes this appropriation available for two fiscal years and, for this account only, the Agency may transfer funds of not more than $500,000 between objectives without prior notice to the Committee, and of not more than $1,000,000 without prior approval of the Committee. But for this difference, all other reprogramming procedures as outlined earlier shall apply.

The Committee's recommended appropriation includes the following increases to the budget request:

1. + $2,000,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute for continued development of viable cleanup technologies.
2. + $500,000 for continued activities of the Small Business Pollution Prevention Center at the University of Northern Iowa.
3. + $750,000 for the painting and coating compliance project at the University of Northern Iowa.
4. + $2,000,000 for continuation of the Sacramento River Toxic Pollution Control Project, to be cost shared.

5. + $1,500,000 for ongoing activities at the Canaan Valley Institute.

6. + $2,500,000 for the Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy (SCERP).

7. + $500,000 for continuation of the Small Water Systems Institute at Montana State University.

8. + $14,500,000 for rural water technical assistance activities and groundwater protection with distribution as follows: $8,600,000 for the NWRA; $2,600,000 for RCAP; $700,000 for GWPC; $1,600,000 for Small Flows Clearinghouse; and $1,000,000 for the NETC.

9. + $1,000,000 for implementation of the National Biosolids Partnership Program.

10. + $1,000,000 for continued work on the Soil Aquifer Treatment Demonstration Project.

11. + $3,000,000 for continuation of the New York and New Jersey dredge decontamination project.

12. + $500,000 for operation of the Long Island Sound Office.

13. + $750,000 for the Southern Appalachian Mountain Initiative.

14. + $100,000 to the Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management to expand the existing education program.

15. + $200,000 for the Northwest Citizen's Advisory Commission to coordinate research and education efforts of environmental issues covering the entire Northwest Straits area.

16. + $250,000 for use in planning to enhance environmental stewardship in the design, construction, and operation of the University of California, Merced.

17. + $1,000,000 for the Northeast Project including $700,000 to be split among the three other regional environmental enforcement projects.

18. + $690,000 to develop a broad-based, highly interdisciplinary risk assessment program with strong community involvement, at Cleveland State University.

19. + $800,000 for the university portion of the Southern Oxidant Study.

20. + $2,000,000 for source water protection programs.

21. + $6,000,000 for section 103 grants to the states to develop regional haze programs under Title I, Part C of the Clean Air Act.

22. + $500,000 for continued work on the Cortland, County, New York aquifer protection plan, $150,000 of which is for planning and implementation of the Upper Susquehanna watershed.

23. + $1,250,000 for the National Onsite Water Demonstration Project.

24. + $2,500,000 for the Federal Energy Technology Center and EPA Region III for continued activities of a comprehensive clean water initiative.

25. + $2,000,000 for Tampa Bay Watch to establish a sustaining program and expand community environmental restoration and developmental stewardship projects designed to elevate the health of the Tampa Bay estuary.

26. + $3,000,000 for the National Technology Transfer Center to establish a technology commercialization partnership program, and

a comprehensive training program on commercialization best practices for EPA and other Federal officials.

Other Environmental Programs and Management activities, funded at the fiscal year 1999 program level, include:

1. $38,800,000 for CCTI Buildings;
2. $4,800,000 for CCTI Transportation;
3. $18,600,000 for CCTI Industry;
4. $7,400,000 for CCTI International Capacity Building;
5. $6,200,000 for partnerships with countries;
6. $7,700,000 for EMPACT;
7. $48,500,000 for compliance monitoring;
8. $81,800,000 for civil enforcement;
9. $3,800,000 for enforcement training;
10. $19,500,000 for human resources management;
11. $4,200,000 for information management-right-to-know programs;
12. $133,400,000 for facility operations; rental and lease activities;
13. $12,900,000 for toxics programs/chemical data collection and screening;
14. $23,700,000 for criminal enforcement activities.

The Committee has provided no funds for the Multilateral Fund, for Sustainable Development Challenge Grants, and for the new Urban Environmental Quality and Human Health program. In addition, the Committee has reduced the funding available for contracts and grants by $40,183,000, and has directed a reduction in payroll costs of $35,000,000. This later reduction will result in no reduction-in-force requirement and can be achieved through continuation of the current EPA hiring freeze until normal attrition brings the Agency to the proper personnel level. This new level is expected to be more in line with the personnel level contemplated in this and in the fiscal 1999 funding measure.

Again this year, the Committee has provided the statutory funding level for the National Environmental Education and Training Foundation. In addition, the Committee expects the Agency to fund the Environmental Finance Centers at a level of $1,250,000, an increase of $310,000 over the level proposed in the budget submissions; and encourages the Agency to provide from within available funds the resources necessary to accelerate completion of the lead safety sampling technician course to meet the urgent need for individuals trained to perform visual inspection and sample dust, soil, and paint chips in high-risk housing and as needed for clearance after painting and remodeling.

The Committee has provided the full budget request for registration and re-registration activities performed by EPA. The Committee is aware of the importance of the Food Quality Protection Act and the need to make the registration of new products an Agency priority. Faster review and approval of registration applications will allow safer, more environmentally friendly products on the market sooner and ensure that farmers have the ability to protect their crop.

In addition to funds provided to the NRWA, RCAP, the GWPC, NETC, and the Small Flows Clearinghouse, the Committee has provided $1,250,000 for the National Onsite Water Demonstration

Project and $2,000,000 for source water protection programs. The Committee intends that these latter funds be used to develop local source water protection programs within each state utilizing the infrastructure and process now used for groundwater and wellhead protection programs. These resources will provide additional technicians for in-the-field work and will virtually guarantee that nearly 1,000 more communities will adopt local, country-wide and/or regional source water protection programs targeted to the highest risk watershed areas in each state.

Bill language requested by the Administration which would permit grants awarded under section 20 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and section 10 of the Toxic Substances Control Act to be used for research, development, monitoring, public education, training, demonstrations, and studies has been included by the Committee.

The Committee has included bill language which specifically provides $6,000,000 for section 103 grants to the states to develop regional haze programs under title I, part C of the Clean Air Act. The Committee recognizes that the Agency's re-interpretation of the Clean Air Act's visibility program in its final regional haze rule imposes significant new and burdensome requirements on all 50 states. Although, in response to state concerns, the final rule contains flexibility for states to develop appropriate strategies to improve visibility in federal Class I areas, this flexibility cannot be realized without adequate funding. The Agency is, therefore, required to direct this additional $6,000,000 to provide funding through section 103 grants to the 50 states. The money shall be used to aid states in the development of emissions inventories, quantification of natural visibility conditions, monitoring and other data necessary to define reasonable progress and develop control strategies, and to support the states' participation in regional efforts to coordinate their strategies, where necessary, and at the election of the individual states. To the extent that western states choose to proceed on an earlier schedule to complete the required State Implementation Plans, the Committee recognizes these states will need a larger allocation in the near term than other states that are increasing their regional haze efforts. The Agency is advised, however, not to shortchange the needs of the other states to begin their work. Furthermore, although the Clean Air Act allocates responsibility for the visibility program to the states, it is a program to protect federal Class I areas and as such requires adequate federal funding. The Committee expects the agency to include funding for state implementation of the regional haze rule in their FY 2001 budget and future budget requests to Congress.

The Committee continues to be concerned about the Environmental Protection Agency's approach to resolving the issue of the Agency's "Interim Guidance for Investigating Title VI Complaints Challenging Permits" which was released on February 5, 1998. This was an effort by the Agency to move beyond a case-by-case approach to address state permit program compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act through the administrative petition process. Numerous organizations, State and local governments, including the Environmental Council of the States, requested that the EPA suspend or withdraw the interim guidance because of concerns about Brownfields, urban sprawl, empowerment zones, and redevelopment. In addition, there was little if any opportunity prior to the release of the guidance for any public or stakeholder input. Therefore, the Committee provided in the fiscal year 1999 Appropriation Act that no funds be used to implement the interim guidance. Identical bill language to continue this prohibition has also been included in the fiscal year 2000 Act.

At this point, there does not appear to be a clear strategy to resolve this issue. A FACA Committee was established and has met on several occasions, but has not appeared to have resolved any of the major issues on how the Agency should handle Title VI complaints. Currently, the Agency is in the process of establishing a new stakeholder process for input on some of these same contentious issues. The Committee is concerned that there may be conflicts between internal and external guidance developed by EPA that will make it difficult to resolve complaints in a fair and efficient manner. Equally important, developing internal guidance before final guidance has been subjected to full public comments conflicts with Congressional intent.

On January 20, 1999, the General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office issued an opinion (B–281575) that EPA's Interim Guidance clearly affects the rights of non-Agency parties and constitutes a "rule" under the Small Business Review and Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA), which is subject to Congressional review. If the Agency intends to promulgate guidance rather than a rulemaking, procedural requirements of a rulemaking should be followed including input from the small business community, sufficient time for notice and comment, published response to comments provided to the agency, interagency review, and analysis of any unfunded mandates on State and local governments. The Committee is very concerned that there be sufficient time for review of any new guidance given the lack of stakeholder review prior to the release of the Interim Guidance last year. In addition, the Committee requests that EPA examine successful State and local programs as model programs, and look at the possibility of delegating initial review and resolution of Title VI claims to States with such established model programs.

The Committee has also again this year included bill language which prohibits the use of funds to take certain actions for the purpose of implementing or preparing to implement, the Kyoto Protocol. The Committee is concerned with reports that, during the past year, the Agency may have strayed across the fine line separating education from advocacy. Although the Agency may under the current prohibition continue to conduct educational seminars and activities, if should ensure balance in those programs. Balance does not mean merely that there is an acknowledgment of viewpoints different from those of the Administration, but that qualified representatives of those viewpoints are included in the programs and in numbers roughly equal to the participants representing the Administration's positions. One dissenting voice in what is otherwise an obviously stacked or biased program does not constitute balance.

The bill language is intended to prohibit funds provided in this bill from being used to implement actions called for under the

Kyoto Protocol, prior to its ratification. Based on an identical provision in the 1999 Appropriations Act, the bill language prohibits the development of rules, regulations, decrees, orders, and non-regulatory actions, such as programs or initiatives, for the purpose of implementing, or in preparation of implementating the Kyoto Protocol.

The Byrd-Hagel Resolution (S. Res. 98), which passed with a vote of 95–0 in July 1997, remains the clearest statement of the will of the Senate with regard to the Kyoto Protocol. Through the prohibition contained herein, the Committee is committed to ensuring that the Administration not implement the Kyoto Protocol without prior Congressional consent, including approval of any implementing legislation, regulation, programs or initiatives.

It has come to the attention of the Committee that the Agency is proposing to add 40 new ambient air toxics monitors during fiscal year 2000 to the 19 monitors which have already been funded. Because of the potential significance of the information to be gained from this monitoring program and the potential investment needed, the Committee believes that it is important for the Agency to have a well developed plan in place to direct the installation and operation of any new monitors. As a result, the Committee directs EPA to develop a comprehensive plan to guide the Agency's efforts in establishing a monitoring program for air toxics. The plan should describe in detail the overall goals and objectives of the monitoring program, including whether the data generated will be used to: (1) characterize ambient concentrations and the public's exposure to air toxics at the national, regional or local level; (2) quantify public health risks at the national, regional, or local level; (3) guide regulatory decisions; (4) evaluate and improve emissions inventories; (5) validate dispersion models; and/or (6) help identify sources of emissions.

Once the objectives and goals have been determined, the plan should provide information on: (1) the number of monitors and measurements that will be needed to satisfy these goals; (2) the specific pollutants to be measured and the ability of the present technology to make measurements for the specific pollutants; and (3) the approximate level of investment needed over time to meet the program's goals and objectives. It is important that the plan include a realistic assessment of the amount of data likely to be generated given existing and anticipated budgetary expenditures, a timeline for when the data will be available for analysis, and an assessment of the likely usefulness of the data in drawing statistically valid estimates of the public's exposure to air toxics on a national or regional level.

If the data generated from the monitoring program are expected to support regulatory decisions, the plan should list the specific regulatory programs impacted or expected to be impacted and describe in detail how the data will be used to guide decisionmaking. Given the likely strengths and limitations of the data, the plan should also assess how the Agency will integrate the resulting information with other sources of information on air toxics from emission inventories, such as the National Toxics Inventory, and air toxics models, such as the ASPEN model and associated National Air Toxic Assessment. The plan should assure that a significant fraction of the resources expended are dedicated to methodologies, such as personal exposure monitoring, that will allow determination of real exposure of individuals rather than reliance on community ambient monitoring being used as a surrogate. Because of the number of existing State monitors, the plan should also address optimal ways of integrating the information gained at the Federal level with the many existing state monitors now in place.

Once a draft of the plan has been completed, the Committee directs EPA to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to review the draft plan and provide comments to the Agency. The Committee urges the Agency to also seek comments on the draft plan from States and other interested parties and to respond to these comments, as well as the comments of the NAS, in developing the final plan.

The Committee notes with approval the efforts of EPA to address the serious and widespread concerns about the 1994 proposed rule regarding so-called "plant pesticides." To assure any final rule is not over-reaching, the Committee expects the Agency, before completing this rulemaking, to solicit and consider additional public comment regarding exemptions from the rule that were suggested by the Consortium of Eleven Scientific Societies convened to address this matter. The Committee remains skeptical of EPA's proposal to consider the genetic material of plants to be a pesticide.

The Committee strongly encourages EPA's Office of Air and Radiation to collaborate with industry to better integrate zero emission technologies such as solar into its programs, competitive solicitations, education, and information dissemination activities. The OAR is requested to respond to the Committee within three months of passage of this Act on how it intends to implement such collaboration.

The Committee strongly discourages the EPA from finalizing any revisions to the 1980 New Source Review (NSR) rule and strongly encourages EPA instead to continue stakeholder discussions with the states, environmental groups and the regulated community. These discussions to date have produced three broadly supported proposals by the regulated community to simplify and clarify the NSR program. The NSR program plays a critical role in the continued growth and improvement of this nation's industrial base, as review under the program is required before any new facility construction and significant non-routine facility process changes. Under the existing program, this review can take over a year. The regulations as currently written are cumbersome, contradictory, and punitive, and EPA's proposed NSR rule will unfortunately not minimize these problems.

Previous efforts by the Agency to reform the program have been repeatedly rejected by both the states and the regulated community. Through STAPPA and ALAPCO, state representatives have indicated that three alternative proposals continue to provide a constructive basis for further discussions and have asked EPA to provide the time necessary to refine the proposals. These stakeholder discussions represent an outstanding opportunity to avoid the contentious proceedings and litigation that have characterized the previous NSR rulemakings, and the Agency is strongly encouraged to continue in this direction.

Beginning in fiscal year 2000, the Committee strongly encourages the Agency to include Green Thumb, Inc. among the national organizations participating in the Senior Environmental Employment (SEE) program. The Committee expects that the long experience of this organization will be a real asset to the SEE program.

The Committee fully expects the Agency to follow through on its current commitment to the Sustainable Industry program. The program's success thus far with the metal finishing industry has focused on collaboration rather than confrontation with industry, improved EPA understanding of industry practices, and achieving better environmental results from companies in tandem with concrete improvements to the regulatory system. The Agency is encouraged to provide resources at the 1999 level in order to support necessary personnel, outreach, grants, and EPA regional capacity for continued progress with the metal finishing industry and other key participating sectors, including specialty chemicals, meat processing, metal casting, shipbuilding and repair, photo processing, and travel and tourism.

While EPA has a number of programs designed to promote pollution prevention and recycling in industrial processes, few resources have been directed at the reuse of materials. One example is the reuse of industrial packages which include packages used for the transportation or storage of commodities, the contents of which are not meant for retail sale without being repackaged. The Committee encourages the Agency to investigate and promote opportunities for the reuse of industrial packages in their original intended form through reconditioning and remanufacture by working with private sector organizations whose primary purposes include education and research in the field of reusable industrial packages. The Agency is also encouraged to review the need for additional research in this area, as well as to educate small business of the benefits of such reuse.

The Committee is concerned that the EPA is no longer working to remedy a restrictive covenant relating to the proposed Outer Loop Flood Compensation Bank in the Pond Creek watershed of Jefferson County, Kentucky. Instead, the Agency is insisting on a costly, off-site wetlands mitigation plan when on-site mitigation is feasible. The Committee notes that the flood compensation bank is supported by local governments and is desperately needed to reduce the potential for the loss of life and property in the Louisville area. The Committee urges EPA to reconsider its position and work toward a solution which will allow the project to move forward expeditiously.

The Committee is concerned that EPA's recent Lead-based Paint Pre-Renovation Education Rule creates difficulty and confusion for multifamily property owners and residents. The substantial and time-consuming paperwork burden imposed on multifamily property owners/managers through these regulations may impede routine repair and maintenance activities. Lead-hazard education of multifamily residents will be facilitated, the Committee believes, by requiring property owners/managers whose staff perform repairs to (1) annually distribute the pamphlet to residents, (2) notify residents at the time of in unit repairs of the potential disturbance of lead-based paint and the availability of copies of the pamphlet, and

(3) post a notice at the site of the repairs in common areas informing residents of the scope and dates of work and that the pamphlet is available for review.

The Committee believes that EPA should amend this regulation at the earliest possible opportunity to ensure that the rule achieves the statutory goal of educating residents about the danger associated with the disturbance of lead based paint. The Committee also directs EPA to meet regularly with property owners to consider the practical effect of the regulations and to discuss how record-keeping burdens can be minimized in conformance with the statutory direction of child health protection. The Committee intends to consider the results of these meetings and Agency actions during the next budget cycle in determining whether the compliance assistance phase of enforcement should be extended.

The Committee is concerned that EPA is proposing to greatly expand pesticide tolerance processing fees. The Committee expects that EPA not implement the tolerance fee proposal until EPA provides the Committee a report detailing the dramatic increase in the proposed fees. EPA's report should include an analysis of the pre-FQPA costs versus the post-FQPA cost attributed to tolerance development.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation [1]	$30,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	31,154,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	29,409,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−1,154,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+591,000

[1] Total does not include transfer of $11,000,000 from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) provides EPA audit and investigative functions to identify and recommend corrective actions of management, program, and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing and potential instances of fraud, waste, or mismanagement. This account funds personnel compensation and benefits, travel, and expenses (excluding rent, utilities, and security costs) for the Office of Inspector General. The appropriation for the OIG is funded from two separate accounts: Office of Inspector General and Hazardous Substance Superfund.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends a total appropriation of $41,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General, a decrease of $2,391,000 below last year's funding level and an increase of $838,000 above the budget request. Of the amount provided, $11,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account. All funds within this account are to be considered annual monies.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$62,600,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	56,948,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	62,630,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+5,652,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−30,000

This activity provides for the design and construction of EPA-owned facilities as well as for the operations, maintenance, repair, extension, alteration, and improvement of facilities utilized by the agency. The funds are to be used to pay nationwide FTS charges, correct unsafe conditions, protect health and safety of employees and Agency visitors, and prevent serious deterioration of structures and equipment.

