AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 126

106TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 106–55

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

MAY 27, 1999.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1143]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1143) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amounts of new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 2000

Amount of bill as reported to Senate	$14,224,022,000
Amount of budget estimates, 2000	14,745,147,000
Fiscal year 1999 enacted	14,353,303,000

56–945 cc

CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

	Page
Total obligational authority	4

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Immediate Office of the Secretary	10
Office of the General Counsel	11
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy	11
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs	11
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	12
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	13
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	13
Office of Public Affairs	13
Executive Secretariat	14
Contract Appeals Board	14
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	14
Office of Intelligence and Security	14
Office of the Chief Information Officer	14
Office of Intermodalism	15
Office of Civil Rights	15
Transportation planning, research, and development	15
Transportation Administrative Service Center	16
Essential Air Service and Rural Airport Improvement Fund	17
Minority Business Resource Center Program	22
Minority business outreach	22

U.S. Coast Guard

Operating expenses	29
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	33
Environmental compliance and restoration	37
Alteration of bridges	38
Retired pay	38
Reserve training	39
Research, development, test, and evaluation	39
Boat safety	41

Federal Aviation Administration

Operations	44
Facilities and equipment	52
Research, engineering, and development	75
Grants-in-aid for airports	80

Federal Highway Administration

Limitation on administration expenses	86
Federal-aid highways	87
Magnetic levitation transportation	100
Appalachian development highway system	101

Page

BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS

National motor carrier safety program 103

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Operations and research 107
Highway traffic safety grants 111

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Safety and operations 113
Office of the Administrator 115
Railroad safety 115
Railroad research and development 115
Railroad Rehabilitation Improvement Program 117
Next generation high-speed rail 117
Alaska railroad rehabilitation 119
Rhode Island rail development 119
Capital Grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) 120
Amtrak Reform Council 123

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

Administrative expenses 125
Formula grants 126
University transportation research 131
Transit planning and research 132
Trust fund share of expenses 135
Capital investment grants 135
Job access and reverse commute grants 150
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority [WMATA] 150

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Operations and maintenance 151

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

Research and special programs 153
Pipeline safety 156
Emergency preparedness grants 158

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Salaries and expenses 160

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses 161

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board: Salaries and expenses 163
National Transportation Safety Board: Salaries and expenses 163

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

General provisions 165
Compliance with paragraph 7, rule XVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .. 167
Compliance with paragraph 7(c), rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate 167
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate 168
Budgetary impact statement 171

TOTAL OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDED—GENERAL FUNDS AND TRUST FUNDS

In addition to the appropriation of $13,985,072,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2000, large amounts of contract authority are provided by law, the obligation limits for which are contained in the annual appropriations bill. The principal items in this category are the trust funded programs for Federal-aid highways, for mass transit, and for airport development grants. For fiscal year 2000, estimated obligation limitations total $33,733,150,000.

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2000, for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended, with respect to appropriations contained in the accompanying bill, the terms "program, project, and activity" shall mean any item for which a dollar amount is contained in appropriations acts (including joint resolutions providing continuing appropriations) or accompanying reports of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, or accompanying conference reports and joint explanatory statements of the committee of conference. This definition shall apply to all programs for which new budget (obligational) authority is provided, as well as to discretionary grants and discretionary grant allocations made through either bill or report language. In addition, the percentage reductions made pursuant to a sequestration order to funds appropriated for facilities and equipment, Federal Aviation Administration, and for acquisition, construction, and improvements, Coast Guard, shall be applied equally to each budget item that is listed under said accounts in the budget justifications submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as modified by subsequent appropriations acts and accompanying committee reports, conference reports, or joint explanatory statements of the committee of conference.

TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, the previous authorization for most Federal highway, transit, and highway safety programs, expired on September 30, 1997. On May 22, 1998, the Congress passed a new authorization bill, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century [TEA21], which the President signed into law on June 9, 1998. Under this law, most of the authorizations are contract authority; that is, they are available for obligation without appropriation. The role of the appropriations process with respect to contract authority programs generally is to set obligation limitations so that overall Federal spending stays

within legislated targets and to appropriate liquidating cash to cover the outlays associated with obligations that have been made.

THE GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT

The Government Performance and Results Act [Results Act] requires Federal agencies to develop strategic plans and annual performance plans and reports. The Department's first multiyear strategic plan was submitted September 30, 1997. The Committee is fully committed to support the Department as it seeks to implement the requirements of the Results Act.

The Committee commends the Department for its aggressive implementation of the Results Act. In the performance plan for fiscal year 2000 that was delivered to Congress on February 1, 1999, performance measures have been identified for all of the Department's major programs. A total of 61 performance goals have been established. These goals are stated in terms of effects on the American public, and many reflect ambitious target levels of performance.

The Department provided the performance plan coincident with the budget justifications. This year's performance plan links the agencies' strategies and initiatives to individual goals and identifies interagency coordination of goals, as the Committee recommended last year. The performance plan also provides the context for each goal in a short paragraph titled "Why we act," along with several years of historical data in most cases. The plan highlights special challenges that the agency faces in achieving each of its goals, and includes an appendix with substantially more information on the data and limitations for each measure. The Committee is pleased to see a continuation and expansion of the separate discussion of management challenges the Department faces. While not required by the act, this is a useful and appropriate addition to the plan that underscores the importance of management in achieving strategic goals. This section tracks with recent reports from the Inspector General and the General Accounting Office.

The Department's activities under the Government Performance and Results Act are clearly a work in progress. The Department has made significant strides in assessing GPRA's potential for strategically aligning the varied and numerous programs under the Department's jurisdiction. However, although the plan identifies strategies to help achieve the Department's long-term goals, the plan does not adequately describe how those strategies will lead to realization of the long-term goals or the relative contributions of each strategy. Generally, this is a shortcoming reasonably expected to be addressed as the GPRA process evolves and becomes more integrated in the policy, budget, and regulatory formulation and identification processes. However, the Committee continues to encourage the Department to focus in particular on improvements to management to achieve outcomes as this has been a historically weak area for the Department. For example, the Committee encourages greater refinement of goals with specific and quantifiable measures to provide greater definition and focus for budgetary, regulatory, and administrative actions.

For clarity, the performance plan should resist identifying activities of agencies or offices under strategic goals unless there is a discussion of such an organization's primary contributions toward

those goals in the body of the plan. Elimination of the mention of these organizations as opposed to activities will provide greater focus on the priorities in the strategic goal (if mention of such organization is gratuitous), or will prompt reevaluation of the organizations' roles in the achievement of the strategic goal. The performance plan has expanded its discussion of the data supporting performance measures, and acknowledges limitations in the quality of that data. These will be critical to the credibility of the agency's performance reporting. The Committee remains concerned about the quality of supporting data and data systems, and urges the Department to more fully document shortcomings in its data as well as possible solutions.

The performance plan still has the feel of a document designed to cover the current panoply of activities ongoing or anticipated for the Department. As the process and the plan mature, the Committee anticipates that the performance plan will become a management document rather than a reporting document.

The Committee recognizes that implementation will be an iterative process, likely to involve several appropriations cycles, and will support the efforts of the Department to improve its performance plan. We will consider the Department's progress in addressing weaknesses in its annual performance plan in tandem with its funding requests. To this end, we urge the Department to examine the program activities currently supporting its budget requests in light of the Department's strategic goals and to determine whether any changes or realignments would facilitate a more accurate and informed presentation of budgetary information. The performance plan included only one change to the budget structure of the Department. The Committee again encourages the Department to examine the program activities currently supporting its budget requests in light of the Department's strategic goals and to determine whether any changes or realignments would facilitate a more accurate or helpful presentation of budgetary information. The Department is encouraged to consult with the Committee as it considers such revisions prior to finalizing any requests pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1104. The Committee will consider any requests with a view toward ensuring that fiscal year 2000 and subsequent budget submissions display amounts requested against program activity structures that bear clear relationships to performance goals.

Year 2000 conversion.—For some time, the Committee has been concerned that the Department would have difficulty overcoming its late start in Y2K remediation of over 600 mission-critical systems. However, the Committee notes the significant progress that has been made over the last year. As of the first week in May, over 90 percent of the Department's mission-critical systems were Y2K compliant, including 100 percent of the systems operated by the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the Maritime Administration, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the Office of the Inspector General, the Office of the Secretary, the Research and Special Programs Administration, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Surface Transportation Board, the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, and the Transportation Administrative Service Center.

In particular, the Committee has closely followed the progress of the Federal Aviation Administration's Y2K efforts. With over 400 mission-critical systems in the FAA inventory, the problem is monumental. As of the first week in May, over 92 percent of FAA's mission-critical systems were Y2K compliant. All of the FAA mission-critical systems being repaired had completed renovation and validation phase activities, and were either fully implemented or well into required implementation phase activities. While earlier completion would have been desirable, the complexity of this challenge must be underscored and completion of the task requires extensive and careful testing. To date, the FAA has been on target to complete Y2K remediation by its projected date of June 30, 1999. The Committee must also note, however, that remediation and testing is not the completion of the task. In addition, the FAA must undertake the additional step of contingency planning in the event that not everything works as expected on January 1, 2000. The Committee expects status reports on contingency planning to be included in the regular reports that the FAA provides to the Committee.

The Committee is pleased that the Coast Guard's legacy Vessel Traffic System at Valdez, Alaska, was certified Y2K compliant in April 1999, rather than waiting until October 1999 as initially scheduled. The Vessel Traffic System is responsible for tracking vessel movements in Prince William Sound.

As of the first week in May, the Coast Guard had completed work on 88 percent of its 74 mission-critical systems, and all but five systems are projected to be completed by June 1999. The five systems yet to be completed are: The Short Range Aids to Navigation-Aid Control Monitoring System (SRAN ACMS); the SRAN Master Unit; the SRAN Remote Transfer Unit; the Command and Control Personal Computer (C^2PC); and the Communications System 2000 (COMSYS 2000).

The Committee has been advised that because the remediation schedules must be coordinated around operational activities, the Coast Guard projects that the three SRAN units and the C^2PC will be compliant by September 1999. Also, the Committee understands that the COMSYS 2000 remediation will be completed prior to the Year 2000, but there is no specific date because the remediation depends on AT&T's upgrade of their own telecommunications equipment.

Despite the Department's Y2K progress, the Committee urges the Secretary and Deputy Secretary to continue to closely monitor agency progress until all mission-critical systems are compliant. In addition, as noted above for the FAA, the agency must prepare comprehensive continuity of operations plans in order to prepare for system failures that could potentially disrupt vital services.

Year 2000 Compliance.—The Department of Transportation shall report in detail on the specific use of year 2000 conversion emergency funds provided by the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1999 and any other act. This report shall demonstrate how all of the funds obligated as of January 1, 2000 were directly applied to the year 2000 conversion of federal information technology systems. For any funds which were used for purposes other than the year 2000 conversion, the report

shall explain the use of such funds and specify the provision which gave the Department the authority to spend the funds for other purposes. The report shall also estimate what portion of the emergency funds were used for technology which would have occurred in 1999 or 2000 even without year 2000 crisis. The report shall be delivered to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senate Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem, the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the Senate Committee on the Budget by May 15, 2000.

BUDGETARY FIREWALLS

The Committee notes that there has been some talk this year about creating special budgetary treatment for the programs and activities of the FAA. Mention is made of taking the aviation trust fund off-budget or creating budgetary "firewalls" around some or all of the aviation accounts. The Committee believes that such budget treatment is unnecessary and unwise. While passenger enplanements have increased steadily in the past several years, the growth has not kept pace with the increase in the federal budget for aviation programs, and the growth in the federal investments in equipment modernization and airport improvements and air traffic operations have substantially outstripped the growth in aircraft operations. When the investment in the airport capital plant represented by Passenger Facility Charges is considered, the increase in total investment is even more compelling compared to workload growth. The Coopers and Lybrand financial study conducted only two years ago severely criticized the FAA as an organization, was appalled at their inability to account for costs, and labeled the organization the equivalent of a dysfunctional family. In addition, the Government Performance and Results Act evaluations consistently place the FAA at or near the bottom in terms of well run government agencies. The Committee believes that an organization with as many financial and management difficulties as the FAA should not even be considered by Congress for insulation from budget, appropriations, or any other oversight. Clearly this is an agency in need of reform, not special dispensation.

Firewalling aviation spending would impede oversight and contribute to FAA's already poor record in controlling costs. Virtually every outside observer of the FAA believes that the FAA has a difficult time setting realistic budget requirements and has a terrible history of controlling costs. The budget problems at the Federal Aviation Administration are problems of management and cost control, not budget treatment.

Last year, Congress firewalled the Highway and Transit accounts and in the 9 months since the President signed that legislation, the Administration has proposed four non-technical legislative changes or packages of changes to that law, the OMB and CBO have had to revise their budget and scoring conventions to make the firewalls reconcile (they still don't reconcile), and the House authorizing Committee is already discussing revisiting that authorization legislation in the coming fiscal year. The creation of firewalls is not a mechanism to be employed lightly—the application of firewalls to an intensely complex and operational organization like the FAA presupposes Congressional consideration that midcourse correc-

tions will be unnecessary, budget execution issues are minor, and the organization is capable of making difficult decisions and holding itself accountable for such decisions and other shortcomings in financial management and procurement execution. The FAA cannot meet such a test.

The argument is also made that a firewall is necessary to make sure that the Airport and Airways trust fund is spent. That contention is without basis. Since its creation, fewer dollars have been generated by the taxes and fees that capitalize the Airport and Airways trust fund than the Congress has appropriated for the aviation accounts—and that doesn't even account for non-transportation expenditures that benefit aviation constituencies. For example, the Department of Defense has spent almost $9,000,000,000 to date on the GPS constellation that is the backbone of satellite navigation for aviation in the future.

The challenges facing the aviation industry and the FAA cannot be solved by changing budgetary treatment of the aviation accounts—that solution defies the facts, reason, and the treatment that the FAA has enjoyed in the current budget process.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Section 3 of the Department of Transportation Act of October 15, 1966 (Public Law 89–670) provides for establishment of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation [OST]. The Office of the Secretary is composed of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary immediate offices, the Office of the General Counsel, and five assistant secretarial offices for transportation policy, aviation and international affairs, budget and programs, governmental affairs, and administration. These secretarial offices have policy development and central supervisory and coordinating functions related to the overall planning and direction of the Department of Transportation, including staff assistance and general management supervision of the counterpart offices in the operating administrations of the Department.

The Committee recommends a total of $59,362,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation including $45,000 for reception and representation expenses.

The Committee is concerned about the continued level of vacancies in the Office of the Secretary and notes that many of the positions have been open for over a year. Accordingly, the appropriation for salaries and expenses has been adjusted downward to reflect current staffing levels generally across the Office of the Secretary. This adjustment is made without prejudice and will be reassessed before final enactment of this bill.

In addition, the Committee is increasingly concerned about the apparent reticence on the part of the Office of Congressional Affairs to brief all impacted Committees of the Congress in a timely fashion of administration proposals directly relating to issues and accounts under those committees' jurisdiction. This concern comes directly on the heels of a constant stream of concerns by Members of Congress that matters of constituent interest are not relayed to all members of a State delegation in an even-handed and timely fashion. Unless these deficiencies are remedied immediately, the Committee will reconsider the need for a departmentwide Office of Congressional Affairs, and may resolve to transfer some of the functions to other offices in the Office of the Secretary and devolve the congressional liaison functions to the individual modal administrations.

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The Immediate Office of the Secretary has the primary responsibility for overall policy development, central supervisory and coordinating functions necessary for the overall planning and direction of the Department.

The Committee recommends $1,900,000, which is consistent with the fiscal year 1999 appropriation with controls placed on travel and PC&B growth. The Committee expects that the funding will be sufficient for the Immediate Office of the Secretary and expects that any shortfall can be accommodated by slight reductions in benefits and travel. The funding provided will allow for 17 positions.

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

The Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary has the primary responsibility of assisting the Secretary in the overall planning and direction of the Department. The Committee has recommended a total of $600,000 for the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary. The Committee's recommendation provides for a staffing level of seven positions.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

The General Counsel is the chief legal officer of the Department of Transportation and the final authority within the Department on all legal questions. The General Counsel's Office provides legal services to the Office of the Secretary, coordinates and reviews the legal work of the Chief Counsels' Offices of the operating administrations, and generally performs the full range of legal services involved in administering an executive department with national and international responsibilities.

The Committee recommends $9,000,000 for the Office of the General Counsel. At this funding level, the Committee expects that the Office will be able to fund 82 staff positions.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POLICY

The Assistant Secretary for Policy is the primary policy officer of the Department and is responsible to the Secretary for analysis, development, articulation, and review of policies and plans for domestic transportation.

The Committee recommends $2,900,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy. This funding level is sufficient to fund the current onboard staff.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AVIATION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs is responsible for administering the economic regulatory functions regarding the airline industry and provides departmental leadership and coordination on international transportation policy issues relating to maritime, trade, technical assistance, and cooperation programs. As overseer of airline economic regulations, the Assistant Secretary is responsible for international aviation programs, the essential air service program, airline fitness and licensing, acquisitions, international route awards, and special investigations such as airline delays and computer reservations systems [CRS].

The Committee has provided $7,700,000, which will provide sufficient resources to fund 86 positions.

Aviation competition guidelines.—When Congress passed the Airline Deregulation Act, it decided that the marketplace, and not regulators, should set airline prices and schedules. That landmark action has generated enormous benefits for the air traveling public. However, the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations has been very concerned about barriers to entry and the health of airline competition which may distort the competitive landscape. The subcommittee has held a number of hearings over the past 2 years and one of the clear messages which has emerged from these hearings is that it is critically important to have a truly free market so that everyone, big and small, can compete. Where there is strong competition in the airline industry, the consumers are the primary beneficiaries. What should also be clear is that there is no prospect of support from the Committee to reregulate the airline industry.

As a possible way of providing greater certainty to the airlines as to what constitutes anticompetitive activity, the Committee encourages the Department to consider a process in which the Department, upon receiving a complaint, would consider within a specified time period whether such alleged activity should be referred to the Department of Justice or whether it was a permissible competitive activity. Such an approach would provide greater certainty for air carriers and could provide an efficient mechanism for focusing the Department of Justice's attention on the most suspect of activities. The Committee believes that such a process can be accommodated within current staffing resources given the staff resources available due to the completion of authorization last year of the surface transportation program. Accordingly, the Committee would reject a request for additional resources for the creation of an analytical or legal capability within the Department of Transportation that would also, by necessity, have to be constituted at the Department of Justice.

The Committee urges the Department of Transportation to work with interested Committees of the Congress, the Department of Justice, and the airlines to implement existing laws and enforcement practices to protect the economy from anticompetitive conduct.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BUDGET AND PROGRAMS

The Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs is the principal staff advisor to the Secretary on the development, review, and presentation of the Department's budget resource requirements, and on the evaluation and oversight of the Department's programs. The primary responsibilities of this Office are to ensure the effective preparation and presentation of sound and adequate budget estimates for the Department, to ensure the consistency of the Department's budget execution with the action and advice of the Congress and the Office of Management and Budget, to evaluate the program proposals for consistency with the Secretary's stated objectives, and to advise the Secretary of program and legislative changes necessary to improve program effectiveness.

The Committee encourages the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs to increase the budget and programs staff participation in department, industry, and budget execution oversight activities. The greater the integration of the budg-

et formulation and execution processes with the activities of the department and the fulfillment of the agencies' missions, the better the quality of the department's financial, management, and resource allocation decisions. The Committee directs the Office of the Secretary to report monthly on the status of all outstanding reports and reporting requirements, including how delinquent Congressionally mandated reports are and an estimated date for delivery. The Committee expects that the Department will constitute this responsibility in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs. In addition, the Committee directs the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and programs to work with the affected modal administrations and the Office of Inspector General to facilitate the timely transfer of funds between the relevant offices.

The Committee recommends a total of $6,870,000 for the Office of Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs. At this level, the Committee has provided funding for 49 positions and included $45,000 for reception and representation expenses for the Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs advises the Secretary on all congressional and intergovernmental activities and on all Department legislative initiatives and other relationships with Members of the Congress; promotes effective communication with other Federal agencies and regional Department officials, and with State and local governments and national organizations for development of departmental programs; and ensures that consumer preferences, awareness, and needs are brought into the decision-making process.

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs. This level holds travel below fiscal year 1998 levels and provides funding for 23 positions.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

The Assistant Secretary for Administration is the principal adviser to the Secretary on departmental administrative management matters, and is responsible for personnel and training, management policy, employment ceiling control systems, automated systems policy, administrative operations, real and personal property management, acquisition management, grants management, internal departmental financial systems, and ADP facilities and services.

The Committee recommends $18,600,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration which includes the OST portion of rent. The Committee has provided a level that will support the current staffing levels with a slight reduction in travel and training activities.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The Director of Public Affairs is the principal adviser to the Secretary and other senior departmental officials and news media on public affairs questions. The Office issues news releases, articles, factsheets, briefing materials, publications, and audiovisual mate-

rials. It also provides information to the Secretary on opinions and reactions of the public and news media on transportation programs and issues.

The Committee recommends $1,800,000 for the Office of Public Affairs, which will support current staffing levels.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

The Executive Secretariat provides and organizes staff service for the Secretary and Deputy Secretary to assist them in carrying out their management functions and facilitate their responsibilities for formulating, coordinating, and communicating major policy decisions. It controls and coordinates internal and external material directed to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary and ensures that their decisions and instructions are implemented.

The Committee recommends a funding level of $1,110,000 for the Executive Secretariat.

CONTRACT APPEALS BOARD

The primary responsibility of the Board of Contract Appeals is to provide an independent forum for the trial and adjudication of all claims by, or against, a contractor relating to a contract of any element of the Department, as mandated by the Contract Disputes Act of 1978, 41 U.S.C. 601.

The Committee has provided $560,000 for the Contract Appeals Board. This level is sufficient to maintain the current staffing level.

OFFICE OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION

The Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization has primary responsibility for providing policy direction for small and disadvantaged business participation in the Department's procurement and grant programs, and effective execution of the functions and duties under sections 8 and 15 of the Small Business Act, as amended.

The Committee recommends $1,222,000, which is sufficient funding to maintain current staffing levels.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY

The Office of Intelligence and Security within the Office of the Secretary coordinates security and intelligence policies and strategies among the modes of transportation and serves as liaison with other Government intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

The Committee recommends the Office of Intelligence and Security be funded from funds made available to the Coast Guard and/or the Federal Aviation Administration. The office is headed by an official from the Coast Guard and the majority of the functions of the office relate to Coast Guard and Federal Aviation Administration missions.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

The Committee recommends $5,100,000 for the Office of the Chief Information Officer. This level is sufficient to maintain the current staffing level of 15 positions.

OFFICE OF INTERMODALISM

The Committee recommends the Office of Intermodalism be funded from within the administrative expenses provided for the Federal Highway Administration.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The Office of Civil Rights is responsible for advising the Secretary on civil rights and equal employment opportunity matters, formulating civil rights policies and procedures for the operating administrations, investigating claims that small businesses were denied certification or improperly certified as disadvantaged business enterprises, and overseeing the Department's conduct of its civil rights responsibilities and making final determinations on civil rights complaints. In addition, the Civil Rights Office is responsible for enforcing laws and regulations which prohibit discrimination in federally operated and federally assisted transportation programs.

The Committee has provided a funding level of $7,200,000 for the Office of Civil Rights.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$9,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	6,275,000
Committee recommendation	3,300,000

[1] Does not include reduction of $21,000 for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.

The Office of the Secretary performs those research activities and studies which can more effectively or appropriately be conducted at the departmental level. This research effort supports the planning, research and development activities, and systems development needed to assist the Secretary in the formulation of national transportation policies. The program is carried out primarily through contracts with other Federal agencies, educational institutions, nonprofit research organizations, and private firms.

Missing children.—The Committee is aware of the effective work of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to combat crimes against children and to reunite abducted or runaway children with their families. There are many opportunities in the transportation sector to alert the public to the status of a missing child. For example, truckstops, airports, rail and bus stations, and other transportation facilities are utilized by millions of Americans every day. These are ideal places to raise public awareness of missing children. Moreover, employees in the transportation sector, including flight attendants, bus and truck drivers, and ticket agents, come into contact with hundreds of individuals every day and could be a key element in identifying abducted children. When nonlaw enforcement entities adopt procedures that hinder pedophiles and kidnappers, they are doing a much needed public service. Of note is WalMart's Code Adam Program. When a child disappears in a participating store, Code Adam is addressed over the public address system. Store personnel immediately stop work to look for the child and monitor all exits. If the missing child is not located in 10 minutes, or is seen with someone other than a parent or

guardian, the police are called. This program is implemented in all 2,800 WalMart and Sam's Club stores. The Committee urges the transportation sector to consider similar programs.

In addition, transportation facilities are generally public places and present the same dangers that any public place has for unaccompanied children. Parents should remember, and transportation providers can help them to be more aware, that they should be ever diligent and make certain that they take precautions to ensure their child's safety while traveling.

The Committee directs the Secretary and each of the modal administrators to work with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the transportation industry to identify and implement initiatives to maximize the transportation sector's involvement in the effort to relocate missing children. The Committee directs the Secretary to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than March 31, 2000, on the identified initiatives in this area and the actions taken to implement those efforts.

TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE CENTER

Limitation, 1999 [1]	($124,124,000)
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	(229,953,000)
Committee recommendation	159,953,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $15,000,000 pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.
[2] Proposed without limitations. Includes DOT and non-DOT entities.

The Transportation Administrative Service Center [TASC] provides a business operation fund for DOT to provide a wide range of administrative services to the Department and other customers. TASC functions as an entrepreneurial and self-sufficient entity and provides competitive quality services responsive to customer needs. The TASC is governed by a Board of Directors composed of customer agencies operating in a competitive business-like environment. The TASC presents proposed operating and financial plans to the Board at the beginning of each fiscal year. Once the Board has approved those plans the TASC provides products and services to its full customer base. The Director of TASC provides quarterly performance and financial reports to the Board, makes recommendations for changes to the approved plans and is responsible for the day-to-day management of the TASC. DOT administrations must procure consolidated administrative services from the TASC unless a financial analysis of the services demonstrates that it is more cost beneficial to the Department as a whole—not to an individual operating entity alone—to change the nature of the service delivery (to consolidate a service or to decentralize a service). TASC services are being marketed to customers outside DOT to provide greater economies of scale, thus reducing costs to individual customers. TASC services include:

—Functions formerly in DOT's working capital fund [WCF];
—Office of the Secretary [OST] personnel, procurement and information technology support operations;
—Systems development staff;
—Operations of the consolidated departmental dockets facilities; and

—Certain departmental services and administrative operations, such as human resources management programs, transit fare subsidy payments, and employee wellness including substance awareness and testing.

The budget proposes that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Office of Aeronautical Charting and Cartography be transferred to TASC in 2000.

All of the services of the TASC will be financed through customer reimbursements, to the extent possible, on a fee-for-service basis.

The bill includes language that includes a limitation on activities financed through the transportation administrative service center at $159,953,000. The limitation shall not apply to non-DOT entities and the Committee directs that activities shall be provided on a competitive basis. Further, the Committee directs that the Department shall submit with the Department's congressional budget submission an approved annual operating plan of the transportation administrative service center and quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE AND RURAL AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT FUND

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	($50,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2000 (mandatory authority) [2]	(50,000,000)
Committee recommendation (mandatory authority)	(50,000,000)

[1] Transfer from FAA facilities and equipment.
[2] From overflight fees.

The Essential Air Service [EAS] and Rural Airport Improvement Program provides funds directly to commuter/regional airlines to provide air service to small communities that otherwise would not receive air service and for rural airport improvement as provided by the 1996 Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act.

The Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996 authorizes user fees for flights that fly over, but do not land in, the United States. The first $50,000,000 of each year's fees go directly to carry out the Essential Air Service Program and, to the extent not used for essential air service, to improve rural airport safety. If $50,000,000 in fees is not available, funding must be transferred from FAA appropriations to the EAS programs. The administration proposes to change this program to permit financing of fee shortfalls through any appropriated funding of the Department.