The Committee is recommending $62,600,000 for Buildings and Facilities, an increase of $5,652,000 above last year's funding level and a decrease of $30,000 below the budget request. This recommendation provides $36,700,000 for continued construction of the consolidated research center at Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, as well as the budget request of $25,900,000 for necessary maintenance and repair costs at Agency facilities and the ongoing renovation of EPA's new headquarters.

The Committee's proposal to make available $36,700,000 for RTP construction is the final increment necessary to complete this important, state-of-the-art research facility within its maximum authorized cost ceiling.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$1,450,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	1,500,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,500,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−50,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−50,000,000

The Hazardous Substance Superfund (Superfund) program was established in 1980 by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act to clean up emergency hazardous materials, spills, and dangerous, uncontrolled, and/or abandoned hazardous waste sites. The Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) expanded the program substantially in 1986, authorizing approximately $8,500,000,000 in revenues over five years. In 1990, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act extended the program's authorization through 1994 for $5,100,000,000 with taxing authority through calendar year 1995.

The Superfund program is operated by EPA subject to annual appropriations from a dedicated trust fund and from general revenues. Enforcement activities heretofore employed were used to identify and induce parties responsible for hazardous waste problems to undertake clean-up actions and pay for EPA oversight of those actions. In addition, responsible parties have been required to cover the cost of fund-financed removal and remedial actions undertaken at spills and waste sites by Federal and state agencies. Through transfers to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) and Science and Technology Accounts, the OIG and the Office of Research and Development also receive funding from this account.

For fiscal year 2000, $1,450,000,000 has been recommended by the Committee, a decrease of $50,000,000 from last year's funding level, and a decrease of $50,000,000 from the amount included in the budget request. Bill language has been included which transfers $11,000,000 from this account to the Office of Inspector General and $35,000,000 to the Science and Technology account. The Committee expects EPA to prioritize resources to the actual cleanup of sites on the National Priority List and, to the greatest extent possible, limit resources directed to administration, oversight, support, studies, design, investigations, monitoring, assessment, and evaluation.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following program level:

$987,000,000 for Superfund response/cleanup actions. This level of funding includes $90,000,000 for continued Brownfields activities.

$140,000,000 for enforcement activities.

$122,337,000 for management and support. This recommendation includes a transfer of $11,000,000 to the Office of Inspector General. Bill language is included which provides for this transfer.

$35,000,000 for research and development activities, to be transferred to Science and Technology as proposed in the budget request.

$57,000,000 for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), including $34,000,000 for research activities and $23,000,000 for worker training.

$70,000,000 for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR).

$28,663,000 for the Department of Justice.

$10,000,000 for all other necessary, reimbursable interagency activities, including $650,000 for OSHA, $1,100,000 for FEMA, $2,450,000 for NOAA, $4,800,000 for the Coast Guard, and $1,000,000 for the Department of the Interior.

Through adoption of this appropriation, the Committee signals its continued strong support for an active and aggressive Superfund site response action/cleanup effort, including strong and bipartisan support for the Brownfields program as an integral part of the overall program.

Further, the Committee supports the national pilot worker training program which recruits and trains young persons who live near hazardous waste sites or in the communities at risk of exposure to contaminated properties for work in the environmental field. The Committee directs EPA to continue funding this effort in cooperation and collaboration with NIEHS. The research activities of NIEHS can compliment the training and operational activities of EPA in carrying out this program. Moreover, an expanded focus to Brownfield communities—identified as the growing number of contaminated or potentially contaminated vacant or abandoned industrial sites—is critical in order to actively engage and train the under-served populations that are the focus of this effort. While the number of National Priorities List sites is remaining fairly static, there is a growing need for continued assessment activities at Brownfield sites across the country.

The Committee has provided ATSDR an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee encourages ATSDR to continue to provide adequate funds for minority health professions, as well as for continuation of a health effects study on the consumption of Great Lakes fish. Finally, an additional $1,000,000 has been provided for ATSDR to complete its work on the Toms River, New Jersey cancer evaluation and research project.

Of the funds provided for transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund to Science and Technology, the Committee directs that the Agency continue to fund the hazardous substance research centers at a level no less than the 1998 level. In addition, the Committee continues to support the work performed through the Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE) program and directs the Agency to provide no less than $6,500,000 for this program for fiscal year 2000.

In the conference report accompanying the 1999 Appropriations Act, the conferees expressed concern that EPA is requiring dredging of contaminated sediments sites without full analysis of its short and long-term impacts, and urged the Agency to delay dredging actions pending completion of a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study of sediment remedial technologies. The Committee notes with approval that the NAS study is underway, and re-affirms the direction to EPA not to initiate or order dredging, except as noted in the aforementioned conference report, until the NAS study has been completed and the results are appropriately considered by the Agency. The Committee also re-affirms that dredging should only be initiated or ordered in cases where a full analysis of long and short-term health and environmental impacts have been conducted as required by EPA's Contaminated Sediment Management Strategy.

The Committee notes that the number of Superfund sites proceeding through to completion of the cleanup process continues to grow, and recognizes that costs associated with the program, as originally conceived in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), will likely go down in the near future. In order to be better prepared for such a Superfund program reduction, the Agency is directed to conduct, from within available funds in this account, an independent analysis of the projected ten year costs for implementation of the CERCLA program. This analysis should include the annual and cumulative costs to the Trust Fund over the next ten years associated with administering CERCLA activities at NPL sites, including: (1) response costs for completion of all sites currently listed on the NPL; (2) response costs associated with additions to the NPL anticipated for fiscal years 2000 through 2005 consistent with the average rate of new site listings over the previous five years; (3) costs, if any, associated with the operations and management at both existing and anticipated new NPL sites; (4) response costs for emergency removals; (5) non-cleanup costs assigned to other activities including, but not limited to, research, enforcement, administration, and inter-departmental transfers. For purposes of this analysis, costs associated with redevelopment or the Brownfields program should not be considered. The Committee requests that this independent analysis be completed and forwarded to the Committee no later than May 1, 2000.

Once again the Committee notes that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has and will continue to remediate sites under its jurisdiction to a level that fully protects public health and safety, and believes that any reversal of the long-standing policy of the Agency to defer to the NRC for cleanup of NRC licensed sites is not a good use of public or private funds. The interaction of the EPA with the NRC, NRC licensees, and others with regard to sites being remediated under NRC regulatory requirements—when not specifically requested by the NRC—has created stakeholder concerns regarding the authority and finality of NRC licensing decisions, the duration and costs of site cleanup, and the potential future liability of parties associated with affected sites. However, the Committee recognizes that there may be circumstances at specific NRC licensed sites where the Agency's expertise may be of critical use of the NRC. In the interest of ensuring that sites do not face dual regulation, the Committee strongly encourages both agencies to enter into an MOU which clarifies the circumstances for EPA's involvement at NRC sites when requested by the NRC. The EPA and NRC are directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than May 1, 2000 on the status of the development of such an MOU.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$60,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	72,500,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	71,556,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−12,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−11,556,000

Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, authorized the establishment of a response program for clean-up of releases from leaking underground storage tanks. Owners and operators of facilities with underground tanks must demonstrate financial responsibility and bear initial responsibility for clean-up. The Federal trust fund was funded through the now-expired imposition of a motor fuel tax of one-tenth of a cent per gallon, which generated approximately $150,000,000 per year. Most states also have their own leaking underground storage tank programs, including a separate trust fund or other funding mechanism, in place.

The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund provides additional clean-up resources and may also be used to enforce necessary corrective actions and to recover costs expended from the Fund for clean-up activities. The underground storage tank response program is designed to operate primarily through cooperative agreements with states. However, funds are also used for grants to non-state entities including Indian tribes under Section 8001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Per the budget request again this year, the Office of Inspector General will receive no funding by transfer from the trust fund through this appropriation.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee has provided $60,000,000, a decrease of $12,500,000 below last year's appropriated level and a decrease of $11,556,000 from the budget request.

The Committee is aware of concerns expressed by several states that LUST funds not be used in a disproportionate manner for federal projects instead of state projects as anticipated by the authorizing statutes. The Committee concurs in this position of predominate use in the states and notes that its recommendation will allow for approximately 85% of the total appropriation to be used in the states.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$15,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	15,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	15,618,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−618,000

This appropriation, authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, provides funds for preventing and responding to releases of oil and other petroleum products in navigable waterways. EPA is responsible for directing all clean-up and removal activities posing a threat to public health and the environment; conducting site inspections; providing for a means to achieve cleanup activities by private parties; reviewing containment plans at facilities; reviewing area contingency plans; and pursuing cost recovery of fund-financed clean-ups. Funds are provided through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund which is composed of fees and collections made through provisions of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the Comprehensive Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act, the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Pursuant to law, the fund is managed by the United States Coast Guard.

The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, the same as that provided last fiscal year and a decrease of $618,000 from the budget request.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$3,199,957,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	3,408,050,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,837,957,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−208,093,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+362,000,000

The State and Tribal Assistance Grant account was created in fiscal year 1996 in an effort to consolidate programs, and provide grant funds for those programs, which are operated primarily by the states. This budget structure includes the Water Infrastructure/SRF account, which was intended to help eliminate municipal discharge of untreated or inadequately treated pollutants and thereby maintain or help restore this country's water to a swimmable and/or fishable quality, and miscellaneous categorical grant programs formerly included within the Abatement, Control and Compliance account.

The largest portion of the STAG account is the State Revolving Funds (SRF). The Clean Water SRF funds water infrastructure grants, which for more than a decade have been made to municipal, inter-municipal, state, interstate agencies, and tribal governments to assist in financing the planning, design, and construction of wastewater facilities. This account also funds the Safe Drinking Water SRF as well as various grant programs to improve both air and water quality. Among these are non-point source grants under Section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Public Water System Supervision grants, Section 106 water quality grants, and Clean Air Act Section 105/103 air and monitoring grants to the states, and other such grants utilized by the states and tribes to meet Federal environmental statutory and regulatory requirements.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends a total of $3,199,957,000, a decrease of $208,093,000 below the current fiscal year spending level, and $362,000,000 above the level proposed in the budget request.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following program level:

$1,175,000,000 for Clean Water State Revolving Funds.

$775,000,000 for Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Funds.

$884,957,000 for state and tribal program/categorical grants.

$50,000,000 for high priority U.S./Mexico border projects.

$15,000,000 for Alaska rural and Native Villages.

$36,500,000 for Clean Air Partnership Grants.

$263,500,000 for special needs water and wastewater grants, including:

1. $2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Cherokee County ($750,000); South Vinemont ($750,000); and Dodge City ($500,000), Alabama.
2. $1,000,000 for water infrastructure needs in Jefferson County, Alabama.
3. $500,000 for the Dog river watershed project in Mobile, Alabama.
4. $2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Stevenson ($1,000,000) and Athens ($1,000,000), Alabama.
5. $500,000 for water quality monitoring of the Tennessee River basin through the Alabama Department of Environmental Management.
6. $300,000 for the East Wetlands Restoration project in Yuma, Arizona.
7. $1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Fort Chaffee, Arkansas.
8. $3,000,000 for the Coastal Low Flow Storm Drain Diversion project in San Diego, California.
9. $1,500,000 for the removal of *Arundo Donax* on the lower Santa Ana River ($1,000,000); and for restoration of Lake Elsinore ($500,000), California.
10. $3,000,000 for continued construction of the Olivenhain Water District, California water treatment project.
11. $2,000,000 for continued work on the Lake Tahoe, California water export replacement project.
12. $3,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for Arcadia and Sierra Madre ($2,000,000) and the City of San Dimas Walker House ($1,000,000); and for the Desalination Research and Innovation Partnership ($500,000), California.
13. $500,000 for continued development of the Calleguas Creek, California watershed management plan.
14. $4,000,000 for water, wastewater, and system infrastructure development and improvements for the Yucaipa Valley Water District ($2,000,000); the Lower Owens River project in Inyo County ($1,000,000); the Lower Owens River project in the City of Los Angeles ($500,000); and the San Timoteo Creek

environmental restoration project in Redlands ($500,000), California.

15. $2,000,000 for Sacramento, California's combined sewer system improvement and rehabilitation project.

16. $2,500,000 for a desalination facility in Carlsbad ($500,000); for the San Diego wastewater capital improvement program ($1,000,000), and for watershed planning for the community and environmental transportation acceptability process in Riverside County ($1,000,000), California.

17. $1,000,000 for wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements in Huntington Beach, California.

18. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in the Russian River Sanitation District ($500,000), and for continued development of the Santa Rosa Reclaimed Water Recharge project ($500,000), California.

19. $1,600,000 for continuation of water reuse demonstration projects in Yucca Valley ($1,000,000) and Twenty Nine Palms ($600,000), California.

20. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure needs on Mare Island, Vallejo, California.

21. $1,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in New Britain and Southington, Connecticut.

22. $1,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure and combined sewer overflow improvements on the Connecticut River in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

23. $10,000,000 for water, wastewater, and water reuse infrastructure improvements in West Palm Beach, Florida ($2,000,000) and through Florida's five water management district Alternative Water Sources Development program ($8,000,000).

24. $2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements for Opa-locka ($1,000,000) and for the Highland Village neighborhood of North Miami Beach ($1,000,000), Florida.

25. $350,000 for the Leon County, Florida storm water runoff study.

26. $1,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements necessary to reduce effluent discharge into Sarasota Bay, Florida.

27. $500,000 for development of the Deer Point Watershed Protection Zone in Bay County, Florida.

28. $1,000,000 for analysis and development of necessary combined system overflow facilities in Atlanta, Georgia.

29. $1,000,000 for infrastructure development and improvements of the Big Creek watershed programs in the cities of Roswell, Mountain Park, and Brookfield, and Fulton County, Georgia.

30. $1,500,000 for continued work on the basin stormwater retention and reuse project at Big Haynes Creek, Georgia.

31. $1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Blackfoot ($500,000), Jerome ($300,000), and Dietrich ($200,000), Idaho.

32. $7,500,000 for drinking water infrastructure improvements in the cities of DeKalb ($2,500,000); Yorkville

($1,000,000); Elburn ($500,000); Batavia ($1,500,000); Oswego ($1,000,000); and Geneva ($1,000,000), Illinois.

33. $5,000,000 for continued development of the tunnel and reservoir project (TARP) of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District in Chicago, Illinois.

34. $1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Robbins ($500,000) and Phoenix ($500,000), Illinois.

35. $1,000,000 for infrastructure development of the Pigeon Creek Enhancement project in Evansville, Indiana.

36. $500,000 for water quality improvements in the Ohio River Valley through the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission.

37. $2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements within the Gary Sanitary District, Indiana.

38. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Kansas City, Kansas.

39. $1,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure development and improvements in Jessamine County, Kentucky.

40. $1,000,000 for wastewater and drinking water infrastructure improvements in Bonnieville ($600,000) and in the Kentucky Turnpike Water District Division 2 ($400,000), Kentucky.

41. $1,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the West County Wastewater Treatment Plant within the Metropolitan Sewer District of Louisville, Kentucky.

42. $6,400,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure needs for Knott County ($2,000,000); Somerset ($1,400,000); Knox County ($1,000,000); and Harlan ($1,000,000); and McCreary County ($1,000,000), Kentucky.

43. $800,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements within the Henderson County Water District ($500,000); and the Logan/Todd Regional Water System ($300,000), Kentucky.

44. $2,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the East Baton Rouge Parish ($1,000,000); Ascension Parish ($1,250,000); and San Gabriel ($250,000), Louisiana.

45. $1,000,000 for continued restoration of Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.

46. $2,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana.

47. $4,000,000 for New Orleans, Louisiana wastewater infrastructure improvements.

48. $1,500,000 for combined sewer overflow infrastructure support in Middlesex and Essex Counties ($750,000), and for continued wastewater infrastructure improvements in Essex County (4750,000), Massachusetts.

49. $2,000,000 for continued wastewater needs in Bristol County, Massachusetts.

50. $2,000,000 for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements in Boston, Massachusetts.

51. $1,500,000 for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

52. $5,000,000 for continuation of the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration project.

53. $1,000,000 for infrastructure improvements within the Clinton River Watershed, Michigan.

54. $1,000,000 for water and watershed infrastructure improvements and research through Western Michigan University at Kalamazoo, Michigan.

55. $2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Port Huron, Michigan.

56. $2,000,000 for continued development of the Mille Lacs regional wastewater treatment facility, Minnesota.

57. $500,000 for the Hogg Creek Interceptor wastewater infrastructure improvements within the West Rankin Regional Sewage System, Mississippi.

58. $1,000,000 for sewer and wastewater infrastructure needs in Picayune, Mississippi.

59. $3,500,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the DeSoto County Wastewater Treatment Facility ($2,950,000), and the City of Farmington wastewater collection and treatment facility ($550,000), Mississippi.

60. $500,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Lamont, Mississippi.

61. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure evaluation and improvements in Jackson, Mississippi.

62. $2,500,000 for the Meramac River, Missouri enhancement and wetlands protection project.

63. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Jefferson County, Missouri.

64. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the East Missoula wastewater system ($250,000); the El Mar Estates wastewater treatment facility ($250,000); and the Lolo wastewater treatment plant ($500,000), Montana.

65. $450,000 for watershed management improvements in Omaha, Nebraska.

66. $2,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure needs of the Moapa Valley Water District ($500,000) and the City of Fallon ($1,000,000); and for an arsenic groundwater study in Fallon, Nevada.

67. $1,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements in Henderson, Nevada.

68. $2,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Epping, New Hampshire.

69. $5,000,000 for combined sewer overflow requirements of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission, New Jersey.

70. $500,000 for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements of the North Hudson Sewerage Authority, New Jersey.

71. $500,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the South Side Interceptor/Queens Ditch in Newark, New Jersey.

72. $3,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure and development needs in Lovington ($1,500,000) and Belen ($1,500,000), New Mexico.

73. $2,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Bernalillo, New Mexico.

74. $10,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure needs in the New York City watershed.

75. $5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements within the Western Ramapo Sewer District in Rockland County, New York.

76. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements at New York and Pennsylvania treatment facilities which discharge into the Susquehanna River.

77. $1,000,000 for infrastructure improvements at the White Plains water filtration facility, New York.

78. $500,000 for planning and development of the Buffalo Creek watershed, New York.

79. $1,500,000 for phase one of the Genesee County, New York public water supply project.

80. $1,500,000 for continued work on the water quality management plans for the Onondaga and Cayuga County, New York watersheds.

81. $1,000,000 for continued development of South Bronx, New York waste transfer stations.

82. $1,500,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Hamlet of Verona, New York.

83. $1,500,000 for the Lake Water Supply project in Monroe County, New York.

84. $1,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements in Syracuse, New York.

85. $20,000,000 for continued clean water improvements of Onondaga Lake, New York.

86. $1,000,000 for the Mecklenburg County, North Carolina surface water improvement and management program.

87. $2,500,000 for drinking water and wastewater infrastructure improvements of the Buncombe County Metropolitan Sewerage District ($2,000,000), and in the town of Waynesville ($500,000), North Carolina.