Many EAS points are located in remote rural areas: 55 of 74 communities served by the Essential Air Service Program are more than 100 highway miles from the nearest small, medium, or large hub airport. Twenty-seven more communities are located in Alaska, where, in all but two cases, year-round road access does not exist, and in many instances does not exist at all. Without air service, such communities would be further isolated from the Nation's economic centers. The funding provided is adequate to maintain existing levels of service in Alaska.

Moreover, businesses are typically interested in locating in areas that have convenient access to scheduled air service. Loss of service would seriously hamper small communities' ability to attract new business or even to retain those they now have, resulting in further strain on local economies and loss of jobs.

The Committee has retained the general provision which limits the number of communities that receive EAS funding by excluding points in the 48 contiguous United States that are located fewer than 70 highway miles from the nearest large or medium hub airport, or that require a subsidy in excess of $200 per passenger unless such a point is more than 210 miles from the nearest large or medium hub airport.

The following table reflects the points currently receiving service and the annual rates as of the end of February 1999. The $50,000,000 funding level is sufficient to maintain current service levels and quality of service at the communities currently served by the EAS program.

In the lower 48 States, the tables show distances that EAS communities are from other air service centers and subsidy-per-passenger calculations. The distance figures are shown to give a sense of the degree of isolation of the communities, and the subsidy-per-passenger figures are a rough measure of the cost of providing the service compared to the number of passengers benefiting from the service. Neither of those calculations are relevant to Alaska. First, only two of the 27 subsidized communities in Alaska have road access to other air service. Thus, the Alaskan communities are clearly among the most isolated in the Nation. In fact, many are islands and would be all but cut off from the rest of the world without air service. Second, any subsidy-per-passenger calculation would be highly misleading, at best. While subsidy-per-passenger may be used as a crude measure of cost benefit in the lower 48, in many of the subsidized EAS markets the principal traffic being carried on the EAS flights is food being delivered to the bush community. Thus, the whole community benefits—indeed is fully dependent on—the EAS flights, not just the few who may actually travel on the flights.

EAS SUBSIDY RATES AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 1999

States/communities	Estimated mileage to nearest hub (small, medium, or large) [1]	Average daily enplanements at EAS point (year ending September 30, 1998)	Current annual subsidy rates (February 1, 1999)	Subsidy per passenger
ARIZONA:				
Kingman	101	6.8	$432,564	$101.97
Page	280	13.0	595,469	73.34
Prescott	102	28.9	432,564	23.90
ARKANSAS:				
El Dorado/Camden	108	6.5	943,347	231.50
Harrison	142	4.3	1,049,612	392.67
Hot Springs	53	12.6	1,049,612	133.17
Jonesboro	79	9.7	943,347	155.77
CALIFORNIA:				
Crescent City	234	18.3	189,043	16.52
Merced	114	12.4	750,890	96.60
COLORADO:				
Alamosa	162	14.1	950,262	107.63
Cortez	258	40.2	408,227	16.21
Lamar	163	4.2	1,009,635	380.85
HAWAII: Kamuela	39	2.4	335,454	225.89

EAS SUBSIDY RATES AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 1999—Continued

States/communities	Estimated mileage to nearest hub (small, medium, or large) [1]	Average daily enplanements at EAS point (year ending September 30, 1998)	Current annual subsidy rates (February 1, 1999)	Subsidy per passenger
ILLINOIS:				
Mattoon	126	2.4	218,783	142.72
Mt. Vernon	92	1.3	479,699	594.42
IOWA: Ottumwa	85	3.5	529,274	241.68
KANSAS:				
Dodge City	149	17.1	611,661	57.10
Garden City	201	32.3	246,666	12.19
Goodland	189	3.4	833,383	393.66
Great Bend	120	8.5	639,096	119.86
Hays	180	18.2	1,108,781	97.33
Liberal/Guymon	145	13.0	191,077	23.42
Topeka	71	16.4	367,662	35.74
MAINE:				
Augusta/Waterville	71	12.4	596,806	77.01
Bar Harbor	157	27.4	596,806	34.83
Rockland	80	20.6	596,806	46.38
MICHIGAN:				
Ironwood/Ashland	59	6.8	357,588	84.26
Manistee	115	4.0	408,638	164.31
MINNESOTA:				
Fairmont	121	3.8	793,272	331.22
Fergus Falls	186	(2)	(2)	(2)
Mankato	75	(2)	(2)	(2)
MISSOURI:				
Cape Girardeau	138	31.4	278,560	14.18
Fort Leonard Wood	130	14.8	337,124	36.32
Kirksville	137	4.2	450,736	171.38
MONTANA:				
Glasgow	280	5.3	671,032	203.04
Glendive	223	2.8	671,032	384.55
Havre	248	4.3	671,032	251.70
Lewistown	125	3.0	671,032	360.00
Miles City	146	3.5	671,032	306.97
Sidney	273	7.6	671,032	140.35
Wolf Point	293	4.5	671,032	240.34
NEBRASKA:				
Alliance	256	5.7	797,133	223.35
Chadron	311	6.4	797,133	199.38
Hastings	162	(2)	(2)	(2)
Kearney	181	14.8	833,383	(2)
McCook	271	8.4	1,308,444	249.61
Norfolk	109	5.3	793,272	239.51
NEVADA: Ely	237	2.0	634,137	504.08
NEW MEXICO:				
Alamogordo/Holloman AFB	91	12.7	777,127	97.76
Clovis	103	14.4	926,594	102.51
Silver City/Hurley/Deming	133	8.8	872,204	158.52
NEW YORK:				
Massena	118	9.7	266,371	43.90
Ogdensburg	123	5.0	266,371	84.37
Watertown	65	7.9	266,371	54.12
NORTH DAKOTA:				
Devils Lake	396	10.4	793,272	122.34
Dickinson	319	12.9	247,255	30.53

EAS SUBSIDY RATES AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 1999—Continued

States/communities	Estimated mileage to nearest hub (small, medium, or large) [1]	Average daily enplanements at EAS point (year ending September 30, 1998)	Current annual subsidy rates (February 1, 1999)	Subsidy per passenger
Jamestown	302	11.3	793,272	112.54
OKLAHOMA:				
Enid	84	8.3	767,398	147.46
Ponca City	81	10.2	767,398	120.23
PENNSYLVANIA: Oil City/Franklin	86	35.9	243,923	10.86
SOUTH DAKOTA:				
Brookings	57	8.3	793,272	152.17
Mitchell	69	([2])	([2])	([2])
Yankton	81	6.4	793,272	199.41
TEXAS: Brownwood	138	5.3	807,717	243.00
UTAH:				
Cedar City	178	23.4	577,538	39.44
Moab	236	8.1	769,572	152.69
Vernal	174	11.7	280,854	38.29
VERMONT: Rutland	69	13.0	596,806	73.27
WASHINGTON: Ephrata/Moses Lake	108	32.3	219,483	10.84
WEST VIRGINIA:				
Beckley	173	6.3	627,512	159.79
Princeton/Bluefield	137	6.3	627,512	159.07
WYOMING:				
Laramie	144	31.3	494,617	25.22
Rock Springs	184	29.4	363,993	19.76
Worland	164	7.8	494,617	101.75

[1] Hub designations are recalculated annually and published by the FAA in the Airport Activity Statistics. The above distances are based on the 1998 Airport Activity Statistics, which is based on CY 1997 passenger data.
[2] Hiatus in service.

GSA RENTAL PAYMENTS

[Dollars and square feet in thousands]

Administration	Fiscal year 1998 actual		Fiscal year 1999 estimate		Fiscal year 2000 President's budget	
	Funding	Square feet	Funding	Square feet	Funding	Square feet
Federal Highway Administration	$17,480	1,077	$17,922	1,076	$20,275	909
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	4,234	217	4,042	206	4,657	222
Federal Railroad Administration	2,930	123	3,084	112	3,302	127
Federal Transit Administration	3,307	155	3,500	157	3,824	157
Federal Aviation Administration	68,549	4,098	74,830	4,221	87,415	4,467
U.S. Coast Guard	35,730	2,367	35,285	1,870	35,610	1,870
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	198	7	192	7	.....	.....
Maritime Administration	4,351	286	4,333	258	4,200	258
Research and Special Programs Administration	2,075	106	1,965	98	2,389	110
Office of Inspector General	2,350	110	2,436	100	2,436	100
Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST)	6,237	239	6,713	229	6,713	225
Transportation Administrative Service Center	6,715	294	5,000	250	10,278	415
Bureau of Transportation Statistics	660	24	750	25	855	27
Surface Transportation Board	1,468	57	1,569	57	1,613	58
Total, Department of Transportation	156,284	9,160	161,621	8,666	183,567	8,945

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1999	$1,900,000
Budget estimate, 2000	1,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,900,000

Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization [OSDBU]/Minority Business Resource Center [MBRC].—The OSDBU/MBRC provides assistance in obtaining short-term working capital and bonding for disadvantaged, minority, and women-owned businesses [DBE/MBE/WBE's]. In fiscal year 2000, the short-term loan program will continue to focus on the lending of working capital to DBE/MBE/WBE's for transportation-related projects in order to strengthen their competitive and productive capabilities.

Since fiscal year 1993, the loan program has been a separate line item appropriation, which segregated such activities in response to changes made by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. The limitation on direct loans under the Minority Business Resource Center is at the administration's requested level of $13,775,000.

Of the funds appropriated, $1,500,000 covers the direct subsidy costs for loans not to exceed $13,775,000; and, $400,000 is for administrative expenses to carry out the Direct Loan Program.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

Appropriations, 1999	$2,900,000
Budget estimate, 2000	2,900,000
Committee recommendation	2,900,000

This appropriation provides contractual support to assist minority business firms, entrepreneurs, and venture groups in securing contracts and subcontracts arising out of projects that involve Federal spending. It also provides support to historically black and Hispanic colleges. Separate funding is requested by the administration since this program provides grants and contract assistance that serves DOT-wide goals and not just OST purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Political and Presidential appointees.—The Committee has included a provision in the bill (sec. 305), which is similar to general provisions that have been included in previous appropriations acts, which limits the number of political and Presidential appointees within the Department of Transportation. The Committee is recommending that the ceiling for fiscal year 2000 be 100 personnel.

Advisory committees.—The Committee has retained a general provision (sec. 000) which would limit the amount of funds that could be used for the expenses of advisory committees utilized by the Department of Transportation. The limitation specified is $1,000,000.

Rebates, refunds, and incentive payments.—The Department receives funds from various Government programs at different time intervals (that is, weekly, monthly, quarterly). For example, under the General Services Administration's Travel Management Center [TMC] Program, rebate checks received from the travel contractor are distributed monthly to each element of the Department in proportion to net domestic airline sales arranged by the contractor.

Past expenditures have to be analyzed to determine the proper sources to refund which can be a time-consuming process. The staff time and cost associated with the precise accounting for each such refund is prohibitive. To alleviate the need to specifically identify the source for each repayment the Committee has included language (sec. 329) that allows a fair and sensible allocation of the rebates and miscellaneous and other funds.

Departmental Aircraft.—The Committee is aware of the significant difficulty that the department has had in using aircraft for the movement of Department of Transportation officials and personnel under the Office of Management and Budget guidelines. If the department is unable to make use of dedicated aircraft in an efficient manner, the Committee believes that there are significant cost savings, flexibility, and efficiency to be garnered through utilizing the private sector for the limited business aircraft requirements of the FAA, the Office of the Secretary, and to a lesser extent, the Coast Guard. Accordingly, the Committee has included bill language that permits the fractional ownership of business aircraft by the department which will allow the department to sell underutilized business aircraft in the agency's inventory and utilizes those resources for more critical priorities. Fractional ownership provides access to an entire fleet of aircraft, availability of a mix of aircraft types and sizes, all on very short notice. Costs include aircraft share, a monthly management fee (to include maintenance, flight and cabin crew, crew training, and routine service), and an hourly rate for time aboard the aircraft. The Committee believes that fractional ownership of administrative aircraft in a number of situations could prove extremely beneficial in reducing the costs and inefficiencies of the aircraft in administrative roles which are currently owned and operated in the government inventory. Therefore, the Committee urges the department to establish a test program of fractional ownership for the Federal Aviation Administration, at a minimum, to replace existing mission support aircraft used for administrative requirements, with a mix of light to mid-size jets to determine the flexibility, efficiency, and cost benefits for the government.

OTHER

User fees.—The Committee has included bill language, as requested, which permits the Office of the Secretary to continue to credit to this account $1,250,000 in user fees.

In addition, the administration's budget proposal includes provisions that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to charge user fees for Coast Guard, Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Research and Special Programs Administration, Surface Transportation Board, and National Transportation Safety Board services, totaling $1,668,000,000. These provisions were drafted to produce the net effect of reducing the budgetary impact of the administration's request, but the agencies themselves are "held harmless" against potential loss of funds because the language is contingent upon authorization of the user fees. Each affected agency would have access to all budgetary resources provided in the appropriations bill, because the offsetting collections are not reduced from the general fund appropriation

until the authorizing legislation is enacted. Despite this fact, the administration's budget takes full credit for these offsetting collections, artificially reducing the overall budget request.

These proposals amount to budgetary "smoke and mirrors". Additionally, these proposed user fees represent new taxes on many different sectors of U.S. business and the traveling public. Congress has consistently rejected such user fee proposals, yet the administration continues to include them in its budget submissions.

The Committee has included a general provision which directs that in the fiscal year 2000 budget submission, the Department must identify offsets for each proposed user fee. These identified offsets will be reduced from each agency's budget if the proposed fees are not authorized and enacted before the next fiscal year. This provision makes the administration fiscally accountable for its user fee proposals.

Reductions and emergency supplementals in fiscal year 1999 appropriations.—In fiscal year 1999, reductions were made to a number of accounts due to the limitation or reduction imposed in the Transportation Administrative Service Center. In addition, the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, Public Law 105–277 included emergency supplemental appropriations and funding for Y2K conversions. In the Senate Committee report, each account head shows the amount appropriated in Division A of Public Law 105–277 before the various reductions or supplementals were made. The table below depicts the amount of funds appropriated for each of the accounts, and the reduction and supplementals.

CHANGES IN FISCAL YEAR 1999 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Account	Public Law 105–277								Public Law 105–262 Appropriations transfer from DOD National Defense Sealift Fund	Net appropriation
	Division A			Division B						
	Section 101(g)	GP 320 TASC	Secs. 111–116	Title I Readiness	Title II Antiterrorism	Title III Appropriations transfer from Ofc of Pres. Y2K Conversion	Title IV Hurricane	Title V Drug interdiction		
Office of the Secretary:										
Salaries and expenses	60,490	−1,367				7,754				66,877
Transportation planning, research, and development	9,000	−21								8,979
Office of Civil Rights	6,966	−113								6,853
Subtotal		−1,501				7,754				
U.S. Coast Guard:										
Operating expenses (includes $300 million for defense related activities)	2,700,000	−2,794		100,000		31,773		16,300		2,845,279
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	395,465			100,000			12,600	117,400		625,465
Reserve training	69,000			5,000						74,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation	12,000			5,000						17,000
Alteration of bridges	14,000								28,800	42,800
Subtotal		−2,794		210,000		31,773	12,600	133,700	28,800	
Federal Aviation Administration:										
Operations	5,562,558	−4,863				28,798				5,586,493
Facilities & Equipment	1,900,000				100,000	122,133				2,122,133
Research, Engineering and Development	150,000					367				150,367

CHANGES IN FISCAL YEAR 1999 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Account	Public Law 105–277								Public Law 105–262 Appropriations transfer from DOD National Defense Sealift Fund	Net appropriation
	Division A			Division B						
	Section 101(g)	GP 320 TASC	Secs. 111–116	Title I Readiness	Title II Antiterrorism	Title III Appropriations transfer from Ofc of Pres. Y2K Conversion	Title IV Hurricane	Title V Drug interdiction		
Subtotal	.....	−4,863	.....	.....	100,000	151,298	.....	.....	.....	.....
Federal Highway Administration:										
Limitation on administrative expenses	(327,413)	(−2,646)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	(324,767)
Federal-aid highways (obligation limitation)	25,511,000	−2,854	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	25,508,146
Surface transportation projects, Massachusetts	.....	.....	100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100,000
Appalachian development highway system, Alabama	.....	.....	100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100,000
Appalachian development highway system, West Va	.....	.....	32,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	32,000
Surface transportation projects, Arkansas	.....	.....	100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100,000
Subtotal	.....	−2,854	332,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: Operations and research and NDR (trust)	161,400	−974	.....	.....	.....	752	.....	.....	.....	161,178
Federal Railroad Administration:										
Office of the Administrator	21,215	−369	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	20,846
Alaska railroad rehabilitation	10,000	.....	28,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	38,000
Subtotal	.....	−369	28,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

Federal Transit Administration:										
Administrative expenses (approps. and oblig. limitation)	54,000	−912				250				53,338
Discretionary grants (rescission of contract authority)			−392,000							−392,000
Subtotal		−912	−392,000							
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp: Operations and Maintenance	11,496	−20								11,476
Research and Special Programs Administration:										
Research and special programs	29,280	−314				282				29,248
Pipeline safety	34,648	−210				150				34,588
Subtotal		−524				432				
Office of the Inspector General: Salaries and expenses	43,495	−179								43,316
Bureau of Transportation Statistics [1]	(31,000)	(−208)								(30,792)
Surface Transportation Board: Salaries and expenses	13,400	−10								13,390
Total changes, Department of Transportation		−15,000	332,000	210,000	100,000	192,259	12,600	133,700	28,800	

[1] BTS reductions in parenthesis included under Federal-aid highways.

U.S. COAST GUARD

Summary of Fiscal Year 2000 Program

The U.S. Coast Guard, as it is known today, was established on January 28, 1915, through the merger of the Revenue Cutter Service and the Lifesaving Service. In 1939, the U.S. Lighthouse Service was transferred to the Coast Guard, followed by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation in 1942. The Coast Guard has as its primary responsibilities the enforcement of all applicable Federal laws on the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; promotion of safety of life and property at sea; assistance to navigation; protection of the marine environment; and maintenance of a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war (14 U.S.C. 1, 2).

The Committee recommends a total program level of $3,957,203,000 for the activities of the Coast Guard in fiscal year 2000. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendations
	1999 enacted	2000 estimate	
Operating expenses [1 2]	2,700,000	2,941,039	2,772,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements [3 4]	395,465	350,326	370,426
Environmental compliance and restoration	21,000	19,500	12,450
Alteration of bridges [5]	14,000	.....	14,000
Retired pay (mandatory)	684,000	730,327	730,327
Reserve training [6]	69,000	72,000	72,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation [6]	12,000	21,709	17,000
Boat safety (mandatory)	(64,000)	(64,000)	(64,000)
Denali Commission expenses	4,000	.....	.....
Total	3,899,465	4,134,901	3,988,203

[1] Excludes reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277. Excludes $116,300,000 in emergency supplemental appropriations. Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.

[2] Fiscal year 1999 enacted amount includes $300,000,000 in defense discretionary funding; fiscal year 2000 estimate includes $334,000,000; fiscal year 2000 Committee recommended amount includes $534,000,000, each amount for national security activities of the Coast Guard and scored against budget function 050 (defense).

[3] Includes $1,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 in asset sales. Excludes $217,400,000 emergency supplemental appropriations. Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.

[4] Fiscal year 2000 estimate includes $41,000,000 in proposed navigation assistance tax fees (proposed legislation).

[5] Excludes $28,800,000 by transfer from DOD.

[6] Excludes $5,000,000 in emergency supplemental appropriations.

OPERATING EXPENSES

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$2,675,000,000	$25,000,000	$2,700,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	2,916,039,000	25,000,000	2,941,039,000
Committee recommendation [3]	2,747,000,000	25,000,000	2,772,000,000
Secretary's discretionary transfer authority	60,000,000		60,000,000
Total available funds	2,776,000,000	25,000,000	2,832,000,000

[1] Includes $300,000,000 for national security activities scored against budget function 050 (defense). Excludes reductions for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277; and excludes $116,300,000 supplemental appropriations. Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.

[2] Includes $334,000,000 for national security activities scored against budget function 050 (defense).

[3] Includes $534,000,000 for national security activities scored against budget function 050 (defense).

The "Operating expenses" appropriation provides funds for the operation and maintenance of multipurpose vessels, aircraft, and shore units strategically located along the coasts and inland waterways of the United States and in selected areas overseas.

The program activities of this appropriation fall into the following categories:

Search and rescue.—One of its earliest and most traditional missions, the Coast Guard maintains a nationwide system of boats, aircraft, cutters, and rescue coordination centers on 24-hour alert.

Aids to navigation.—To help mariners determine their location and avoid accidents, the Coast Guard maintains a network of manned and unmanned aids to navigation along our coasts and on our inland waterways, and operates radio stations in the United States and abroad to serve the needs of the armed services and marine and air commerce.

Marine safety.—The Coast Guard insures compliance with Federal statutes and regulations designed to improve safety in the merchant marine industry and operates a recreational boating safety program.

Marine environmental protection.—The primary objectives of this program are to minimize the dangers of marine pollution and to assure the safety of U.S. ports and waterways.

Enforcement of laws and treaties.—The Coast Guard is the principal maritime enforcement agency with regard to Federal laws on the navigable waters of the United States and the high seas, including fisheries, drug smuggling, illegal immigration, and hijacking of vessels.

Ice operations.—In the Arctic and Antarctic, Coast Guard icebreakers escort supply ships, support research activities and Department of Defense operations, survey uncharted waters, and collect scientific data. The Coast Guard also assists commercial vessels through ice-covered waters.

Defense readiness.—During peacetime the Coast Guard maintains an effective state of military preparedness to operate as a service in the Navy in time of war or national emergency at the direction of the President. As such the Coast Guard has primary responsibility for the security of ports, waterways, and navigable waters up to 200 miles offshore.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation for Coast Guard operating expenses is $2,772,000,000, including $25,000,000 from the oilspill liability trust fund and $534,000,000 from function 050 for the Coast Guard's defense-related activities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1999 enacted [1]	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Personnel resources:			
Military pay and benefits	1,285,598	1,359,891	1,268,022
Civilian pay and benefits	202,972	220,631	211,091
Military health care	123,395	139,070	133,395
Permanent change of station [PCS] and related travel and transportation	63,160	66,028	63,160
Training and education	65,634	71,793	70,634
Recruiting	6,095	10,877	6,716
FECA/UCX	11,091	11,091	11,091
Total, personnel resources	1,757,945	1,879,381	1,764,109
Operating funds and unit level maintenance:			
Atlantic area command	109,646	109,616	104,146
Pacific area command	110,057	117,990	112,490
District commands:			
1st district	40,401	40,429	40,401
7th district	44,555	45,454	44,555
8th district	28,020	28,483	28,483
9th district	17,580	17,418	17,418
13th district	13,165	13,721	13,165
14th district	8,435	7,332	7,332
17th district	20,402	20,174	20,402
Headquarters directorates	184,674	205,871	184,674
Headquarters managed units	39,360	42,096	37,360
Other activities	6,854	6,888	6,854
Total, operating funds and unit level maintenance	623,149	655,472	617,280
Depot level maintenance:			
Aircraft maintenance	150,337	156,862	150,337
Electronic maintenance	35,783	38,079	35,783
Ocean engineering and shore facility maintenance	101,478	102,792	101,478
Vessel maintenance	103,013	108,453	103,013
Total, depot level maintenance	390,611	406,186	390,611
Readiness and overseas operations supplemental	28,295	.....	.....
Counter-drug and interdiction supplemental	16,300	.....	.....
TASC reduction	−2,794	.....	
Total appropriation	2,813,506	2,941,039	2,772,000

[1] Includes reduction of $2,794,000 for TASC pursuant to Public Law 105–277. Includes supplemental appropriations of $116,300,000 for emergency expenses. Does not include supplemental funding for Y2K.

Note.—Fiscal year 1999 enacted and fiscal year 2000 request include $300,000,000 and $334,000,000, respectively, for national security activities, budget function 050 (defense).

PERSONNEL RESOURCES

Military pay and benefits.—The bill includes $1,268,022,000 for military pay and allowances. This is $60,424,000 above the fiscal year 1999 enacted level. This amount fully funds the 4.8 percent pay raise that the Senate passed earlier this year; it also provides all funds requested for special pay, including retention incentives and DoD parity compensation, to slow the exodus of highly trained, qualified personnel from the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard is to be commended for the progress that has been made over the past several years to streamline and increase the efficiency of the uniformed services. Staffing continues to lag behind recruiting and retention goals, as qualified individuals find other employment in a thriving economy and as personnel leave the Coast Guard due to the extraordinary pace of operations. However, the 5-year FTE utilization experience of the Coast Guard indicates that they continue to run behind requested levels and accordingly, the Committee recommends a reduction in the FTE levels and a commensurate reduction in the military pay and benefits request.

Military health care.—The Committee has provided $133,395,000 for military health care, an increase of $10,000,000 over the fiscal year 1999 enacted level. With other additional resources, military health care funding for fiscal year 2000 is $151,395,000, an increase of $12,325,000 above the budget request. Of the amount made available for health care, $3,000,000 is to be used to continue dependent and Coast Guard retiree enrollment in the Uniformed Services Family Health Plan.

Training and education.—Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommends limiting training and education funding. The Coast Guard has excessive infrastructure and should consider consolidating its training to optimize utilization for a smaller force. As part of its streamlining effort, the Coast Guard conducted a study in 1995 that recommended closing the west coast training center. The Committee recommends that the Coast Guard close this facility and relocate all basic, advanced, and specialty training conducted there to the other four training centers. This consolidation results in a fiscal year 2000 savings of $10,000,000 not including non-recurring closure costs.

Sitka Rocky Gutierrez Airport.—The Committee has been informed that the Coast Guard has been cooperating with state and local officials to transfer Coast Guard property to Sitka Airport as part of the airport's expansion plan. The Committee encourages the Coast Guard to continue to negotiate with state and local officials and make every effort to find a solution that is acceptable to all parties.

OPERATING FUNDS AND UNIT LEVEL MAINTENANCE

National security.—The Committee's recommendation includes $534,000,000 from the defense function for Coast Guard support of national security activities. The Coast Guard plays a key role in support of military missions under the U.S. Atlantic and Southern Commands in support of drug interdiction missions, refugee and immigration support, and enforcement and joint military training.

The Coast Guard is a cost-effective force which is multimissioned. Its ships, aircraft, shore units, and people have four primary roles: maritime safety, maritime law enforcement, marine environmental protection, and national defense. These roles are complementary and contribute to the Coast Guard's unique niche within the national security community. The value of the Coast Guard forces and their mission experience was clearly evident by their active participation in Operations Desert Shield/Storm in the Persian Gulf, and more recently, in Operation Desert Thunder in the Persian Gulf and Operations Restore/Uphold Democracy in Haiti. The Coast Guard has deployed forces to support the current NATO operations in Yugoslovia. The Coast Guard is one of the five Armed Forces, and is a full partner on the joint national security team. To be a credible partner, the Coast Guard must maintain a high state of operational readiness. Many parts of the Coast Guard's budget contain funding requests that, if cut, would severely impair the Coast Guard's operational readiness and, therefore, its ability to meet national security commitments.

Headquarters Directorates.—The Committee recommends $184,674,000, the same level of funding that was provided in fiscal year 1999. The recommendation is below the budget request due to budget constraints and are made without prejudice.

Mackinaw.—The bill includes funding for continued operation and maintenance of the icebreaking cutter *Mackinaw* during fiscal year 2000.

Drug interdiction activities.—The Committee has provided the requested $521,000,000 for the war on drugs. It should be left to the Commandant's discretion how the drug interdiction activities funding is to be distributed. The Committee believes that this area is perfectly suited for application of performance measures and evaluation of program impacts.

Marine Fire and Safety Association.—The Committee remains supportive of efforts by the Marine Fire and Safety Association [MFSA] to provide specialized firefighting training and maintain an oilspill response contingency plan for the Columbia River. The Committee encourages the Secretary to provide funding for MFSA consistent with the authorization and directs the Secretary to provide $183,000 to continue efforts by the nonprofit organization comprised of numerous fire departments on both sides of the Columbia River. The funding will be utilized to provide specialized communications, firefighting training and equipment, and to implement the oilspill response contingency plan for the Columbia River.

Ballast water management program.—The Committee recommended funding level includes $3,000,000 to implement the nationwide ballast water management program.

Vessel Maintenance.—The Committee requests the Coast Guard to provide a list of the locations where Coast Guard performs nondepot level maintenance or alters and modifies its vessels. The report should list all locations by Coast Guard district and by region and is to be received by July 30, 1999.

DEPOT LEVEL MAINTENANCE

The Committee recommends $390,611,000 for depot level maintenance for vessels, aircraft, electronic equipment, and shore facili-

ties. This is the same amount as the enacted level for fiscal year 1999 and is $15,757,000 below the budget estimate. The reduction is due to fiscal constraints.

BILL LANGUAGE

Secretary's discretionary transfer authority.—The bill includes language that permits the Secretary to transfer up to $60,000,000 from Federal Aviation Administration operations to Coast Guard operating expenses for the purposes of providing additional funds for drug interdiction activities or activities related to the Office of Intelligence and Security.

User fees.—The bill includes language that prohibits the planning, finalization, or implementation of any regulation that would promulgate new maritime user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of enactment of this act.

Notwithstanding this provision in the fiscal year 1999 conference report (Public Law 106–277), the budget request proposed to collect $41,000,000 from a new user fee on navigational services provided by the Coast Guard. The Committee has rejected the administration's proposal to raise taxes on transportation users year after year. Nevertheless, the administration continues to employ this tired budget gimmick because it presents a budget in which funding for the Coast Guard is artificially high.

The bill includes a general provision to make the administration fiscally accountable for proposing unauthorized user fees. The bill directs the Department to identify a specific spending offset for each dollar collected by a new user fee in the fiscal year 2001 budget submission.

Audit Reimbursement.—The bill includes a provision to transfer $5,000,000 to the Department of Transportation Inspector General. The transferred funding will reimburse the IG for audits and investigations of Coast Guard-related issues, programs, and systems. Other agencies are also required to transfer funds to the department IG.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$375,465,000	$20,000,000	$395,465,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	330,326,000	20,000,000	350,326,000
Committee recommendation	350,426,000	20,000,000	370,426,000

[1] Includes $1,000,000 in asset sales. Excludes $217,400,000 emergency supplemental appropriations. Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.

[2] Includes $41,000,000 in proposed navigation assistance fees.

This appropriation provides for the major acquisition, construction, and improvement of vessels, aircraft, shore units, and aids to navigation operated and maintained by the Coast Guard. Currently, the Coast Guard has in operation approximately 250 cutters, ranging in size from 65-foot tugs to 399-foot polar icebreakers, more than 2,000 boats, and an inventory of more than 200 helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft. The Coast Guard also operates approximately 600 stations, support and supply centers, communications facilities, and other shore units. The Coast Guard provides

over 48,000 navigational aids—buoys, fixed aids, lighthouses, and radio navigational stations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The following table summarizes the Committee's programmatic recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1999 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 2000 estimate [2]	Committee recommendation
Vessels	219,923	165,760	123,560
Aircraft	35,700	22,110	33,210
Other equipment	36,569	53,726	52,726
Shore facilities and aids to navigation	54,823	55,800	63,800
Personnel and related support	48,450	52,930	52,930
Deepwater replacement project [3]	[3] (20,000)	(44,200)	44,200
Total	395,465	350,326	370,426

[1] Includes $1,000,000 in asset sales. Excludes $217,400,000 in supplemental appropriations. Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.
[2] Includes $41,000,000 in proposed navigation assistance fees.
[3] The budget estimate proposes to fund the Deepwater project in vessels.

VESSELS

The Committee recommends $123,560,000 for vessel acquisition and improvements. The projected allocation of these funds is shown in the table below:

VESSELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Acquire vessels and equipment:		
Seagoing buoy tender [WLB] replacement	77,000	77,000
47-foot motor lifeboat [MLB] replacement project	24,360	24,360
Coastal patrol boat [CPB]	1,000	.....
Follow-on for polar icebreaker replacement	1,900	1,900
Stern loading buoy boat replacement	5,000	5,000
Survey and design—cutters and boats	500	500
Mackinaw replacement	.....	3,000
Surface search radar replacement project	4,000	4,000
Deepwater capability replacement	44,200	.....
Repair, renovate, or improve existing vessels and small boats:		
Configuration management	3,700	3,700
Polar class icebreaker reliability improvement project [RIP]	4,100	4,100
Total (new program level)	165,760	123,560

Mackinaw replacement.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 to complete concept design on replacement vessel, including a multi-purpose alternative, for icebreaking operations on the Great Lakes. The Committee remains concerned about the projected long lead time for delivery of a replacement vessel and urges the Coast Guard to expeditiously complete the alternative of analysis and

cost benefit analysis and proceed to next acquisition key decision point.

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft procurement, the Committee recommends $33,210,000. Funds for aircraft acquisitions are distributed as follows:

AIRCRAFT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
HC–130 engine modification	.....	1,100
HH–65A helicopter kapton rewiring	3,360	3,360
HH–65A engine re-power program	.....	10,000
Long range search aircraft capability preservation	5,900	5,900
HH–65A helicopter mission unit computer unit replacement	3,650	3,650
HU–25 aircraft avionics improvements	2,900	2,900
HH–60J navigation upgrade	3,800	3,800
HC–130 side looking airborne radar [SLAR]	2,500	2,500
Total	22,110	33,210

HH–65 Helicopter.—At the request of the Committee, the Coast Guard has documented the need to improve the engine performance of the HH–65 helicopter as its operational weight has increased and to increase horsepower by 23 percent. The bill includes $10,000,000 to initiate the engine re-power program.

HC–130 engine modification.—In the interest of crew safety and reduced maintenance cost savings, other military services have applied oil debris detection systems with a residue burn off capability to their aircraft. This system provides on-board detection which alerts air crews of the debris which can cause catastrophic engine failure. The Committee has included $1,100,000 to install this system on the entire Coast Guard HC–130 fleet. The Committee expects that this will be a one-time cost and all HC–130 can be retrofit with the modification in fiscal year 2000.

OTHER EQUIPMENT

The Committee recommends $52,726,000. The following table displays the project allocations:

OTHER EQUIPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Fleet logistics system [FLS]	6,000	6,000
Ports and waterways safety system [PAWSS]	4,500	4,500
Marine information for safety and law enforcement [MISLE]	10,500	10,500
Defense message system [DMS] impementation	3,477	3,477
Loran-C continuation	1,000	.....
Human resources information system	1,100	1,100

OTHER EQUIPMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Personnel management information system/joint uniform military pay system II	4,400	4,400
Aviation logistics management information system [ALMIS]	2,700	2,700
National distress system modernization	16,000	16,000
Commercial satellite communication upgrade	4,049	4,049
Total	53,726	52,726

Loran-C.—Loran-C is a reliable and cost-effective navigation system that virtually every mode of transportation uses, and the Committee supports assigning the Coast Guard the responsibility to continue to operate and maintain the Loran system. The Committee is pleased that the department views the need to upgrade aging Loran equipment and infrastructure as a department-wide, requiring funding from several agencies. Accordingly, the Committee has deleted funding in this account for the modernization of Loran-C and has funded system upgrades elsewhere in the bill.

National Distress System.—The Committee has provided $16,000,000 for the National Distress and Response System (NDRS) modernization project. The Committee urges the Coast Guard to expeditiously develop an upgraded system and determine which components of the modernized national distress system should be leased or purchased.

SHORE FACILITIES AND AIDS TO NAVIGATION

The program level recommended is $63,800,000.

SHORE FACILITIES AND AIDS TO NAVIGATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Shore—General:		
Survey and design shore projects	6,000	6,000
Minor AC&I shore construction projects	6,000	6,000
Coast Guard housing	7,800	7,800
Shore—Air stations:		
Renovate air station hangar, Kodiak	8,300	8,300
Air station Miami—renovate fixed wing hangar	3,500	3,500
Air station ramp structural improvements—Elizabeth City, NC	3,800	3,800
Shore—Centers/groups/stations:		
Construction patrol boat maintenance facility	3,100	3,100
Relocate CG marine safety office and station—Cleveland, OH	1,000	1,000
Modernize CG Station Shinnecook—Hampton Bays, NY	3,500	3,500
Homeporting of drug interdiction assets	2,800	2,800
Upgrade educational facilities, CG Academy	5,000	5,000
Unalaska pier		8,000
Aids to navigation facilities: Waterways aids-to-navigation projects	5,000	5,000
Total	55,800	63,800

DEEPWATER PROJECT

In fiscal year 1998, the Coast Guard initiated the Integrated Deepwater Systems project, a major acquisition of surface ships, aircraft, sensors, and communications equipment to conduct operations beyond 50 miles offshore. The Deepwater project will be the most expensive acquisition program in the Coast Guard's history. It promises to be the most complex acquisition and perhaps the most controversial. While the Committee finds merit in an acquisition strategy that avoids a one-for-one asset replacement, the Committee is concerned that it may be too ambitious and unproven for an agency that has experienced difficulty in managing large and complex acquisition programs.

The Committee remains concerned that this project is not affordable within the current budget constraints. The cost of the Deepwater project is projected to grow substantially and is projected to reach as much as $500,000,000 annually after the contract is awarded in fiscal year 2002. The Inspector General and General Accounting Office testified to the Committee that the current projected cost of the Deepwater project will outstrip the Office of Management and Budget target for Coast Guard capital spending. Furthermore, there would not be sufficient funds available for any other AC&I program under current projections.

The Committee recommendation establishes a new account for the Deepwater Project and has included up to $60,000,000 to continue concept exploration in fiscal year 2000. The bill includes $44,200,000 as requested and permits the Coast Guard to use an additional $15,800,000 at the discretion of the Commandant. The bill directs proceeds from the sale of identified excess property into this account to provide a dedicated revenue stream to supplement funding for the acquisition of the deepwater system. The Committee is concerned that the only way to realize the potential of the deepwater concept is to identify a funding mechanism source to create necessary resources for this program.

PERSONNEL AND RELATED SUPPORT

The program level recommended is $52,930,000. Within the amount provided, $52,930,000 shall be for core acquisition costs.

The Committee has provided the full amount requested for AC&I personnel and related support.

[In thousands of dollars]

Personnel and related support	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Direct personnel costs	51,180	51,180
Core acquisition costs	1,750	1,750
Total	52,930	52,930

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

Appropriations, 1999	$21,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	19,500,000
Committee recommendation	12,450,000

The Environmental Compliance and Restoration account provides funds to address environmental problems at former and current Coast Guard units as required by applicable Federal, State, and local environmental laws and regulations. Planned expenditures for these funds include major upgrades to petroleum and regulated-substance storage tanks, restoration of contaminated ground water and soils, remediation efforts at hazardous substance disposal sites, and initial site surveys and actions necessary to bring Coast Guard shore facilities and vessels into compliance with environmental laws and regulations.

The Committee commends the Coast Guard for its progress in cleaning its contaminated facilities. The remaining backlog of restoration projects has decreased from $132,000,000 at the end of fiscal year 1993 to the current estimate of $60,000,000. The Committee is aware that for the past several fiscal years, the Coast Guard has used only approximately 59 percent of the funds in this account for environmental compliance and restoration. The Committee recommends that $12,450,000 be available only to continue the environmental restoration and compliance-related activities of the Coast Guard.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$14,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	
Committee recommendation	14,000,000

[1] Excludes $28,800,000 by transfer from DOD, Public Law 105–262.
[2] The budget estimate proposes $11,000,000 for altering bridges which will be reimbursed from Federal-aid highways.

The "Alteration of bridges" appropriation provides funds for the Coast Guard's share of the cost of altering or removing bridges obstructive to navigation. Under the provisions of the Truman-Hobbs Act of June 21, 1940, as amended (33 U.S.C. 511 et seq.), the Coast Guard, as the Federal Government's agent, is required to share with owners the cost of altering railroad and publicly owned highway bridges which obstruct the free movement of navigation on navigable waters of the United States in accordance with the formula established in 33 U.S.C. 516.

The Committee directs that, of the funds provided, $7,000,000 shall be allocated to the Sidney Lanier highway bridge in Brunswick, GA; $2,000,000 to the EJ&E railroad bridge in Morris, IL; $2,000,000 to the John F. Limehouse bridge in Charlestown, SC; and, $3,000,000 to the Florida Ave. bridge in New Orleans, LA.

RETIRED PAY

Appropriations, 1999 (mandatory)	$684,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000 (mandatory)	730,327,000
Committee recommendation (mandatory)	730,327,000

The "Retired pay" appropriation provides for retired pay of military personnel of the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve, members of the former Lighthouse Service, and for annuities payable to beneficiaries of retired military personnel under the retired serviceman's family protection plan (10 U.S.C. 1431–1446) and survivor

benefit plan (10 U.S.C. 1447–1455), and for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act. The average number of personnel on the retired rolls is estimated to be 33,462 in fiscal year 2000, as compared with an estimated 32,199 in fiscal year 1999 and 31,088 in fiscal year 1998.

The budget estimate proposed indefinite budget authority instead of a fixed amount for this mandatory entitlement program. The Committee, however, believes that Coast Guard retired pay should remain subject to appropriations and does not recommend amending current law to provide indefinite budget authority.

RESERVE TRAINING

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$69,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	72,000,000
Committee recommendation	72,000,000

[1] Excludes $5,000,000 emergency supplemental appropriations.

Under the provisions of 14 U.S.C. 145, the Secretary of Transportation is required to adequately support the development and training of a Reserve force to ensure that the Coast Guard will be sufficiently organized, manned, and equipped to fully perform its wartime missions. The purpose of the Reserve training program is to provide trained units and qualified persons for active duty in the Coast Guard in time of war or national emergency, or at such other times as the national security requires. Coast Guard reservists must also train for mobilization assignments that are unique to the Coast Guard in times of war, such as port security operations associated with the Coast Guard's Maritime Defense Zone [MDZ] mission and include deployable port security units.

The Coast Guard is provided Reserve training funding as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Functional program element	Fiscal year 1999 levels [1]	President's request (7,600 SELRES)	Committee recommendation (8,000 SELRES)
Initial training	2,466	2,581	2,581
Continuing training	45,565	43,844	43,844
Operation and maintenance support	15,374	15,672	15,672
Program management and administration	10,595	9,903	9,903
Total	74,000	72,000	72,000

[1] Includes $5,000,000 supplemental appropriations.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$8,500,000	$3,500,000	$12,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	18,209,000	3,500,000	21,709,000
Committee recommendation	13,500,000	3,500,000	17,000,000

[1] Excludes $5,000,000 emergency supplemental appropriations.

The Coast Guard's Research and Development Program seeks to improve the tools and techniques with which Coast Guard carries out its varied operational missions and to increase the knowledge base upon which it depends to fulfill its regulatory responsibilities.

The Committee recommendation includes $17,000,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation distributed as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1999 [1]	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Program areas:			
Search and rescue capability	875	1,162	1,162
Waterways safety and management and aids to navigation	2,116	1,444	1,444
Marine safety	3,198	3,108	3,108
Support interagency ship structure committee	289	159	159
Marine environmental protection	1,694	2,263	2,263
Comprehensive law enforcement	1,129	3,213	3,213
Technology investment	4,350	6,235	2,302
Personnel, program support, and operations	3,349	4,125	3,349
Total	17,000	21,709	17,000

[1] Includes $5,000,000 supplemental appropriations.

The Committee has provided $17,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 research, development, test and evaluation programs.

Marine Environmental Protection.—Within the amount provided for Marine environmental protection, the Committee has included not less than $1,500,000 to continue the development and testing of methods to verify the occurrence of ship ballast exchange to ensure that alien aquatic species are not introduced into American waterways.

Comprehensive Law Enforcement.—The Committee has funded the requested amount and recommends that the Coast Guard focus its research efforts in this area on the development and exploitation of technologies that will improve current gaps in detecting, identifying, and classifying targets. Within the funds provided for Comprehensive Law Enforcement, the Committee has included $1,500,000 to apply previously developed submarine acoustic monitoring technology to counter-drug operations. Funds should be allocated to an academic research laboratory that can develop a fully automated monitoring system that utilizes acoustic sensors with satellite transmitters, shore-based receivers, and electronic target processors to improve the identification and interdiction of vessels trafficking illegal drugs and other contraband.

Technology Investment.—Although supportive of the Coast Guard strategy to leverage technology whenever practicable, the Committee is concerned that many of the projects within this account already are being explored in major acquisition programs, including the Integrated Deepwater Systems procurement. The Committee, therefore, reduces the funding for technology investment to $2,302,000 and encourages the Coast Guard to better focus its work in this area.

Personnel, Program Support, and Operations.—The Committee provides $3,349,000, the same as the fiscal year 1999 enacted level. The Committee is concerned about the growth in RDT&E management overhead and asserts that the amount provided is manageable if the Coast Guard initiates necessary management directives to reduce administrative and support expenses.

BOAT SAFETY

(AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999 (mandatory)	$64,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000 (mandatory)	64,000,000
Committee recommendation (mandatory)	64,000,000

This account provides financial assistance for a coordinated National Recreational Boating Safety Program for the several States. Title 46, United States Code, section 13106, establishes a "Boat safety" account from which the Secretary may allocate and distribute matching funds to assist in the development, administration, and financing of qualifying State programs. The "Boat safety" account consists of amounts transferred from the highway trust fund which are derived from the motorboat fuel tax (18.4 cents per gallon).

The Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century provides for a guaranteed funding level of $64,000,000 annually for this program. No additional appropriations are necessary for fiscal year 2000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Land conveyance, Coast Guard Station New Castle.—The bill includes a provision permitting the transfer of Coast Guard Station New Castle to the University of New Hampshire.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2000 PROGRAM

The Federal Aviation Administration traces its origins to the Air Commerce Act of 1926, but more recently to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which established the independent Federal Aviation Agency from functions which had resided in the Airways Modernization Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and parts of the Civil Aeronautics Board. FAA became an administration of the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967, pursuant to the Department of Transportation Act (October 15, 1966).

The total recommended program level for the FAA for fiscal year 2000 amounts to $11,235,652,000. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	1999 enacted	2000 budget estimate	
Operations	[1] 5,562,558	[2] 6,039,000	5,857,450
Direct appropriation		(4,539,000)	(5,857,450)
Secretary's discretionary transfer authority			60,000
User fees: Budget authority (mandatory)		40,000	40,000
Facilities and equipment	[3] 1,900,000	2,319,000	2,045,652
Research, engineering, and development	[4] 150,000	173,000	150,000
Airport improvement program	[5] 1,660,000	1,600,000	2,000,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	1999 enacted	2000 budget estimate	
Total	9,278,558	10,171,000	10,093,102

[1] Excludes reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277; excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.
[2] Includes $1,500,000,000 new user fees proposed in President's budget request.
[3] Excludes $100,000,000 emergency supplemental funding for explosive detection systems; excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.
[4] Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.
[5] Original obligation limitation for AIP in fiscal year 1999 was $1,995,000,000.

The FAA is a complex and multilayered organization that consistently defies management models. The organization has the best and the worst organizational characteristics of a bureaucracy: intense stability and intense resistance to change. Accordingly, technological modernization of air traffic systems, streamlining of regulatory processes, personnel changes, accounting changes, and program reviews meet broad institutional resistance while the entire organization would ostensibly concur with the goal of each such initiative.

There has been a great deal of discussion recently about the "looming crisis" at the FAA and with the pending "gridlock" in the skies due to insufficient FAA funding. This klaxon cry is not new—it has been a common refrain over the past 15 years which seems to increase in volume every time the Administration proposes a new capital plan or reauthorization bill, or every time Congress undertakes the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration's programs. But the crisis always seems to recede the closer we look at it, or the closer we get to the projected "gridlock" deadline. Does that mean that the vast number of studies, conferences and think-tanks that have weighed in on this topic are off base—clearly not. Without question, air traffic has increased, and capacity management challenges have also increased, but the airlines', the airports', and the FAA's ability to grow capacity and more efficiently manage traffic loads has also increased. The system works and will continue to evolve as the nature of air traffic demands grow and change. Congress, once again, needs to make sure that we don't respond to projections of dynamic growth in the industry with static capacity growth models. For the past several years, the Committee has focused our aviation capital investment on airport infrastructure, on technology that will allow airports and the airlines to be more efficient, and on technology and process changes that will increase the efficiency of the air traffic control system and personnel. While the progress is not as rapid as the Committee would like, the FAA is making progress with the possible exception of controller productivity and the FAA Administrator has testified that the new controller agreement is expected to generate new productivity improvements on that front.

While the claim is often made that the FAA's difficulties are because the agency lacks a reliable revenue stream, the facts simply don't bear that out—99.8 percent of the FAA's budget over the past five years has been appropriated and approved by Congress. Over the past three years, FAA's appropriation has grown by 17.6 percent. By comparison, over the same time frame, FDA's funding

grew 12.1 percent, NASA's budget went down 1.6 percent, and the budget for Defense declined by 1.7 percent. Clearly, FAA has fared better than most in the budget process.

It's also important to note that FAA's budget growth has come in an environment where their workload has only been growing between 1 and 3 percent per year. The FAA's recently released Aerospace Forecasts fiscal years 1999–2010 reported that domestic enplanements (not operations) increased by 2.1 percent in 1998. The FAA moves airplanes, not passengers and operations are only projected to grow at an average 2.1 percent over the next ten years. Traditionally, the FAA's estimates have been high by 50–100 percent on enplanements and by slightly less on operations. But, assuming the projections are correct (even though they are being made in a period of unprecedented economic growth), the FAA's appropriation is projected to continue to outpace the growth in the FAA's workload. Unfortunately, the missing piece of the equation is the corresponding productivity gains and cost saving measures on the part of the FAA. The FAA must do better.

The President's budget request for the FAA proposed almost a 6 percent growth over last year's appropriation including new user fees. On top of the last three years' growth, FAA's budget will have grown by over 25 percent over four years. The budget request is not lean, particularly when viewed in the context of the current budgetary constraints and compared to other agencies in the Federal Government, or even within the Department of Transportation—or compared to the agency's workload growth or the virtual absence of any meaningful cost savings. In short, the budget request is generous and aggressive. The question shouldn't be whether we are spending enough on the FAA, the question should be whether it will be spent wisely and whether increased spending will translate into increased productivity and aviation safety.

Clearly, some of the refocusing that the FAA Administrator has done with the Facilities and Equipment budget—emphasizing the Free Flight Phase I initiative, for example—provides the Committee with a sense that the agency's priorities are becoming more aligned with the Committee's focus. However, some of the continuing problems with the Agency's two largest procurements, STARS and WAAS, fuel concern that the agency hasn't turned the corner yet in the administration of major procurements. Clearly, there is a critical need for continued, and perhaps increased oversight, from within the FAA, and from organizations like the Department of Transportation Inspector General, the General Accounting Office, and the Congress.

In addition, the Committee is concerned that recent Congressional pressures to "firewall" parts of the Transportation budget in order to insulate certain portions of the budget from having to compete with other Federal spending are counterproductive. These efforts seem more designed to increase resources to one part of the Department of Transportation for the sake of increased investment without assessing whether such "investment" will actually increase efficiency, safety, or improve productivity. Clearly, the experience with the Advance Automation Suite, the STARS, WAAS, MLS, OASIS, and several other procurements demonstrate that money

alone is not the answer to squeezing increased efficiency and productivity from the air traffic system.

The case is unquestionably the same with the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). The fiscal year 1999 obligation limitation level set by the Congress last year was the highest ever—before considering the additional investment in airport infrastructure made possible by the Passenger Facility Charge (PFCs) revenues. Interestingly, a cursory analysis of the last 20 years of AIP spending indicates that an increased percentage of the program is committed to landside rather than airside projects. The Committee questions whether a dramatic increase in funding would somehow change the trend in this program.

In short, the FAA has thrived in the regular budget and appropriations process and the leadership of the FAA utilizing the increased procurement and personnel authority granted by Congress several years ago is beginning to improve the FAA's performance. Expenditures on FAA programs continue to exceed the taxes paid into the aviation trust fund demonstrating the import the Congress places on maintaining a robust investment in the air transportation system. The Committee's focus as we review the FAA's programs is on how to do things better, not how to insulate the FAA from oversight or from having to compete with other budget priorities.

OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$5,562,558,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	4,539,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,857,450,000

[1] Excludes reduction of $4,863,000 for TASC pursuant to Public Law 105–277; excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.

[2] Excludes $1,500,000,000 user fees to be appropriated.

FAA's "Operations" appropriation provides funds for the operation, maintenance, communications, and logistic support of the air traffic control and navigation systems and activities. It also covers the administration and management of the regulatory, airports, commercial space, medical and engineering, and development programs.

User fees.—The administration proposed to collect almost $1,500,000,000 in new user fee taxes from commercial aviation users of the air traffic control system. The fees would be available for appropriation only for aviation purposes. The administration also estimates collecting $40,000,000 in overflight fees in fiscal year 2000. These fees are to be available without Appropriations Committee action for the essential air service program (under the Office of the Secretary of Transportation) and rural airport safety.

Operations.—The activities of the operations accounts comprise seven main areas consistent with FAA's reorganization to bring together functions and activities that support the provision of a single, major service and to establish a single executive responsible for that service.

Air traffic services.—Provides for the operations and maintenance of the national air traffic control and navigation system and the installation of air traffic and navigation equipment. Air traffic serv-

ices consists of five subactivities: air traffic, NAS logistics, systems maintenance, leased telecommunications, and flight inspections.

Aviation regulation and certification.—Promotes aviation safety and ensures compliance with safety and certification standards for air carriers, commercial operators, air agencies, airmen, and civil aircraft, including aircraft registration; develops and administers safety standards for airworthiness of aircraft and components. Includes accident investigation, aviation medicine, aviation rulemaking, and the suspected unapproved parts office.

Aviation security.—Provides for the overall planning, direction, management, evaluation, and enforcement of civil aviation security; supports efforts covering the investigation and interdiction of illegal drugs and the assessment of foreign airports.

Research and acquisition.—Responsible for all research, prototyping, system development, and acquisition activities. Includes the William J. Hughes Technical Center.

Administration of airports.—Provides for the administration of airport grants and the safety inspection and certification of the Nation's airports.

Commercial space transportation.—Facilitates and promotes commercial space launches by the U.S. private sector and licenses and regulates commercial launches, launch site operations, and certain payloads.

Staff offices.—Funds the Office of the Administrator and the Deputy Administrator, and offices that report directly to the Administrator and provide executive direction; operations and communications control; civil rights; government and industry affairs; policy, planning, and international aviation; legal counsel; financial services; human resources; repair and center operations; and public affairs. Also includes the administrative functions that establish policy and direct and develop programs in the areas of FAA aircraft use and management, building space management, budget and accounting, business information and consultation, human resource management, and technical and management training; includes the regional administrators and the Aeronautical Center Director.

The bill includes $5,857,450,000 for the operations activities of the Federal Aviation Administration from the airport and airway trust fund.

As in past years, FAA is directed to report immediately to the Committees on Appropriations in the event resources are insufficient to operate a safe and effective air traffic control system.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendation in comparison to the budget estimate:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendations
	1999 program level [1 2]	2000 budget estimate	
Air traffic services	4,343,042	[3] 4,696,487	4,681,246
Aviation regulation and certification	629,509	667,631	629,509
Aviation security	123,301	144,642	133,301
Research and acquisition	73,994	183,740	156,533
Administration of airports	48,449	50,608	.....
Commercial space transportation	6,146	6,838	6,146

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendations
	1999 program level [1 2]	2000 budget estimate	
Administration	259,283		
Staff offices	73,971	289,054	250,715
Accountwide adjustments			
Total	5,562,558	6,039,000	5,857,450
User fees	43,000	1,540,000	
Appropriated funds	5,519,558	4,543,000	5,857,450
Secretary's discretionary transfer authority			60,000
Total available funds	5,562,558	6,133,000	5,917,450

[1] Includes $4,863,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.
[2] Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.
[3] Includes $1,500,000,000 in proposed user fee taxes.

AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES

The Committee recommends a total of $4,681,246,000 for the operation and maintenance of the national air traffic control and flight service system.