88. $2,000,000 for continued development of a storm water abatement system in the Doan Brook Watershed Area, Ohio.

89. $3,000,000 for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements in Port Clinton ($1,500,000) and Van Wert ($1,500,000), Ohio.

90. $1,000,000 for water treatment infrastructure improvements in Girard, Ohio.

91. $2,000,000 for wastewater improvements associated with the Toledo Waste Equalization Basin, Ohio.

92. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Hood River, Oregon.

93. $3,000,000 for continued development of the Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration program in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

94. $1,000,000 for Hampden Township, Pennsylvania wastewater infrastructure improvements.

95. $1,000,000 for continued wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Springettsbury Township and City of York, Pennsylvania.

96. $1,000,000 for planning and development of a master plan of the Susquehanna-Lackawanna, Pennsylvania watershed through the Pennsylvania Geographic Information Consortium.

97. $4,000,000 for groundwater, drinking water and watershed infrastructure restoration and improvements in Carrolltown Borough ($1,650,000); Sipesville ($2,230,000); and the Saint Vincent watershed ($120,000), Pennsylvania.

98. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Roaring Brook Township Sewer Authority ($300,000); the Borough of Olyphant ($300,000); and the Borough of Honesdale ($400,000), Pennsylvania.

99. $1,000,000 for wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements in New Kensington, Pennsylvania.

100. $5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Lewistown Municipal Water Authority ($500,000); Chambersburg Borough ($1,250,000); Hollidaysburg Borough ($1,500,000); Houtzdale Borough Municipal Authority ($200,000); Northern Blair Regional Sewer Authority ($800,000); Metal Township Sewer Authority ($500,000); and Decatur Township ($250,000), Pennsylvania.

101. $2,000,000 for the continued development of water supply needs of the Lake Marion Regional Water Agency, South Carolina.

102. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure development and improvements at the George's Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant, Pickens County, South Carolina.

103. $2,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure improvements of the Sunbright Utility District, Morgan County, Tennessee.

104. $3,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure improvements of the El Paso/Las Cruces Sustainable Water Project.

105. $1,500,000 to conduct a study of the effect of pesticide runoff on inter-urban lakes in Fort Worth, Texas.

106. $2,000,000 for continued development of water supply needs in Brownsville, Texas.

107. $500,000 for the Brazos/Navasota, Texas watershed management initiative.

108. $500,000 for continued development of the Riverton, Utah water reuse system improvement project.

109. $2,000,000 for water infrastructure improvements for the City of Ogden ($1,000,000) and for the former Department of Defense Depot facility in Ogden ($1,000,000), Utah.

110. $10,000,000 for continued development of combined sewer overflow improvements in Richmond ($5,000,000) and Lynchburg ($5,000,000), Virginia.

111. $2,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in western Lee County ($1,250,000) and in Amonate, Tazewell County ($750,000), Virginia.

112. $300,000 for implementation of the Potomac River Visions Initiative through the Friends of the Potomac.

113. $1,500,000 for water system improvements in Metaline Falls, Washington.

114. $1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Huntington, West Virginia.

115. $7,400,000 for water, wastewater, and sewer infrastructure improvements in Davis ($2,000,000); Newburg ($2,000,000); the Chestnut Ridge Public Service District in Barbour County ($2,000,000); and Worthington ($1,400,000), West Virginia.

116. $2,000,000 for continued development of the Metropolitan Milwaukee Sewerage District interceptor system.

117. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Beloit,Wisconsin.

118. $5,900,000 for continuation of the National Community Decentralized Wastewater Demonstration Project to develop and transfer technologies which offer alternatives to centralized wastewater treatment facilities. The three communities of Monroe County, Florida Keys, Florida ($4,000,000); Mobile, Alabama ($1,200,000); and Skaneateles Lake, New York have been added to the demonstration project based on their unique and diverse geology and geography, as well as on the commitment of each community to find appropriate alternative technologies to resolve their wastewater treatment needs. The Committee expects to continue the cost share requirements for these three projects as was provided the first three project communities.

119. $1,500,000 for continued drinking water infrastructure improvements for Bad Axe, Michigan.

120. $1,500,000 for drinking water infrastructure needs in Jackson County, Ohio.

The Committee notes that there is a long-standing cost share requirement of 45% for the recipients of these special needs grants. The Committee, however, again expects the Agency to work closely with the governments or entities receiving such special needs grants to, when appropriate, be flexible in the application of the historical cost share requirements of this program.

The Committee has provided the full budget request for state and tribal program assistance/categorical grants for all activities. This recommendation includes categorical grants for the following programs: (1) air resource assistance to State, local and tribal governments under section 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act, as amended; (2) Pesticides Program implementation; (3) pesticides enforcement; (4) hazardous waste financial assistance; (5) lead grants; (6) pollution prevention; (7) toxic substances enforcement; (8) underground storage tanks; (9) public water system supervision; (10) underground injection control; (11) wetlands State program development; (12) section 319 of FWPCA non-point source pollution grants, including programs formerly eligible under the section 314 Clean Lakes program; (13) water pollution control agency resource supplementation under section 106 of FWPCA; (14) water quality cooperative agreements under section 104(b)(3) of FWPCA and; (15) Indians general assistance; and (16) radon State grants.

As was the case in the past three fiscal years, no reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes applying for Partnership grants need to be submitted to the Committee for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations.

Bill language is included at the request of the President which permits the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to hereafter use funds appropriated under section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to make grants to Indian Tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act. Bill language, similar to language carried in the 1999 Appropriation Act, has also been included which for fiscal year 2000 and prior years permits states to include as principal amounts considered to be the cost of administering or capitalizing State Revolving Fund loans to eligible borrowers.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$5,108,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	5,026,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	5,201,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+93,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−93,000

The Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) was created by the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976. OSTP advises the President and other agencies within the Executive Office on science and technology policies and coordinates research and development programs for the Federal Government.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,108,000 for fiscal year 2000, an increase of $93,000 from the fiscal year 1999 appropriation and a decrease of $93,000 from the President's budget request.

The Committee commends the work of OSTP's Working Group on Structural Biology at Synchrotron Radiation Facilities based upon the report issued in January, 1999 on this subject. The Working Group examined synchrotron facilities that were operated by the U.S. Department of Energy. Those facilities, however, provided time for users from a variety of backgrounds and research interests including energy and biomedical areas. In reviewing these dual purpose facilities, the Working Group concluded that, because of the multiple research purposes of these facilities, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) could appropriately share in some of the costs associated with these facilities. The Working Group also noted that other facility or instrumentation areas that also might be candidates for such funding approaches included high-field nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR). As this area is of interest to the Committee and to other agencies, including the National Science Foundation, the Committee requests that the Science Advisor instruct the Working Group to undertake a similar review of funding opportunities, coordinated siting and support approaches, and future development strategies for the next generation of high-field NM technologies. Such a report would be particularly useful as a tool for assessing scientific and funding opportunities for the next fiscal year, and would hope to have a preliminary report on this matter prior to April 1, 2000.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$2,827,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	2,675,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,020,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+152,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−193,000

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was established by Congress under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The Office of Environmental Quality (OEQ), which provides professional and administrative staff for the Council, was established in the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970. The Council on Environmental Policy has statutory responsibility under NEPA for environmental oversight of all Federal agencies and is to lead interagency decision-making of all environmental matters.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee has recommended $2,827,000 for the CEQ and OEQ, an increase of $152,000 above last year's spending level and a decrease of $193,000 from the budget request.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$33,666,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	34,666,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	33,666,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−1,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

Funding for the Office of the Inspector General at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is provided pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1105(a)(25), which requires a separate appropriation account for appropriations for each Office of Inspector General of an establishment defined under section 11(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978.

The Committee recommendation, the same as the budget request, provides for the transfer of $33,666,000 from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund to finance the Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2000.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$880,737,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	2,870,254,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,401,725,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−1,989,517,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−2,520,988,000

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was created by reorganization plan number 3 of 1978. The Agency carries out a wide range of program responsibilities for emergency planning and preparedness, disaster response and recovery, and hazard mitigation.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends $880,737,000 which represents a decrease of $1,989,517,000 from the fiscal year 1999 appropriations and a decrease of $2,520,988,000 from the 2000 budget request.

Of the amounts approved in the following appropriations accounts, the Agency must limit transfers of funds between programs and activities to not more than $500,000 without prior approval of the Committee. Further, no changes may be made to any account or program element if it is construed to be a change in policy. Any program or activity mentioned in this report shall be construed as the position of the Committee and should not be subject to any reductions or reprogrammings without prior approval of the Committee.

DISASTER RELIEF

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$300,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	2,343,745,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,780,425,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−2,043,745,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−2,480,425,000

The Federal Emergency Management Agency has responsibility for administering disaster assistance programs and coordinating the Federal response in Presidentially declared disasters. Major activities under the disaster assistance program are human services which provides aid to families and individuals; infrastructure which supports the efforts of State and local governments to take emergency protective measures, clear debris and repair infrastructure damage; hazard mitigation which sponsors projects to diminish effects of future disasters; and disaster management, such as disaster field office staff and automated data processing support.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends $300,000,000 for disaster relief, the same as the budget request for regular aappropriations. The Committee has not included emergency appropriations of $2,480,425,000 as requested by the President.

PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	0
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	$30,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−30,000,000

The budget request for fiscal year 2000 proposes a new account for Pre-disaster Mitigation programs. In the past, this activity has been funded within the Emergency Management Planning and Assistance account. The Committee recommends no funding in this new account in fiscal year 2000. Instead, the Committee has included this activity as part of the Emergency Management and Planning Assistance account at the same level as provided in fiscal year 1999, $25,000,000.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

STATE SHARE LOAN

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$1,295,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	1,355,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,295,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−60,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	($25,000,000)	$420,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	(25,000,000)	440,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	(25,000,000)	420,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	(0)	−20,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	(0)	0

Beginning in 1992, loans made to States under the cost sharing provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act were funded in accordance with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. The Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account, which was established as a result of the Federal Credit Reform Act, records the subsidy costs associated with the direct loans obligated beginning in 1992 to the present, as well as administrative expenses of this program.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends $1,295,000 for the cost of State Share Loans, the same as the President's request and a decrease of $60,000 from the fiscal year 1999 level. In addition, the Committee has provided $25,000,000 for the limitation on direct loans pursuant to Section 319 of the Stafford Act, as well as $420,000 for administrative expenses of the program.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$177,720,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	171,138,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	189,720,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+6,582,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−12,000,000

This activity encompasses the salaries and expenses required to provide executive direction and administrative staff support for all agency programs in both the headquarters and field offices. The account funds both program support and executive direction activities.

The Committee recommends $177,720,000 for salaries and expenses, a decrease of $12,000,000 from the budget request and an increase of $6,582,000 when compared to fiscal year 1999. The amount recommended by the Committee should be sufficient to fund all current employees with some modest growth for those areas where the agency's mission has been expanded. The Committee recommendation includes funding for modest growth in the areas of anti-terrorism and Project Impact. The Committee is not convinced that a more than 10% growth in personnel is necessary in order to implement the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Panel Reports on improving the operation of the United States Fire Administration and directs FEMA to prioritize its spending with this in mind.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$6,515,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	5,400,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	8,015,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+1,115,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−1,500,000

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) was established administratively within FEMA at the time of the Agency's creation in 1979. Through a program of audits, investigations and inspections, the OIG seeks to prevent and detect fraud and abuse and promote economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the Agency's programs and operations. Although not originally established by law, FEMA's OIG was formed and designed to operate in accordance with the intent and purpose of the Inspector General Act of 1978. The Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988 created a statutory Inspector General within FEMA.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,515,000 for the Office of Inspector General, an increase of $1,115,000 above the fiscal year 1999 appropriation and a decrease of $1,500,000 from the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$280,787,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	240,824,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	250,850,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+39,963,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	+29,937,000

This appropriation provides program resources for the majority of FEMA's "core" activities, including, response and recovery; preparedness, training and exercises; mitigation programs, fire prevention and training; information technology services; operations support; and executive direction. Costs for the floodplain management component are borne by policyholders and reimbursed from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

The Committee recommends a fiscal year 2000 appropriation of $280,787,000, an increase of $39,963,000 to the fiscal year 1999 level and an increase of $29,937,000 to the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

The budget request included a new account for pre-disaster mitigation at a value of $30,000,000. The Committee does not agree that the new account is required and instead has included $25,000,000 within the EMPA account. This funding will continue the Project Impact program which leverages local government and private funding to encourage communities across the country to become disaster resistant. With more than 100 communities already part of the program, the Committee encourages FEMA's continued support to those communities to ensure the initiative has a long term effect on reducing disaster costs.

The Committee supports the basic conclusions of the Blue Ribbon Panel Reports on improving the operation of the United States Fire Administration but finds the funding increases requested to implement the findings may be too aggressive at this time and recommends a reduction of $5,000,000 to this activity. This reduction will still allow for an increase of over $6,000,000 for Fire Prevention and Training activities, an increase of over 24% when compared to the fiscal year 1999 funding level. The Committee fully supports the initiative to improve and expand the National Fire Incident Reporting System and directs FEMA to work with the Consumer Product Safety Commission to ensure that the Commission's work receives a benefit from the reporting system improvements.

The budget request includes an initiative to focus on emergency management professional development at a cost of $10,000,000 in fiscal year 2000. The Committee does not support this initiative in the current fiscal environment and denies the funding request.

The Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $4,000,000 to the budget request for anti-terrorism activities. The Committee notes that the budget request included an increase of over $10,000,000 for this activity. The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recently held hearings on federal anti-terrorism programs. The conclusion of the hearing was that waste and confusion is rife within the fragmented federal anti-terrorism programs. In light of the hearings held by the Committee responsible for program oversight, this Committee is concerned that a 100% growth in funding may not be used in a responsible manner. The Committee has included funding for modest personnel increases and a modest expansion of programs, but cautions FEMA to ensure that none of FEMA's efforts should be structured in such a way as to duplicate the activities of other federal anti-terrorism programs.

The Committee supports FEMA's initiative to consolidate non-disaster funds to State Emergency Management Agencies into the Emergency Management Performance Grant. Through this consolidation, grant processing will be streamlined, reporting requirements will be simplified, and States will better meet their emergency management priorities. The Committee understands that the EMPG is the next evolution of the partnerships developed with States through the Performance Partnership Agreements and notes that FEMA's initiative is consistent with a recent Office of Inspector General recommendation.

The Committee directs FEMA to ensure that, in exchange for the additional flexibility provided through the EMPG, States are held accountable for EMPG funds by tying such funds to performance measures. FEMA is expected to provide adequate financial and programmatic accountability in order to demonstrate appropriate use of EMPG funds.

The Committee acknowledges that the cost share developed for the EMPG is a composite cost share based on the cost share policies for the funding sources contributing funds to the EMPG, and that the State may use the consolidated grant for any purpose(s) authorized by any of the program authorities included in the grant, without regard to the proportion of the grant that was made based on any one of those programs.

The Committee recommendation includes the following increases to the budget request:

1. $1,000,000 for a state emergency communications center to be co-located with the National Guard at Fort Harrison in Montana.
2. $2,000,000 for construction of a hurricane shelter in Milton, Florida.

3. $1,237,000 for the repair/construction of the Tracy Fire Station Number 1 in the City of Tracy, California.

4. $1,000,000 for the installation of wave monitoring buoys in the Gulf of Mexico off the Louisiana coast.

5. $2,500,000 for a windstorm simulation project at Florida International University.

6. $400,000 for upgrades to the computer modeling capability of FEMA and the California Office of Emergency Services. Specifically, the Regional Assessment of Mitigation Priorities computer program is to be upgraded to evaluate earthquake disaster mitigation projects.

7. $6,300,000 for Disaster Resistant Universities, including $3,300,000 for Syracuse University, $1,000,000 for South Florida University, and $2,000,000 for California States University, San Bernardino.

8. $6,000,000 for continuation of the seismic retrofit project at Loma Linda University Hospital utilizing laser technology.

9. $1,500,000 for the commercialization of emergency response technologies, to be performed by the National Technology Transfer Center.

10. $1,000,000 for the Operations Support Directorate to archive key agency documents by digitalization to optical disks.

11. $1,000,000 for FEMA to conduct a Logistical Staging Area concept demonstration of civil-military cooperation. This concept will include warehouse facilities at the Stanly County Airport located in North Carolina that will assist emergency management planning and logistical support assistance on a regional basis.

12. $2,000,000 for a seismic retrofit project at the University of Redlands, Redlands, California.

The Committee is concerned with FEMA's proposed re-write of the regulations pertaining to the Public Assistance Insurance Requirements. The proposal could place an enormous financial burden on states, local governments, school districts, private non-profit hospitals, and universities. In light of these potential impacts and action already taken by the House of Representatives through the Disaster Mitigation and Cost Reduction Act, the Committee directs the General Accounting Office to conduct a study to determine the financial impacts of FEMA's proposed regulation. This study should also analyze and compare current and future expected availability and cost of disaster insurance for public infrastructure eligible for FEMA's Public Assistance Program. The Committee directs FEMA to withhold its proposed disaster insurance regulations until the GAO report has been submitted and reviewed by the House and Senate.

The Committee directs FEMA to develop an evacuation plan for a Category 3 or greater storm, a levee break, flood or other natural disaster for the New Orleans area; including the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson, Lafourche, St. Bernard, Plaquemines, St. Charles and Terrebonne. FEMA should incorporate the feasibility of a vertical evacuation into multi-level structures and identify evacuation problems and infrastructure improvements and is directed to work with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, Louisiana Office of Emergency Preparedness, New Orleans Regional Planning Commission, and Terrebonne Readiness and Action Committee in the preparation of this plan and report.

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND

The fiscal year 1999 bill included language establishing the Radiological Emergency Preparedness Fund. The Committee recommendation includes continuation of this Fund in fiscal year 2000.

The Committee directs the FEMA Director to deliver to the Committee, by March 31, 2000, an implementation plan to address the Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program Strategic Review recommendations developed in 1998, including program-enhancing priorities, responsibilities, implementation requirements, and schedules. Following submittal of the plan, the Director shall provide to the Committee by July 2000 a report on the status of implementation.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$110,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	100,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	125,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−15,000,000

The Emergency Food and Shelter Program within the Federal Emergency Management Agency originated in the 1983 Emergency Jobs legislation. Minor modifications were incorporated in the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. The program is designed to help address the problems of the hungry and homeless. Appropriated funds are awarded to a National Board to carry out programs for sheltering and feeding the needy. This program is nationwide in scope and provides such assistance through local private voluntary organizations and units of government selected by local boards in areas designated by the National Board as being in highest need.

The Committee has recommended $110,000,000 for the Emergency Food and Shelter Program, an increase of $10,000,000 when compared to the fiscal year 1999 funding level and $15,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee continues to believe this is a well run and very worthwhile program and acknowledges and appreciates the support and commitment to the program by many religious and charity organizations.