The Committee is confident that this level, although constrained, is sufficient for air traffic services and offers the following analysis for illustration of the flexibility represented by the Committee's recommendation. The requirements for funding for this activity could be predicated on a series of adjustments to the fiscal year 1998 appropriated level. Initially, the appropriation could be adjusted downward for the estimated $50,000,000 in overflight fees that were not forthcoming in fiscal years 1998 or 1999 but are anticipated at a level of $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2000. The Administrator and the Secretary have both indicated that the FAA has been able to maintain a safe air traffic control environment notwithstanding the inability to access the revenues that would have come from these fees. In addition, substantial controller staff years in this appropriation are directly attributable solely to union activities and over $37,000,000 is attributable to direct overtime staffing. Given the high level of staff-years committed to union activities viewed in conjunction with the seemingly unalterable trend for substantial reliance on overtime staffing, the Committee encourages the Federal Aviation Administration to pursue greater flexibility in staffing arrangements to reduce the current reliance on overtime.

While the Committee does not recommend reducing the appropriation by the approximately $20,000,000 growth in backfill overtime staffing and the seemingly suboptimal timing of the generous allotment of staff-years for union activities, or interim incentive pay which should no longer be necessary, or the increased cost of moving away from the current supervisor structure and ratio, removing the cost of administrative services aircraft or even adjusting the base to reflect the actual fiscal year 1999 baseline, the FAA should pursue efficiencies that would result from a greater coordination of activities in this area and reductions have been assumed for the minimum of $18,000,000 in NAS plan handoff costs that

will not occur and for the oceanic and contract tower savings discussed elsewhere in the report.

Further, the Committee notes that the FAA forecasting of aviation activity has tended to be overly optimistic as discussed in last year's report. The FAA has consistently overestimated future aviation activity which has a cascading impact on the Air Traffic Services budget as it takes 3 to 5 years to fully train a new controller. Overestimates in the need for new controllers 5 years from now will likely lead to significant future expenditures for unnecessary resources. Air traffic control operation costs continue to increase faster than demand for FAA air traffic control services. The high likelihood that future FAA workloads are overestimated should provide some guidance for the FAA as resource constraints are accommodated.

In addition, the FAA must increase the efficiency of the air traffic control work force. Some of those possible efficiencies are mentioned in this and other reports. The average annual growth in operations at air traffic control towers, en route centers, and flight service stations from 1992 to 1997 has been 0.05 percent, 2.13 percent, and 0.55 percent, respectively. Current average operations per hour at en route centers are less than 3 per controller hour, and current average operations per hour at air traffic control towers are less than 6 per controller hour. Those averages would seem to indicate that there is some room for improvement in controller efficiency or staffing coordination.

The Committee is confident that careful management of the funds provided in this act will ensure sufficient resources are available to cover the substantial salary increases contained in the controller's pay agreement.

Maintenance concerns.—The Committee is aware of increasing concerns and complaints about the FAA's decision to impose agency-wide spending restrictions on activities funded by the operations appropriation. The Committee has refrained from earmarking more money for specific items such as staffing and training in the operations account to provide the maximum level of flexibility for the Administrator as she manages the FAA workforce but reiterates the concern that adequate resources are committed to maintaining the FAA's capital plant.

Remote certification and maintenance.—The Committee is concerned about the cost and manpower required to maintain and certify older, more remotely located radar systems. It is the Committee's understanding that technology allows for remote maintenance and certification of these radar systems by continuously measuring a radar's critical performance parameters and automatically transmits the test results over a standard phone line to a designated Maintenance Control Center. In essence, this technology gives older generation radars advanced RMM capability.

Contract tower program.—The Committee recommendation includes $52,100,000 for the contract tower program as well as $5,000,000 for a contract tower cost-sharing program. These funds are in addition to those provided for the regular contract tower program.

The Department of Transportation's Inspector General has found that the contract tower program has provided level I air traffic con-

trol services at a lower cost for 110 towers previously operated by the FAA and provided air traffic control services at 50 towers the FAA could not have afforded to staff.

The cost sharing program allows those towers that fall below the FAA threshold to participate in the program by contributing a local match. The Committee believes that this new program will enable small airports to have their tower staffed with an FAA certified air traffic controller; thereby ensuring the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.

The Committee notes that the FAA contract tower program continues to receive overwhelming support from aviation users and airports as a cost-effective way to enhance aviation safety. As a result, the Committee continues to fully support this program and innovative initiatives such as the contract tower cost-sharing program for certain airports. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the contract tower cost-sharing program and resources funding the original contract tower program at $52,100,000 to continue the base contract tower program and that allow the program to be extended to other visual flight rule (VFR) air traffic control towers operated by the FAA (former Level II and III air traffic control towers as previously classified by FAA). Within 60 days of enactment of this Act, the FAA Administrator is directed to provide to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee a plan proposing the extension of the contract tower program to those VFR towers. The plan should identify potential cost savings and other benefits, such as the positive impact on controller staffing at busier FAA air traffic facilities, and include a timeline for expanding the contract tower program to these facilities during the fiscal year. Average savings from the current contract tower program as compared to an FAA managed baseline average about $250,000 per facility annually. Accordingly, since the savings should be greater with the former level II and III VFR towers, the Committee believes that savings from expanding the program to these towers offer potential savings of as much as $15,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 with even greater savings in subsequent fiscal years.

In addition, the FAA is directed to continue operation of the contract towers at Olympia, WA; Greenville Municipal Airport, MS; Huntsville, AL; and Lea County Airport, NM under this program. Further, the Committee directs the FAA to work with the local Mississippi officials to establish contract towers at Olive Branch Airport and the Tupelo Airport, to work with local and state officials to provide contract tower and operational assistance for the transferred air facility at Adak, with local and military officials to explore contract tower operations at Ft. Sill Army Radar Operation Control, to work with local officials for contract tower service for Felts Field, Washington, and with local Indiana officials for contract tower service for Muncie/Delaware County Airport.

The Committee urges the FAA to work with the communities to explore alternatives, such as sharing tower operating costs, to maintain tower operations.

Contract tower oversight.—In May 1998, the Department of Transportation Office of Inspector General (OIG) provided an audit report on the contract tower program. While the report found the

quality of service between contract and FAA-operated towers to be comparable, it did note that some contract towers had not been staffed at contract specified levels, and that some contractors had been compensated for services that had not been provided. The OIG recommended that the FAA take steps to recoup the overpayments, ensure that contract terms are adhered to, and institute a formal review process. The Committee directs the FAA to report on the progress of implementing the OIG recommendations and requests that the OIG report on the staffing levels at Outagamie County Regional Airport in Appleton, Wisconsin to include an assessment of whether staffing levels are adequate for aircraft operations at the airport.

GPS approaches.—The Committee recommendation includes sufficient funds to continue the FAA's work on GPS approaches and to initiate preliminary consideration and analysis of GPS approaches for helipads to be integrated with helipad lighting design. In addition, the Committee recommendation includes funding for a GPS approach for Bert Mooney Airport in Butte, MT.

National airspace redesign.—The Committee directs not less than $11,000,000 to support the administration's initiative to comprehensively review and design the domestic and oceanic airspace within the United States. The Committee directs the FAA to concentrate the administration's initial efforts on the eastern region, particularly on the redesign of the New York/New Jersey metropolitan airspace, consistent with the administration's plans. These initial efforts will support the planning and design challenges in the New York/New Jersey region's airspace, the most complex and densely traveled airspace in the world. The airspace in this region is some of the most congested in the nation and the current airspace design is quite sensitive to delays if weather or other delay contributing factors occur. The FAA is encouraged to take advantage of new technologies such as satellite navigation and aircraft capabilities, and new flight paths in the redesign effort and to explore best practices from other congested airspace to identify tools to better manage traffic and capacity in this critical air transportation metropolitan airspace.

The national and regional redesign will take advantage of new technologies, such as satellite navigation and aircraft capabilities, and new flight paths. The Committee encourages the administration to ensure that the final result of the redesign will deliver the greatest safety, efficiency and environmental benefits to system operators, users and citizens near airports, particularly those who are affected by air noise.

The Committee requires the FAA to submit quarterly reports on the status of the Newark Delay Reduction Initiatives continuing from last year's conference report.

Oceanic Traffic Services.—The FAA has had difficulty in modernizing the Oceanic services function and the demands on the air traffic routes in the Pacific and the North Atlantic desperately require the capacity enhancement that technological and operational modernization promises for oceanic services. Consistent with the spirit of the Administration's request to move to a PBO for air traffic services, the Committee allows the contracting out of the oceanic function. This function is discreet and operationally discernible

from other FAA air traffic services and facilities and could be an ideal candidate for incrementally moving toward a PBO, privatized, or more competitive air traffic services model for the FAA. A 1997 GRA study commissioned by the FAA Oceanic Integrated Product Team estimated the cost of the Oceanic operation at almost $200,000,000 (1995 data). The Committee requests quarterly reports providing updates on this initiative and the anticipated timeframe for increased efficiency due to modernization and operations under an oceanic services contract.

Leased telecommunication services/RCL.—In prior-years' reports the Committee has expressed concern about underutilization of the radio communications link [RCL], which is owned by FAA and is one of the largest microwave networks in the country. The alternative to increased use of the RCL is reliance on leased telecommunications. The Committee directed FAA to transfer to the radio communications link as much of the existing workload as possible to better utilize that resource. The Committee understands that FAA plans to use RCL circuits rather than increasing reliance on leased circuits from a private vendor.

Notwithstanding this intention on the part of the FAA, the Committee has concluded that FAA is likely to continue to underutilize its radio communications link [RCL] network in favor of leased telecommunications by virtue of the fact that the FAA has failed to follow through on this plan in the past. The Committee suggests that FAA accommodate constrained air traffic services appropriations by disposing of a part of its underutilized RCL network and taking staffing savings. The Committee requests semiannual reports commencing in July 1999 from the FAA on the status of plans to more fully utilize RCL or to decommission it.

Training.—The Committee notes the difficulty that the FAA has had in balancing training management and administration between culture changing activities, proficiency training, and general human resource development training activities, among others. The Committee encourages the agency to redouble its efforts to address the training issues identified by the Office of Inspector General and to continue to report to the Committees on Appropriations on a semiannual basis. Due to resource constraints, the FAA will clearly have to make choices between various training priorities. The Committee continues to note the importance of air traffic controller proficiency and developmental training and concurs in the agency decision not to divert this funding for other activities.

Rocky Mountain Emergency Services Training Center.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for the Rocky Mountain Emergency Services Training Center (RMESTC) in Helena, Montana.

Precision runway monitor at Newark International Airport.—The Committee directs the Administrator to continue to work with the appropriate local authorities toward the installation of Precision Runway Monitor (PRM) at Newark International Airport.

FAA data bases.—Over time, FAA has invested substantial resources in the development and maintenance of a large number of data bases. The growth and proliferation of data bases is a consequence of a number of factors including the wide scope of FAA's responsibilities, its organizational structure, and the widely dif-

fering dynamics of various components of the aviation industry. However, responsibility and/or control over the data bases is not currently centralized; instead it is spread among the various lines of business and other organizational elements who are the prime users of the data collected. There is little agencywide data integration. As such, FAA is becoming increasingly data rich and information poor.

Accordingly, the Committee continues to encourage the FAA to develop a data management plan that leads to optimized data sharing among FAA organizational elements; better control over the costs of data base management; the capability to review and analyze data on a subject as well as a functional basis; and enhanced capability of senior management to resolve time critical questions and issues that may cut across agency organizational elements.

In the fiscal year 1999 report, the FAA was directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations on progress toward a data management plan. The Committee is encouraged by the FAA response to that direction and looks forward to the anticipated report in October 1999 on the development of an integrated, agencywide data management plan. Such a plan is a major undertaking, but it is vital for strategic and policy planning. The FAA has taken an important first step in focusing on the importance of data management with the appointment of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) and with the creation of a framework and methodology for moving forward on the plan.

AVIATION REGULATION AND CERTIFICATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $629,509,000.

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles.—The United States currently maintains approximately 60 percent of the worldwide manufacturing capacity of UAVs. However, there are no standardized regulatory criteria under which manufacturers can develop and build UAVs, or operational procedures that allow them to test and operate UAVs outside restricted airspace on military test ranges. It appears to be timely for the FAA to begin addressing the integration of UAVs into the National Airspace System. The Committee urges the FAA to work with the highly qualified team of experts at the Physical Sciences Laboratory at New Mexico State University to study the issue of wider use of UAVs and what work needs to be done to incorporate UAVs into the National Airspace System.

AVIATION SECURITY

The Committee recommends $133,301,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over fiscal year 1999.

RESEARCH AND ACQUISITION

The Committee recommends $156,533,000.

ADMINISTRATION OF AIRPORTS

The Committee recommends $48,449,000 provided elsewhere in the bill.

COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION

The Committee recommends $6,146,000.

STAFF OFFICES

The Committee recommends $250,715,000, consistent with the presentation in the President's budget request adjusted to reflect budgetary constraints.

BILL LANGUAGE

Reprogrammings.—The Committee continues to have concerns with the inspector general's findings of major variances in amounts proposed for reduction by budget line item to actual amounts reprogrammed. The FAA should not make changes to congressionally approved reprogramming notices, without congressional concurrence. To increase oversight in this area, the Administrator is directed to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with line by line accounts of all future reprogramming actions taken subsequent to approval by Congress.

Second career training program.—The Committee has included bill language which was included in the President's budget request which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for the second career training program. This prohibition has been carried in annual appropriations acts for many years.

Sunday premium pay.—The bill retains a provision, first included in the fiscal year 1995 appropriations bill, which prohibits FAA from paying Sunday premium pay, except in those cases where the individual actually worked on a Sunday. This provision is identical to that which was in effect for fiscal years 1995–99. It was requested by the administration for fiscal year 2000.

Manned auxiliary flight service stations.—The Committee has retained bill language which was requested by the administration to prohibit the use of funds for operating a manned auxiliary flight service station in the contiguous United States. There is no funding provided in the "Operations" account for such stations in fiscal year 2000.

Contract tower program.—The Committee has included language for a contract tower cost-sharing program.

Secretary's discretionary transfer funds.—The Committee has included language that provides authority for the Secretary to transfer up to $60,000,000 from Coast Guard operating expenses, for the purpose of air traffic control operations and maintenance to enhance aviation safety and security.

Oceanic Services Function.—The Committee has included language permitting the FAA to contract out the Oceanic services function.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$1,900,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	2,319,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,045,652,000

[1] Excludes $100,000,000 emergency supplemental for explosives detection systems. Also excludes supplemental funding of Y2K.

Under the "Facilities and equipment" appropriation, safety, capacity and efficiency of the Federal airway system are improved by the procurement and installation of new equipment and the construction and modernization of facilities to keep pace with aeronautical activity and in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration's comprehensive capital investment plan [CIP], formerly called the national airspace system [NAS] plan.

The Federal Aviation Administration's most recent estimate is that it will spend approximately $41,000,000,000 on the Air Traffic Control Modernization effort from 1981 through 2004. The estimate for the modernization of the system has continued to evolve and escalate and the FAA has deployed several new systems since 1981. However, the FAA has not delivered virtually any system (and certainly not any major ones) within cost, schedule, or performance goals due primarily to a complete failure to impose acquisition management discipline. Earlier this year, the General Accounting Office testified:

> "From the inception of the air traffic control modernization program to today, FAA has not consistently followed a disciplined management approach for acquiring new systems. In the 1980's and early 1990's, FAA did not follow the phased approach of federal acquisition guidance designed to help mitigate the cost, schedule, and performance risk associated with the development of major systems. The agency believed that it could develop and install new systems more quickly by combining several of the five phases outlined in this guidance. However, as a result of not following this disciplined, phased approach, FAA often encountered major difficulties such as those associated with developing the Advanced Automation System. In 1995, the Congress exempted FAA from many federal procurement rules and regulations, in April, 1996, FAA implemented an acquisition management system, which emphasized, once again, the need for a disciplined approach to acquisition management. However, we (GAO) found continuing weaknesses in key areas such as how FAA monitors the status of projects throughout their life-cycle."
>
> "FAA has taken a number of steps to overcome problems with past modernization efforts. Most notably, the agency has moved away from its prior practice of taking on large, complex projects all at once and is now acquiring new systems by using a more incremental approach. In addition, the agency is no longer making unilateral decisions about air traffic control modernization. Instead, it has been working actively with the aviation community to make decisions more collaboratively. Furthermore, FAA has begun to address some of the root causes of its modernization problems by implementing processes to help (1) improve its ability to estimate and account for project costs, (2) develop a complete architecture (blueprint) for modernizing the National Airspace System, (3) reduce the risks associated with software development, and (4) reform the organization's culture, including providing incentives to make managers more accountable. While FAA has delivered

> some of its major systems, it must be recognized that many of these projects encountered difficulties in meeting their original cost and schedule goals, and the baselines were subsequently revised."

Clearly, management and modernization of the National Airspace System is a herculean and complicated task, and a challenge which will continue as long as air travel is the fastest, most cost-effective, and safest means of traveling significant distances. Modernization is an incremental and persistent responsibility. Although FAA has recently modified procurement processes and implemented an acquisition management system in 1996, the schedule delays, cost escalations, and performance problems continue to plague modernization efforts. While there are several core issues that continue to appear as reasons for the problems, most of those core issues are arguable rooted in the FAA's organizational culture. Many observers of the FAA acquisition dynamic have concluded that the FAA culture has led employees to act in ways that do not evidence a strong commitment to mission focus, accountability, coordination, and adaptability. The Administrator is currently undertaking a number of steps to change the FAA culture, and early signs are that those efforts are having marginal success. Clearly, changing the FAA culture is a long term proposition, but the Committee recommendations have been reviewed with a focus on reinforcing greater accountability, mission focus, and striving for better or alternative ways of improving the system.

CIP MILESTONES FOR MAJOR SYSTEM ACQUISITIONS

System name	Year of first-site implementation					Year of last-site implementation				
	1983 NAS plan	1991 CIP	1993 CIP	1998 CIP	1999 CIP	1983 NAS plan	1991 CIP	1993 CIP	1998 CIP	1999 CIP
Advanced Automation System (AAS)	1990	1991	1991	([1])	([1])	1994	2001	2004	([1])	([1])
Display System Replacement (DSR)	.....	.....	.....	1998	1998	.....	.....	.....	2000	2000
Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS)	.....	.....	.....	1998	([2])	.....	.....	.....	2005	([2])
Tower Automation Program (TAP)	.....	.....	.....	([3])	([3])	.....	.....	.....	([3])	([3])
Air Route Surveillance Radar (ARSR–4)	1988	1993	1994	1996	1996	1991	1996	1996	1999	1999
Airport Surface Detection Equipment (ASDE–3)	1987	1992	1993	1993	1993	1990	1994	1996	1999	1999
Automated Weather Observing System (AWOS)/ Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS)	1986	1989	1989	1989	1989	1990	1997	1997	2002	2002
Central Weather Processor (CWP)	1990	1991	1991	1991	1991	1991	1998	[4] 1992	[4] 1993	[4] 1993
Flight Service Automation System (FSAS)	1984	1991	1991	1991	1991	1989	1995	1994	1995	1995
Mode-S	1988	1993	1994	1994	1994	1993	1996	1996	[5] 1999	[5] 1999
Radio Microwave Link (RML) Replacement and Expansion	1985	1986	1986	1986	1986	1989	1994	1993	1993	1993
Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR)	([6])	1993	1994	1994	1994	([6])	1996	1996	2001	2000
Voice Switching and Control System (VSCS)	1989	1995	1995	1995	1995	1992	1997	1997	1997	1997

[1] The AAS Program has been restructured into three areas: En Route (DSR), Terminal (STARS), and Tower (TAP).
[2] STARS schedule is under review.
[3] The Tower Automation Program (TAP) has been terminated.
[4] Dates denoted are for MWP I only. The CWP–RWP segment has been eliminated as a continuation of the CWP Program, and has been merged with MWP II into the Weather and Radar Processor (WARP) Program.
[5] Dates denoted are for Interim Beacon Interrogator (IBI) Last-Site Implementation.
[6] The TDWR was not included in the 1983 NAS Plan.

Source: FAA 1983 NAS Plan; 1991, and 1993 CIP; February 1998 GAO testimony "Observations on FAA's Modernization Program" and December 1998 GAO report "Status of the FAA's Modernization Program."

REASONS FOR DELAY AND COST INCREASES IN CIP PROJECTS

System name	Reasons for delay
Advanced automation system [AAS]	In general, AAS delays were due to an overly ambitious plan, inadequate FAA oversight of the contractor, and ineffective resolution of requirements issues. The AAS Program has been restructured into three areas: En route, terminal, and tower.
Air route surveillance radar [ARSR–4] ..	Problems with the radar's development and site preparation delayed first-site implementation. Testing took longer than originally expected. Delays have also occurred due to changes in system design, interface problems with other ATC systems, and slips in site construction. Recent delays are due to environmental issues at Ajo, Arizona and typhoon damage at Mount Santa Rosa, Guam which are the last sites.
Airport surface detection equipment [ASDE–3].	Original delays occurred because FAA and the contractor underestimated software complexity. FAA changed some requirements, and testing uncovered some performance problems. Software development, establishing remote towers, site selection/preparation, and the addition of seven systems have delayed the program.
Automated weather observing system [AWOS]/automated surface observing system [ASOS].	Site prep, installation, and maintenance problems, as well as delays in receiving Government-furnished equipment contributed to original delays. Last-site implementation delay occurred because of communications funding shortfalls and installation delays of the communications infrastructure to deliver weather information. Recent delays are associated with the addition of ASOS systems per fiscal years 1997–98 congressional direction.
Central weather processor [CWP]	Early software development problems and software discrepancies during testing delayed the system in early stages. The program was descoped to just the CWP-MWP I segment, which is now fully implemented.
Flight service automation system [FSAS].	Original delays occurred because of software development and testing problems with the Model I system. Program implementation is complete.
Mode S	Problems in developing hardware and software during initial phases delayed the system, and software problems caused a delay in first-site implementation. Implementation of the last-site has moved due to en route interface requirements and site preparation delays.
Radar microwave link [RML] replacement and expansion.	In the early stages, site acquisition and prep problems delayed the system. Other delays occurred because of a change in the prime contractor and due to problems encountered during operational test and evaluation. Program implementation is complete.
Terminal doppler weather radar [TDWR].	Site availability and land acquisition problems have delayed last-site implementation. Recent delays are associated with land procurement and environmental issues at the last 2 sites (Chicago-Midway and New York).
Voice switching and control system [VSCS].	Early delays were due to the two prototype contractors having technical difficulties in meeting FAA's requirements for system reliability. Additional delays occurred because of software development and integration problems during the upgrade of the prototype to a production model. The implementation schedule has not changed since the 1991 CIP. The last-site implementation was achieved on schedule in February 1997.

The bill includes an appropriation of $2,045,652,000 for the facilities and equipment of the Federal Aviation Administration. The

Committee's recommended distributions of the funds for each of the major accounts are as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

Title	Fiscal year 1999 enacted	Fiscal year 2000 budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION			
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPING	52,566.0	33,166.1	33,166.1
AVIATION WEATHER SERVICES IMPROVEMENTS	26,300.0	23,862.0	21,062.0
EN ROUTE AUTOMATION		10,055.0	10,055.0
OCEANIC AUTOMATION SYSTEM		10,000.0	10,000.0
AERONAUTICAL DATA LINK (ADL) APPLICATIONS	39,000.0	27,855.0	27,855.0
NEXT GENERATION VHF A/G COMMUNICATION SYSTEM		9,640.0	2,625.0
AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (ATM)	51,200.0		
CONFLICT PROBE	41,000.0		
HOST REPLACEMENT	20,000.0		
NAS INFORMATION SYSTEMS		500.0	
FREE FLIGHT PHASE ONE		184,800.0	202,800.0
SUBTOTAL—EN ROUTE PROGRAMS	177,500.0	266,712.0	274,397.0
TERMINAL AUTOMATION (STARS)	99,200.0	58,900.0	58,900.0
AFSS VOICE SWITCH REPLACEMENT		3,000.0	1,000.0
LOCAL AREA AUGMENTATION SYSTEM FOR GPS (LAAS)		4,000.0	
WIDE AREA AUGMENTATION SYSTEM (WAAS)		65,200.0	
NEXT GENERATION NAVIGATION SYSTEMS	92,000.0		118,100.0
NEXT GENERATION LANDING SYSTEMS	34,175.0		18,000.0
SUBTOTAL—LANDING/NAVAIDS	126,175.0	72,200.0	137,100.0
FAA TECHNICAL CENTER FACILITY—BUILDING LEASE	5,290.0	1,322.5	1,322.5
NAS IMPROVEMENT OF SYSTEM SUPPORT LABORATORY	2,000.0	2,000.0	
TECHNICAL CENTER FACILITIES	7,000.0	7,000.0	11,477.5
INDEPENDENT OPERATIONAL TEST SUPPORT	3,500.0	3,500.0	
UTILITY PLANT MODIFICATIONS		2,477.5	
SUBTOTAL, RDT&E EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	17,790.0	16,300.0	12,800.0
TOTAL ACTIVITY 1	473,231.0	447,278.1	516,363.1
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT			
LONG RANGE RADAR (LRR) PROGRAM—REPLACE/ESTABLISH	5,700.0		
EN ROUTE AUTOMATION	194,692.4	198,055.0	153,200.0
NEXT GENERATION WEATHER RADAR (NEXRAD)	4,900.0	6,900.0	4,900.0
AIR TRAFFIC OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT	1,000.0	1,000.0	
WEATHER AND RADAR PROCESSOR (WARP)	20,000.0	12,872.0	5,800.0
AERONAUTICAL DATA LINK (ADL) APPLICATIONS	600.0	1,000.0	
ARTCC BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS/PLANT IMPROVEMENTS	54,000.0	54,000.0	36,900.0
VOICE SWITCHING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (VSCS)	10,000.0	17,500.0	18,500.0
AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	35,000.0	42,000.0	15,000.0
CRITICAL COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT	1,850.0	2,000.0	850.0
DOD BASE CLOSURE—FACILITY TRANSFER	1,000.0	3,900.0	3,300.0
BACK-UP EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS (BUEC)	8,500.0	4,500.0	1,580.0
AIR/GROUND COMMUNICATION RFI ELIMINATION	1,600.0	1,700.0	1,700.0

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Title	Fiscal year 1999 enacted	Fiscal year 2000 budget estimate	Committee recommendation
VOLCANO MONITOR	2,000.0	.....	2,000.0
ATC BEACON INTERROGATOR (ATCBI) REPLACEMENT	14,800.0	45,400.0	23,000.0
ATC EN ROUTE RADAR FACILITIES	4,100.0	3,700.0	2,700.0
EN ROUTE COMMS AND CONTROL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	2,000.0	3,230.4	1,430.0
RCF FACILITIES—EXPAND/RELOCATE	.....	6,700.0	6,700.0
FAA TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE	.....	6,100.0	6,100.0
SUBTOTAL—EN ROUTE PROGRAMS	361,742.4	410,557.4	283,660.0
TERMINAL DOPPLER WEATHER RADAR (TDWR)—PROVIDE	4,300.0	9,300.0	8,300.0
TERMINAL AUTOMATION (STARS)	100,000.0	136,340.0	136,340.0
TERMINAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES—REPLACE	63,625.0	76,000.0	75,500.0
CONTROL TOWER/TRACON FACILITIES—IMPROVE	17,722.2	21,982.7	21,982.7
TERMINAL VOICE SWITCH REPLACEMENT (TVSR)/ETVS	10,300.0	9,900.0	10,900.0
EMPLOYEE SAFETY/OSHA AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE STDS	22,000.0	29,700.0	22,000.0
CHICAGO METROPLEX	.....	1,500.0	700.0
NEW AUSTIN AIRPORT AT BERGSTROM	2,500.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
POTOMAC METROPLEX	.....	17,100.0	5,800.0
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA METROPLEX	17,900.0	31,000.0	17,500.0
ATLANTA METROPLEX	15,000.0	13,000.0	7,700.0
NAS INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NIMS)	20,000.0	8,900.0	5,500.0
AIRPORT SURVEILLANCE RADAR (ASR–9)	5,000.0	.....	5,000.0
AIRPORT SURFACE DETECTION EQUIPMENT (ASDE–3)	5,600.0	2,400.0	500.0
AIRPORT MOVEMENT AREA SAFETY SYSTEM (AMASS)	9,800.0	11,700.0	11,700.0
VOICE RECORDER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	3,000.0	3,000.0	1,200.0
TERMINAL DIGITAL RADAR (ASR–11)	62,200.0	136,070.0	105,000.0
WEATHER SYSTEMS PROCESSOR	11,900.0	24,000.0	24,000.0
DOD/FAA ATC FACILITIES TRANSFER	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,600.0
PRECISION RUNWAY MONITORS	3,300.0	3,300.0	3,300.0
TERMINAL RADAR (ASR)—IMPROVE	2,773.4	3,838.8	3,838.8
TERMINAL COMMUNICATIONS IMPROVEMENTS	1,119.8	1,124.0	1,124.0
RCE EQUIPMENT	.....	3,400.0	3,400.0
SUBTOTAL—TERMINAL PROGRAMS	379,040.4	546,055.5	474,385.5
AUTOMATED SURFACE OBSERVING SYSTEM (ASOS)	9,900.0	8,080.0	9,900.0
OASIS	19,250.0	21,486.0	10,000.0
FLIGHT SERVICE FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,364.4	1,577.3	1,364.4
FLIGHT SERVICE STATION MODERNIZATION	2,000.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
SUBTOTAL—FLIGHT SERVICE PROGRAMS	32,514.4	33,143.3	23,264.4
VOR/DME/TACAN NETWORK PLAN	4,700.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEM (ILS)—ESTABLISH/UPGRADE	.....	8,200.0	.....
ILS—REPLACE MARK 1A, 1B, AND 1C	2,100.0	1,000.0	.....
LOW LEVEL WINDSHEAR ALERT SYSTEM (LLWAS)	3,000.0	2,200.0	2,200.0
RUNWAY VISUAL RANGE (RVR)	2,000.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
GULF OF MEXICO OFFSHORE PROGRAM	2,400.0	.....	.....
WIDE AREA AUGMENTATION SYSTEM (WAAS)	.....	42,900.0	.....
NDB SUSTAIN	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
NAVIGATIONAL AND LANDING AIDS—IMPROVE	2,761.8	3,146.8	6,400.0
APPROACH LIGHTING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT (ALSIP)	5,000.0	2,700.0	5,700.0
PRECISION APPROACH PATH INDICATORS (PAPI)	2,500.0	1,000.0	.....

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Title	Fiscal year 1999 enacted	Fiscal year 2000 budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DISTANCE MEASURING EQUIPMENT	1,200.0	1,200.0	1,200.0
VISUAL NAVAIDS	400.0	1,000.0	3,500.0
TACTICAL LANDING SYSTEMS	3,000.0	.....	.....
INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES AUTOMATION (IAPA)	.....	900.0	900.0
GPS AERONAUTICAL BAND	.....	17,000.0	.....
SUBTOTAL—LANDING AND NAVIGATIONAL AIDS	30,061.8	86,246.8	24,900.0
ALASKAN NAS INTERFACILITY COMM SYSTEM (ANICS)	3,500.0	3,600.0	3,600.0
FUEL STORAGE TANK REPLACEMENT AND MONITORING	10,600.0	10,500.0	10,500.0
FAA BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT—IMPROVE/MODERNIZE	4,000.0	4,000.0	4,000.0
ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS—SUSTAIN/SUPPORT	17,500.0	17,500.0	17,500.0
AIR NAVAIDS AND ATC FACILITIES (LOCAL PROJECTS)	2,000.0	2,000.0	2,000.0
AIRCRAFT RELATED EQUIPMENT PROGRAM	2,000.0	5,000.0	1,840.0
COMPUTER AIDED ENG GRAPHICS (CAEG) REPLACEMENT	1,000.0	4,300.0	3,000.0
AIRPORT CABLE LOOP SYSTEMS—SUSTAIN	.....	1,000.0	.....
SUBTOTAL—OTHER ATC FACILITIES	40,600.0	47,900.0	42,440.0
TOTAL ACTIVITY 2	843,959.0	1,123,903.0	848,649.9
NON-ATC FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT			
NAS MANAGEMENT AUTOMATION PROGRAM (NASMAP)	800.0	1,100.0	800.0
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT	17,000.0	22,500.0	22,500.0
AVIATION SAFETY ANALYSIS SYSTEM (ASAS)	11,600.0	16,400.0	11,600.0
OPERATIONAL DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (ODMS)	1,000.0	600.0	600.0
FAA EMPLOYEE HOUSING—PROVIDE	8,000.0	8,000.0	8,000.0
LOGISTICS SUPPORT SYSTEM AND FACILITIES	2,300.0	3,000.0	2,300.0
TEST EQUIPMENT—MAINTENANCE SUPPORT	500.0	1,000.0	1,000.0
INTEGRATED FLIGHT QUALITY ASSURANCE	3,000.0	5,000.0	4,000.0
SAFETY PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS SUBSYSTEM (SPAS)	3,500.0	5,200.0	3,500.0
NATIONAL AVIATION SAFETY DATA CENTER	1,800.0	1,500.0	1,500.0
PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT SYSTEM	9,700.0	5,000.0	2,000.0
EXPLOSIVE DETECTION SYSTEMS	100,000.0	97,500.0	100,000.0
FACILITY SECURITY RISK MANAGEMENT	1,000.0	11,500.0	11,500.0
INFORMATION SECURITY	4,000.0	10,325.0	4,000.0
NAS RECOVERY COMMUNICATIONS (RCOM)	.....	1,000.0	1,000.0
SUBTOTAL—SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	164,200.0	189,625.0	174,300.0
AERONAUTICAL CENTER TRAINING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES	12,000.0	3,200.0	.....
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) TRAINING FACILITIES	400.0	1,500.0	.....
DSR TRAINING SIMULATOR (MARC)	4,000.0	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL—TRAINING EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES	16,400.0	4,700.0	.....
TOTAL ACTIVITY 3	180,600.0	194,325.0	174,300.0
MISSION SUPPORT			
SYSTEM ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT	28,960.0	27,300.0	22,200.0
PROGRAM SUPPORT LEASES	27,500.0	31,100.0	31,100.0
LOGISTICS SUPPORT SERVICES	5,600.0	5,600.0	5,600.0
MIKE MONRONEY AERONAUTICAL CENTER—LEASE	14,800.0	14,600.0	14,600.0

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Title	Fiscal year 1999 enacted	Fiscal year 2000 budget estimate	Committee recommendation
IN-PLANT NAS CONTRACT SUPPORT SERVICES	2,000.0	2,800.0	2,800.0
TRANSITION ENGINEERING SUPPORT	41,800.0	40,900.0	38,700.0
FREQUENCY AND SPECTRUM ENGINEERING—PROVIDE	1,500.0	3,000.0	3,000.0
PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION MOVES	2,500.0	3,200.0	3,200.0
FAA SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE	1,000.0	2,500.0	2,330.0
TECHNICAL SERVICES SUPPORT CONTRACT (TSSC)	47,550.0	48,800.0	47,143.0
RESOURCE TRACKING PROGRAM	500.0	1,500.0	1,000.0
CENTER FOR ADVANCED AVIATION SYSTEM DEV. (MITRE)	57,000.0	63,400.0	60,100.0
Y2K COMPUTER ISSUES	25,000.0		
Y2K COMPUTER ISSUES (EMERGENCY)	122,133.0		
TOTAL ACTIVITY 4	376,343.0	244,700.0	231,773.0
PERSONNEL AND RELATED EXPENSES			
PERSONNEL AND RELATED EXPENSES	248,000.0	308,793.9	274,566.0
TOTAL	2,122,133.0	2,319,000.0	2,045,652.0

ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

The Committee recommends $516,361,100 for various engineering, development, test, and evaluation activities.

Advanced Technology Development and Prototyping

The Advanced Technology Development and Prototyping covers a range of timely and critical initiatives within the Engineering, Development, Test and Evaluation activity. In particular, the Committee encourages the FAA to focus on the problem posed by runway incursions funded at $3,978,200 within this subactivity. The development of a low cost surface detection system could greatly contribute to confidence on the part of industry and controllers that runway incursions can be identified immediately and managed accordingly. Such confidence would facilitate overall system efficiency in a cascading fashion by maximizing throughput at congested and critical facilities during times of inclement weather.

En route programs

Aviation Weather Services Improvements.—The Committee recommends $21,062,000. This funding is to continue the full scale software development and testing activities, begin algorithm testing, and other developmental and testing activities. Weather is the major contributor to delays and is a major contributor to accidents. The ITWS program supported by this funding holds the promise for improving weather information integration both to controllers and airline industry users for planning activities. However, the program is running behind schedule due to software development delays and does not require $3,800,000 of the budget request for Nims Interface and Telecommunication funds in fiscal year 2000.

En Route Automation.—The Committee expectation provides the full budget request for Activity 1, but encourages the FAA to pro-

ceed slowly with development of additional functional builds to this system.

Aeronautical Data Link (ADL) Applications.—The Committee recommends $27,855,000 for Aeronautical Data Link applications. This activity is a critical component of the "Free Flight Phase I" initiative which is anticipated to provide significant efficiencies and benefits to the user community. The Committee directs the FAA to provide a cost benefit analysis of FAA deployment of the national HID/NAS LAN as compared to contracting out for that capability from the private sector.

Next Generation VHF Air/Ground Communication System.—The Committee recommendation provides $2,625,000 for this digital communications upgrade initiative and directs the FAA to provide the Committee with an analysis of TDMA as opposed to CDMA technology for this functional capability for the agency.

NAS Information Systems.—The Committee recommends no funding for this activity. The justification describes activities better performed in the Operations budget.

Free Flight Phase One Integration.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 more than the full request for the Free Flight Phase One initiative and commends the Administrator for her leadership and involvement of the industry in this initiative. The Free Flight Phase One concept is incremental in nature and should provide the industry and controllers with critically needed efficiency tools. The Committee recommendation includes resources for the expansion of the Departure Spacing Program (DSP) through the installation of equipment at Teterboro, White Plains, Islip Tower, and the Air Traffic Control System Command Center. In addition, the Committee recommendation provides $16,000,000 in Free Flight Phase One for the Safe Flight 2000 program of which $6,000,000 is for the Capstone Initiative and $11,000,000 is for the Ohio River Valley ADS-B Initiative.

Terminal programs

Terminal Automation Program.—The Committee recommendation includes the full request for the Terminal Automation Program (STARS) for both activity 1 and activity 2. It appears that the Committee concerns expressed in last year's report were prescient:

> ". . . the Committee is increasingly concerned about program slippages, cost growth, and the severity of the computer-human interface problems. The Committee reiterates its concern that procurements like STARS, WAAS, and the deepwater capability replacement program are beyond the capability of the Department to manage given the complexity of the systems and the critical nature of the external factors that influence program development."

The STARS program is a candidate for a case study in how not to manage a major procurement. The initial contract was awarded in September 1996 as a commercial-off-the-shelf/non-developmental item [COTS/NDI]-based automated radar terminal system for use in terminal radar approach control facilities. The concept behind the STARS procurement was to maximize the use of a commercially available system, and augment that commercial system with

a minimum of software development. This strategy was pursued because the FAA experience with software intensive development acquisitions have resulted in large cost increases, multiple rebaselinings and major schedule slippages. The initial contractor proposal estimated that 916,000 lines of software code could be used from its existing system and that 119,000 lines of new software code would be developed. The Department of Transportation Inspector General reported in February 1999, that 370,000 lines of new software code would need to be developed and that FAA now considers STARS to be a software development system. Clearly, either the initial STARS procurement strategy was flawed, the program execution was flawed, the FAA failed to establish adequate safeguards to requirements creep, the contract mechanism was inappropriate to the complexity of the acquisition, and/or the FAA still has not discovered how to manage software dependent programs.

The magnitude of the schedule slippages, cost escalations, and (most recently) procurement strategy shifts are entirely the consequence of the FAA's seeming inability to set requirements and manage the contractor to acquisition completion. The experience with computer-human interface "CHI" required modifications should lead the FAA to the realization that procurements to replace entire systems should be abandoned and that the most ambitious FAA acquisition for terminal or tracon automation should focus on replacing components of a system rather than the entire system. Conversely, the Committee believes that the poor performance in the procurement arena should compel the FAA to evaluate the relative merits of contracting out any aspect of the air traffic management function possible including both technology refreshment and operation as a way to mitigate procurement risk.

The recent FAA decision to install "stop-gap" ARTS Color Displays (ACD's) at five major centers without a clear and full identification of the associated costs a few months after committing to an Early Display Configuration (EDC) of the STARS display does not instill confidence on the Committee's part that the FAA is managing this program to set requirements, modified requirements, or has any sensitivity to managing the ultimate costs of this modernization program. Further, the Committee is concerned that proceeding with this new "stop-gap" strategy without a clear and full identification of the associated costs is imprudent. In addition, the Committee is concerned that the ACD's do not contain many, if not most, of the CHI modifications deemed essential by the controllers and the FAA for the STARS EDC displays as safety critical. Either the CHI changes are safety critical or they are not—but clearly the CHI standards for ACD's at the five priority facilities should be no less than that required for STARS EDC. The Committee directs the FAA to report to Congress not later than September 1, 1999 on the total cost of the five ACD installations compared to what the cost would be for the equivalent installation of STARS color displays. The report should also identify those CHI changes required for STARS which do not exist as features in the ACD, and the cost of bringing the ACD to the same level of compliance.

The FAA has announced that the Syracuse, NY and El Paso, TX Terminal Radar Approach Control Centers (TRACONS) will receive

the Early Display Configuration (EDC) of STARS in late 1999 and early 2000, respectively, while parallel development continues on the full STARS. As an interim measure, the FAA plans to install stop-gap ARTS Color Displays (ACD) for the New York and Reagan Washington National TRACONS in the summer and fall of 2000. The FAA also intends to purchase on an unspecified timeline ACD's for the Dallas-Fort Worth and the new Northern California and North Georgia TRACONS.

The Committee understands that the final STARS schedules and program costs will be known by the FAA in late-summer 1999, and shares the FAA's strong commitment to expeditious full STARS implementation, including at those TRACONS where ACD installation is planned on an interim basis. While the STARS EDC will be on-line in Syracuse and El Paso by early 2000, the stop-gap ACD's for two TRACONS will not be operational until later in 2000. The Committee expects the FAA to continue development of EDC displays for all configurations including the ARTS IIIE, and to give consideration to installing them in TRACONS scheduled to receive ACD's should the FAA learn that the announced schedule at the New York and Reagan Washington National TRACONS will slip beyond summer and fall of 2000.

Landing and navigational aids programs

AFSS Voice Switch Replacement.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for this activity to initiate the award of a contract and related program support activity.

Next Generation Navigation Systems.—The Committee recommends $118,100,000 for next generation navigation systems, to be distributed as follows:

Wide Area Augmentation System	$108,100,000
Loran-C navigation system	10,000,000

Although the Committee continues to be concerned by the risk associated with the Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS) as expressed in previous Committee reports, the Committee is somewhat heartened by the FAA decision to retain Loran-C for a minimum of at least eight more years. The Committee continues to be concerned about the confusion that surrounds the WAAS program. Rather than providing a clear path for the WAAS program, the Johns Hopkins study described a system architecture that envisioned 30 satellites, increased signal strength, the addition of the second civil frequency, the removal of selective availability, and the possibility of additional ground stations. While the navigation system of the future is clearly primarily satellite based, it may be equally clear that it is not exclusively satellite based—or that that should be the goal. Fortunately, the slavish preoccupation that the FAA and some in the industry had with "sole means" appears to have been replaced with the recognition that a more probable option includes some form of ground-based navigation aids, notably Loran-C or inertial navigation systems. Further, what is increasingly clear is that the navigational system of the future in developing required navigation performance should address the concerns expressed about jamming, intentional or unintentional interference with satellite based signals, radio propagation, satellite or ground-based system failure, the to-date undefined risks associated with

the ionosphere, and the cost effectiveness of the system. A recent paper presented to the Air Navigation Commission of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) concluded that: "more stringent required navigation performance criteria are required for sole-service and these should be developed before any reduction in the provision of the ground-based infrastructure for navigation creates a *de facto* GNSS sole-service." For the third consecutive year, the Committee recommendation reiterates the Committee's commitment to pursuing satellite based navigation capability by providing the full amount of the Administration request for WAAS.

The Committee continues to support steps to ensure that loran will be available to meet ongoing user navigation safety and efficiency requirements. Loran provides important multimodal navigation capabilities, well-proved, cost-effective, and significant safety and efficiency benefits. The Committee continues to be convinced that support of the loran infrastructure is prudent to meet continuing requirements for the technology, particularly in light of the difficultly the FAA is experiencing with WAAS. Clearly, a GPS/loran alternative to WAAS is to use Loran-C to provide a level of redundant radionavigation capability. Various levels of dependence on Loran could be established such as exclusive reliance on Loran-C or relying on the basic backup network of VOR/DME's for IRU/FMC-equipped aircraft and Loran-C for all other aircraft. Such an alternative may have significant cost and operational advantages in both the short and longer term and failure to maintain the investment in loran infrastructure at this time would be irresponsible.

Next Generation Landing Systems.—The Committee recommends $18,000,000 for next generation navigation systems, to be distributed as follows:

Tactical Landing Systems (TLS)	$2,000,000
Local Area Augmentation System (LAAS)	2,000,000
Instrument Landing Systems	14,000,000

TLS.—Demonstrations of the tactical landing system indicate that the technology may have applications in specific situations. Using existing aircraft avionics, the TLS is designed to provide both guidance commands and safety alerts to pilots. The Committee recommendation for next generation landing systems includes $2,000,000 to continue evaluation and demonstration of this technology as directed in prior appropriations bills.

ILS.—The Committee, consistent with continued concern about the WAAS program cost effectiveness and schedule, recommends an increase in the ILS procurement and installation program. Priority consideration should be given to Harry Brown Airport, Saginaw, MI; Newark Airport (for LDA with glideslope), NJ; Baton Rouge Regional Airport, LA; Evanston, WY; Cedar Rapids, IA; St. George, AK; North Las Vegas Airport, NV; St. Louis Lambert International Airport, MO; McComb Airport, MS; and Atlantic City, NJ.

LAAS/Cedar Rapids.—The Committee recommends that, if certified, the FAA accept the LAAS at Cedar Rapids, IA and operate it at that location.

En route programs

Technical Center Facilities.—The Committee recommendation includes funding for both laboratory improvements and for ongoing capital reinvestment in the technical center facilities.

Independent Operational Test Support.—The Committee recommendation includes the relevant funding for testing and test support within the lines of the programs to be tested. Funding is more appropriately included within the program to properly reflect total system costs.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

En Route Automation.—The Committee recommendation includes all components of the request for En Route Automation in full except the Oceanic modernization request. The Committee recommendation is for the FAA to contract out the modernization and operation of the Oceanic facilities. The FAA has already canceled phase two of the Oceanic modernization project and FAA actions to reprogram fiscal year 1998 funds and to reduce the fiscal year 1999 budget raise questions as to the viability of this initiative as currently configured. Moreover, many FAA officials involved with the project have argued for a revision of the project's scope already. The Committee is encouraged by the quality of the current program management and is confident in the FAA's ability to manage the contracting out of all or part of this function. The justification for Oceanic for fiscal year 1999 indicates that a long term acquisition strategy is timely for this program and the Committee believes that the difficulties in this program in the past, and the discreet nature of the oceanic missions make the entire program (or a subset of the facilities) an ideal candidate for contracting out. The Committee believes that industry is supportive of this approach, is aware of at least three potential competitors for such a service, and believes that this concept can be implemented to Oceanic facilities incrementally or in their entirety. The Committee is further interested in the contracting out of the modernization and operation of this function as a potential new model for specialized air traffic services.

Next Generation Weather Radar (NEXRAD).—The Committee recommends $4,900,000 for Next Generation Weather Radar upgrades, $2,000,000 below the budget request. The FAA has the Committee's approval to seek contributions from the National Weather Service and the U.S. Air Force who share the FAA's interest in seeking a system modification that addresses the anomalous propagation problem existent in the present system.

Air Traffic Operations Management.—The Committee recommendation does not include the budget request for air traffic operations management as the fiscal year 1999 justification indicated that the fiscal year 1999 appropriation completed the initiative.

Weather and Radar Processor (WARP).—The Committee recommends $5,800,000 to complete Stage 1/2 deployments under the WARP contract. Consideration of the balance of the request is deferred pending development of a timetable for integration of the proposed enhanced WARP capabilities with new NAS systems and Free Flight Phase 1.

Aeronautical Data Link (ADL) Applications.—The Committee recommends the entire request for activity 1 funding for ADL but the Committee does not recommend any activity 2 funding for ADL as the fiscal year 1999 appropriation for activity 2 was for the same purpose.

ARTCC Building Improvements/Plant Improvements.—The Committee recommends $36,900,000, the budget request level less the $17,100,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1999 for the Honolulu CERAP. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2000 includes $9,600,000 for the Honolulu CERAP consistent with the request.

Voice Switching and Control System (VSCS).—The Committee recommends $19,500,000 for the VSCS software and switch upgrades, $1,000,000 above the request.

Air Traffic Management.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for this initiative as most of the activities funding under this heading in fiscal year 1999 have been reconstituted into other headings in the Facilities and Equipment account. The budget justification for air traffic management does not justify the same level of funding given that development.

Critical Communications Support.—The Committee recommends $850,000 for critical communications support, the same level as fiscal year 1999. If additional requirements emerge during fiscal year 2000, the Committee is open to a reprogramming from other communication modernization accounts.

DOD Base Closure—Facility Transfer.—The Committee recommends $3,300,000 for DOD Base Closure—Facility Transfer, $2,300,000 more than fiscal year 1999. The Committee directs the FAA to include a future requirement estimate in subsequent budget justifications. Although future estimates might increase or decrease with outyear closures or decisions obviating the need for FAA assumption of certain facilities, it would be helpful to the Committee to have the FAA's best assessment of future requirements in this area.

Back-up Emergency Communications (BUEC).—The Committee recommends $1,580,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Air/ground Communication RFI Elimination.—The Committee recommends $1,700,000 for this activity, the same level as the budget request. The Committee is concerned, however, with the substantial increase in the projected outyear costs in this area and encourages the FAA to assess whether other technologies provide more cost effective solutions to this requirement.

Volcano Monitor.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the monitoring of volcanoes in international flight routes. The Committee is concerned by the lack of a budget request for this activity and has found suitable budget savings to make room for this critical safety investment.

ATC Beacon Interrogator (ATCBI) Replacement.—The Committee recommendation is for $23,000,000, an increase of $8,200,00 over fiscal year 1999 levels. This level is sufficient to procure ATCBI–6 replacement interrogators for 25 facilities. Due to the slippages in the STARS program, this number of interrogators should allow the FAA to replace ATCBI at the most critical facilities and also

move forward on those facilities where STARS equipment will be deployed first. The Committee is aware that an additional 100 facilities will require ATCBI–6 equipment to complete the replacement program.

ATC En Route Radar Facilities.—The Committee recommendation of $2,700,000 is a $1,000,000 increase over fiscal year 1999 appropriated levels if adjusted for proposed reprogramming action. The Committee directs the FAA to provide a future requirement estimate for this program with the fiscal year 2001 budget justification.

En Route Comms and Control Facilities Improvement.—The Committee recommends $1,430,000 for this activity and notes that sustaining activities are more properly budgeted in the Operations account.

Terminal programs

Terminal Doppler Weather Radar.—The Committee has provided $8,300,000, $1,000,000 less than the budget request. This reduction is possible because land acquisition problems continue to plague the program making deployment of a system impossible during fiscal year 2000.

Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities—Replace.—The Committee has provided $75,500,000 for this activity, $11,875,000 more than appropriated in fiscal year 1999. Of the funds available for this activity, $700,000 is for Phase I; $1,800,000 is for Phase II; $35,200,000 is available for Phase III; and $35,100,000 is available for Phase III. The Committee directs $1,000,000 for the Martin State Airport control tower; $500,000 for the Pangborn Memorial air traffic control tower; $1,000,000 for the construction of an air traffic control tower at Paine Field; $1,250,000 for Birmingham International Airport; $2,354,000 for North Las Vegas air traffic control tower; and $1,000,000 for a replacement tower at Billings Logan International Airport. Further, the Committee directs $1,000,000 for initial construction of a replacement tower at Corpus Christi and directs the FAA to explore with the city of Corpus Christi the financing and construction of a replacement FAA–designed tower and terminal radar approach control facility including an arrangement to acquire the facility from the city by 2002.

Airport traffic control tower [ATCT]/TRACON facilities.—The Committee recommends $21,982,726 to upgrade and improve various terminal facilities and equipment on a continuing basis to provide an acceptable level of safe service and to meet current and future operational requirements. The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for control tower communications equipment upgrades at Manchester Airport, NH.

Terminal Voice Switch Replacement (TVSR/ETVS).—The Committee recommends an increase of $1,000,000 above the budget request to expedite the purchase and installation of Rapid Deployment Voice Switches (RDVS).

Employee Safety/OSHA and Environmental Compliance Standards.—The Committee recommendation includes $22,000,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999. The Committee directs the FAA to provide greater detail in the fiscal year 2001 budget justification for this program as well as an explanation of why the

outyear costs estimates are escalating so rapidly. Further, if the agency believes additional funding is necessary or warranted in fiscal year 2000 and can be justified, the agency should submit a reprogramming request.

Chicago Metroplex.—The Committee recommends $700,000 for completion of resectorization and for equipment upgrades. The Committee is aware of the FAA's efforts to improve radar system redundancies for the Chicago TRACON and Chicago O'Hare International Airport Traffic Control Tower during a time of serious budget constraints. The Committee recognizes the need for a reliable back up system that will help ensure controller efficiency and effectiveness. The Committee recommends that the FAA continue to work to provide a reliable back up radar system, acceptable for terminal separation standards, for use by Chicago O'Hare International Airport facilities.

Potomac Metroplex.—The Committee recommends $5,800,000 in fiscal year 2000 funding for this project for Engineering, EIS/Airspace study, program management expenses, and other costs.

Northern California Metroplex.—The Committee recommends $17,500,000 for all items except budget justification activity task 6. Given the status of the STARS procurement, activity task 6 can be deferred for at least one fiscal year, and the Committee is skeptical whether it is necessary at all. In addition, the Committee is concerned by the escalation in the completion cost of this project which has increased by almost 100 percent since the submission of the fiscal year 1999 budget. The Committee is extremely concerned that the agency does not have a better handle on the cost to complete this close to the end of the project.

Atlanta Metroplex.—The Committee recommends $7,700,000 for all items except budget justification activity task 3 for reasons similar to those mentioned for the Northern California Metroplex.

NAS Infrastructure Management System (NIMS).—The Committee recommends $5,500,000 for the NAS Infrastructure Management System rebaselining and restructuring effort for fiscal year 2000. This program was proposed as a substantial source for reprogramming in fiscal year 1999 and is currently under an investment analysis and rebaselining review. The Committee recommendation should be sufficient to complete those initiatives and the Committee will consider the rebaselined program for fiscal year 2001.

Airport surveillance radar [ASR–9].—The Committee provides $5,000,000 and urges the FAA to evaluate the benefits of siting ASR–9 systems to serve the Eagle County Regional Airport, CO; the Mid-Delta Regional Airport, Greenville, MS; and Bethel, AK.

Airport Surface Detection Equipment (ASDE–3).—The Committee recommends $500,000 for completion of this program as justified in the fiscal year 1999 budget justification. The Committee is open to a reprogramming if additional funding is required to bring the program to final completion.

Airport Movement Area Safety System (AMASS).—The Committee recommendation provides the entire budget request for this program although there are significant inconsistencies between the fiscal year 1999 and fiscal year 2000 justifications. The Committee believes that addressing the potential safety and efficiency con-

sequences of not remedying runway incursions justifies a preliminary recommendation of $11,700,000. However, the FAA is directed to provide a report by July 1, 1999 reconciling the cost estimates in the two justifications and explaining how this program complements the runway incursion initiatives elsewhere in this account.