Once again this year, bill language is included which limits administrative costs to 3.5% for fiscal year 2000.

FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION FUND

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$5,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	0

The budget request included a proposal to establish a Flood Map Modernization Fund. The goal of the fund would be to create a mechanism to collect revenue and distribute funds for the modernization of flood plain maps. Many flood plain maps are over 30 years old and are in dire need of replacement using more accurate and modern technology to ensure that properties are properly categorized with respect to their flood risk. The Committee applauds the goal of such a fund, but has significant objections to the financing scheme which was proposed in the budget. The budget proposal of assessing a $15 fee on each federally regulated mortgage would impose an inequitable tax on homeowners and an administrative burden on mortgage processors. At this time the Committee recommends establishing the fund with an appropriation of $5,000,000, but notes that on-going operation of the fund will require additional funding. FEMA is encouraged to propose mechanisms other than the fee on federally regulated mortgages in order to fully finance this program.

Of the funds provided, $2,000,000 is to be provided to the New York Department of Environmental Conservation for initiating the Statewide Flood Plain Mapping Program. The funding will be used for re-mapping of high priority MRIP communities and will be performed using advanced GIS-based hydrologic and hydraulic modeling software and methods which have been developed in cooperation with and approved by FEMA.

The Committee directs the Federal Emergency Management Agency to revisit the issue of flood zone remapping for Gulf County, Florida. In addition, the Committee directs the Federal Emergency Management Agency to report to the Committee on the procedures used by the agency to develop new flood zone maps when the region in question is also a Coastal Barrier Resources Act zone.

NATIONAL INSURANCE DEVELOPMENT FUND

The National Insurance Development Fund was established from the proceeds of the Riot Reinsurance Program. It was also used as the vehicle for funding the Federal Crime Insurance Program and it received deposits for crime insurance premiums and other receipts. In the process of carrying out its responsibilities under this program, FEMA incurred debts as a result of borrowings for the NIDF. The budget request includes a provision which liquidates these borrowings by forgiving the debt and the interest on the borrowings.

The Committee agrees with FEMA that this matter should be closed and recommends inclusion of the necessary language to forgive the indebtedness. The cost of forgiving the interest on this debt is less than $500,000.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

The Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 requires the purchase of insurance in communities where it is available as a condition for receiving various forms of Federal financial assistance for acquisition and construction of buildings or projects within special flood hazard areas identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. All existing buildings and their contents in communities where flood insurance is available, through either the emergency or regular program, are eligible for a first layer of coverage of subsidized premium rates.

Full risk actuarial rates are charged for new construction or substantial improvements commenced in identified special flood hazard areas after December 31, 1974, or after the effective date of the flood insurance rate map issued to the community, whichever is later. For communities in the regular program, a second layer of flood insurance coverage is available at actuarial rates on all properties, and actuarial rates for both layers apply to all new construction or substantial improvements located in special flood hazard areas. The program operations are financed with premium income augmented by Treasury borrowings.

The Committee has included bill language proposed in the budget request for salaries and expenses to administer the fund, not to exceed $24,333,000, and for mitigation activities, not to exceed $78,710,000. Also included is a limitation of $20,000,000 for expenses under Section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, which shall be available for transfer to the National Flood Mitigation Fund.

The Committee is aware that authorization to write new policies during fiscal year 2000 does not currently exist. The Committee urges the passage of appropriate authorizing legislation prior to September 30, 1999 to ensure continuation of this program.

NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$20,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	$32,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriations	+20,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−12,000,000

The budget request includes a new program to address the issue of repetitive loss properties within the National Flood Insurance Program. This new program would target properties with a high incidence of repetitive losses, and offer removal or elevation of structures with the goal of significantly reducing the future costs of the National Flood Insurance Fund. The budget proposal would finance this program with a transfer of $20,000,000 from the National Flood Insurance Fund and $12,000,000 in direct budget authority. The Committee commends FEMA for addressing this very real problem and endorses the effort. Unfortunately, the Committee does not have sufficient resources to fully fund the budget proposal. Therefore, the Committee recommends $20,000,000 for this effort in fiscal year 2000, to be derived by transfer from the National Flood Insurance Program. The Committee is aware of a number of areas in the country where repetitive flood losses have occurred. In particular, the Committee has had brought to its attention the situation of six jurisdictions of the Johnson Creek watershed in Oregon. It appears that this location would qualify for further buyout activities under this program. FEMA is encouraged to review the situation in Oregon and take whatever action is appropriate.

General Services Administration

CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$2,622,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	2,619,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,622,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+3,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	0

The Consumer Information Center (CIC) helps Federal departments and agencies promote and distribute consumer information and promotes public awareness of existing government publications through dissemination of a consumer information catalog and other media programs.

The Consumer Information Center Fund, a revolving fund established by Public Law 98–63, provides for the efficient operation of the Consumer Information Center. The revolving fund finances CIC activities through annual appropriations, reimbursement from agencies for distribution costs, fees collected from the public, and incidental income.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,622,000 for fiscal year 2000. This is an increase of $3,000 from the fiscal year 1998 level and the same as the fiscal year 2000 budget request. The bill also includes a limitation of $7,500,000 on the availability of the revolving fund. Any revenues accruing to this fund during fiscal year 2000 in excess of this amount shall remain in the fund and are not available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

The Director of the Consumer Information Center has significant responsibilities for management and execution of the programs within the Consumer Information Center. At the present time, the Director's position is a GM–15 grade which does not appear to reflect the responsibilities of the position. The Committee directs the General Services Administration to review the classification level of the position of Director of the Consumer Information Center and to provide a recommendation to the Committee with the fiscal year 2001 budget.

The Consumer Information Center Fund is comprised of appropriated dollars and contributions from other governmental and non-governmental sources. Each year the CIC provides the Congress with an accounting of the Fund, showing expected income and expenditures for the current fiscal year and the next fiscal year. The latest report shows an expected balance at the end of fiscal year 2000 of only $230,000. Based upon the experience of prior years, the Fund will have a negative balance by the end of fiscal year 2001 unless a cash infusion is provided through either an increase in gifts or a significant one-time appropriation. The Committee has not taken any action at this time to provide additional appropriated dollars, but may need to do so prior to the start of fiscal year 2001 to avoid depletion of the Fund.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$12,653,800,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	13,665,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	13,578,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−1,011,200,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−924,600,000

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created by the National Space Act of 1958. NASA conducts space and aeronautics research, development, and flight activity designed to ensure and maintain U.S. preeminence in space and aeronautical endeavors.

The Committee recommends a total program level of $12,653,800,000 in fiscal year 2000, which is a decrease of $924,600,000 from the budget request and $1,011,200,000 below the fiscal year 1999 enacted appropriation.

The Committee recognizes that the funding reduction for NASA is significant. However, when looked at on a program-by-program or project-by-project basis, the recommendations are less severe than they appear at first. Projects which are specifically noted for cancellation are for the most part very early in their development, so sunk costs are minimal and long-term savings are significant. This is true in the case of Contour and LightSAR. Additionally, other reductions are in the budgets for planning future missions and technology development, and many of these budgets have grown significantly over the last two years. Examples include: supporting research and technology within the Space Science account, which has increased by over $250,000,000 since fiscal year 1998; planning for future missions in the Explorer and Discovery programs, which have increased by $145,000,000 since fiscal year 1998; Earth Probes funding has increased over $100,000,000 since fiscal year 1998; and the Earth Observing System Data Information System program has expended more than $1,600,000,000 since its inception and has delivered minimal products to NASA despite this expenditure. Numerous other examples could be sited, these are only the most compelling reasons which justify the reductions proposed by the Committee.

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$5,388,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	5,480,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	5,638,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−92,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−250,000,000

This appropriation provides for human space flight activities, including development of the international space station and operation of the space shuttle. This account also includes support of planned cooperative activities with Russia, upgrades to the performance and safety of the space shuttle, and required construction projects in direct support of the space station and space shuttle programs.

The Committee recommends a total of $5,388,000,000 for the human space flight account in fiscal year 2000. The recommendation is a decrease of $250,000,000 from the budget request and $92,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 enacted appropriation.

The Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $100,000,000 from the budget request for the International Space Station and $150,000,000 from the budget request for Space Shuttle Operations. The Committee received many requests for additional funding for the upgrades to the shuttle but was unable to accommodate the additional funding at this time. The Committee will continue to monitor the shuttle program and may be able to address this issue prior to final enactment of this bill. The Committee remains committed to safe operation of the space shuttle program and does not believe the funding reduction proposed will jeopardize the program's record of safe operations.

The Committee applauds the progress being made by NASA and its partners in the assembly of the International Space Station. However, the Committee remains concerned that continued progress may be hampered if Russian assets continue to be diverted to the MIR space station. It is imperative that the MIR space station not become a drain on the limited financial resources of Russia. It is also vital that the infrastructure in central Asia, as well as Russian Soyuz and Progress vehicles, remain dedicated to the priority of supporting assembly and operation of the International Space Station. NASA is directed to take all action necessary to ensure that the MIR station does not become a liability to the International Space Station program and that Russia lives up to its previous commitments to assist in the assembly and operations of the International Space Station.

The Committee continues to be concerned about increasing requirements and costs in the International Space Station program. While Congress has advocated introducing more commercialization and privatization into the ISS program, the Committee sees little progress at NASA toward implementing this direction. The Committee believes long-term cost savings will result from more commercial involvement and endorses the White House stated policy that commercially available goods and services should be purchased to the maximum extent possible. To this end, the Committee directs NASA to aggressively consider commercial proposals for ISS program requirements. Except for cases involving national security or public safety concerns, when a commercial provider proposes a solution that meets mission requirements in a cost-effective manner, the agency must accept the commercial proposal. If NASA determines it is not in the best interest of the government for reasons other than national security or public safety, NASA must demonstrate the reasons for pursuing a non-commercial solution. In cases involving cost comparisons between government and commercial options, NASA must compare the proposed commercial price against the full cost associated with the government solution, including fixed costs for maintaining government assets. The Committee believes it is critical that NASA not compete with commercial providers for routine space hardware and service requirements. NASA must endeavor to create an environment that fosters the growth of a commercial space industry to service commercial ISS users. It is the Committee's strong belief that utilizing commercial services at this time will help control long-term ISS costs and encourage more commercial interest in the ISS program.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$4,975,700,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	5,653,900,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	5,424,700,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−678,200,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−449,000,000

This appropriation provides for the research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These activities include: space science, life and microgravity science, earth sciences, aeronautical research and technology, advanced concepts and technology, launch services, and academic programs. Funds are also included for the construction, maintenance, and operation of programmatic facilities.

The Committee recommends $4,975,700,000 for Science, Aeronautics and Technology in fiscal year 2000. The amount recommended is $449,000,000 below the budget request. The amount provided includes a decrease of $240,800,000 for Space Science, an increase of $7,000,000 for Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, a decrease of $285,000,000 for Earth Sciences, an increase of $43,500,000 for Aero-Space Technology, no change to the budget request for Mission Communications Services, and an increase of $26,300,000 for Academic Programs. Specific program adjustments are explained below.

SPACE SCIENCE

For space science programs, the Committee recommends the following changes to the budget request:

1. Reduce funding for future planning for the Explorer program by $60,000,000.
2. Reduce funding for future planning for the Discovery program future mission by $60,000,000.
3. Cancellation of the Contour mission for a savings of $50,000,000.
4. Reduce funding for supporting research and technology by $95,800,000 of which $60,800,000 is to be taken from the Technology program and $35,000,000 is to be taken from the Research program.
5. An increase of $10,000,000 for Space Solar Power.
6. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Science Center at Glendale Community College.
7. An increase of $1,500,000 for the Louisville Science Center.
8. An increase of $1,500,000 for the Science Center Initiative at Ohio Wesleyan University.
9. An increase of $5,000,000 for the Polymer Energy Rechargeable System.
10. An increase of $2,000,000 for the center on life in extreme thermal environments at Montana State University in Bozeman.
11. An increase of $3,000,000 for the Adler Planetarium in Chicago, Illinois.
12. NASA is directed to provide a total of $20,000,000 for fundamental physics research.

LIFE AND MICROGRAVITY SCIENCES

For Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications, the Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

1. An increase of $1,000,000 for the “Garden Machine” program at Texas Tech University.
2. An increase of $4,000,000 for the Space Radiation program at Loma Linda University Hospital.
3. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Neutron Therapy Facility at Fermilab.

As part of the fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill, the Congress provided $15,000,000 and directed NASA to conduct research using the shuttle for a dedicated mission. NASA declined to pursue such a mission, citing a lack of resources. The Committee reiterates that providing regular research flight opportunities for life and microgravity sciences during space station assembly is critical for providing scientists the opportunity to develop research capabilities needed for optimal utilization of the station. The Committee is dismayed that, despite numerous expressions of concern from the Congress on this issue, and the provision of extra funds, NASA has not yet responded to include additional research flights in its shuttle launch schedule. The current plan includes only one life and microgravity research shuttle mission over at least a 5-year period from 1999 through 2004. This is unacceptable. The Committee directs NASA to use the $15,000,000 provided in fiscal year 1999 to pursue near-term flight opportunities for life and microgravity sciences. Specifically, NASA should use the funding to increase the research allocation on STS–107 and to initiate work on a new research mission in the early fiscal year 2002 timeframe. The Committee believes annual dedicated life and microgravity research flights during the space station assembly period are essential and directs NASA to actively pursue this goal.

EARTH SCIENCES

For Earth Sciences, the Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

1. Cancellation of the GLOBE program for a savings of $5,000,000.
2. A reduction of $100,000,000 from the Earth Probes program, including cancellation of the TRIANA program, the LightSAR program, and the Earth System Science Pathfinders program.
3. The Earth Observing System budget request is reduced by $150,000,000, consisting of $60,000,000 from the Technology Infusion program, $40,000,000 reduction in algorithm development, and $50,000,000 from the EOS follow-on effort.
4. The Earth Observing System Data Information System budget request is reduced by $51,000,000.
5. An increase of $2,000,000 for a Remote Sensing Center for Geoinformatics at the University of Mississippi.
6. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Advanced Tropical Remote Sensing Center of the National Center for Tropical Remote Sensing Applications and Resources at the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science.

7. An increase of $10,000,000 for the Regional Application Center in Cayuga County, New York.

8. An increase of $2,500,000 for a joint U.S./Italian space-based research initiative for the study and detection of forest fires.

9. An increase of $3,000,000 for continuation of programs at the American Museum of Natural History.

10. An increase of $1,500,000 for a remote sensing center at the Fulton-Montgomery Community College in New York. The center is to work through the Regional Application Center at Cayuga County, New York.

11. An increase of $1,000,000 for continued development of the nickel metal hydride battery.

The Committee is disappointed in NASA's effort to use unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) to meet science requirements. The ERAST program has spent in excess of $100,000,000 over the past five years to push the development of operational UAV platforms. ERAST is close to completing its technology objectives, and the Office of Space Science should now design a robust program to utilize this new scientific platform.

The Committee understands that NASA's current plans include only a minimal UAV science demonstration, to provide an individual scientist with a flight opportunity on an aircraft of choice. This level of commitment is inadequate. The National Academy of Sciences has urged that there be a sound balance between "in situ" and space-based observations in the Global Climate Change Program. Further, they have stated that "innovative treatment of the nation's research aircraft capability, both piloted and robotic is strongly advised."

The Committee urges NASA's Office of Earth Science to make a strategic commitment to UAV platforms by devising a program that is structured to create a business incentive for platform providers. In this regard, the Committee requests a report outlining NASA's five year plan for UAVs as a scientific platform, including a projected budget profile that is not confined within the existing manned aircraft budget. In particular, NASA should closely examine the alternative of leased services or fractional ownership arrangements to meet these goals. The Committee requests this report by November 15, 1999 and expects NASA's fiscal year 2001 budget request to reflect this plan.

AERO-SPACE TECHNOLOGY

For Aero-space Technology, the Committee recommends the following adjustment to the budget request:

1. An increase of $25,000,000 for Ultra Efficient Engine Technology.

2. An increase of $1,800,000 for phase two of the synthetic vision information system being tested at the Dallas-Ft.Worth Airport.

3. An increase of $1,200,000 for continued support of the Dynamic Runway Occupancy Measurement System demonstration at the Seattle-Tacoma Airport.

4. An increase of $2,000,000 to facilitate the acquisition of a 16 beam SOCRATES system and integration of SOCRATES into the AVOSS program.

5. An increase of $5,000,000 for the Trailblazer program at the Glenn Research Center.

6. An increase of $500,000 for the Institute for Software Research to continue its collaborative effort with NASA-Dryden, focusing on adaptive flight control research and fault tolerant systems.

7. An increase of $1,500,000 for the Software Optimization and Reuse Technology program.

8. An increase of $2,000,000 for the establishment of the NASA-Illinois Technology Commercialization Center as an extension of the Midwest Regional Technology Transfer Center, to be located at the DuPage County Research Park.

9. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Florida Technological Research and Development Authority to develop a technology-oriented business incubator in Homestead, Florida.

10. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Earth Alert program for a test of the system throughout the State of Maryland.

11. An increase of $1,500,000 for the National Technology Transfer Center, to bring total funding for the center up to $7,200,000.

Last year the Committee noted its interest in the work being done for NASA by the Schepens Eye Research Institute. The Committee is aware that much of the research being conducted by the Institute's Center of the Aging Eye may be of use to NASA when astronauts begin to spend extended periods of time in space. With this in mind, the Committee directs NASA to provide a report which addresses the research conducted by the Institute for NASA and further opportunities for research.

The Committee encourages NASA to work in coordination with the Department of Energy and other interested federal agencies on an investigation of the cavitative physics behind the patented Micro-Combustion Heat Engine prototype technology developed by Micro-Combustion, L.L.P. The Committee is encouraged by initial NASA investigations and believes this new technology represents an energy breakthrough deserving of further study. Understanding the national security concerns associated with this technology, the Committee requests NASA inform the Committee in writing, with respect to its intentions, no later than January 30, 2000.

The Committee is aware of the unique closed system capabilities of Biosphere 2 Center, the earth system research facility located in Oracle, Arizona. The Committee directs NASA, after consultation with Biosphere 2, to submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment of this Act, that details potential partnerships between NASA and Biosphere 2 to enhance the research capabilities of NASA.

The Committee is pleased to note that NASA has included in the budget request $18,000,000 for the NASA-Ames Software Independent Verification and Validation Facility in Fairmont, West Virginia.