Voice Recorder Replacement Program.—The Committee recommends $1,200,000 for the voice recorder replacement program, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999 after adjustment for proposed reprogramming by the FAA.

Terminal Digital Radar (ASR–11).—The Committee recommends $105,000,000 for the ASR–11 terminal radar program which is approximately the fiscal year 2000 budget request adjusted for the proposed reprogramming amount for the ASR–11 program in fiscal year 1999 and a reduction for site surveys that are unnecessary in fiscal year 2000 due to related program slippages. Clearly, the difficulties that the FAA has had with the STARS procurement translate into program flexibility for the ASR–11 procurement, but the Committee is concerned that the program not become a source for slippages in other accounts. The need to modernize terminal radars is too important to compress the required funding stream any more than the current program architecture envisions. The Committee acknowledges the report from the FAA regarding surveys and cost effectiveness of several proposed radar sites and encourages the FAA to redeploy replaced radars at some of the facilities that cannot justify an ASR–11 deployment on a cost effectiveness basis. In addition, the Committee requests that the FAA provide a recommendation for the most cost effective permanent radar solution for central Oregon (Deschutes and Jefferson Counties); the mountainous region between Butte, Helena, and Bozeman, MT; and Provo and Salt Lake City International Airport in Salt Lake City, UT. In addition, the Committee directs the FAA to explore the acquisition of an ATCBI–5 radar at Keahole-Kona International Airport pending the ASR–11 survey and design work for that airport. Further, the FAA report on the cost effectiveness of a site noted in last year's report assessed the cost effectiveness of siting an ASR–11 at Provo. The Committee directs the analysis to be reevaluated with the awareness that such a siting of an ASR–11 would be of primary benefit to air traffic to Salt Lake City International Airport with complementary secondary benefits to Provo.

DOD/FAA ATC Facilities Transfer.—The Committee recommends $1,600,000 for this activity, a $600,000 increase over fiscal year 1999. This funding is sufficient to assure the continuation of operations for Ft. Sill Army Radar operations and for the assumption of air traffic services currently being provided by the military at Minot AFB, ND and to complete the transfer of approach control services from Patrick AFB, FL.

Flight service programs

Automated surface observing system [ASOS].—The administration requested $8,080,000 for ASOS. The Committee has provided $9,900,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999. The Committee encourages the FAA to continue commissioning systems procured through fiscal year 1998 and for related program manage-

ment costs. The Committee continues to be concerned that the FAA has not adequately funded the program for several years. Adequate funding was not provided for connectivity lines, controller equipment, or operation and maintenance funds. That oversight has left the FAA short of assets to fund ASOS systems for nontowered airports. The FAA, the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB], and user aviation associations have identified over 200 sites which should be equipped with ASOS. In particular, the Committee urges consideration of expediting the installation and commissioning of the ASOS system for Caledonia County State Airport, VT and Henderson Executive Airport, NV.

Oasis.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for the Oasis program which the Committee understands may again be facing delays. The Committee is aware of the difficulty the FAA has had with the prototype systems and directs the agency not to obligate any additional appropriated funds until such time as the Department of Transportation and the program office have conducted a review of the procurement and program requirements to assess the viability of the current program structure. Further, the Committee expects the FAA to use appropriated funds to conduct necessary stopgap work on the existing systems and expects adequate staffing levels to be maintained until such time as Oasis is a viable replacement program.

Flight Service Facilities Improvement.—The Committee recommends $1,364,400, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Landing and navigational aids programs

Wide area augmentation system [WAAS].—The Committee recommends a reduction in this account consistent with the treatment of this program elsewhere in this account.

Navigational and landing aids.—The Committee recommends $6,400,000 for this activity. The additional increase in the funding level over the fiscal year 1999 level is for continued development work on a low cost next generation precision gyroscope utilizing silicon manufacturing technologies. In this development effort, the Committee directs the FAA to continue to work with the involved institutions to facilitate the expedited development of a lower cost gyroscope for application in navigation systems. The reduction from the budget request can be accommodated in task 13. The Committee directs the FAA to give priority consideration to the St. Louis-Lambert International Airport for navigational aids related to the expansion project for which the FAA has issued an LOI. This may be handled by the signing of a reimbursable agreement between the FAA and St. Louis Lambert International Airport.

Approach Lighting System Improvement (ALSIP).—The Committee recommends $5,700,000 for this navigational and landings aids, $3,000,000 over the budget request and $700,000 over the fiscal year 1999 level. The Committee recommendation includes funding for the installation of ALSF–2 systems at Salt Lake City International Airport and LaCrosse Municipal Airport, to make lighting improvements at McCarran International Airport, and to initiate a survey of lighting improvements necessary at Harrisburg Inter-

national Airport, and for an assessment of airfield lighting requirements in rural Alaska.

Distance Measuring Equipment.—The Committee recommends $1,200,000 for the procurement and installation of DME systems. The recommendation includes funding for the relocation and upgrade of the DME at Las Vegas.

Visual Navaids.—The Committee recommends $3,500,000 and has aggregated the Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPI) line and the visual navaid line. The Committee recommendation includes funding for the procurement and installation of Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPI's) as well as Runway End Identification Lights (REIL's), and specifically for the installation of PAPI on runways 4L and 4R at Newark Airport.

GPS Aeronautical Band.—The Committee recommendation provides no funding for this line consistent with the treatment of WAAS and Next Generation Navigational Systems elsewhere in this account. Until the WAAS program has been restructured and rebaselined, it is premature for an effort of this magnitude.

Other ATC facilities programs

Air Navaids and ATC Facilities (Local Projects).—The Committee recommendation provides the full budget request level for this program, but directs the FAA to budget for this as an operations and maintenance item in the future.

Aircraft Related Equipment Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,840,000 for activity tasks 1, 4, and 6.

Computer Aided Engineering Graphics (CAEG) Replacement.—The Committee recommendation provides $3,000,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over fiscal year 1999 for the replacement and modernization of the computer aided engineering and graphics modules.

Airport Cable Loop Systems—Sustain.—The Committee recommendation does not provide the requested $1,000,000 without prejudice. The Committee would favorably consider a reprogramming request for this project from an appropriate facilities or communications program.

Nonair traffic control facilities and equipment

NAS Management Automation Program (NASMAP).—The Committee recommends $800,000, the same level as appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Hazardous Materials Management.—The Committee recommendation includes the full budget request for the cleanup and management of FAA facilities with hazardous materials issues. The Committee directs the FAA to present a listing of anticipated projects for both fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 with the fiscal year 2001 budget justification.

Aviation Safety Analysis System (ASAS).—The Committee recommendation provides $11,600,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999. The Committee recommendation includes funding for Phase 1 of the Airport/Air Carrier Information Reporting System (AAIRS) and the Operations Specifications Subsystem (OPSS) at a minimum. The Committee directs the FAA to provide a greater breakout of individual initiative cost and benefits with the fiscal

year 2001 budget justification and to provide a report by November 1, 1999 of the positions that can be eliminated due to the efficiencies generated by ASAS modernization of data tracking.

Logistics Support System and Facilities.—The Committee provides $2,300,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Integrated Flight Quality Assurance.—The Committee provides $4,000,000 for completion of a virtual data pool development and initiate the development of data sharing protocols, $1,000,000 more than appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Safety Performance Analysis Subsystem (SPAS).—The Committee recommendation provides $3,500,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

National Aviation Safety Data Center.—The Committee recommendation provides the entire $1,500,000 requested for the new data management equipment, but requests a report from the FAA describing the system to be procured before obligation of the funding.

Performance Enhancement System.—The Committee recommendation provides $2,000,000 for this program that is to integrate data into the OASIS system. The Committee is open to an appeal on this item if the FAA can justify the resources given the current status of the OASIS program.

Explosive Detection Systems.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000,000 for this program, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Facility Security Risk Management.—The Committee recommendation provides the entire budget request for this program. The Committee directs the FAA to provide more detail on activity tasks 8, 9, and 10 to the Subcommittee by July 1, 1999.

Information Security.—The Committee recommendation provides $4,000,000 for this program, the same level as fiscal year 1999.

NAS Recovery Communications (RCOM).—The Committee recommendation includes the entire budget request and directs the FAA to evaluate the potential for ultra wide bandwidth technology as part of the replacement of outdated radio equipment. The FAA is directed to report to the Committee on the relative merits of the technologies under consideration by August 1, 1999.

Training, equipment, and facilities

The Committee recommendation includes no funding for the budget request items in this area without prejudice. The projects requested in this area can be deferred without compromising efficiency, safety, or operational proficiency.

Mission support

System Engineering and Development Support.—The Committee recommendation provides a 6 percent cost escalation in system engineering technical assistance prime contractor services cost over fiscal year 1999 rates, which translates to a program level of $22,200,000 for fiscal year 2000 based on the utilization rates in the justification.

In-plant NAS Contract Support Service.—The Committee recommendation provides the full budget request for NAS Contract Support Services. The Committee directs the FAA to provide a pro-

gram by program breakout of the contract costs associated with the application of this program.

Transition Engineering Support.—The Committee recommendation provides $38,700,000 for this contract service program, a slightly greater than 6 percent escalation in staff year costs over fiscal year 1999 levels.

FAA Corporate System Architecture.—The Committee recommendation provides the full budget request with the exception of activity task 5.

Technical Services Support Contract (TSSC).—The Committee recommendation provides $47,143,000.

Resource Tracking Program.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,000,000, a doubling of the fiscal year 1999 appropriated level.

Center for Advanced Aviation System Dev. (MITRE).—The Committee recommendation provides $60,100,000, half the requested increase in MITRE services and roughly a 6 percent growth over fiscal year 1999 levels.

MAJOR EQUIPMENT ACTIVITY

TERMINAL DOPPLER WEATHER RADAR

City	Acceptance	Commissioning dates
Memphis	July 1993	December 1994.
Houston Intercontinental	March 1993	July 1994.
Atlanta	April 1993	December 1995.
Washington National	February 1994	January 1996.
Denver	December 1993	August 1995.
Chicago O'Hare	March 1994	July 1996.
St. Louis	May 1994	February 1995.
Orlando	June 1994	April 1996.
New Orleans	July 1994	March 1996.
Tampa	December 1994	April 1996.
Miami	November 1995	June 1996.
Pittsburgh	December 1994	July 1997.
Andrews AFB	December 1994	August 1996.
Newark	December 1994	October 1997.
Boston	April 1995	January 1996.
Kansas City	December 1994	July 1995.
Detroit	March 1996	September 1996.
Houston Hobby	August 1995	July 1996.
Dallas/Love	May 1995	January 1996.
Dallas/Fort Worth	June 1995	June 1996.
Dayton	May 1995	April 1998.
Wichita	June 1995	September 1995.
Indianapolis	July 1995	October 1996.
Cincinnati	July 1996	June 1997.
Philadelphia	July 1996	October 1997.
Phoenix	March 1997	March 1997.
Milwaukee	March 1997	November 1997.
Chicago Midway	January 2000	July 2000.
Cleveland	July 1996	October 1996.
Columbus	December 1996	May 1997.
San Juan	May 1998	June 1999.
West Palm Beach	February 1996	May 1997.
Nashville	April 1997	February 1998.
Louisville	June 1997	March 1999.

TERMINAL DOPPLER WEATHER RADAR—Continued

City	Acceptance	Commissioning dates
Washington Dulles	November 1996	March 1998.
Charlotte	September 1995	December 1995.
Salt Lake City	March 1997	March 1999.
Fort Lauderdale	February 1998	May 1999.
Baltimore	November 1996	May 1997.
Raleigh-Durham	April 1997	January 1998.
Minneapolis	March 1997	May 1997.
Oklahoma City	March 1997	April 1997.
Tulsa	May 1997	April 1998.
New York City (JFK and LGA)	February 2000	September 2000.
Las Vegas	November 1998	May 1999.

AIRPORT SURFACE DETECTION EQUIPMENT [ASDE–3]

Site location	Delivery date	Commissioning date
FAA Academy [1]		
WJH Technical Center [2]		
Pittsburgh, PA	December 1989	June 1996.
San Francisco	November 1991	October 1995.
Dallas/Fort Worth	February 1992	March 1995.
Philadelphia	February 1992	March 1996.
Los Angeles [3]	August 1992	April 1995.
Detroit	August 1992	December 1994.
Cleveland	August 1992	December 1994.
Boston	August 1992	March 1995.
Portland	August 1992	December 1994.
Atlanta	September 1992	January 1995.
Seattle	September 1992	December 1993.
Los Angeles [3]	February 1993	February 1995.
Denver (DIA) [3]	March 1993	May 1995.
St. Louis	December 1993	February 1995.
Denver (DIA) [3]	December 1993	October 1995.
New York-Kennedy	January 1994	February 1995.
Minneapolis	July 1994	March 1995.
Anchorage	August 1994	October 1995.
New Orleans	October 1994	September 1995.
Baltimore	November 1994	June 1995.
Kansas City	December 1994	May 1995.
Miami	February 1995	November 1996.
Houston [3]	February 1995	August 1995.
Memphis	June 1995	December 1997.
Chicago	June 1995	April 1996.
Houston [3]	August 1996	July 1997.
Charlotte	September 1999	December 1999.
Louisville	August 1998	May 1999.
Reagan Washington National	February 1996	November 1999.
Cincinnati	October 1995	September 1996.
Dulles	May 1997	February 1998.
San Diego	November 1995	November 1996.
Dallas-Fort Worth [3 4]	November 1996	February 1998.
Andrews AFB	January 1998	February 1999.
Salt Lake City	March 1998	May 1999.
Las Vegas [4]	March 1999	December 1999.
New York-LaGuardia	June 1999	December 1999.

AIRPORT SURFACE DETECTION EQUIPMENT [ASDE–3]—Continued

Site location	Delivery date	Commissioning date
Newark	June 1998	May 1999.

[1] FAA training/field support/depot support facility.
[2] To be relocated to Aeronautical Center, Oklahoma City.
[3] Dual sensor facilities.
[4] Assets redirected from Tampa, Raleigh-Durham, Orlando, Orange County.

Terminal air traffic control facilities

Funding for terminal air traffic control facilities started in previous years:

St. Louis (TRACON), MO	North Las Vegas, NV
Portland, OR	St. Louis (ATCT), MO
Houston (Hobby), TX	Louisville (Standiford Field), KY
Chicago (O'Hare), IL	Worchester, MA
Chicago (Midway), IL	Covington, KY
Pontiac, MI	Newark, NJ
Albany, NY	Grand Canyon, AZ
Birmingham, AL	Seattle (ATCT), WA
Little Rock, AR	LaGuardia, NY

Phase III for terminal air traffic control facilities started in fiscal year 1998 and before:

Boston, MA	Port Columbus, OH
Roanoke, VA	

Phase II funding for terminal air traffic control facilities started in fiscal year 1999 and before:

Atlanta, GA

Phase I funding for terminal air traffic control facilities to be replaced in fiscal year 2000:

Swanton, OH

Personnel and related expenses

Personnel and Related Expenses.—The Committee recommendation provides $274,566,000, disallowing the requested increases in the base for travel, other objects, and selected portions of the requested PC&B increase. Other reductions were taken based on inconsistencies between the President's request and Committee recommended levels resulting in a recommended level 9 percent above fiscal year 1999 appropriated levels.

ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee has not included the advance appropriations for fiscal years 2001 through 2007 requested by the administration.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$150,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	173,000,000
Committee recommendation	150,000,000

[1] Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.

This appropriation finances research, engineering, and development programs to improve the national air traffic control system by increasing its safety, security, productivity, and capacity. The programs are designed to meet the expected air traffic demands of the future and to promote flight safety. The major objectives are to keep the current system operating safely and efficiently; to protect

the environment; and to modernize the system through improvements in facilities, equipment, techniques, and procedures in order to insure that the system will safely and efficiently handle the volume of aircraft traffic expected to materialize in the future.

The Committee encourages the FAA to provide slightly greater detail in the budget justification presentation of the Research, Engineering, and Development account similar to the detail provided in the Facilities and Equipment account. In particular, the justification should provide cost breakouts for the individual initiatives within each budget item.

The bill includes $150,000,000 for research, engineering, and development. The Committee suggests the following allocation:

Program Name	Fiscal Year 1999 Enacted	Fiscal Year 2000 Estimate	Committee Recommendation
System Development and Infrastructure:			
System planning & resource management	$1,164,000	$1,294,000	$1,164,000
Technical laboratory facility	9,730,000	11,075,000	11,075,000
Center for Advanced Aviation System Development	4,890,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
Subtotal	15,784,000	17,269,000	17,139,000
Capacity and Air Traffic Management Technology:			
Safe Flight 21	.....	16,000,000	.....
Winglet efficiency/wake vortex	.....	.....	4,000,000
Subtotal	.....	16,000,000	4,000,000
Weather:			
Hazardous weather program	15,084,000	12,665,000	13,665,000
Juneau, AK	3,600,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
Subtotal	18,684,000	15,765,000	16,765,000
Aircraft Safety Technology:			
Aircraft systems fire safety	4,750,000	5,528,000	4,750,000
Advanced materials/structural safety	1,734,000	2,338,000	2,338,000
Propulsion and fuel systems	2,831,000	3,126,000	3,126,000
Flight safety/atmospheric hazards research	2,619,000	3,844,000	3,844,000
Aging aircraft	14,694,000	15,998,000	18,094,000
Aircraft catastrophic failure prevention research	1,787,000	1,981,000	1,981,000
Aviation safety risk analysis	6,471,000	6,824,000	6,824,000
Subtotal	34,886,000	39,639,000	40,957,000
System Security Technology:			
Explosives and weapons detection	41,700,000	40,676,000	37,500,000
Airport security technology integration	2,708,000	2,285,000	2,285,000
Aviation security human factors	5,282,000	5,256,000	5,256,000
Aircraft hardening	2,000,000	5,001,000	2,000,000
Subtotal	51,690,000	53,218,000	47,041,000
Human Factors & Aviation Medicine:			
Flight deck/maintenance/system integration human factors	11,000,000	10,142,000	9,142,000

Program Name	Fiscal Year 1999 Enacted	Fiscal Year 2000 Estimate	Committee Recommendation
Air traffic control/airway facilities human factors	10,000,000	11,236,000	8,000,000
Aeromedical research	4,065,000	4,829,000	3,065,000
Subtotal	25,065,000	26,207,000	20,207,000
Environment and Energy	2,891,000	3,481,000	2,891,000
Innovative/Cooperative Research	1,000,000	1,421,000	1,000,000
Total appropriation	150,000,000	173,000,000	150,000,000

The objectives of and Committee recommendations for the 8 major activities in FAA's Research, Engineering, and Development Program are discussed below.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Objectives: To provide (1) a systems engineering approach and benefit/cost analyses to the development of a comprehensive research, engineering, and development program and (2) visibility, accountability, coordination, and control of the research, engineering, and development activities.

System planning and resource management.—The Committee recommends $1,164,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

FAA technical laboratory facility.—The administration's request was $11,075,000 for work at the FAA Technical Center. The Committee provides the full budget request.

Center for Advanced Aviation System Development.—The Committee provides the appropriation for the Center for Advance Aviation System Development within the Facilities and Equipment appropriation.

CAPACITY AND AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To ensure that air traffic management operations safety is maintained and then improved, to increase system capacity and utilization of existing airspace and airport resources, and to accommodate greater user flexibility and efficiency.

Safe Flight 21.—The Committee recommendation includes the appropriation for this activity within the appropriation for Free Flight Phase 1.

Winglet efficiency/wake vortex.—The Committee recommends $4,000,000 for research, prototyping, and flight testing into this technology that reduces fuel consumption and reduces the severity of wake vortex creation potentially allowing more efficient spacing of aircraft.

WEATHER

Objectives: To improve the timeliness and accuracy of weather forecasting in order to enhance flight safety, increase system capacity, improve flight efficiency, reduce air traffic control [ATC] and pilot workload, improve flight planning, and increase productivity.

Hazardous weather program/Socrates.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,300,000 for continued research and testing into possible applications of the Socrates technology. The funding will permit progress to be made toward testing and evaluating a Socrates eight-beam system. In addition, the recommended level includes $500,000 toward the initial proof of concept, and design and development work of an Ice Monitoring and Detection (IMADS) system based on passive polarization technology.

AIRCRAFT SAFETY TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To develop technologies, standards, and maintenance regulations that maintain or improve aircraft safety in an evolving, changing, and demanding aviation environment.

This research supports airborne data monitoring systems, advanced materials and crashworthiness research, the Center for Aviation Systems Reliability (CASR), and the Aging Aircraft Nondestructive Inspection Validation Center (AANC), which conduct research in the area of aircraft safety technology. The research initiatives in this area are a unique and comprehensive effort to improve the safety of aging aircraft by applying new technical capabilities in inspection, and drawing upon expertise in government, university and industry. To support the continuation of that partnership, the Committee recommendation includes more than $3,000,000 for support of AANC, $2,800,000 for CASR, $4,200,000 for the Engine Titanium Consortium, and substantial other funds to support the efforts of the Air Assurance Center of Excellence.

Aircraft systems fire safety.—The Committee recommends $4,750,000 for this budget item, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Aging aircraft.—The Committee recommendation provides $18,094,000, for aging aircraft research. The Committee recommendation includes direct support of more than $3,000,000 for the Aging Aircraft Nondestructive Validation Center which is substantially below the activity level in fiscal year 1998 and slightly less than $3,000,000 for activities at the Center for Aviation System Reliability.

Aviation Safety Risk Analysis.—The Committee recommendation provides $6,824,000, the same level as requested by the administration.

SYSTEM SECURITY TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To enhance the security of passengers and crews in all aspects of aircraft, airports, and related ATC facilities by developing systems that prevent or deter terrorist activities.

Explosives and weapons detection.—The Committee recommendation provides $37,500,000. This level recognizes the need to continue to pursue emerging technologies as well as the availability of a second certified explosive detection system. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $1,000,000 for the Safe Skies initiative to accelerate research and development of explosives and biological agents being conducted by the Institute of Biological Detection Systems and $5,000,000 into Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis technologies.

Aircraft hardening.—The Committee recommendation provides $2,000,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Airport Security Human Factors.—The Committee provides the full request for airport security human factors and underscores the importance of this work to the integrity of the entire security effort. Screeners, who operate the equipment in airports, are absolutely critical in providing effective airport security. Technology, while critical, is only optimally effective if operated properly. Work on the selection and training of screeners as well as systemic data analysis of performance is critical to fielding systems that can address the threat.

HUMAN FACTORS AND AVIATION MEDICINE

Objectives: To establish ways to improve the effectiveness of human performance in the operation of the aviation system and to seek better methods for preventing human error, accidents, and incidents.

Human Factors & Aviation Medicine.—During hearings for fiscal year 2000 FAA appropriations, the Committee submitted a question related to whether there was any scientific or medical reason why the United States should not "cautiously increase the retirement age to age 63" like other countries have for commercial aviation. The text of the question follows:

> The Age 60 Rule was instituted in 1959 without the benefit of medical or scientific studies and without public comment. The EEOC has essentially eliminated age discrimination rules in all facets of commercial aviation with the exception of FAR Part 121 and Part 135 carriers. Other countries—Great Britain, Germany, France, Austrailia, etc.—have modified their age 60 restrictions. Japan began a study on the age sixty issue and discontinued it after finding no safety or operational reasons to maintain age 60 as a mandatory retirement age. The most recent pilot aging study was the Hilton Systems Technical Report 8025 (known generally as the Hilton Study) undertaken by Lehigh University and Hilton Systems, Inc to "conduct statistical analysis on historical data to investigate the relationship between pilot age and accident rates." The report concluded: "we saw no hint of an increase in accident rate for pilots of scheduled air carriers as they neared their 60th birthday." In spite of this study, the Age 60 Rule not only remains in effect, it was expanded in 1995 to include Part 135 pilots in spite of no record of any age-related accidents or incidents in the affected pilot group. Clearly, the United States seems to be moving against the international aviation community and contrary to our own national trends on age discrimination rules. Can you provide any medical or scientific reason why the United States should not follow the findings of the Hilton Study and "cautiously increase the retirement age to age 63?"

The answer from the FAA indicated that, "While science does not dictate the age of 60, that age is within the age range during which sharp increases in disease mortality and morbidity occur." and

"* * * In late 1990, FAA initiated its most recent study of the issue, aimed at consolidating available accident data and correlating it with the amount of flying by pilots as a function of age. This resulted in the March 1993 Hilton study report, 'Age 60 Project, Consolidated Database Experiments, Final Report', which found 'no hint of an increase in accident rate for pilots of scheduled air carriers as they neared their 60th birthday" but noted that there were no data available on scheduled air carrier pilots beyond age 60." The Committee directs the FAA to conduct a survey of all available non-scheduled commercial (and non-commercial, if available) data concerning the relative accident data correlated with the amount of flying by pilots as a function of their age for pilots of age 60–63 and comparing it with all four year groupings of scheduled commercial pilots (and non-commercial pilots, if available) declining from age 60, i.e., 56–59, 55–58, 54–57, * * * to 21–24. etc. In addition, compare the discernable groups in their entirety and track accident frequency as a function of age. The Committee directs the FAA to deliver this report no later than January 1, 2000. No more than half the funds appropriated in the Human Factors and Aviation Medicine program may be obligated for other than this initiative until delivery of the report.

Air traffic control/airway facilities human factors.—The Committee recommends $8,000,000.

Aeromedical research.—The Committee recommends $3,065,000.

Environment and Energy.—The Committee recommends $2,891,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

Innovative/Cooperative Research.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for innovative and cooperative research, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

Objectives: To protect the environment, conserve energy, and keep the U.S. air transportation industry strong and competitive. The Committee recommends $2,891,000.

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

Objectives: To maximize the total effectiveness of research, engineering, and development by incorporating the efforts of other Government agencies, the industry, and universities. The Committee recommends $1,000,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999	$1,600,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	1,750,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,750,000,000

The Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended, authorizes a program of grants to fund airport planning and development and noise compatibility planning and projects for public use airports in all States and territories.

The Committee recommends $1,750,000,000 in liquidating cash for grants-in-aid for airports. This is consistent with the Committee's obligation limitation on airport programs for fiscal year 2000 for the reported Senate reauthorization proposal, and for the payment of previous years' obligations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Obligation limitation, 1999	($1,950,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2000	(1,600,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(2,000,000,000)

The total program level recommended for fiscal year 2000 for grants-in-aid to airports is $2,000,000,000 and is intended to be sufficient to continue the important tasks of enhancing airport safety, ensuring that airport standards can be met, maintaining existing airport capacity, and developing additional capacity.

The Airport Improvement program for fiscal year 2000 is not yet authorized. For fiscal year 1999, Congress appropriated an obligation limitation of $1,950,000,000. This represents the highest appropriated level in history, and when combined with Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) receipts at applicable airport in excess of $1,600,000,000, total resources available for airport improvement and investment should have topped $2,550,000,000. Unfortunately, the Airport Improvement Program has been the subject of three legislative extensions and will terminate on August 6, 1999 unless the program is reauthorized or extended a fourth time for the remaining 55 days of the year. Clearly, small airports have had a difficult time bidding airport improvement projects in fiscal year 1999 due to the uncertain status of the federal program.

The Committee recommendation establishes a new program level for fiscal year 2000 of $2,000,000,000 and rescinds the inapplicable obligation limitation for the unauthorized program. The Committee is committed to restructuring the program consistent with a reauthorization program, if reauthorization is completed prior to enactment of the fiscal year 2000 Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

The Committee notes that a sizable alternative source of funding is available to airports in the form of passenger facility charges [PFC's]. The first PFC charge began for airlines tickets issued on June 1, 1992. DOT data shows that as of March 1, 1999, 302 airports have been approved for collection of PFC's in the amount of $23,100,000,000. During calendar year 1998 it is estimated that airports collected $1,444,000,000 in PFC charges and $1,469,000,000 is estimated to be collected in calendar year 1999. Of the airports collecting PFC's, approximately one-fourth collected about 90 percent of the total, and all of these are either large or medium hub airports. DOT estimates that these airports will collect more than $1,400,000,000 in calendar year 2000, depending on the number of applications received and approved and assuming current statutory authority. The administration has proposed to raise the statutory cap on the maximum PFC that may be charged.