The Committee supports NASA's plan to transition the ERAST alliance into a competitive process to meet its original ERAST objectives. Further, the Committee is aware of NASA's interest in reaching 100,000 feet using solar power. However, the Committee urges NASA to ensure that the project's primary focus support technologies that will enable an operational unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) platform to meet the established science requirements of the Office of Earth Science. In particular, NASA should support over-the-horizon command-and-control protocols and work to ensure platform integration within the national airspace system. As NASA "down selects" to one consumable fuel UAV, the Committee believes NASA must ensure an appropriate transition phase for other alliance partners. Although the change in direction of the ERAST program is warranted, the Committee urges that the transition be implemented in such a manner that it not undermine the viability of NASA's investment in the alliance member companies.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

For Academic Programs, the Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

1. An increase of $6,500,000 for the National Space Grant College and Fellowship program, bringing the total funding for this program to $19,100,000.
2. An increase of $1,500,000 for the Franklin Institute for development of an exhibit on astronomy.
3. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Sci-Quest, the North Alabama Science Center.
4. An increase of $2,300,000 for the JASON Foundation's JASON XI expedition, "Going to Extremes."
5. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Carl Sagan Discovery Center at the Children's Hospital at Montefiore Medical Center.
6. An increase of $4,000,000 for the Texas Learning and Computational Center at the University of Houston.
7. An increase of $5,000,000 for the Space Science Museum and Educational Program at Downey, California.
8. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Ohio View Project.
9. An increase of $2,000,000 for continued academic and infrastructure needs related to the computer sciences, mathematics and physics building at the University of Redlands.
10. An increase of $1,000,000 for the NASA Minority University Research Program to provide support for the establishment of a center of excellence in Mathematics and Science at Texas College.

The Committee remains concerned about the lack of emphasis on maintaining the critical advantage that the U.S. has with its highly skilled, highly educated workforce. The United States' leadership in cutting edge technologies in aerospace and aeronautics would be severely damaged if activities are not enhanced to address this threat to global competition. The Committee strongly believes the establishment of an Aerospace Education Center is important to address this void. NASA SEMAA program has a critical role to play in this regard and NASA is encouraged to more fully develop this SEMAA resource via an Aerospace Education Center.

MISSION SUPPORT

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$2,269,300,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	2,511,100,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,494,900,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−241,800,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−225,600,000

The appropriation provides for mission support, including: safety, reliability, and quality assurance activities supporting agency programs; space communication services for NASA programs; salaries and related expenses in support of research in NASA field installations; design, repair, rehabilitation, and modification of institutional facilities and construction of new institutional facilities; and other operational activities supporting the conduct of agency programs.

The Committee recommends a total of $2,269,300,000 for the mission support account. The recommended amount is $241,800,000 below the fiscal year 1999 appropriation and $225,600,000 below the budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes deferral of all Construction of Facilities projects, to be accomplished at some future date. This results in a budget reduction of $67,100,000. In addition, given the programmatic changes directed in other NASA activities, personnel and related costs are reduced by $100,000,000 and research and operations support funding is reduced by $58,500,000.

The Committee continues its prohibition on the use of funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act, or any other Act enacted before the date of enactment of this Act, by the Administrator of NASA to relocate aircraft of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration based east of the Mississippi River to the Dryden Flight Research Center in California.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$20,800,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	20,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	20,800,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+800,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	0

The Office of the Inspector General was established by the Inspector General Act of 1978 and is responsible for audit and investigation of all agency programs.

The Committee recommends $20,800,000 for the Office of the Inspector General in fiscal year 2000, an increase of $800,000 to the amount provided in fiscal year 1999 and the same as the budget request for fiscal year 2000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The bill continues the current four administrative provisions as proposed in the budget. An additional administrative provision is included this year which addresses the need for NASA to transition to full cost accounting.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on administrative expenses	Revolving loan program
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	[1] $0	$257,000	$1,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	600,000,000	176,000	2,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	600,000,000	257,000	0
Comparison with 1999 appropriation	−600,000,000	+81,000	−1,000,000

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on administrative expenses	Revolving loan program
Comparison with 2000 request	−600,000,000	0	+1,000,000

[1] In the fiscal year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act, the Committee increased the limitation on new loans to $18,600,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 for the purpose of dealing with improbably liquidity needs resulting from Y2K concerns; therefore, no limitation is needed for this fiscal year.

The National Credit Union Central Liquidity Facility Act established the National Credit Union Administration Central Liquidity Facility (CLF) on October 1, 1979, as a mixed-ownership government corporation within the National Credit Union Administration. It is managed by the National Credit Union Administration and is owned by its member credit unions. Loans may not be used to expand a loan portfolio, but are authorized to meet short-term requirements such as emergency outflows from managerial difficulties, seasonal credit, and protracted adjustment credit for long-term needs caused by disintermediation or regional economic decline.

In the fiscal year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act, the Committee increased the limitation on new loans to $18,600,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; therefore, no limitation is needed in this legislation. The Committee recommends the request of $257,000 on administrative expenses, which is $81,000 above the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. Additionally, the Committee recommends $1,000,000 for the revolving loan program, which is $1,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 appropriation. The Administration did not have a similar request.

The Committee is concerned that residents of public housing are not being adequately provided with on-site financial services. The Committee suggests that HUD and the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA) submit a feasibility study of providing credit union services to residents of public housing.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$3,646,825,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	3,671,200,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,921,450,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−24,375,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−274,625,000

The National Science Foundation was established in 1950 and received its first appropriation of $225,000 in 1951. The primary purpose behind its creation was to develop a national policy on science, and support and promote basic research and education in the sciences filling the void left after World War II.

The Committee recommends a total of $3,646,825,000 for fiscal year 2000. This recommendation is a decrease of $24,375,000 below last year's appropriation and $274,625,000 below the President's budget request.

Of the amounts approved in the following appropriations accounts, the Foundation must limit transfers of funds between programs and activities to not more than $500,000 without prior approval of the Committee. Further, no changes may be made to any account or program element if it is construed to be policy or a change in policy. Any activity or program cited in this report shall be construed as the position of the Committee and should not be subject to reductions or reprogramming without prior approval of the Committee. Finally, it is the intent of the Committee that all carryover funds in the various appropriations accounts are subject to the normal reprogramming requirements outlined above.

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$2,778,500,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	2,770,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,004,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+8,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−225,500,000

The appropriation for Research and Related Activities covers all programs in the Foundation except Education and Human Resources, Salaries and Expenses, NSF Headquarters Relocation, Major Research Equipment, and the Office of Inspector General. These are funded in other accounts in the bill. The Research and Related Activities appropriation includes United States Polar Research Programs and Antarctic Logistical Support Activities and the Critical Technologies Institute, which were previously funded through separate appropriations. Beginning with fiscal year 1997, the President's budget provided funding for the instrumentation portion of Academic Research Infrastructure in this account.

The Committee recommends a total of $2,778,500,000 for Research and Related Activities in fiscal year 2000, an increase of $8,500,000 above last year's funding level and a decrease of $225,500,000 below the budget request. The Committee's recommendation includes the following program levels which it expects the Foundation to adhere to: (1) Biological Sciences, $391,000,000; (2) Computer and Information Science and Engineering, $312,670,000; (3) Engineering, $369,000,000; (4) Geosciences, $473,000,000; (5) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, $735,000,000; (6) Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences, $138,000,000; (7) U.S. Polar Research Programs, $183,000,000; (8) U.S. Antarctic Logistical Support Activities, $62,600,000; and (9) Integrative Activities, $114,230,000.

Within the amount provided to the Computer and Information Science and Engineering directorate, $35,000,000 is to support individual and team research projects consistent with H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, which, as introduced, authorizes a sizable increase for Information Technology (IT) research over the next five fiscal yerars. Budget constraints make it impossible for the Committee to provide the funding level as provided in H.R. 2086 or the full budget request for this new initiative without adversely disrupting funding in all other program areas. Nevertheless, the Committee believes $35,000,000 is a significant down-payment towards what it expects will be a long-term, comprehensive research program in this important field of computing and information technologies.

Included in the amount provided to the new Integrative Activities directorate is $35,000,000 for the new Biocomplexity Initiative; $50,000,000 for Major Research Instrumentation; $25,000,000 for Science and Technology Centers; and $4,230,000 for the Science and Technology Policy Institute. Although acknowledging the funding flexibility afforded the Foundation through its use of the Opportunity Fund, the Committee has, for fiscal year 2000, included no funds for this activity. Should the NSF find it necessary to pursue funds for "emergency" research needs at any time during the fiscal year, the Committee will make every effort to respond to appropriate reprogramming requests as quickly as possible.

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$56,500,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	90,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	85,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−33,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−28,500,000

This account provides funding for the construction of major research facilities that provide unique capabilities at the cutting edge of science and engineering.

The Committee recommends a total of $56,500,000 for the major research equipment account for fiscal year 2000. This appropriation reflects the budget request levels of $8,000,000 for the Millimeter Array, $15,900,000 for the Large Hadron Collider, $12,000,000 Polar support aircraft upgrades, $5,400,000 for continued construction of the new South Pole Station, and $7,700,000 for the Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation.

As outlined under the Research and Related Activities account, the Committee has included $35,000,000 for new research related activities consistent with the Information Technology Initiative (IT). The Committee, however, is not prepared at this time to commit resources to the construction of a single site, five teraflop computing facility as requested in the budget submission. The Committee has taken this action, without prejudice, due to budget constraints and other, higher priority pressures on available financial resources. The Committee expects to consider this request in future year budget submissions and would hope to have the benefit of any new IT research that may be available to assist during those forthcoming deliberations.

Finally, the Committee has provided $7,500,000 to begin production of the High-Performance Instrumented Airborne Platform for Environmental Research (HIAPER). The Committee recognizes the atmospheric science community's need for such a new high-altitude research aircraft, and notes that this aircraft has gone through a multiple-year review and selection process prior to its approval and endorsement by the National Science Board. Upon its completion, this aircraft will be available to support outstanding research opportunities over the next 25 to 30 years.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$660,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	662,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	678,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−2,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−18,000,000

The Foundation's Education and Human Resources activities are designed to encourage the entrance of talented students into science and technology careers, to improve the undergraduate science and engineering education environment, to assist in providing all pre-college students with a level of education in mathematics, science, and technology that reflects the needs of the nation and is the highest quality attained anywhere in the world, and extend greater research opportunities to underrepresented segment of the scientific and engineering communities.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends $660,000,000, a decrease of $2,000,000 below last year's appropriated level and a decrease of $18,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee's proposal includes the following program funding levels: (1) Educational System Reform, $114,200,000; (2) Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), $48,410,000; (3) Elementary, Secondary and Informal Education, $193,520,000; (4) Undergraduate Education, $103,540,000; (5) Graduate Education, $69,650,000; (6) Human Resource Development, $73,680,000; and (7) Research, Evaluation and Communication, $57,000,000.

The Committee has provided the budget request for the HBCU–UP initiative. However, the Committee strongly encourages the Foundation to take all appropriate steps to increase funding, through both the Education and Human Resources and the Research and Related Activities accounts, to support enhanced education and research opportunities at additional HBCU institutions.

The Committee views the Advance Technological Education program as crucial to ensuring a highly competent technical workforce. The Committee is pleased that the Foundation is using a portion of the H1–B visa receipts along with effective partnership with the relevant, local scientific and technical business sector to further expand the scope and significance of the program.

The Committee believes that it is important to promote agricultural and related environmental awareness through improved curriculum and materials development targeted at the K–12 level of education. Recent reports by the National Research Council, the Farm Foundation, and other organizations have highlighted the need for improved education efforts in this vital area for all students. The Committee urges the Foundation to actively encourage and to provide appropriate support for competitive proposals that will improve agricultural and environmental literacy, promote critical thinking and problem solving skills, and improve the quality of agricultural and environmental education materials being used by K–12 teachers in our Nation's schools. Such efforts should be coordinated with similar efforts to be undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, particularly as it incorporates several years of effort developed by the National Resource and Conservation Services to prepare an agro-ecosystem curriculum for teachers focusing on land, food, and people.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$146,500,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	144,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	149,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+2,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−2,500,000

The Salaries and Expenses activity provides for the operation, support and management, and direction of all Foundation programs and activities and includes necessary funds that develop, manage, and coordinate Foundation programs.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $146,500,000 for salaries and expenses, a decrease of $2,500,000 from the President's budget request and an increase of $2,500,000 over last year's appropriated level.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$5,325,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	5,200,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	5,450,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+125,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 request	−125,000

This account provides National Science Foundation audit and investigation functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies which could lead to fraud, waste, or abuse.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee has recommended $5,325,000 for the Office of Inspector General. This amount is $125,000 above last year's funding level and is a decrease of $125,000 below the budget request.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$80,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	90,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	90,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−10,000,000

The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, established by title VI of Public Law 95–557 in October 1978, is committed to promoting reinvestment in older neighborhoods by local financial institutions working cooperatively with community people and local government. This is primarily accomplished by assisting community-based partnerships (NeighborWorks organizations) in a range of local revitalization efforts. Increasing homeownership among lower-income families is a key revitalization tool. Neighborhood Housing Services of America (NHSA) supports lending activities of the NeighborWorks organizations through a national secondary market that leverages its capital with private sector investment.

The Committee recommends $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, a decrease of $10,000,000 below the fiscal year 1999 level and the budget request. Consistently, the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation performs beyond its goals and the Committee's expectations. The Committee applauds NRC's contributions to the affordable housing industry and endorses the second round of its homeownership initiative and its multifamily initiative.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	$7,000,000
Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	24,426,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	25,250,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	−17,426,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 budget request	−18,250,000

The Selective Service System was reestablished by the Selective Service Act of 1948. The basic mission of the System is to be prepared to supply manpower to the Armed Forces adequate to ensure the security of the United States during a time of national emergency. Since 1973, the Armed Forces have relied on volunteers to fill military manpower requirements. However, the Selective Service System remains the primary vehicle by which men will be brought into military if Congress and the President should authorize a return to the draft.

The fiscal year 2000 budget request for registration and administrative activities for the Selective Service System is $25,250,000. The Committee recommends that the selective service registration activities be terminated in fiscal year 2000 and provides $7,000,000 for termination costs.

The bill includes language permitting the System to use fiscal year 1999 funds for necessary administrative expenses and termination costs.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee recommends inclusion of twenty-two general provisions, twenty of which were requested in the fiscal year 2000 budget and were carried in the fiscal year 1999 Appropriations Act (Public Law 105–276). The Committee recommendation does not include the proposed provision pertaining to the United States/Mexico Foundation. The Committee recommendation does include a provision pertaining to reporting requirements of the Secretary of Veteran's Affairs prior to entering into leases of real property, which was carried in the fiscal year 1999 Appropriations Act. The Committee also recommends a new general provision, Sec. 422, which rescinds $3,000,000,000 of the borrowing authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

A new section 423 has been included which prohibits funds to be used to publish or issue an assessment required under section 106 of the Global Change Research Act of 1990 unless certain conditions are met.

The Committee understands that there are many qualified minority-owned businesses, women-owned businesses, and small businesses that design and place advertising and advertising campaigns, which can assist the departments and agencies receiving appropriations in this bill in their public information efforts using the print, radio, and electronic media. The Committee believes these firms can provide valuable new insights and expertise to public information programs. The Committee expects the departments and agencies to increase the use of these qualified businesses in the initiation, design, and placement of public information in the print, radio, and electronic media.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives states: "Each report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution."

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from clause 7 of section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law. * * *"

Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2), rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are made describing the transfers of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

The Committee has included language transferring not to exceed $17,932,000 from compensation and pensions to general operating expenses and medical care. These funds are for the administrative costs of implementing cost-saving proposals required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992. Language is also included permitting necessary sums to be transferred to the medical facilities revolving fund to augment funding of medical centers for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized by the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992.

The Committee recommends transferring the following amounts to the VA's general operating expenses appropriation pursuant to the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990: the veterans housing benefit program fund program account ($156,958,000), the education loan fund program account ($214,000), the vocational rehabilitation loans program account ($415,000), and the Native American veteran housing loan program account ($520,000). In addition, the bill provides for transfers of $7,000 for program costs and $54,000 for the administrative expenses of the general post fund, national homes program from the general post fund.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Veterans Affairs which would transfer funds from the medical care collections fund to medical care.

The Committee recommends providing authority under administrative provisions for the Department of Veterans Affairs for any funds appropriated in 2000 for compensation and pensions, readjustment benefits, and veterans insurance and indemnities to be transferred between those three accounts. This will provide the Department of Veterans Affairs flexibility in administering its entitlement programs. Language is also included permitting the funds from three life insurance funds to be transferred to general operating expenses for the costs of administering such programs.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring all uncommitted prior balances of excess rental charges as of fiscal year 1999 and all collections made during fiscal year 2000 to the flexible subsidy fund.

The Committee recommends a provision under the Public Housing Capital Fund which transfers all balances for debt service previously funded within annual contributions for assisted housing.

The Committee recommends a transfer of $10,000,000 from the Drug Elimination Grants for Low-Income Housing to the Office of Inspector General for Operation Safe Home.

The Committee has included language transferring $1,000,000 of funds appropriated for administrative expenses to carry out the section 108 loan guarantee program to the departmental salaries and expenses account.

The Committee recommends transferring a total of $518,000,000 from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration for salaries and expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Committee has included language transferring a total of $22,343,000 from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration to the Office of Inspector General.

The Committee has included language transferring $9,383,000 from the Government National Mortgage Association's guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account to HUD's salaries and expenses account.

The Committee recommends language allowing a transfer of $19,493,000 from the federal housing enterprise oversight fund to the office of federal housing enterprise oversight account.

The Committee has included language transferring $150,000 from the Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account to HUD's salaries and expenses account.

The Committee has included language transferring $200,000 from the Native American housing block grants account to the salaries and expenses account.

The Committee has included language under the Environmental Protection Agency transferring funds from the hazardous substance superfund trust fund ($11,000,000) to the Office of Inspector General. In addition, $35,000,000 is transferred from the hazardous substance superfund trust fund to the science and technology account.

The Committee recommends transferring $15,000,000 from the oil spill liability trust fund to the oil spill response account.

The Committee has included language under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation transferring up to $33,666,000 from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund to the Office of Inspector General.

The Committee has included language under the Federal Emergency Management Agency transferring $3,000,000 from the disaster relief account to the emergency management planning assistance account.

The Committee has included language under the Federal Emergency Management Agency transferring up to $20,000,000 from the National Flood Insurance Fund to the National Flood Mitigation Fund.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII, CL. 3(e) (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 204 OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

SEC. 204. FLEXIBLE AUTHORITY.—During fiscal year 1997 and fiscal years thereafter, the Secretary may manage and dispose of multifamily properties owned by the Secretary, including, for [fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999] *fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000*, the provision of grants and loans from the General Insurace Fund (12 U.S.C. 1735(c)) for the necessary costs of rehabilitation or demolition, and multifamily mortgages held by the Secretary on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

SECTION 207 OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS GRANTS

SEC. 207. (a) ELIGIBILITY.—Notwithstanding section 854(c)(1)(A) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)(1)(A)), from any amounts made available under this title for [fiscal year 1999] *fiscal years 1999 and 2000* that are allocated under such section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate and make a grant, in the amount determined under subsection (b), for any State that—

(1) * * *

(2) is not otherwise eligible for an allocation for [fiscal year 1999] *fiscal years 1999 and 2000* under such clause (ii) because the areas in the State outside of the metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) in [fiscal year 1999] *fiscal years 1999 and 2000* do not have the number of cases of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome required under such clause.