It is interesting to note the trends in where airport investment dollars are flowing. Of the PFC revenue streams approved from 1992–98, 26 percent of the total resources have been committed to specifically airside projects, while 40 percent have been committed

specifically to landside projects. When AIP program funds are included, the mix moves to 36 percent for landside projects and 41 percent for airside projects. Accordingly, the limited experience with PFC projects when balanced with AIP program funds tend to strike a rough balance between the two broad categories of projects. As our airport infrastructure matures, the Committee expects that both airside and landside capacity enhancements will become increasingly expensive and the marginal cost benefit of purchasing increased capacity will in all likelihood decline. Clearly, we must be more and more focused on which airport infrastructure investments to make to maximize system capacity and to ensure air connectivity for the entire project. In the absence of a reauthorized airport program, the Committee has attempted to address those two priorities in the recommendation and would anticipate airport investment overall to continue to grow with PFC airports gradually increasing their investment in airside projects.

AIRPORT PROGRAMS

The Committee has carefully considered a broad array of discretionary grant requests that can be expected in fiscal year 2000. Specifically, the Committee expects the FAA to give priority consideration to applications for the projects listed below in the catergories of the AIP for which they are eligible. If funds in the remaining discretionary category are used for any projects in fiscal year 2000 that are not listed below, the Committee expects that they will be for projects for which FAA has issued letters of intent (including letters of intent the Committee recommends below that the FAA subsequently issues), or for projects that will produce significant aviation safety improvements or significant improvements in systemwide capacity or otherwise have a very high benefit/cost ratio.

Within the program levels recommended, the Committee directs that priority be given to applications involving the further development of the following airports:

Brookhaven-Lincoln County Airport, MS
Aberdeen Regional Airport, SD
Abilene Regional Airport, TX
Anaconda Airport, MT
Anchorage International Airport, AK
Bangor International Airport, ME
Baton Rouge Metropolitan Airport/Ryan Field, LA
Birmingham International Airport, AL
Bishop Airport, MI
Boeing Field/King County International Airport, WA
Brewton Airport, AL
Burlington International Airport, VT
Butler County Airport, PA
Caledonia Airport, VT
Cherry Capital Airport, MI
Chignik Lagoon Airport, AK
Chippewa County International Airport, MI
City of Colorado Springs Municipal Airport, CO
Clarks Point Airport, AK
Dane County Regional Airport, WI
DeKalb-Peachtree Airport, GA
Delta County Airport, MI
Dickinson Municpal Airport, ND
Dothan Airport, AL
Erie International Airport, PA
Eufuala Airport, AL
Fairbanks, International Airport, AK
Felts Field Airport, WA
Ford Airport, MI
Forks Airport, WA
Glacier Park International Airport, MT
Golden Triangle Regional Airport, MS
Governor's Regional Airport, GA
Great Falls International Airport, MT
Grosse Ile Municipal Airport, MI
Gulfport-Biloxi International Airport, MS
Gwinnett County Airport, GA
Halifax Regional Airport, NC
Hamilton/Marion County Airport, AL
Harnett County Airport, NC
Hattiesburg-Laurel Regional Airport, MS
Hawkins Field Airport, MS
Helena Regional Airport, MT

Herber City Municiple Airport, UT
Holy Cross Airport, AK
Houghton County Memorial Airport, MI
Huntsville International Airport/Jones Field, AL
Indiana County/Jimmy Stewart Airport, PA
Jackson International Airport, MS
James M Cox Dayton International Airport, OH
Johnston International Airport, NC
Juneau International Airport, AK
Kotzebue Airport, AK
Kent County International Airport, MI
Key Field Airport, MS
Lancaster Airport, PA
Las Cruces Municipal Airport, NM
Lea County Airport, NM
Lehigh Valley International Airport, PA
Lenawee County Airport, MI
Logan-Cache Airport, UT
Louisiana Regional Airport, LA
Madison County Airport, AL
Mammoth Lakes Airport, CA
Manistee County Blacker Airport, MI
March AFB Airport, CA
McGrath Airport, AK
Miami International Airport, FL
Mingo County Airport, WV
Mobile Regional Airport, AL
Monroe Municipal Airport, LA
Montgomery Regional Airport/Dannelly Field, AL
Moorehead City Airport, MN
New Orleans International Airport, LA
Nome Airport, AK
Northwest Alabama Regional Airport, AL
Oakland-Pontiac Airport, MI
Ogden-Hinckley Airport, UT
Olive Branch Airport, MS
Philadelphia Municipal Airport, MS
Atka Airport, AK
Pittsburgh International Airport, PA
Provo Municipal Airport, UT
Pryor Field Airport, AL
Reading Municipal, General Carl A Spaatz Field, PA
Reno/Tahoe International Airport, NV
Richard B. Russell Field, GA
Rickenbacker International Airport, OH
Russellville Municipal Airport, AL
Russian Mission Airport, AK
Salt Lake City International Airport, UT
Sawyer Airport, MI
Shelby County Airport, AL
Sheldon Point Airport, AK
Spokane International Airport, WA
Springfield/Branson Regional Airport, MO
Statesboro County Airport, GA
Stennis International Airport, MS
Tishomingo County Airport, MS
Tooele Valley Airport, UT
Tulip City Airport, MI
Tunica Municipal Airport, MS
Waynesboro Municipal Airport, MS
Wendover Airport, UT
Westmoreland County Airport, PA
Whitefield Airport, NH
Wilkes County Airport, NC
Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport, PA
Williamsport-Lycoming County Airport, PA

LETTERS OF INTENT

Congress authorized FAA to use letters of intent [LOI's] to fund multiyear airport improvement projects that will significantly enhance systemwide airport capacity. FAA is also to consider a project's benefits and costs in determining whether to approve it for AIP funding. FAA adopted a policy of committing to LOI's no more than about 50 percent of forecasted discretionary funds allocated for capacity, safety, security, and noise projects. The Committee viewed this policy as reasonable because it gave FAA the flexibility to fund other worthy projects that do not fall under a LOI. Both FAA and airport authorities have found letters of intent helpful in planning and funding airport development.

The Committee appreciates the complexity of assessing a project's impact on systemwide capacity but believes that FAA should do its best in this regard before committing future AIP funds under a LOI.

The Committee in the past was concerned that FAA had not exercised sufficient control over the use of LOI's. Accordingly, to maintain program integrity and ensure LOI commitments are met, the Committee repeats its recommendation, as Congress reauthorizes this program, that FAA be granted the authority to award new

LOI's only after scheduled and recommended LOI payments fall to less than 50 percent of AIP discretionary funds.

Current letters of intent assume the following fiscal year 2000 grant allocations:

Alaska: Anchorage Internationl	$4,950,000
Arkansas: Fayetteville (northwest Arkansas)	7,000,000
California: Sacramento Metro	1,600,000
Florida:	
Fort Myers Southwest Florida international	2,000,000
Orlando International	6,343,000
Georgia: Hartsfield Atlanta International	8,363,000
Illinois:	
Mid-America, Belleville reliever	14,000,000
Chicago Midway	8,000,000
Kentucky:	
Greater Cincinnati	5,000,000
Louisville	3,525,000
Michigan: Detroit Metropolitan	16,640,000
Mississippi: Golden Triangle	34,000
Missouri: St. Louis Lambert International	13,813,000
Nevada:	
Reno/Tahoe International	7,600,000
Las Vegas-Henderson Sky Harbor	2,540,000
Rhode Island: Theodore F. Green State	6,528,000
South Carolina: Hilton Head	383,000
Tennessee: Memphis International	6,800,000
Texas:	
New Austin at Bergstrom	6,430,000
Midland	1,327,000
Utah: Salt Lake City International	9,000,000
Virginia: Reagan Washington National	12,643,000
Washington: Seattle-Tacoma International	11,600,000
Total	156,119,000

In addition, applications are pending for capacity enhancement projects which would, if constructed, significantly reduce congestion and delay. These projects require multiyear funding commitments. The Committee recommends that the FAA enter into letters of intent for multiyear funding of such capacity enhancement projects.

Orlando International Airport, FL.—The Committee encourages the FAA to give full and immediate consideration to the Greater Orlando Aviation Authority's application for a letter of intent for construction of a north crossfield taxiway connecting the two west runways (18L/36R and 18R/36L) with the existing east runway. The Committee is informed that substantial safety and capacity benefits will accrue from the completion of this project.

Unauthorized use of airport lands.—The Committee is concerned about the recent findings of the General Accounting Office that lands acquired for airport purposes through Federal grants or the Federal Surplus Property Act have been used for other purposes in violation of grant and transfer because of FAA's nominal on-site monitoring efforts and over reliance on self certifications of compliance by airports. Some of the latter were found to be fallacious and there was inconsistent application of FAA's own enforcement guidelines across FAA field offices, according to the GAO. As a result, the actual scope of the problem remains unknown.

Accordingly, within 6 months from the passage of this Act, the Committee directs the FAA to conduct an on-site survey of all airports with lands acquired through grants or surplus property

transfers and report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee on the survey results including, the scope of unauthorized land use changes, the proposed enforcement and corrective actions, and changes made to FAA's guidelines for use by FAA field offices to assure more consistent and complete monitoring and enforcement. After the initial report, the FAA shall include with its annual budget submissions a status report on both enforcement and corrective actions taken, and the number and types of airports to be surveyed in the ensuing fiscal year, including the number of on site surveys, for each field or regional office responsible.

Max Westheimer Airport.—The Committee is aware of the Norman, Oklahoma community's interest in putting the property located at the Max Westheimer Airport into productive aviation-related, academic and other uses. The Committee urges the FAA to work with the local community to achieve a solution that is mutually beneficial to all involved interests.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2000 PROGRAM

The principal missions of the Federal Highway Administration are: administration, in cooperation with the States, of the Federal-aid highway program; regulation and enforcement of Federal requirements relating to the safety of operation and equipment of commercial motor carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; and governance of the safety in movement over the Nation's highways of dangerous cargoes such as explosives, flammables, and other hazardous materials.

Under the Committee recommendations, a total program level of $28,883,455,000 would be provided for the activities of the Federal Highway Administration in fiscal year 2000. The following table summarizes the fiscal year 1999 program levels, the fiscal year 2000 program request and the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	1999 program level	2000 budget estimate	
Appalachian development highway system [1]	132,000	.....	.....
Federal-aid highways limitation [2]	25,511,000	27,312,230	27,701,350
Limitation on administrative expenses [3]	(327,413)	(344,616)	(370,000)
Office of Motor Carrier Administrative expenses [4]	(53,375)	(55,418)	(55,418)
Exempt Federal-aid obligations	1,424,047	1,132,000	1,132,000
Emergency relief supplemental obligations	115,965	.....	.....
Miscellaneous appropriations [5]	200,000	.....	.....
Motor carrier safety	100,000	105,000	105,000
Total	27,483,012	28,549,230	28,883,455

[1] In fiscal year 2000, TEA21 provides $450,000,000 contract authority for ADHS within Federal-aid highways.
[2] Includes Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act program.
[3] Excludes reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.
[4] Included within limitation on administrative expenses. Does not reflect administrations May 1999 budget amendment proposing $50,000,000 increase for Office of Motor Carriers.
[5] Includes $100,000,000 each for Massachusetts and Arkansas.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	($327,413,000)
Budget estimate, 2000	(344,616,000)
Committee recommendation [2]	(370,000,000)

[1] Excludes reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.

The limitation on administrative expenses controls spending for virtually all the salaries and expenses of the Federal Highway Administration. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century changed the funding source for the highway research accounts from the administrative takedown of the Federal-Aid Highway Program to individual contract authority provisions.

The following table reflects the fiscal year 1999 level, the level requested by the administration, and the Committee's recommendation:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	1999 level	2000 budget estimate	
Administrative expenses (except OMC):			
Salaries and benefits	192,091	200,979	224,363
Travel	9,473	9,473	9,473
Transportation	656	663	663
GSA rent	17,922	20,275	20,275
Communications, rent, and utilities	9,369	9,465	9,465
Printing	1,609	1,609	1,609
TASC	18,880	19,054	19,054
Supplies	2,079	2,079	2,079
Equipment	3,862	4,362	4,362
Other	18,097	21,239	21,239
TASC reduction	−2,646		
Subtotal	271,392	289,198	312,582
Motor carrier safety administrative expenses:			
Salaries and benefits	41,610	43,052	45,052
Travel	3,480	3,480	3,480
Transportation	110	111	111
Communications, rent, and utilities	395	399	399
Printing	558	564	564
Other services	5,140	5,730	5,730
Supplies	275	275	275
Equipment	1,807	1,807	1,807
Subtotal	53,375	55,418	57,418
Total	324,767	344,616	370,000

Administrative expenses.—The Committee recommends $370,000,000 for this appropriation. The Committee has also included language to require the FHWA to provide $29,000,000 for critical highway safety initiatives and audits and investigation of highway programs. Accordingly, because of this provision, the Committee provides the FHWA the flexibility to allocate the committee recommendation among such expenses as ADP, permanent change

of station, travel, transportation, and nonmandatory bonuses and incentives.

This spending is manageable within the LAE due to the recommended increase in the account and the elimination of $10,000,000 in one time costs in fiscal year 1999 that do not carry to fiscal year 2000. In addition, the Administration budget request presents administrative expenses in excess of $26,000,000 below the Committee recommended level. The Committee expects the FHWA to focus on program delivery, initiate development effort on the new community/federal information partnership program in the last quarter of fiscal year 2000 from funding within the base, restrain travel, printing, training, and resist an increase in rent for the NASSIF facility unless substantial improvements are made to the facility by the landlord. Such actions will allow the FHWA more than adequate resources to fund all ingrade increases, all mandatory and requested non-mandatory pay increases, establishment of an office of intermodalism within Federal Highways, and remaining non-salary administrative costs if those initiatives remain priorities.

Motor carrier operations.—The Committee recommends $57,418,000 for motor carrier operations. This recommendation includes a $2,000,0000 transfer from LAE for investigations and audits and does not include any funding for a truck and bus safety summit outside the Washington, DC area.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999	$24,000,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	26,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	26,300,000,000

This activity comprises the majority of all federally aided programs through which the States are financially and technically aided to continue a national highway system that meets the transportation needs of the Nation in terms of capacity and safety.

All programs included within the Federal-aid account are financed from the highway trust fund. Authorizations in the form of contract authority are enacted in substantive legislation. These authorizations are apportioned and/or allocated to the States and generally remain available for obligation over a 4-year period. Liquidating cash appropriations are subsequently requested to fund outlays resulting from obligations incurred under contract authority.

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $26,300,000,000 for the Federal-aid highways program.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	($25,511,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2000	(27,312,230,000)
Committee recommendation	(27,701,350,000)

[1] Excludes reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.

The Committee has provided an obligation limitation of $27,701,350,000 for the Federal-aid highway program for fiscal year 2000.

The following table shows the estimated amount each State will receive in total Federal-aid highway funds for fiscal year 2000:

Federal-aid highway funds

[In thousands of dollars]

STATES	*AMOUNT*
Alabama	514,148
Alaska	308,181
Arizona	415,724
Arkansas	337,191
California	2,318,987
Colorado	294,973
Connecticut	386,713
Delaware	111,905
Dist. of Columbia	98,768
Florida	1,187,961
Georgia	916,932
Hawaii	130,803
Idaho	196,204
Illinois	849,160
Indiana	639,812
Iowa	301,714
Kansas	293,256
Kentucky	438,683
Louisiana	428,329
Maine	134,457
Maryland	399,519
Massachusetts	472,512
Michigan	816,991
Minnesota	376,788
Mississippi	306,799
Missouri	619,870
Montana	253,611
Nebraska	195,078
Nevada	184,033
New Hampshire	131,019
New Jersey	649,202
New Mexico	250,273
New York	1,301,042
North Carolina	717,748
North Dakota	165,608
Ohio	939,002
Oklahoma	390,514
Oregon	311,359
Pennsylvania	1,269,827
Rhode Island	152,168
South Carolina	407,639
South Dakota	184,310
Tennessee	581,687
Texas	1,918,601
Utah	197,066

STATES	*AMOUNT*
Vermont	115,318
Virginia	648,737
Washington	457,851
West Virginia	283,603
Wisconsin	505,118
Wyoming	176,411
Subtotal	25,683,211
Territories	5,748
Allocation Reserve	2,651,391
Total	28,340,350

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Within the $27,312,230,000 obligation limitation that the Administration proposed that not more than $641,450,000 be made available for transportation research programs, including the surface transportation program, technology deployment program, training and education, intelligent transportation systems, university transportation research, and MAGLEV; $31,000,000 for the Bureau of Transportation Statistics; and $20,000,000 for the advanced vehicles technologies program. The Committee recommends a total limitation of $391,450,000 on research and development activities. These funds shall be distributed as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate, 2000	Committee recommendation
Surface transportation research	185,000	97,000
Technology deployment program	100,000	40,000
Training and education	28,000	16,000
University transportation research	27,250	27,250
Intelligent transportation systems	271,200	211,200
National advance driver simulator	[1] 10,000	.....
Total	641,450	391,450

[1] Funded from revenue aligned budget authority.

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

The Committee recommends a total limitation of $211,200,000 to be distributed as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate, 2000	Committee recommendation
Intelligent transportation systems:		
Research and development	94,150	35,550
Operational tests	19,150	6,650
Evaluation	7,500	7,000
Architecture and standards	14,000	14,000
Mainstreaming	14,400	6,000
Program support	9,000	9,000

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget estimate, 2000	Committee recommendation
ITS Deployment Incentives Program	113,000	113,000
Total, ITS	271,200	211,200

Research and Development.—Within the funds provided for R&D, the Committee's allowance includes $7,300,000 for commercial vehicle operations research, which is $800,000 more than requested. Those additional funds will advance critical safety data systems, such as SAFER/CVIEW and ASPEN, and further test the Safer Data mailbox project that allows for the electronic retrieval of information on prior inspections of commercial motor vehicles and drivers. The mailbox technology provides a valuable tool used by enforcement officers to reduce highway crashes and fatalities involving trucks and buses. Using the information provided, state safety personnel concentrate inspections on previously identified high-risk carriers and drivers, especially those who do not correct out-of-service defects identified in previous inspections.

The Safer Data mailbox project allows state enforcement officials working at the roadside to gain access to near real-time inspection information. One of the greatest needs for that information is to assist officers working in the border states who are ensuring that safety requirements are met as specified in NAFTA. Historical safety information is lacking on carriers from adjoining countries, making quick retrieval of safety information most critical. Past inspection records in the mailbox system may be the only information available for making critical safety and inspection decisions at the border. The Committee expects FHWA to continue to advance this project and ensure that it is made available to all states, especially border states. FHWA shall work with a border state to serve as a lead technology distribution agent. The lead state would provide technical assistance to all states interested in advancing and deploying the Safer Data mailbox system.

The Committee recognizes the unique positioning of Drexel University because it is ideally located within 15 miles of interstate highways, major bridges, parkways, intercity and light commuter rail, rapid transit systems, bus systems, an international port, and an international airport. The Committee urges the Administrator to work with Drexel University to focus on the link between intelligent transportation systems and transportation infrastructure.

Intelligent vehicle initiative [IVI].—The Committee urges the Director of the Joint Program Office to ensure that the primary Federal role in the IVI is focused on expediting the innovation of integrated crash avoidance technologies for passenger vehicles. In view of the substantial human factors research, performance specification work, crash avoidance and information systems integration, and cost/benefit assessment work that remains to be completed, an IVI program focused on those critical safety issues is of foremost importance. Such activities as automation of transit vehicles, snow removal systems, and other highway maintenance vehicles and re-

search on nonsafety components of the IVI shall receive a much lower priority than critical safety objectives.

Evaluation.—The Committee recommends $7,000,000 for program evaluation studies and recognizes the importance of continuing to evaluate the benefits and costs of various ITS projects and tracking progress on those projects. Of the funds provided, up to $1,000,000 is available for the testing and development of a smart Commercial Drivers License utilizing smart card and biometric elements to enhance safety and efficiency.

Architecture and standards.—The Committee recommends $14,000,000, for architecture and standards work. The Committee understands that the Department has proposed a national standard under a mandate in the TEA21 legislation based on the use of an active radio frequency identification (RFID) technology for Commercial Vehicle Operations utilizing Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC). This is of concern because it minimizes, if not ignores, the significant presence of passive RFID technology equipment in transportation operations nationwide. As many states utilize an alternative passive system for transportation-related DSRC functions, particularly electronic toll collection, concerns have been shared with the Committee over not creating an architecture that precludes the application of passive RFID technologies in the search for a standard under the TEA21 mandate. The Committee directs the department to establish a program to test passive technology and incorporate the results into the department's development and implementation of a national architecture and standards regime. The Committee believes that the congressional mandate to establish a national standard was not meant to preclude different types of technology, but rather to create an architecture that would permit different technologies to mature and to create an architecture that permits regional, interregional, and national interoperability. The Committee urges the department to pursue a set of national standards in that spirit and requests a report on the results of efforts in this area with the fiscal year 2001 budget submission.

Mainstreaming.—The Committee believes that the Department was spending too much of scarce ITS resources trying to convince planners, the engineering community, and others of the benefits of ITS. There is substantial literature documenting the benefits of using ITS; numerous training courses and programs are well underway; and the ITS concept is beginning to be mainstreamed in the transportation community. Consequently, the Committee's allowance provides $6,000,000, the same level provided in fiscal year 1999. Remaining mainstreaming funds shall be used to provide technical assistance on the planning, procurement, and implementation of integrated ITS technologies, offer guidance on the use of the national architecture, and supplement critical training not available from the private sector or universities.

The Committee is pleased that the Department has changed the scope and nature of the "mainstreaming" activity and supports initiatives to provide direct technical and procurement assistance to states and other governmental entities planning, evaluating, or deploying ITS.

National ITS Program Plan.—The Committee looks forward to receiving as soon as possible an update of the National ITS Pro-

gram Plan, which will be prepared in a manner consistent with the requirements of Section 5205 of the TEA21.

ITS deployment projects.—The Committee action provides a limitation of $113,000,000 for ITS deployment projects. The funds provided are for deployment projects in the areas listed below. The amounts associated with each area represent the minimum amount such area shall receive.

ITS deployment projects	*Committee recommendation*
Southeast Michigan	$4,000,000
Salt Lake City, UT	6,500,000
Branson, MO	1,500,000
St.Louis, MO	2,000,000
Shreveport, LA	2,000,000
State of Montana	3,500,000
State of Colorado	4,000,000
Arapahoe County, CO	2,000,000
Grand Forks, ND	500,000
State of Idaho	2,000,000
Columbus, OH	2,000,000
Inglewood, CA	2,000,000
Fargo, ND	2,000,000
Albuquerque/State of New Mexico interstate projects	2,000,000
Dothan/Port Saint Joe	2,000,000
Santa Teresa, NM	1,500,000
State of Illinois	4,800,000
Charlotte, NC	2,500,000
Nashville, TN	2,000,000
Tacoma Puyallup, WA	500,000
Spokane, WA	1,000,000
Puget Sound, WA	2,200,000
State of Washington	4,000,000
State of Texas	6,000,000
Corpus Christi, TX	2,000,000
State of Nebraska	1,500,000
State of Wisconsin rural systems	1,000,000
State of Wisconsin	2,400,000
State of Alaska	3,700,000
Cargo Mate, Northern NJ	2,000,000
Statewide Transcom/Transmit upgrades, NJ	6,000,000
State of Vermont rural systems	2,000,000
State of Maryland	4,500,000
Washoe County, NV	2,000,000
State of Delaware	2,000,000
Reno/Tahoe, CA/NV	1,000,000
Towamencin, PA	1,100,000
State of Alabama	1,300,000
Huntsville, AL	3,000,000
Silicon Valley, CA	2,000,000
Greater Yellowstone, MT	2,000,000
Pennslyvania Turnpike, PA	7,000,000
Portland, OR	1,500,000
Delaware River, PA	1,500,000
Kansas City, MO	1,000,000
Total	113,000,000

HIGHWAY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends the following allocation of highway research and development contract program funds:

[In thousands of dollars]

	2000 estimate	2000 recommendation
Safety	12,000	13,000
Pavements	12,500	13,700
Structures	16,100	15,500
Environment	6,000	6,000
Policy	5,200	4,000
Planning and real estate	4,000	4,000
Motor carrier	6,400	6,000
Highway operations	700	700
Freight	500	500
Total	63,400	63,400

Within the appropriate research areas, FHWA is directed to fund each of the research activities or programs specified in various sections of TEA21.

Safety.—The Committee recommends $13,000,000 for safety research and development activities. The Committee supports research and demonstration activities to advance technology and best practices understanding of lighting and signing to improve the driving performance of older drivers as well as research into the use of UV lights and flourescent materials to improve night time visibility, to help identify lane markings and pedestrians at night. The Committee expects that the additional funds recommended will be used to expedite work on projects delayed to pay for construction of the NADS. Within the recommendation, the Committee has included $100,000 for FHWA, working with industry suppliers and the FRA, to conduct the necessary research and to incorporate guidance in the National Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for highway/rail grade crossing pre-signal operations, and to advance a new traffic signal warrant for preemption requirements. The research and guidance materials will assist engineers by ensuring appropriate design, timing and interface between highway and railroad signal equipment. Of the funds provided, up to $750,000 shall be available to evaluate and deploy a nationwide Highway Watch Program to improve roadway safety.

Pavements.—The Committee recommends $13,700,000 for pavements research. The Committee is encouraged by the potential benefits for highway construction—including lower construction and maintenance costs, higher riding quality, and a longer life-cycle of new and reconstructed highways—resulting from the use of geosynthetic materials. Therefore, the Committee has included $400,000 for geosynthetic material research at the Western Transportation Institute at Montana State University.

The Committee also directs FHWA to conduct further research into polymer additives for pavements. The Committee is aware that recent performance measurements have shown in various limited applications to increase the expected life of asphalt pavement. Therefore, the Committee has included $1,500,000 to conduct extensive research into this area. Of this amount, $1,250,000 shall be for the pavement research related to developing low cost pavement with flexibility to tolerate frost heaves in extreme climates. Fur-

ther, the Committee encourages the FHWA to work with an academic and industry-led national consortium and fund with available balances, an additional polymer additive project to demonstrate the use of polymer additives in pavement for civil infrastructure purposes.

The Committee is aware of the Federal Highway Administration's pavement design analysis work that utilizes the fundamental properties of the various pavement materials, analytical packing algorithms and granular mechanics, coupled with state-of-the-art imaging techniques and computational modeling and builds on the work performed at the University of Mississippi. The Committee directs the FHWA to continue to cooperate and work with the researchers there to develop concepts and technologies that will lead to better constructed and longer lasting high quality pavements.

The Committee recognizes the potential for the use of silica fume to decrease the national waste material stream and increase the durability and quality of concrete structures and pavement. Within the funds provided, the Committee directs that $1,000,000 be used to evaluate and promote the benefits of using silica fume high performance concrete, and that the Administrator of the FHWA report on its findings to the Committee no later than September 30, 2001. The Committee directs the Administrator to work with a representative national organization of the silica fume industry to carry out this project.

For the purpose of constructing a segment of highway for research purposes, utilizing a binder composed of polymer additives currently being tested by the FHWA, the State of South Carolina may utilize funds allocated to it under the congestion mitigation and air quality program, consistent with current law. The Committee is aware and applauds such a cooperative arrangement between FHWA and the State of South Carolina—effectively leveraging the use of Federal research dollars by creating practical "laboratories" for selected research initiatives on our nation's roadways. The Committee is aware that research into this binder has not been completed, but that recent performance measurements conducted by FHWA have shown significant increases in the expected life of pavement utilizing this binder. The Committee also makes available $1,250,000 for research costs associated with this project and directs the FHWA to work with the South Carolina State University and Clemson University, where there exists significant transportation engineering capabilities, to further the goals of this research.