(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of the allocation and grant for any State described in subsection (a) shall be an amount based on the cumulative number of AIDS cases in the areas of that State that are outside of metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) of such section 854(c)(1)(A) in [fiscal year 1999] *fiscal years 1999 and 2000* in proportion to AIDS cases among cities and States that qualify under clauses (i) and (ii) of such section and States deemed eligible under subsection (a).

* * * * * * *

SECTION 542 OF THE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1992

SEC. 542. MULTIFAMILY MORTGAGE CREDIT DEMONSTRATIONS.

(a) * * *

(b) RISK-SHARING PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) FUNDING.—Using any authority provided in appropriation Acts to insure loans under the National Housing Act, the Secretary may enter into commitments under this subsection for risk sharing with respect to mortgages on not more than 7,500 units during fiscal year 1996, and not more than an additional 25,000 units [during fiscal year 1999] *in each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000*. The demonstration authorized under this subsection shall not be expanded until the reports required under subsection (d) are submitted to Congress.

* * * * * * *

(c) HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) LIMITATION ON INSURANCE AUTHORITY.—Using any authority provided by appropriations Acts to insure mortgages under the National Housing Act, the Secretary may enter into commitments under this subsection with respect to mortgages on not more than 12,000 units during fiscal year 1996, not more than an additional 7,500 units during fiscal year 1997 and not more than an additional 25,000 units [during fiscal year 1999] *in each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000*. The demonstration authorized under this subsection shall not be expanded until the reports required under subsection (d) are submitted to the Congress.

* * * * * * *

UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

* * * * * * *

LOWER INCOME HOUSING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(z) TERMINATION OF SECTION 8 CONTRACTS AND REUSE OF RECAPTURED BUDGET AUTHORITY.—

(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may reuse any budget authority, in whole or part, that is recaptured on account of *expiration or* termination of a housing assistance payments contract [(other than a contract for tenant-based assistance)] only for one or more of the following:

* * * * * * *

[(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall be effective for actions initiated by the Secretary on or before September 30, 1995.]

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

SEC. 16. (a) INCOME ELIGIBILITY FOR PUBLIC HOUSING.—

(1) * * *

(2) PHA INCOME MIX.—

(A) TARGETING.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), of the public housing dwelling units of a public housing agency made available for occupancy in any fiscal year by eligible families, not less than 40 percent shall be occupied by families whose incomes at the time of commencement of occupancy do not exceed 30 percent of the area median income, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families*; except that the Secretary may establish income ceilings higher or lower than 30 percent of the area median income on the basis of the Secretary's findings that such variations are necessary because of unusually high or low family incomes*.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

(c) INCOME ELIGIBILITY FOR PROJECT-BASED SECTION 8 ASSISTANCE.—

(1) * * *

(3) TARGETING.—For each project assisted under a contract for project-based assistance, of the dwelling units that become available for occupancy in any fiscal year that are assisted under the contract, not less than 40 percent shall be available for leasing only by families whose incomes at the time of commencement of occupancy do not exceed 30 percent of the area median income, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families*; except that the Secretary may establish income ceilings higher or lower than 30 percent of the area median income on the basis of the Secretary's findings that such variations are necessary because of unusually high or low family incomes*.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

SECTION 203 OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

INSURANCE OF MORTGAGES

SEC. 203. (a) * * *

(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage shall—

(1) * * *

(2) Involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Secretary shall approve) in an amount—

(A) not to exceed the lesser of—

(i) * * *

(ii) 87 percent of the dollar amount limitation determined under section 305(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan

Mortgage Corporation Act for a residence of the applicable size; except that the dollar amount limitation in effect for any area under this subparagraph may not be less than *the greater of the dollar amount limitation in effect under this section for the area on the date of enactment of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999 or* 48 percent of the dollar limitation determined under section 305(a)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act for a residence of the applicable size; and

* * * * * * *

SECTION 15d OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT OF 1933

SEC. 15d. (a) The Corporation is authorized to issue and sell bonds, notes, and other evidences of indebtedness (hereinafter collectively referred to as "bonds") in an amount not exceeding [$30,000,000,000] *$27,000,000,000* outstanding at any one time to assist in financing its power program and to refund such bonds. The Corporation may, in performing functions authorized by this Act, use the proceeds of such bonds for the construction, acquisition, enlargement, improvement, or replacement of any plant or other facility used or to be used for the generation or transmission of electric power (including the portion of any multiple-purpose structure used or to be used for power generation); as may be required in connection with the lease, lease-purchase, or any contract for the power output of any such plant or other facility; and for other purposes incidental thereto. Unless otherwise specifically authorized by Act of Congress the Corporation shall make no contracts for the sale or delivery of power which would have the effect of making the Corporation or its distributors, directly or indirectly, a source of power supply outside the area for which the Corporation or its distributors were the primary source of power supply on July 1, 1957, and such additional area extending not more than five miles around the periphery of such area as may be necessary to care for the growth of the Corporation and its distributors within said area: *Provided, however,* That such additional area shall not in any event increase by more than 2½ per centum (or two thousand square miles, whichever is the lesser) the area for which the Corporation and its distributors were the primary source of power supply on July 1, 1957: *And provided further,* That no part of such additional area may be in a State not now served by the Corporation or its distributors or in a municipality receiving electric service from another source on or after July 1, 1957, and no more than five hundred square miles of such additional area may be in any one State now served by the Corporation or its distributors.

* * * * * * *

CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

The Committee submits the following statements in compliance with clause 3, rule XIII of the House of Representatives, describing the effects of provisions proposed in the accompanying bill which may be considered, under certain circumstances, to change the application of existing law, either directly or indirectly.

Language is included in various parts of the bill to continue ongoing activities and programs where authorizations have not been enacted to date. In some cases, the Committee has recommended appropriations which are less than the maximum amounts authorized for the various programs funded in the bill. Whether these actions constitute a change in the application of existing law is subject to interpretation, but the Committee felt that this should be mentioned.

The Committee has included limitations for official reception and representation expenses for selected agencies in the bill.

Sections 401 through 421 of title IV of the bill, all of which are carried in the fiscal year 1999 Appropriations Act, are general provisions which place limitations or restrictions on the use of funds in the bill and which might, under certain circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law. The bill also includes two new general provisions, the first of which modifies the borrowing authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the second places a limitation on the use of funds unless research is subjected to peer review prior to its use for assessment purposes.

The bill includes, in certain instances, limitations on the obligation of funds for particular functions or programs. These limitations include restrictions on the obligation of funds for administrative expenses, the use of consultants, and programmatic areas within the overall jurisdiction of a particular agency.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, readjustment benefits, allowing the use of funds for payments arising from litigation involving the vocational training program.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, medical care, earmarking and delaying the availability of certain equipment and land and structures funds.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, general operating expenses, providing for the reimbursement to the Department of Defense for the costs of overseas employee mail. This language has been carried previously and permits free mailing privileges for VA personnel stationed in the Philippines. Language is included which permits this appropriation to be used for administration of the Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training Act in 1997.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, construction, major projects, establishing time limitations and reporting requirements concerning the obligation of major construction funds, limiting the use of funds, and allowing the use of funds for program costs.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, construction, minor projects, providing that unobligated balances of previous appropriations may be used for any project with an estimated cost of less than $4,000,000, allowing the use of funds for program costs, and making funds available for damage caused by natural disasters.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, parking revolving fund, providing for parking operations and maintenance costs out of medical care funds.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions, permitting transfers between mandatory accounts, limiting and providing for the use of certain funds, and funding administrative expenses associated with VA life insurance programs from excess program revenues. Seven provisions have been carried in previous Appropriations Acts. Two new provisions have been added. The first would allow the use of salaries and expenses funding to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication for services provided. The second new provision makes previously earmarked funds available for a different project.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, housing certificate fund, which limits the fees for section 8 certificate and voucher programs, and allows for the transfer of unobligated balances from various prior year accounts into this account.

Language is included under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, public housing capital fund, which transfers prior year balances from public housing service coordinators.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, drug elimination grants for low-income housing, which specifies the use of certain funds, and transfers funds for the Operation Safe Home program.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, revitalization of severely distressed public housing (HOPE VI), which prohibits the use of funds for awards to settle litigation or pay judgements and which amends environmental review provisions.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, native American housing block grants, which provides for the use of certain funds, provides for the transfer of funds, and places a limitation on the principal amounts of notes issued.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, housing opportunities for persons with AIDS, which provides for use of funds for technical assistance.

Language is included under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, community development block grants fund, which earmarks funds for specific housing organizations and programs, limits the expenses for planning and management development and administrative activities, and modifies and repeals certain provisions of the CDBG program.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, home investment partnerships program, which earmarks funds for a counseling program, and provides for the transfer of funds from prior year accounts.

Language is included under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, housing for special populations: elderly and disabled, which earmarks funds for tenant-based rental assistance for the disabled, and which permits waivers of certain program provisions under the disabled and elderly programs.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, flexible subsidy fund, which permits the use of excess rental charges.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, FHA-general and special risk program account, which earmarks funds for various purposes.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, fair housing and equal opportunity, which places restrictions on the use of funds for lobbying activities.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, office of lead hazard control, lead hazard reduction, which sets-aside funds for certain programs.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, salaries and expenses, which earmarks funds for various purposes.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, office of federal housing enterprise oversight, which limits net appropriations for the General Fund of the Treasury.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, administrative provisions, which maintains and reduces annual adjustment factors, provides public housing flexibility, revises allocations for housing opportunities for people with AIDS recipients, redesignates the use of funds for economic development initiatives provided in prior fiscal years, provides the Secretary with discretion on the establishment of income ceilings, establishes the millenial housing commission, clarifies a dollar limitation for FHA, amends the U.S. Housing Act to allow the re-use of certain budget authority, allows for the use of enhanced housing vouchers, rescinds balances in prior Appropriations Acts, provides funding for two programs, and repeals section 218 of Public Law 104–204.

Language is included under Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, salaries and expenses, which limits the size of the Board.

Language is included under Department of the Treasury, Community Development Financial Institutions, community development financial institution program account, which sets aside funds for various purposes, and defines training program costs as administrative expenses.

Language is included under Corporation for National and Community Service, which terminates the program.

Language is included under the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, salaries and expenses, permitting the use of funds for a pro bono program.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, science and technology, which extends the availability of funds for liquidating obligations.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, environmental programs and management, which limits use of funds, provides funds for development of regional haze programs, expands the use of funds awarded for certain programs, and resolves a contract dispute.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, office of inspector general, which extends the availability of funds for liquidating obligations.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, hazardous substance superfund, limiting availability of funds for toxicological profiles performed by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, state and tribal assistance grants, which provides grants to states and local tribal governments, authorizes the reallotment of certain construction grants, and resolves certain claims.

Language is included under the Council on Environmental Quality, which limits the size of the Council.

Language is included under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, emergency management planning and assistance, which authorizes the director of FEMA to provide consolidated emergency management performance grants.

Language is included under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, emergency food and shelter, limiting administrative expenses.

Language is included under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, flood map modernization fund, establishing the fund and allowing for the acceptance of contributions from state and local governments.

Language is included under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, national insurance development fund, which forgives debt.

Language is included under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, national flood insurance fund, which limits administrative expenses, program costs, and the amount available for repayment of debt, and which sets the rate for flood insurance for fiscal year 2000 at the level set in the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.

Language is included under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, national flood mitigation fund, which establishes a fund for flood mitigation activities.

Language is included under the General Services Administration, Consumer Information Center, limiting certain fund and administrative expenses.

Language is included under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, administrative provision, extending the availability of construction of facility funds, permitting funds for contracts for various services in the next fiscal year, and transferring of prior year appropriations to the appropriate new appropriations accounts.

Language is included under the National Credit Union Administration, central liquidity facility, limiting new loans and administrative expenses.

Language is included under the National Science Foundation, research and related activities, providing for the use of receipts from other research facilities, requiring under certain circumstances proportional reductions in legislative earmarkings, and use of funds.

Language is included under the National Science Foundation, education and human resources activities, requiring under certain circumstances proportional reductions in legislative earmarkings.

Language is included under the National Science Foundation, salaries and expenses, permitting funds for contracts for various services in the next fiscal year and permitting the reimbursement of funds to the General Services Administration.

Language is included under the Selective Service System, salaries and expenses, which terminates the program.

Appropriations Not Authorized by Law

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following lists the agencies in the accompanying bill which contain appropriations that are not authorized by law:

Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Construction, Major projects.

Department of Housing and Urban Development: All programs except Public and Indian Housing programs.

Community Development Financial Institutions.

Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Corporation for National and Community Service.

Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality (not authorized above $1,000,000).

Environmental Protection Agency:
- Science and Technology (except the Clean Air Act and Safe Drinking Water Act).
- Environmental Programs and Management (except the Clean Air Act and Safe Drinking Water Act).
- Hazardous Substance Superfund.
- State and Tribal Assistance Grants.

Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Federal Emergency Management Agency:
- Emergency Food and Shelter Program.
- Emergency Management Planning and Assistance (with respect to the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Urban Property Protection and Reinsurance Act).

General Services Administration—Consumer Information Center.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

National Credit Union Administration Revolving Loan Fund.

Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporations.

Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act

During fiscal year 2000 for purposed of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), the following information provides the definition of the term “program, project, and activity” for departments and agencies carried in the accompanying bill. The term “program, project, and activity” shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the 2000 Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, the accompanying House and Senate reports, the conference report of the joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference.

In applying any sequestration reductions, departments and agencies shall apply the percentage of reduction required for fiscal year 2000 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–177 to each program, project, activity, and subactivity contained in the budget justification documents submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate in support of the fiscal year 2000 budget estimates, as amended, for such departments and agencies, as subsequently altered, modified, or changed by Congressional action identified by the aforementioned Act, resolutions and reports. Further, it is intended that in implementing any Presidential sequestration order, (1) no program, project, or activity should be eliminated, (2) no reordering of funds or priorities occur, and (3) no unfunded program, project, or activity be initiated. However, for the purposes of program execution, it is not intended that normal reprogramming between programs, projects, and activities be precluded after reductions required under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are implemented.

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 1

Date: July 30, 1999.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2000.

Motion by: Mr. Knollenberg.

Description of Motion: To add language in the report agreeing that HUD should continue its current practice of awarding Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) funds to organizations that conduct a variety of enforcement activities, including reviewing property insurance.

Results: Adopted 27 Yeas to 26 Nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Aderholt	Mr. Boyd
Mr. Bonilla	Mr. Clyburn
Mr. Callahan	Mr. Cramer
Mr. Cunningham	Ms. DeLauro
Mr. DeLay	Mr. Edwards
Mr. Frelinghuysen	Mr. Farr
Ms. Granger	Mr. Hinchey
Mr. Hobson	Mr. Hoyer
Mr. Istook	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Kingston	Ms. Kaptur
Mr. Knollenberg	Ms. Kilpatrick
Mr. Kolbe	Mrs. Lowey
Mr. Latham	Mrs. Meek
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Mollohan
Mr. Miller	Mr. Moran
Mr. Nethercutt	Mr. Murtha
Mr. Packard	Mr. Obey
Mr. Regula	Mr. Olver
Mr. Rogers	Mr. Pastor
Mr. Skeen	Ms. Pelosi
Mr. Sununu	Mr. Porter
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Price
Mr. Walsh	Ms. Roybal-Allard
Mr. Wamp	Mr. Sabo
Mr. Wicker	Mr. Serrano
Mr. Wolf	Mr. Visclosky
Mr. Young	

Full Committee Votes

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 2

Date: July 30, 1999.
Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2000.
Motion by: Mr. Edwards.
Description of Motion: To increase Veterans Medical Care by $730 million and to delay any reduction in the rates of taxation on capital gains until January 1, 2001.
Results: Rejected 25 Yeas to 26 Nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Clyburn	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Cramer	Mr. DeLay
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Farr	Ms. Granger
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Istook
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Kingston
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Knollenberg
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Kolbe
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Latham
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Miller
Mr. Moran	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Murtha	Mr. Packard
Mr. Obey	Mr. Porter
Mr. Olver	Mr. Regula
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Rogers
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Skeen
Mr. Price	Mr. Taylor
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Walsh
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Wamp
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Wicker
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

Comparison With Budget Resolution

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344) requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how the authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302(b) of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution of then budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

The bill provides no new spending authority as described in section 401(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended.

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) allocation—		This bill—	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	68,633	82,045	68,632	82,040
Mandatory	21,319	21,136	21,258	21,136

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following information was provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

	Millions
Budget Authority in bill	$89,890
Outlays:	
2000	52,449
2001	24,995
2002	6,659
2003	3,566
2004	3,697

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the Congressional Budget Office has provided the following estimate of new budget authority and outlays provided by the accompanying bill for financial assistance to state and local governments:

	Millions
Budget authority	$26,887
Fiscal year 2000 outlays resulting therefrom	4,354

RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following information describes the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

The Committee recommends a rescission of $74,400,000 from unobligated and obligated amounts from various programs at the Department of Housing Urban Development.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions	21,857,058	21,568,364	21,568,364	-288,694	....
Readjustment benefits	1,175,000	1,469,000	1,469,000	+294,000	....
Veterans insurance and indemnities	46,450	28,670	28,670	-17,780	....
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite)	300,266	282,342	282,342	-17,924	....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(300)	(300)	(300)	....	....
Administrative expenses	159,121	156,958	156,958	-2,163	....
Education loan fund program account	1	1	1	....	....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(3)	(3)	(3)	....	....
Administrative expenses	206	214	214	+8	....
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account	55	57	57	+2	....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(2,401)	(2,531)	(2,531)	(+130)	....
Administrative expenses	400	415	415	+15	....
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account	515	520	520	+5	....
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration	23,539,072	23,506,541	23,506,541	-32,531	....

Veterans Health Administration					
Medical care	16,528,000	16,671,000	18,371,000	+1,843,000	+1,700,000
Delayed equipment obligation	778,000	635,000	635,000	-143,000	
Total	17,306,000	17,306,000	19,006,000	+1,700,000	+1,700,000
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-27,420)			(+27,420)	
Medical care cost recovery collections:					
Offsetting receipts	-583,000	-608,000	-608,000	-25,000	
Appropriations (indefinite)	583,000	608,000	608,000	+25,000	
Total available	(17,889,000)	(17,914,000)	(19,614,000)	(+1,725,000)	(+1,700,000)
Medical and prosthetic research	316,000	316,000	326,000	+10,000	+10,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	63,000	61,200	61,200	-1,800	
General Post Fund, National Homes:					
Loan program account (by transfer)	(7)	(7)	(7)		
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70)	(70)	(70)		
Administrative expenses (by transfer)	(54)	(54)	(54)		
General post fund (transfer out)	(-61)	(-61)	(-61)		
Total, Veterans Health Administration	17,685,000	17,683,200	19,393,200	+1,708,200	+1,710,000
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses	855,661	912,353	886,000	+30,339	-26,353
Offsetting receipts	(38,960)	(36,754)	(36,754)	(-2,206)	
Total, Program Level	(894,621)	(949,107)	(922,754)	(+28,133)	(-26,353)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
(Transfer from medical care)	(27,420)			(-27,420)	
(Transfer from national cemetery)	(90)			(-90)	
(Transfer from inspector general)	(30)			(-30)	
National Cemetery Administration	92,006	97,000	97,000	+4,994	
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-90)			(+90)	
Office of Inspector General	36,000	43,200	38,500	+2,500	-4,700
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-30)			(+30)	
Construction, major projects	142,300	60,140	34,700	-107,600	-25,440
Construction, minor projects	175,000	175,000	102,300	-72,700	-72,700
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	90,000	40,000	80,000	-10,000	+40,000
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries	10,000	11,000	11,000	+1,000	
Capital asset fund		10,000			-10,000
Total, Departmental Administration	1,400,967	1,348,693	1,249,500	-151,467	-99,193
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs	42,625,039	42,538,434	44,149,241	+1,524,202	+1,610,807
(By transfer)	(61)	(61)	(61)		
(Limitation on direct loans)	(2,774)	(2,904)	(2,904)	(+130)	
Consisting of:					
Mandatory	(23,378,774)	(23,348,376)	(23,348,376)	(-30,398)	
Discretionary	(19,246,265)	(19,190,058)	(20,800,865)	(+1,554,600)	(+1,610,807)

TITLE II					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Housing Certificate Fund	8,326,542	11,522,095	10,540,135	+2,213,593	-981,960
(By transfer)	....	(183,000)	(183,000)	(+183,000)	....
Housing set-asides:					
Expiring section 8 contracts	(9,600,000)	(10,640,135)	(10,540,135)	(+940,135)	(-100,000)
Section 8 relocation assistance	(433,542)	(156,000)	....	(-433,542)	(-156,000)
Regional opportunity counseling	(10,000)	(20,000)	....	(-10,000)	(-20,000)
Welfare to work housing vouchers	(283,000)	(144,400)	....	(-283,000)	(-144,400)
Contract administration	....	(209,000)	....	....	(-209,000)
Incremental vouchers	....	(346,560)	....	....	(-346,560)
Administrative fee change	....	(6,000)	....	....	(-6,000)
Section 8 rescission	(-2,000,000)	....	....	(+2,000,000)	....
Subtotal	(8,326,542)	(11,522,095)	(10,540,135)	(+2,213,593)	(-981,960)
Public housing capital fund	3,000,000	2,555,000	2,555,000	-445,000	....
Public housing operating fund	2,818,000	3,003,000	2,818,000	....	-185,000
Subtotal	5,818,000	5,558,000	5,373,000	-445,000	-185,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	310,000	310,000	290,000	-20,000	-20,000
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing (HOPE VI)	625,000	625,000	575,000	-50,000	-50,000
Indian housing block grant	620,000	620,000	620,000		
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	6,000	6,000	6,000		
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(68,881)	(71,956)	(71,956)	(+3,075)	
Total, Public and Indian Housing	15,705,542	18,641,095	17,404,135	+1,698,593	-1,236,960
Community Planning and Development					
Rural housing and economic development	25,000	20,000		-25,000	-20,000
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	215,000	240,000	215,000		-25,000
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	10,000			-10,000	
Community development block grants	4,750,000	4,775,000	4,500,200	-249,800	-274,800
Emergency funding	20,000			-20,000	
Section 108 loan guarantees:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(1,261,000)	(1,261,000)	(1,087,000)	(-174,000)	(-174,000)
Credit subsidy	29,000	29,000	25,000	-4,000	-4,000
Administrative expenses	1,000	1,000	1,000		
Brownfields redevelopment	25,000	50,000	20,000	-5,000	-30,000
Regional connections		50,000			-50,000
Regional empowerment zone initiative		50,000			-50,000
Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	45,000			-45,000	

America's private investment companies:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)		(1,000,000)			(-1,000,000)
Credit subsidy		37,000			-37,000
Redevelopment of abandoned buildings initiative		50,000			-50,000
HOME investment partnerships program	1,600,000	1,610,000	1,580,000	-20,000	-30,000
Homeless assistance grants	975,000	1,020,000	970,000	-5,000	-50,000
Homeless assistance demonstration project		5,000			-5,000
Total, Community planning and development	7,695,000	7,937,000	7,311,200	-383,800	-625,800
Housing Programs					
Housing for special populations	854,000	854,000	854,000		
Housing for the elderly	(660,000)	(660,000)	(660,000)		
Housing for the disabled	(194,000)	(194,000)	(194,000)		
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(140,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(140,000,000)		(+20,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(100,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(-50,000)	
Administrative expenses	328,888	331,000	328,888		-2,112
Offsetting receipts	-529,000			+529,000	
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,100,000)	(18,100,000)	(18,100,000)		
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)		
Administrative expenses	211,455	64,000	64,000	-147,455	
Administrative expenses (unobligated balances)		(147,000)	(147,000)	(+147,000)	
Negative subsidy	-125,000	-75,000	-75,000	+50,000	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Subsidy	81,000			-81,000	
Subsidy (unobligated balances)		(153,000)	(153,000)	(+153,000)	
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-32,657	320,000	317,888	+350,545	-2,112
Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)		
Administrative expenses	9,383	15,383	9,383		-6,000
Offsetting receipts	-370,000	-422,000	-422,000	-52,000	
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology	47,500	50,000	42,500	-5,000	-7,500
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities	40,000	47,000	37,500	-2,500	-9,500
Office of Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction	80,000	80,000	70,000	-10,000	-10,000

Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses	456,843	502,000	456,843	....	-45,157
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(518,000)	(518,000)	(518,000)	....	....
(By transfer, GNMA)	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	....	....
(By transfer, Community Planning & Development)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	....	....
(By transfer, Title VI)	(200)	(150)	(150)	(-50)	....
(By transfer, Indian Housing)	(400)	(200)	(200)	(-200)	....
Total, Salaries and expenses	(985,826)	(1,030,733)	(985,576)	(-250)	(-45,157)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	12,200	....	....	-12,200	....
Office of Inspector General	49,567	38,000	40,000	-9,567	+2,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	....	....
(By transfer from Drug Elimination Grants)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	....	....
Total, Office of Inspector General	(81,910)	(70,343)	(72,343)	(-9,567)	(+2,000)
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight	16,000	19,493	19,493	+3,493	....
Offsetting receipts	-16,000	-19,493	-19,493	-3,493	....
Administrative Provisions					
Single Family Property Disposition	-400,000	....	....	+400,000	....
Calculation of downpayment	15,000	....	....	-15,000	....
FHA increase in loan amounts	-83,000	....	....	+83,000	....
GSE user fee	....	-10,000	....	....	+10,000
Annual contribution (transfer out)	....	(-79,000)	(-79,000)	(-79,000)	....
Annual contributions (transfer out)	....	(-104,000)	(-104,000)	(-104,000)	....
Sec. 212 Rescission	....	....	-74,400	-74,400	-74,400
Sec. 213 National Cities in Schools	....	....	5,000	+5,000	+5,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Sec. 214 Moving to Work	....	....	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Total, administrative provisions	-468,000	-10,000	-64,400	+403,600	-54,400
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development	24,079,378	28,052,478	26,057,049	+1,977,671	-1,995,429
Appropriations	(24,047,178)	(28,052,478)	(26,131,449)	(+2,084,271)	(-1,921,029)
Rescission	....	....	(-74,400)	(-74,400)	(-74,400)
Emergency appropriations	(32,200)	....	....	(-32,200)	....
TITLE III					
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
American Battle Monuments Commission					
Salaries and expenses	26,431	26,467	28,467	+2,036	+2,000
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board					
Salaries and expenses	6,500	7,500	9,000	+2,500	+1,500
Department of the Treasury					
Community Development Financial Institutions					
Community development financial institutions fund program account	80,000	110,000	70,000	-10,000	-40,000
Microenterprise technical assistance	....	15,000	....	....	-15,000
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	15,000	....	....	-15,000	....
Total	95,000	125,000	70,000	-25,000	-55,000

Consumer Product Safety Commission					
Salaries and expenses	47,000	50,500	47,000	....	-3,500
Corporation for National and Community Service					
National and community service programs operating expenses	425,500	545,500	....	-425,500	-545,500
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	10,000	....	....	-10,000	....
Office of Inspector General	3,000	3,000	3,000	....	....
Total	438,500	548,500	3,000	-435,500	-545,500
United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims					
Salaries and expenses	10,195	11,450	11,450	+1,255	....
Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses	11,666	12,473	12,473	+807	....
Environmental Protection Agency					
Science and Technology	650,000	642,483	645,000	-5,000	+2,517
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	40,000	37,271	35,000	-5,000	-2,271
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	10,000	....	....	-10,000	....
Subtotal, Science and Technology	700,000	679,754	680,000	-20,000	+246
Environmental Programs and Management	1,848,000	2,046,993	1,850,000	+2,000	-196,993
Transfer to STAG (P.L. 106-31)	-1,300	....	....	+1,300	....
Subtotal, EPM	1,846,700	2,046,993	1,850,000	+3,300	-196,993

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General	31,154	29,409	30,000	-1,154	+591
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	12,237	10,753	11,000	-1,237	+247
Subtotal, OIG	43,391	40,162	41,000	-2,391	+838
Buildings and facilities	56,948	62,630	62,600	+5,652	-30
Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,450,000	+50,000	-50,000
Delay of obligation	100,000	....	....	-100,000	....
Transfer to Office of Inspector General	-12,237	-10,753	-11,000	+1,237	-247
Transfer to Science and Technology	-40,000	-37,271	-35,000	+5,000	+2,271
Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,447,763	1,451,976	1,404,000	-43,763	-47,976
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program	72,500	71,556	60,000	-12,500	-11,556
Oil spill response	15,000	15,618	15,000	....	-618
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	2,506,750	1,953,000	2,315,000	-191,750	+362,000
Categorical grants	880,000	884,957	884,957	+4,957	....
Additional provisions - Division A, P.L. 105-277	20,000	....	....	-20,000	....
Transfer from EMP (P.L. 106-31)	1,300	....	....	-1,300	....
Subtotal, STAG	3,408,050	2,837,957	3,199,957	-208,093	+362,000
Total, EPA	7,590,352	7,206,646	7,312,557	-277,795	+105,911

Executive Office of the President					
Office of Science and Technology Policy	5,026	5,201	5,108	+82	-93
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,675	3,020	2,827	+152	-193
Total	7,701	8,221	7,935	+234	-286
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation					
Office of Inspector General (transfer)	(34,666)	(33,666)	(33,666)	(-1,000)	
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Disaster relief	307,745	300,000	300,000	-7,745	
(Transfer out)		(-3,000)	(-3,000)	(-3,000)	
Emergency funding	2,036,000	2,480,425		-2,036,000	-2,480,425
Pre-disaster mitigation		30,000			-30,000
(Transfer out)		(-3,000)			(+3,000)
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:					
State share loan	1,355	1,295	1,295	-60	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)		
Administrative expenses	440	420	420	-20	
Salaries and expenses	171,138	189,720	177,720	+6,582	-12,000
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	3,641			-3,641	
Office of Inspector General	5,400	8,015	6,515	+1,115	-1,500
Emergency management planning and assistance	240,824	250,850	280,787	+39,963	+29,937
(By transfer)		(6,000)	(3,000)	(+3,000)	(-3,000)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	3,711			-3,711	
Radiological emergency preparedness fund	12,849			-12,849	
Collection of fees	-12,849			+12,849	
New language		-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency food and shelter program	100,000	125,000	110,000	+10,000	-15,000
Flood map modernization fund	....	5,000	5,000	+5,000	....
National insurance development fund	....	(3,730)	(3,730)	(+3,730)	....
National Flood Insurance Fund (limitation on administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses	(22,685)	(24,131)	(24,333)	(+1,648)	(+202)
Flood mitigation	(78,464)	(78,912)	(78,710)	(+246)	(-202)
(Transfer out)	....	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	....
National flood mitigation fund	....	12,000	....	....	-12,000
(By transfer)	....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(+20,000)	....
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	2,870,254	3,401,725	880,737	-1,989,517	-2,520,988
Appropriations	(826,902)	(921,300)	(880,737)	(+53,835)	(-40,563)
Emergency funding	(2,043,352)	(2,480,425)	....	(-2,043,352)	(-2,480,425)
General Services Administration					
Consumer Information Center Fund	2,619	2,622	2,622	+3	....
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Human space flight	5,480,000	5,638,000	5,388,000	-92,000	-250,000
Science, aeronautics and technology	5,653,900	5,424,700	4,975,700	-678,200	-449,000
Mission support	2,511,100	2,494,900	2,269,300	-241,800	-225,600
Office of Inspector General	20,000	20,800	20,800	+800	....
Total, NASA	13,665,000	13,578,400	12,653,800	-1,011,200	-924,600

National Credit Union Administration					
Central liquidity facility:					
(Limitation on direct loans)	(600,000)	(600,000)	....	(-600,000)	(-600,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)	(176)	(257)	(257)	(+81)	....
Revolving loan program	2,000	....	1,000	-1,000	+1,000
National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities	2,770,000	3,004,000	2,778,500	+8,500	-225,500
Major research equipment	90,000	85,000	56,500	-33,500	-28,500
Education and human resources	662,000	678,000	660,000	-2,000	-18,000
Salaries and expenses	144,000	149,000	146,500	+2,500	-2,500
Office of Inspector General	5,200	5,450	5,325	+125	-125
Total, NSF	3,671,200	3,921,450	3,646,825	-24,375	-274,625
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation					
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	90,000	90,000	80,000	-10,000	-10,000
Selective Service System					
Salaries and expenses	24,176	25,250	7,000	-17,176	-18,250
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	250	....	....	-250	....
Total	24,426	25,250	7,000	-17,426	-18,250

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, title III, Independent agencies	28,558,844	29,016,204	24,773,866	-3,784,978	-4,242,338
Appropriations	(26,515,242)	(26,535,779)	(24,773,866)	(-1,741,376)	(-1,761,913)
Emergency funding	(2,043,602)	(2,480,425)	....	(-2,043,602)	(-2,480,425)
TITLE IV - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Tennessee Valley Authority Borrowing Authority	....	....	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Grand total	95,263,261	99,607,116	91,980,156	-3,283,105	-7,626,960
Current year, FY 2000	(95,263,261)	(99,607,116)	(91,980,156)	(-3,283,105)	(-7,626,960)
Appropriations	(93,187,459)	(97,126,691)	(92,128,956)	(-1,058,503)	(-4,997,735)
Rescission	....	....	(-74,400)	(-74,400)	(-74,400)
Emergency funding	(2,075,802)	(2,480,425)	....	(-2,075,802)	(-2,480,425)
(By transfer)	(34,727)	(236,727)	(236,727)	(+202,000)	....
(Transfer out)	(-61)	(-203,061)	(-203,061)	(-203,000)	....
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(101,149)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(+1,894)	....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(846,655)	(799,860)	(199,860)	(-646,795)	(-600,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(359,361,000)	(340,361,000)	(359,187,000)	(-174,000)	(+18,826,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(561,502)	(561,333)	(561,333)	(-169)	....

Total amounts in this bill	95,263,261	99,607,116	91,980,156	-3,283,105	-7,626,960
Scorekeeping adjustments	-3,145,802	-6,294,000	-2,090,000	+1,055,802	+4,204,000
Total mandatory and discretionary	92,117,459	93,313,116	89,890,156	-2,227,303	-3,422,960
Mandatory	22,312,774	21,258,376	21,258,376	-1,054,398	
Discretionary	69,804,685	72,054,740	68,631,780	-1,172,905	-3,422,960

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

If presented to the President in its current form, the fiscal year 2000 VA-HUD appropriations bill would surely and deservedly be vetoed.

The bill appears to be little more than a crass political statement designed to allow the House majority leadership to say they have passed 12 of the 13 annual appropriations bills by the start of the August break—when, in fact, they have accomplished far less than those numbers would indicate.

What the action on this bill demonstrates more than anything else is that the Republican majority in the House of Representatives still has no coherent strategy that will result in successful completion of the appropriations process by October 1st, or by anytime near that date. There are many shortcomings in this bill, but the damage is not limited just to the VA-HUD bill. To try to garner support for House consideration, the section 302(b) allocation for the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee was increased last week by more than $3 billion in budget authority. That increase came at the expense of the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education Subcommittee, the allocation for which now is $16 billion (or nearly 20 percent) below the enacted level. Apparently the majority believes that dropping any pretense to the facade that there was a chance to move the Labor-HHS bill is preferable to deeming $5.5 billion in the VA-HUD bill as "emergency spending", as the subcommittee had originally recommended.

Even after the improvements made possible by the raid on the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee, however, there are many problems remaining in the VA-HUD bill.

The basic problem is that the VA-HUD subcommittee was required by the majority leadership to comply with a total funding level that is seriously inadequate to meet the needs this bill is supposed to cover. Overall, leaving aside the various one-time rescissions and offsets used to hold down the apparent spending levels, total appropriations under this bill are about $3.2 billion below the actual 1999 level. They are even further below the levels that would be needed to keep up with inflation and rising program costs.

The VA-HUD appropriations bill funds agencies and programs with missions of great importance to the American public—meeting our responsibilities to war veterans, providing relief and promoting recovery after natural disasters, protecting the environment, helping to meet housing needs, and undertaking basic and applied scientific research. Yet somehow the Republican leadership has decided that the appropriate funding level for this bill is $3.2 billion less than would be needed just to maintain the 1999 dollar level.

These cuts are particularly incomprehensible because they come not at a time of fiscal crisis but rather a time of unprecedented prosperity, when the federal budget is in the best shape in decades. The federal budget deficit has declined steadily every year since 1992, and last year it turned into a surplus for the first time in three decades. Every projection shows that surplus continuing to grow. Just a couple of weeks ago, the Majority Leader declared that the federal government is "wallowing in surplus". The majority is so convinced that massive budget surpluses are assured that they are insisting on an $800 billion tax cut.

But despite all this prosperity and plenty, the Republican leadership has evidently decreed that we cannot even spend the same amount as last year on housing assistance for low-income elderly people and families with children, or on research funded by NASA and the NSF, or on community service by our youth, or financial support for building businesses in impoverished urban and rural communities. If we can't adequately meet these needs during the current period of prosperity and surplus, when will we ever be able to do so?

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION (NASA)

The major agency that takes the largest cuts in the bill is NASA. Total appropriations for 2000 under the bill are $1 billion, or 7 percent, less than the 1999 level. These cuts jeopardize the future of our space research programs, including programs directed at solving real problems here on earth as well as pushing forward the frontiers of knowledge about our universe.

The largest portion of these cuts are taken in NASA's science, aeronautics and technology ("SAT") account—which funds most of NASA's science and space programs other than the Space Station and the Space Shuttle. The bill cuts appropriations for the overall SAT account 12 percent, or $678 million, below 1999. It also cuts funding for the Space Shuttle $150 million below the request—perhaps forcing deferral of necessary upgrades and improvements—and cuts funding for the Space Station $100 million below the request.

Earth sciences

Within the SAT account, the largest cuts come in the earth science area, which is cut 17 percent ($240 million) below last year. These are the NASA programs that use space-based observations to gather and interpret information about the earth.

The earth sciences cuts in the bill are targeted heavily towards programs for developing new methodologies, better observing instruments, and improved techniques for translating raw data into useful end products. In particular, the bill cuts funding for Earth Observing System "technology infusion" 77 percent below the budget request, and cuts funding for algorithm development (i.e., development of methods for interpreting and presenting observational data) 31 percent below the request. It cancels completely the "Pathfinder" generation of earth probes, which are aimed at developing and demonstrating new remote sensing technologies while providing data not available from other sources. It also cancels two other earth sciences missions—LightSAR and TRIANA.

The bill also calls for a 22 percent ($50 million) reduction below the request for Earth Observing System Data Information Systems

(EOSDIS). This activity is responsible for processing, compiling and archiving the huge masses of data now being generated by NASA's earth science systems and making this data available to users in the scientific community and the general public. Thus, under the bill, NASA will continue to receive data from its earth observing satellites, but will have to scale back its efforts to make that data available to those who want to use it.

Finally, the bill calls for cancellation of NASA's part of the GLOBE program, a small ($5 million) program which involves elementary and secondary school students and teachers throughout the world in making and analyzing environmental observations.

These cuts in earth sciences programs are shortsighted and unfortunate. Space-based observations hold great promise for helping to solve real problems here on earth, such as better understanding and predicting climate phenomena like El Nino or the current droughts, reducing uncertainties about long-term climate change, and better tracking and analyzing air and water pollution. These technologies and data also have current potential applicability to a host of other pursuits—"precision agriculture", water resources management, and siting of highways and construction projects, to name a few.

Space science

The bill cuts space science programs by $241 million (or 11 percent) below the Administration's request for 2000, and by $163 million (or 8 percent) below the 1999 level. This budget item funds the planetary missions, space-based observatories and other spacecraft that have so captured public imagination in the past few years. It also funds research grants to universities and other institutions.

As in the earth science area, the bill's space science cuts are targeted to the next generation of missions and technologies. The bill recommends sharply reducing future mission planning and development in the Discovery and Explorer series of spacecraft. It also makes $95 million in cuts to supporting research and technology programs. These programs fund work in areas such as propulsion, sensors and instruments, high performance computing, and design of small or lightweight spacecraft, as well as making grants to universities and researchers for analysis and interpretation of results from past and current space missions and for basic theoretical work.

Mission support

The bill reduces appropriations for the Mission Support account by 10 percent below 1999 and 9 percent below the request. The recommended cuts include deferral of all facilities construction projects and a $100 million reduction in personnel funding. NASA indicates that deferral of all construction projects would affect correction of critical safety deficiencies. NASA also indicates that the cut in personnel funding would probably force agency-wide furloughs of three weeks, require a hiring freeze that would hamper efforts to revitalize the current workforce, and ultimately require layoffs.

All of these cuts are ill advised. It is particularly unfortunate that the NASA and contractor employees who have undertaken a major restructuring and streamlining of the agency and who are responsible for many recent successes are now being told that they must face furloughs and layoffs. Why? The message Congress sends with these cuts is that space science and research activities are secondary efforts at best that can be blithely tampered with. The reverberations of such a callous attitude will probably be felt for many years.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Some of the largest cuts in the bill come in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. While the committee reported bill is sometimes presented as providing an increase of almost $2 billion for HUD relative to 1999, this comparison does not present an accurate picture of what happens to HUD programs. The 1999 level was artificially held down by $2 billion in rescissions of prior-year budget authority in the section 8 program (which had no impact on program spending in 1999) and by almost $1 billion in one-time offsets involving the FHA (about half of this was due to savings from legislation included in the 1999 appropriations bill, the rest came from a scorekeeping gimmick that is not being repeated).

Excluding the effects of these one-time savings, the bill cuts appropriations for HUD programs by $945 million below a hard freeze—from $27.076 billion in 1999 to $26.131 billion in 2000. Thus, we are not just talking about reductions below what would be needed to keep up with inflation or program costs, but rather cuts below the actual dollar amount spent the year before. The bill is also almost $2 billion less than the Administration's request.

Reductions in HUD programs below the prior year's level are spread throughout the bill. Of the 24 on-going accounts within the HUD title, the bill increases spending for one, freezes 9 at the 1999 level, and cuts the remaining 14 below 1999. Some of the cuts are small, others are substantial.

The affordable housing crisis

These cuts should be considered in the context of the continuing serious crisis in housing affordability for lower-income people. The problem may actually be getting worse, as the economic boom drives up rents beyond the reach of low-wage workers in many areas. While many people who used to be unemployed and dependent on public assistance programs are now working, they often still have serious difficulty affording decent housing—especially in areas with the best employment opportunities.

The most recent HUD study on housing needs found more than 5.3 million very-low-income families with "worst case" needs who were receiving no federal housing assistance at all. (These are defined as families with incomes under 50 percent of the local median who either pay more than 50 percent of their income for rent or live in seriously substandard housing.) During the 1990s, the fastest growth in worst-case housing needs has been among working families.

Federal housing programs

The Federal Government provides financial support for two main forms of direct housing assistance: public housing (i.e., low-income housing owned and operated by local housing authorities) and "section 8" housing assistance, which provides rent subsidies to help people afford privately owned housing. Together, these programs assist about four million households, representing more than 9 million individuals.

A large portion—about 31 percent—of these households consist of one or more senior citizens. Another 11 percent are persons with disabilities. Most of the rest are families with children. In addition to public housing and section 8, HUD also provides housing assistance through smaller programs that subsidize the development and operation of housing for the elderly and disabled (the section 202 and 811 programs), the HOME block grant to local governments, special housing programs for the homeless, and various other means.

Retrenchment of Federal support for housing

Despite the continuing need, the past several years have seen a retrenchment in the federal commitment to housing. After growing for the previous two decades, the number of households assisted has at best been kept level between 1994 and 1998, and actually appears to have declined a bit during this period. Between 1995 (before rescissions) and 1998, appropriations dropped by 50 percent for the elderly and disabled housing programs, by 27 percent for homeless assistance programs, and by 32 percent for capital assistance for public housing.

In 1999, this trend began to turn around, with appropriations provided for the first expansion since 1994 in section 8 housing assistance and an increase in public housing capital funds. The current bill would halt that modest progress and put federal housing programs back on the path of decline.

Section 8 housing vouchers—no new assistance

The bill provides no funds whatsoever to increase the number of families receiving section 8 housing vouchers. By contrast, $283 million was appropriated last year to provide 50,000 new vouchers, and the housing authorization legislation enacted last year authorized 100,000 new vouchers for 2000. The 50,000 vouchers funded last year were specifically targeted to helping families on welfare make the transition to work, by helping them to move closer to better job opportunities, for example. With 5.3 million households with worst case housing needs receiving no help at all and waiting lists for section 8 assistance averaging 28 months nationally (and many years in some cities), it is unfortunate that this bill funds absolutely none of the new vouchers requested by the Administration and authorized by Congress last year.

Public housing

Another very serious problem with the bill is its treatment of public housing. The bill—

cuts capital assistance for public housing by $445 million—from $3 billion in 1999 to $2.555 billion in 2000.

cuts special grants to assist in revitalization, demolition and replacement of the most seriously distressed public housing (the "HOPE VI" program) by $50 million—from $625 million in 1999 to $575 million in 2000;

cuts grants for drug elimination programs by $20 million—from $310 million to $290 million (these pay both for security and law enforcement efforts and for anti-drug programs for youth residing in public housing); and

keeps operating subsidies for public housing steady at the 1999 level of $2.818 billion.

the cut in capital assistance (although proposed by the Administration) seems particularly unfortunate, as the backlog in modernization and capital improvement needs in public housing has been estimated at $20 billion. As for operating assistance, the 1999 level is widely recognized to be inadequate—HUD calculates that it will cover just 92 percent of the amount required by the funding formula and housing authorities maintain that the percentage covered is actually even lower. Freezing funding at that level for another year will just make the situation worse.

Public housing operating subsidies cover the difference between rents paid by residents and operating costs such as utilities, staff, and maintenance. Housing authorities generally have very few sources of income other than tenant rents and federal subsidies. Faced with a need to make sure the utility bills are paid, they may have little choice but to respond to the shortfall in operating subsidies by cutting back on maintenance and deferring repairs.

Thus, the result of reduced capital assistance and frozen operating assistance will be less maintenance, a growing backlog of repairs, and further deterioration of the housing stock. At some point—and perhaps that point will soon be reached in some places—housing authorities may decide that they cannot afford to maintain and operate all of their units.

Our colleagues should keep in mind that public housing is not just a big city matter. While many big cities do not have large stocks of public housing, there are about 3,200 local housing authorities spread throughout the nation, operating in small and medium sized cities as well as large ones. Just last year, Congress signaled its interest in the state of public housing by passing major authorizing legislation making substantial reforms. this bill now sends the opposite signal.

community development block grants

The bill cuts funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program by $250 million, from $4,750 billion in 1999 to $4.5 billion in 2000. This program primarily provides very flexible block grants to city and county governments (and to states for distribution to small cities and counties). Grantees can use the funds for public facilities (such as day care centers or health centers), public improvements (such as street improvements), social services, housing development, and economic development, among other purposes. We all have heard strong messages from our local elected officials about the importance of maintaining or even increasing funding for this important program.

Cuts in other HUD programs

The bill makes reductions in a wide range of other HUD programs. In some cases, these cuts are quite small—leaving one to wonder why they are being made at all. For example, is the $5 million cut in the $975 million Homeless Assistance Grants program really considered necessary to save money in the bill, or is it intended to make some sort of statement? And if it is making a statement, what sort of statement is it intended to make—that the House majority thinks we are spending too much on help for the homeless? In other cases the cuts are quite substantial relative to the size of the program. All of these cuts will diminish the federal government's capacity to respond to real needs—needs which would justify modest increases in many cases.

Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS ("HOPWA")—funded at $215 million in the bill, a cut of $10 million below 1999;

Home Investment Partnerships Program (very popular block grant for state and local governments, to be used for affordable housing purposes)—funded at $1.580 billion in the bill, a cut of $20 million below 1999;

Homeless Assistance Grants—funded at $970 million, a cut of $5 million below 1999;

Fair Housing Activities (grants to state and local government agencies and private non-profit organizations for fair housing testing, enforcement, education and outreach—funded at $37.5 million, a cut of $2.5 million below 1999;

Grants for lead-based paint hazard reduction—funded at $70 million, a cut of $10 million below 1999;

"Regional Opportunity Counseling" (program to help families using section 8 vouchers to move outside of low-income areas)—zero funding in bill; 1999 funding is $10 million;

Housing Counseling (program to help low- and moderate-income families better understand process of purchasing a home and the potential sources of assistance)—funded at $7.5 million, a cut of $10 million below 1999; and

Self-help Housing Ownership Program ("SHOP", a set-aside within CDBG that makes grants to non-profit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity for "sweat equity" and volunteer-based housing programs)—funded at $15 million, a cut of $5 million below 1999.

Salaries and expenses

Finally, I am also concerned about funding for salaries and expenses at HUD, which the bill freezes at the 1999 level of $986 million (including transfers from other accounts). Roughly 70 percent of the salaries and expenses appropriation is used to cover personnel costs, with most of the rest going for relatively fixed expenses such as rent, utilities, and ADP contracts. The Administration has requested a $45 million increase, most of which is needed to cover increases in employee pay and benefit costs for the existing number of employees. The Administration's request does not propose any increase in staff above the 1999 level.

With no increase to cover the cost of pay raises provided by law and other relatively fixed costs, the bill could force HUD to cut staff. In fact, the Department estimates that the committee's funding level will require about 600 positions to be cut.

This is absolutely the wrong time to be cutting HUD's staff. The Department is trying to improve its financial and information management, increase oversight of federally assisted housing, combat fraud and abuse in its programs, and implement a complex congressionally mandated restructuring of the "section 8" assisted housing portfolio. It is unfair and misguided to tell HUD to do a better job of managing its programs and assets (as it must) and then cut the staff it needs to carry out that job.

OTHER HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

In addition to HUD, the bill makes appropriations for at least two other smaller agencies with missions related to housing and economic development. Both have their budgets cut under this bill.

CDFI fund

One of these agencies is the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, a unit of the Treasury Department. This agency makes grants to community-based institutions whose purpose it is to provide financing for micro-enterprises, small businesses, housing development and community facilities in low-income areas. Assistance from the CDFI Fund is used primarily for capital, but also for technical assistance and other purposes. This would seem to be the kind of program that members of both political parties could enthusiastically support—it is small-scale, locally based, and emphasizes provision of credit for entrepreneurship in economically distressed areas. Indeed, the committee report on this bill praises the CDFI Fund's strategic plan and management team. Nevertheless, for some reason the bill cuts funding for the CDFI Fund by more than a quarter—from $95 million in 1999 to $70 million in 2000.

Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation

Another agency targeted for cuts in the bill is the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. This agency provides financial and technical support to a network of local organizations that seek to turn around declining neighborhoods through strategies for encouraging home ownership and rehabilitation. The Corporation's affiliates have an impressive record of mobilizing numerous sources of capital and credit and using relatively small amounts of federal funds to leverage large amounts of private financing. A multi-year program to increase homeownership in targeted neighborhoods more than exceeded its goals, and the Corporation is now embarked on a successor program. The committee report on this bill praises the Corporation's achievements. But for some reason the bill cuts appropriations for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation from $90 million in 1999 to $80 million in 2000.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

While an amendment adopted in committee increased the amount in the bill for veterans medical care to the minimum level deemed acceptable by veterans service organizations, the recommended amount still leaves many needs unmet. At the reported level, the bill still falls $1.3 billion short of the amount nearly 60 veterans groups believe is necessary for veterans health care. And although the medical programs are above the Administration's request, several other VA accounts are below requested amounts. The construction accounts, for instance, would receive about $100 million less than requested. At a time when the VA is trying to rehabilitate some older, less efficient facilities and focus more on outpatient treatment, this action is counterproductive. In addition, the cuts in general operating expenses of the VA could result in reductions-in-force and could frustrate efforts to improve service in the Veterans Benefits Administration.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Although the total funding recommendation of $7.2 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency is $100 million above the budget request, examining some of the specific actions proposed reveals serious shortcomings. Popular programs such as Superfund and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund are funded below 1999 levels. The Environmental Programs and Management account is reduced by $40 million in external grants/contracts and $35 million in salary/payroll costs. The Administration estimates that the payroll reduction alone would require a cutback of roughly 400 staff years. Since the Agency is already operating under a hiring freeze to accommodate budget reductions in 1999, this action would compound a difficult situation. And while the statutory language relating to the Kyoto Protocol and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (Environmental Justice) is the same as that carried in the 1999 Act, explanatory language in this report is of considerable concern to the Administration and others.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

The following is an example showing how the unrealistic budget caps imposed by the 1997 Balanced Budget Act pits one popular program against another. The subcommittee's recommendations funded the Corporation for National and Community Service (AmeriCorps) at about 90 percent of the 1999 level. In addition, the subcommittee recommended a reduction of $1.3 billion from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. After listening to the shocked reaction to that cut from the space and science communities for a few days, a manager's amendment in committee proposed to increase funds for NASA by $400 million. The proposed offset was AmeriCorps, terminating one of President Clinton's favorite programs. As has been made abundantly clear in the past five years, any VA-HUD bill presented to the President without substantial funding for AmeriCorps will not be signed into law. It would be hard to find any reputable budget observer who believes the committee's recommendations for either AmeriCorps or NASA will be the last word.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

One of the most insidious reductions reflected in this bill is the one for the National Science Foundation. The committee's recommendation is $275 million below the President's request, reducing the Foundation to less than the amount provided in 1999. It is difficult to predict exactly how and where a reduction of this magnitude in our nation's premier science agency will be felt. But everyone should be able to understand and appreciate the comment of the NSF Director after hearing of the committee's recommendation: "We are able and ready to do 21st century science and engineering—but we can not do it on a 20th century budget."

One program that would be especially damaged under the committee's action is the Administration's Information Technology for the 21st Century Initiative. The National Science Foundation is leading a six-agency multi-year effort to prepare the groundwork for continued American leadership and innovation in computing and software systems. The committee's recommendation to provide only $35 million of the $146 million requested for the initiative will delay investment in fundamental, long-term information technology research. With the information technology industry employing millions of Americans and contributing $700 billion to the U.S. economy, this action is terribly shortsighted. Another troubling reduction that would result from the committee's recommendation is the 30 percent cut in the Foundation's biocomplexity initiative designed to study the interdependencies among elements of specific environmental systems.

TVA BORROWING AUTHORITY GIMMICK

After taking into consideration: (1) the deep cuts in programs virtually throughout the bill, (2) the additional section 302(b) allocation robbed from the Labor-HHS Subcommittee, and (3) the directed scoring provisions that generate $800 million in outlay savings, this bill was still $3 billion above its tentative budget allocation. The final gimmick employed was adding a completely non-germane provision reducing the permanent borrowing authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority from $30 billion to $27 billion. While the Office of Management and Budget scores this provision (section 422) as having no budgetary impact, the Congressional Budget Office gives the subcommittee a $3 billion budget authority credit. Since the effect of the provision is to reduce the TVA's authority to borrow from the public, it is hard to understand how it would have any impact whatsoever on the federal budget or the U.S. Treasury.

TVA officials, noting that the Authority's debt is currently $26.4 billion, are very concerned about the borrowing authority reduction. They fear that having to comply with one more pollution regulation or respond to a hurricane or other natural disaster could be problematic with the lowered limit. They also have concerns that the reduced limit could be viewed negatively by the financial markets. If the TVA's cost to borrow money rises, millions of consumer's power bills could increase as a result.

CONCLUSION

Finally, we should all clearly understand that the House majority does not intend these cuts to be a one-time affair, to be restored in the future. Rather, the majority party's budget plan calls for this situation not only to continue year after year, but actually to get steadily worse. The budget resolution passed earlier this year calls for total appropriations for domestic programs in 2001 to be less than in 2000. By 2004, the resolution calls for domestic appropriations to have fallen by more than 20 percent in inflation-adjusted terms. That is what pays for the majority's $800 billion tax cut.

The vision for the future presented by the majority's budget plan is that every year we do a little less: That every year our public housing gets a little more dilapidated, that every year we fund a little less basic scientific research, that every year the standard of medical care for our veterans goes down a bit, that every year the backlog of sewage treatment and safe drinking water needs gets a little bigger. And, in the view of the majority's budget plan, all this is acceptable, because it allows a huge tax cut bill to be enacted. This steady decline in public services is not our vision for the future, nor do we think it is our constituents' vision for the future. However, that is the path this Congress appears to be headed down. And, regrettably, this bill represents a big step down that path of decline.

DAVE OBEY.

○