Structures.—The Committee recommends $15,500,000 for structures research. The Committee believes that a unique opportunity to conduct research exists during the Interstate 15 reconstruction project and other transportation projects in the Salt Lake Valley, UT. The research performed during the reconstruction of I–15 and other projects will provide the country with a detailed analysis of the load capacities of deteriorated bridge structures, seismic retrofitting, new nondestructive evaluation techniques, and many other valuable areas of research. The Committee has included $1,500,000 for this research and because of the urgency of this research, directs the FHWA to make these funds available to the Utah Department of Transportation and the Utah Transportation Center in a

timely manner to ensure the execution of this research. The Committee is interested in research to develop advanced engineering and wood composites for bridge construction and has provided $1,200,000 for that purpose within this program. In addition, the FHWA is encouraged to work with Cal State University at San Diego on advanced composite material for bridges and up to $1,000,000 is available for that purpose. As the Department pursues research in the testing of structures and composites, the Committee recommends the seismic expertise of the Structural Engineering Technology Laboratories and the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program and urge the department to consider the applicability and benefits of establishing a earthquake simulation facility at the Nevada Test Site for full-scale earthquake testing applications. The Committee is aware of the composite, structures, and highway engineering work ongoing at the West Virginia University and has provided $2,000,000 for structures and pavement funds for the establishment of a Center of Excellence at the WVU Constructed Facility Center. The Committee recommendation also includes $1,000,000 for the deployment of technology to prevent and mitigate alkali silica reactivity utilizing lithium salts as previously authorized through 23 USC Sections 5001(a)(2) relating to technology deployment and 5001(c)(2) relating to bridge research and construction.

The Committee recognizes the specialized expertise of the Lehigh University's Center for Advanced Technology for Large Structural Systems (ATLASS) in the field of large scale structure, such as bridges and encourages the Administrator to continue to working with Lehigh University on this research.

Environment Research.—The Committee recommends $6,000,000 for research on environmental issues affecting highway operations and construction, the requested amount. The unique goal of the National Environmental Respiratory Center to research the health effects of combined pollutants or contaminants is relevant to the Department's focus on environmental and health consequences of pollutants generated by transportation emissions. To understand the aggregate health effects of real-world, highly complex mixtures of air contaminants, NERC will develop identical health data across several complex, man-made mixtures, including those from transportation sources. The Committee urges the Department of Transportation to collaborate with the National Environmental Research Center on its research strategy so that national transportation system design and policy has the benefit of this important data.

The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the UNI Native Vegetation Center. The Native Vegetation Center operates as a clearinghouse and information center for the use of native vegetation in the upper Midwest, it produces seed stocks for commercial sellers and in some cases provides seed to state and local highway authorities. Using native prairie seed not only provides scenic advantages, it lowers maintenance because it does not require mowing, weed spraying or other erosion prevention measures.

Policy.—The Committee recommends $4,000,000 for policy research. Of the funds provided, the FHWA shall develop a comprehensive program of intermodal logistics training and operational

testing to enhance the safe and efficient movement of freight through the state intermodal corridors and facilities.

Cross State Line Planning.—The Committee is aware of the difficulty of conducting and coordinating preliminary planning for highway improvements and regional connectors for facilities that cross state lines. Accordingly, the Committee directs the FHWA to study this issue and propose tools or processes that will facilitate the preliminary planning process in the absence of a Memorandum of Understanding between the affected states.

Planning and real estate.—The Committee's allowance includes $4,000,000 for planning and real estate research. The Committee understands that $2,500,000 is programed in the research account to begin work on an initiative to model data in a large scale simulation that moves individual carriers and freight loads over the nation's multimodal transportation system. The Committee is very interested in this work and requests that the department keep the Committee abreast of progress in this area. The Los Alamos National Laboratory is currently developing the National Transportation Network Analysis Capability (NTNAC), under the sponsorship of the Departments of Transportation, Energy, and Defense. The objective of this research is to study and understand the national transportation system as a single, integrated, multimodal system. Efforts under the NTNAC have resulted in the completion of the proof-of-principle phase, demonstrating the potential of creating on a national scale a network analysis capability for rail and highway transportation. This phase has confirmed the ability for the NTNAC to provide guidance for policy and investment decisions, reduce delays and congestion, and analyze the nation's demand for petroleum-based fuels. With the successful conclusion of the proof-of-principle phase, the Committee requests that the Department of Transportation serve as the lead agency in the next phase of the NTNAC—the development of a full scale simulation capability. The Committee requests that DOT provide support for this important next step of the NTNAC, including the introduction of maritime and aviation interests into the NTNAC. DOT's active role and support will provide the NTNAC with the resources and capability to complete these efforts, resulting in the first analytical system that represents the U.S. transportation system as a single, integrated, intermodal system.

Economic Development Highways.—The Committee is interested in some recent studies that demonstrate the degree of new and sustainable economic development generated by new or substantially improved highway facilities through economically disadvantaged regions. The Committee directs the Department to identify the multistate regions that have persistent unemployment levels lower than the national average and the highway facilities that currently serve the population base in such a region.

Motor Carrier.—The Committee recommends $6,000,000 for the motor carrier research program. The Executive Director of FHWA shall ensure that the budget justification for this research area is improved substantially. Future budget requests will delineate the specific projects that will be funded and the exact amounts that are requested for each project. In addition, terminating projects and their associated baseline amounts and all continuing projects and

associated funding amounts will be specified. Of the funds provided in this account, $500,000 are for the truck driving center safety initiative at Crowder College, MO. Total expenses from any DOT funding source for the international conference on motor carrier research shall be limited to less than $60,000. Up to $1,000,000 available to study the effects of shift changes on truck driver alertness.

Because of a variety of concerns, the Committee last year directed FHWA to request the Transportation Research Board (TRB) to review the motor carrier research program. A committee of experts assembled by TRB found that the program is neither needs based nor objectively prioritized. TRB concluded that OMCHS was placing insufficient attention on research pertaining to crash prevention and countermeasures. The Committee directs that the fiscal year 2000 budget program be redesigned to implement each of the recommendations offered by the TRB. Before obligating any of the fiscal year 2000 funds, the Committee directs that a revised motor carrier safety research plan be submitted to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that demonstrates that crash causation analysis will become a priority; that OMCHS will expedite its efforts to develop a motor carrier crash causation database that will provide the information required to better plan future research projects; and that OMCHS has realigned its R&D program to achieve cost-effective safety benefits, paying particular attention to opportunities to reduce the largest number of commercial motor vehicle-involved crashes through R&D. The Committee expects that the fiscal year 2001 budget submittal to continue implementing this revised strategy.

Interstate rest areas.—There is increasing concern that due to increasing rehabilitation, liability, and maintenance costs, many states are experiencing difficulty operating Interstate rest areas and many are considering closing them. Some states are pursuing commercialization as a solution and others are considering privatization. This is an area where the Federal government could contribute through informing states about best practices in solving these types of issues and in providing leadership in developing standards or guidelines. The Committee directs the FHWA to study the issue and provide recommendations as to methods for states to ensure competitive alternatives for interstate travelers and to provide uniformity, rest area signage standards, oasis identification conformity. In addition, the Committee directs the FHWA to study and report to the Committee the effects of shift changes on truck driver alertness.

Electronic Control Module Technology.—The Committee is aware of the potential benefits of electronic control module technology in trucks. Electronic control modules store data, such as vehicle speed and brake pedal and throttle position, that could prove useful to law enforcement investigations of crashes on our nation's highways and roads and prevent future loss of life in much the same way that flight data recorders contribute to airplane crash investigations. The Committee requests that the FHWA work with interested parties to explore a standard of protocol for access to and the relevant data to be recorded in this area and report back to the Committee by June 2000. It is the Committee's expectation that in

the development of any such safety enhancement tool, any standards or protocols would follow high standards of privacy and would only apply to instances in which law enforcement had secured a warrant with the intention of investigating a serious crash.

Freight.—The Committee recommends $500,000 for freight research. Within the recommended amount, the Committee urges the agency to continue research to improve multimodal connections for freight and high value shipments in a manner consistent with passenger services.

TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Center for Advanced System Technology.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Center for Advanced Simulation Technology, Long Island, NY, of which not less than $1,000,000 shall be made available to Auburn University for a transportation management program. These funds will be used to develop outreach initiatives involving technology transfer, technical assistance and training related to transportation management, traffic control, and simulation and human factors.

CONSTRUCTION OF FERRY BOATS AND FERRY TERMINAL FACILITIES

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

The Committee has provided a limitation on obligations of $38,000,000 for the new construction of ferry boat and ferry terminal facility program. The Committee notes that the authorization of this program reserves $20,000,000 of the total amount for projects within the marine highway system. Within the $18,000,000 not reserved for this purpose, the Committee urges priority consideration for Penn's Landing ferry, PA $2,000,000 is provided for a ferry upgrade at McCelland and wood landing sites which is part of the Lewis and Clark Trail. In addition, $3,000,000 shall be provided to the State of Hawaii to initiate an intra-island ferry service from Barbers Point to Honolulu Harbor. In addition, $1,000,000 is provided for the New Bedford, MA, ferry terminal.

REVENUE ALIGNED BUDGET AUTHORITY

Beginning in fiscal year 2000, TEA21 provides that guaranteed funding levels for the federal-aid highways and highway safety programs are adjusted to reflect revised receipt estimates for the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund. In conjunction with this adjustment, section 110 of Title 23, entitled the Revenue Aligned Budget Authority (RABA), authorizes contract authority in an amount equal to the additional obligation limitation. This follows through on the TEA21 philosophy that highway program funding levels are linked to receipts to the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund.

In fiscal year 2000, the RABA adjustment is $1,456,350,000. The budget request proposes to reallocate a portion of the RABA to Administration priorities in environmental programs, transit, highway safety, research and rail. Of the $1,456,350,000 adjustment, $452,120,000 would be transferred to other modes, and $1,004,230,000 would remain within the federal-aid for highways program.

The Committee recommendation rejects that approach in favor of an approach that passes the automatically increased funding generated by the greater than anticipated gas tax receipts and estimates of gas tax receipts directly to the states consistent with each state's individual guaranteed share under Section 1105 of TEA21. Such an approach maximizes the resources flowing to each state and avoids the diversion of funds that would otherwise occur as the following table illustrates.

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Admin. Distr.	TEA21 Distr.	Full RABA committee recommendation
Alabama	8,853	26,776	28,994
Alaska	7,435	15,619	17,485
Arizona	12,811	21,404	24,341
Arkansas	6,429	17,563	18,808
California	101,652	121,069	131,672
Colorado	8,956	15,346	17,174
Connecticut	14,339	19,941	21,872
Delaware	3,214	5,786	6,664
Dist. of Columbia	2,838	5,192	5,721
Florida	26,467	61,049	68,189
Georgia	20,049	47,344	52,155
Hawaii	3,548	6,804	7,382
Idaho	4,604	10,222	10,632
Illinois	28,471	44,480	47,824
Indiana	12,747	33,088	36,312
Iowa	5,771	15,790	17,230
Kansas	5,610	15,396	16,748
Kentucky	8,799	22,807	24,945
Louisiana	7,682	22,291	24,069
Maine	3,542	7,001	7,656
Maryland	15,650	20,821	22,866
Massachusetts	19,259	24,746	26,446
Michigan	19,479	42,421	46,131
Minnesota	9,608	19,730	21,061
Mississippi	5,901	16,012	17,423
Missouri	13,308	32,348	34,931
Montana	5,460	12,984	14,956
Nebraska	4,238	10,167	11,587
Nevada	5,085	9,500	10,656
New Hampshire	3,538	6,844	7,238
New Jersey	27,746	33,960	36,439
New Mexico	5,235	12,976	14,273
New York	48,541	67,928	72,713
North Carolina	13,671	37,146	40,912
North Dakota	3,947	8,576	9,794
Ohio	25,601	48,838	53,317
Oklahoma	7,057	20,342	22,438
Oregon	6,663	16,378	17,199
Pennsylvania	31,880	66,704	68,972
Rhode Island	4,232	7,849	8,853
South Carolina	7,482	21,044	23,404
South Dakota	4,260	9,615	10,306
Tennessee	11,199	30,282	32,984
Texas	48,403	99,070	110,258
Utah	4,937	10,296	11,129
Vermont	3,224	5,990	6,764

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Admin. Distr.	TEA21 Distr.	Full RABA committee recommendation
Virginia	14,912	33,682	37,111
Washington	11,394	23,984	25,806
West Virginia	5,548	14,936	15,406
Wisconsin	11,684	26,148	28,733
Wyoming	4,096	9,146	10,367
Total	697,054	1,335,430	1,456,350

MAGNETIC LEVITATION TRANSPORTATION

TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999	($15,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2000	.....
Committee recommendation	(20,000,000)

Section 1218 of TEA21 provides $20,000,000 in highway trust funds contract authority for Maglev preconstruction activities in fiscal year 2000. The administration budget proposes to reallocate these funds to Advanced Vehicles Techology Research, and to provide $20,000,000 of revenue aligned budget authority for Maglev within the transportation research and development program.

The Committee recommendation provides $20,000,000 for the magnetic levitation technology deployment program, of which not more than $500,000 shall be available to the Federal Railroad Administration for administrative expenses and technical assistance. Within the funds made available under this heading, the Committee provides $6,000,000 for the high-speed intercity magnetic levitation project between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, $1,000,000 for the Segmented Rail Phased Induction Electric Magnetic Motor (SERAPHIM) project, $2,000,000 for the Las Vegas-Southern California maglev system, and $1,000,000 for the Southern California Association of Governments Los Angeles International Airport to March Air Force Base magnetic levitation program.

NATIONWIDE DIFFERENTIAL GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$7,500,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	10,400,000
Committee recommendation	(5,000,000)

[1] Fiscal year 1999 funds were provided within the Coast Guard's acquisition, construction, and improvement account, for both the completion of the coastal DGPS system and for the ground-based NDGPS.

[2] Proposed to be funded from revenue aligned budget authority.

In 2000, the administration has requested $10,400,000 in transferred revenue aligned budget authority funds to enable installation of nationwide differential global positioning system [NDGPS] transmitters by enhancing the existing Coast Guard network throughout the United States. In fiscal year 1999, NDGPS funding

was included in the Coast Guard's "Acquisition, construction, and improvements" account, for continued installation of DGPS transmitters throughout the United States, toward the enhancement of the existing Coast Guard DGPS network, which is now operating only in areas along the coasts and navigable inland waterways.

In general, the Committee is concerned that investment in the near-term would accrue to many other Federal agencies and commercial interests. The Committee maintains that DGPS-related expenses should not be derived solely from the Federal highway trust fund or other DOT accounts. Recognizing the importance of DGPS to a wide array of strategic national purposes, the Secretary will need to obtain funding from other Federal agencies and sources as well as other modal administrations. The Committee notes that the Department of Transportation was directed to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as part of the fiscal year 2000 budget justification identifying the long-term costs, benefits, and cost sharing that might be reasonably expected for DGPS. To date, this report has not been received by the Committees on Appropriations. No fiscal year 2000 funds provided in this Act shall be obligated by the Department of Transportation on the nationwide differential global positioning system program until this report has been submitted to the Committees on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the NDGPS program, for both capital and operating expenses. These funds will provide for the installation of 4 new GWEN site installations in fiscal year 2000, for a total of 22 sites to be operating at the end of the fiscal year. Other capital costs include equipment, weather forecasting systems, and an upgrade to the control station. The operations component of the funds will provide for property management of all 63 national GWEN sites, and operations and maintenance of the initial 22 online stations. The bill includes language which transfers the funds provided to the Federal Railroad Administration, the DOT lead agency for this program.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The Committee recommendation includes $450,000,000 for construction of unfinished segments of the Appalachian development highway system [ADHS]. The ADHS connects largely rural, underdeveloped areas in 13 States. Its completion is critical to the economic development of these often-ignored areas. In many cases, the unfinished segments of the ADHS are high-accident locations in the Appalachian States, so the Committee believes continued construction will have a high payoff in highway safety benefits.

Given the current funding schedule and without inflationary increases, it would take at least another 13 years to complete the system, putting the completion date at 46 years from its inception in 1965. Given the hazardous conditions of many of the roads on and around the unfinished segments of the ADHS, and the commitment of the Congress to the people of Appalachia, this delay is unacceptable. Additional funds should be found to expedite the com-

pletion of overdue system in a reasonable and accellerated timeframe.

FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS PROGRAM

The Committee is very concerned with the degree to which funding awards have been made in the past on a partisan basis in the Public Lands Program. The General Accounting Office has noted that the administration has awarded more projects and total funding to projects in Democratic districts, even though States requested more funds for projects in Republican districts. The Committee directs FHWA to move toward a merit-based approach in funding public lands projects, and to refine criteria for the funding of projects under this program. The Secretary shall report to both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees semiannually concerning the execution of the program.

The Committee directs the Secretary to make available the following amounts for the following projects:

Bear River Migratory bird refuge access road and Soldier Hollow Road improvements in Wasatch County, UT	$3,000,000
Delaware Water Gap National Recreational Area, NJ	4,000,000
Glacier National Park North Fork Road from Columbia Falls to Camas Creek, MT	2,400,000
Kenai Peninsula road improvements	500,000
New River Gorge National River, pave and realign Cunard Road, WV	960,000
Donlin Creek access road, AK	500,000
New Mexico Route 4 Jemez Pueblo Bypass, NM	500,000
Lemhi Pass Road upgrade from Highway 324 to Sacajewea Campground, MT	2,000,000
Kenai National Wildlife Refuge Skilak Loop Road	4,000,000
Chugach National Forest, Bird Creek road widening and public safety project	1,000,000
Harpers Ferry National Historical Park Shoreline Drive improvements, WV	2,400,000
John Day Highway safety improvements at Blue Mountain Summit, OR	2,700,000
Highway 323 upgrade between Alzada and Ekalaka, MT	2,200,000
SR 248 reconstruction from US 40 to Park City, UT	3,700,000
Historic Columbia River Highway, rebuild Starvation Creek to Viento State Parks	500,000
Sitka Road Harbor mountain bypass	1,000,000
Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site	2,200,000
Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge,	1,700,000
Hakalau Forest National Wildlife Refuge	400,000

BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	($31,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2000	(31,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(31,000,000)

[1] Excludes reduction of $208,000 for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.

The Bureau of Transportation Statistics [BTS] was established in section 6006 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA], to compile, analyze, and make accessible information on the Nation's transportation systems, collect information on intermodal transportation, and enhance the quality and effectiveness of the statistical programs of the Department of Transpor-

tation. For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends a funding level of $31,000,000.

BTS offices include the Director, Statistical Programs and Services, Transportation Studies, and the Office of Aviation Information [OAI]. In addition, effective January 1, 1996, the responsibility to collect motor carrier financial data was transferred to the BTS after the sunset of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Office of Aviation Information collects and compiles financial and traffic (passenger and cargo) data. This information provides the Government with uniform and comprehensive economic and market data on individual airline operations. This program includes a small field office located in Anchorage, AK, which provides consumers and the Government with airline data related to essential air service and the intra-Alaskan mail rate program. The statistical aviation data compiled by OAI includes: airline passenger traffic statistics, ontime performance data by carrier, financial performance and certification data, fuel purchase and consumption, and other business and consumer directed statistics. These statistics are vitally important to the Federal Government and the aviation industry. In some cases, it is statutorily required that these statistics be used by the Federal Aviation Administration and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation in allocation of trust funds, aviation bilateral negotiations, and other Federal transportation policy decisionmaking.

Railroad rationalization and diversion analysis.—The Committee directs that of the funds provided, not more than 90 percent may be obligated prior to the delivery of the report requested under this section in the fiscal year 1999 Senate report.

NATIONAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY PROGRAM

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999	$100,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	105,000,000
Committee recommendation	105,000,000

This program was first authorized by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982. It provides grants to States for improved enforcement of Federal and State motor carrier safety rules. It has been shown that added enforcement of truck safety rules reduces truck-related accidents and fatalities. The major objective of this program is to reduce the number and severity of accidents involving commercial motor vehicles.

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $105,000,000.

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Appropriations, 1999	($100,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2000	(105,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(105,000,000)

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $105,000,000 for the national motor carrier program and a program

level of $155,000,000 consistent with the President's revised budget request.

The Committee recommends the following allocation of motor carrier safety funds:

Basic motor carrier safety grants	$95,881,250
Performance-based incentive grant program	8,431,250
Border and high priority initiatives	9,500,000
State training and administration	2,187,500
Information systems and strategic planning	39,000,000
Total	155,000,000

Covered Bridges.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for the Covered Bridge program authorized under TEA21.

2002 Winter Olympic Games.—The Committee recognizes the critical nature of the following transportation projects for the success of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. The Committee recommends that the Secretary give priority consideration to these projects: I–80: Kimball Junction—Modification/Reconstruction; I–80: Silver Creek Junction—Modification/Reconstruction; SR 248 Reconstruction: US 40 to Park City; Soldier Hollow Improvements: Wasatch County; I–15 Reconstruction: 10800 South to 600 North; and I–215: 3500 South—Interchange Reconfiguration.

Commercial Drivers License Program.—The Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986 established the federal Commercial Driver's License (CDL) program. Despite self-congratulatory statements from the FHWA regarding the success of the CDL program, it is clear from several recent fatal accidents, as well as from testimony before the Committee, that great efforts need to be made by the OMCHS to satisfy the intent of the 1986 Act.

An "effectiveness study" performed for the OMCHS indicates several stark vulnerabilities that undermine the goals of the CDL program. They include the fact that a majority of states do not use the Commercial Driver License Information System (CDLIS) to screen the personal information of applicants for non-CDL licenses to determine if the applicant has been issued a CDL by another state. "In such states," according to the effectiveness study, "it is possible a CDL holder could obtain a non-CDL, in addition to his or her CDL. Also, some states do not use the CDLIS to screen reinstated CDLs." The study also pointed up the fact that a frighteningly high percentage of drivers who have had their CDLs withdrawn due to safety violations appear willing to risk further sanctions and continue to operate commercial vehicles without a license. All of these vulnerabilities constitute clear violations of the core principles underlying the CDL program.

The uneven performance by the states in implementing these principles was highlighted by recent testimony by the DOT Inspector General (IG). According to the IG:

> "New York State does not pull a person's past licensing history when he or she applies for a commercial driver's license. If a driver is convicted of DUI while operating a commercial motor vehicle, that driver's license is revoked. If the driver is DUI in a personal vehicle, he or she loses personal driving privileges and maintains commercial driv-

> ing privileges. In contrast, in Pennsylvania if convicted of DWI while driving a personal vehicle, the entire driver's license is suspended. If convicted of DWI while driving a commercial vehicle, the commercial license is revoked for one year. For more than one DWI offense, the license is permanently revoked."

Recent fatal accidents involving motor coach operators in New Jersey and Louisiana, as well as the recent Amtrak collision with a truck at Bourbonnais, Illinois, further point up severe deficiencies in the CDL program. A total of thirty bus passengers were killed between the December, 1998 bus crash in Sayreville, New Jersey and the May, 1999 bus crash in New Orleans, Louisiana. That compares to a total of 21 fatalities for the four-year period that preceded the New Jersey crash. While the NTSB has yet to report on the final cause of each of these crashes, it is noteworthy that, in the case of the New Jersey crash, the bus operator had his license suspended multiple times, both for speeding and for the unsafe operation of his bus. He was allowed to have his license reinstated only after attending driving school. In the case of the New Orleans crash, it has been reported that the driver had a record of persistent drug abuse for several years. He had failed five random drug tests and had been fired from three separate jobs, including jobs with two transit companies. According to these reports, the night before the fatal crash the driver had arrived by ambulance at a local hospital barely conscious and suffering from severe dehydration and low blood pressure. In the case of the Bourbonnais truck accident, the IG testified before the Committee that "the truck driver was using a permit issued to him when his commercial license was suspended because he received three speeding tickets within an unacceptable time period. Under these circumstances, the suspension had not had meaningful effect."

Importantly, the current deficiencies of the CDL program have been identified by the motor carrier industry itself. In recent testimony before Congress, the President of the American Trucking Associations stated that:

> "OMCHS must ensure that all states are accurately reporting out-of-state driver convictions to the driver's state of licensure, and doing so in a timely fashion. OMCHS must also ensure that driver convictions are not hidden from an employer's view in the system, as is the case in at least 15 states. It is essential that a CDL record reflect a driver's complete history while driving a commercial vehicle. There is no better predictor of future driving behavior than past driving behavior. OMCHS must use all of the tools at its disposal, including the withholding of a state's highway funds, to ensure states' compliance with the established elements of the CDL program."

The Committee believes that the OMCHS must take immediate and aggressive steps to strengthen the CDL program and address the deficiencies identified by its own internal studies, by the IG, and by other groups including the motor carrier industry. Rather than serving as apologists for the states, the OMCHS should be using all tools at its disposal, including the ones cited by the indus-

try, to demand improved performance by the states. Toward that end, the Committee directs the Federal Highway Administrator to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on an annual basis that specifically outlines each vulnerability he identifies within the CDL program, the remedies he intends to promulgate to address each vulnerability, specific deadlines for implementation of each remedy, the specific manner in which he will measure the effectiveness of each remedy, and the specific steps he will take if the remedy is found to be ineffective. The first such report shall be due at the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 2000.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2000 PROGRAM

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] was established as a separate organizational entity in the Department of Transportation in March 1970, to reduce the escalating number of deaths, injuries, and economic costs resulting from traffic crashes on the Nation's highways. The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act provides for the establishment and enforcement of Federal safety standards for motor vehicles and associated equipment and research, including the operation of required testing facilities and the National Driver Register. The Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act initially provided for the establishment of low-speed, collision bumper standards, consumer information activities, diagnostic inspection, and odometer regulations and was later amended to incorporate responsibility for the administration of Federal automotive fuel economy standards.

The Highway Safety Act provides for a coordinated highway safety grant program to be carried out by the States, together with supporting research, development, and demonstration programs. Under section 403 of title 23, United States Code, technical assistance is provided to the States in the conduct of their highway safety programs, and research and demonstration projects are conducted to develop and show the effectiveness of new techniques and countermeasures to address highway safety problems.

Grants are provided to the States under title 23, United States Code, section 402 to assist in the establishment and improvement of highway safety programs designed to reduce traffic crashes, deaths, and injuries. Alcohol incentive grants are allocated to the States for alcohol-impaired driver safety programs. The occupant protection incentive grants program is separated into two parts: Section 405 rewards States that implement strong laws and programs to increase safety belt and child safety seat use; section 405(b), child passenger protection education grant program, encourages the States to implement child passenger protection and education programs such as proper installation of child restraints, restraint design, placement, and training in all aspects of child restraint use.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

Program	Fiscal year 1999 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Operations and research	$161,400,000	[2] $199,450,000	[3] $161,400,000
National driver register (HTF)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
Highway traffic safety grants (firewall)	200,000,000	206,800,000	214,300,000
Total	361,400,000	406,250,000	375,700,000

[1] Excludes reductions of $974,000 for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277. Also excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.
[2] Includes $124,450,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.
[3] From firewall and discretionary highway trust fund sources.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century provides $72,000,000 of contract authority from the highway trust fund to finance NHTSA's fiscal year 2000 operations and research activities under title 23 U.S.C. 403. This funding is included within the firewall guarantee for highway spending, and is not subject to appropriations. The bill includes an authorization subject to appropriations of $89,400,000 for operations and research activities under sections 30104 and 32102 of title 49 U.S.C. and chapter 303 of title 49 U.S.C. for fiscal year 2000. Thus, the total authorized level for fiscal year 2000 for NHTSA operations and research activities is $161,400,000.

The administration, however, has requested to transfer $125,450,000 of Revenue Aligned Budget Authority (RABA) from the Highway Trust Fund firewall to support NHTSA's operations and research account. This proposal disregards the spirit and letter of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to increase federal investment in our nation's highway and transit systems. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century is the product of a delicate compromise, and the Committee is dismayed that the administration would propose to disregard its core provisions only a year after the President signed it into law. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the Committee is opposed to the diversion of RABA funds away from its intended purposes.

To comply with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, the Committee has consulted extensively with NHTSA to revise its budget request. The Committee recommends fully funding the authorized level and provides an appropriation of $161,400,000 to be distributed as follows:

Program	*Committee recommendation*
Safety performance	$14,249,000
Safety assurance	20,972,000
Highway safety	57,617,000
Research and analysis	61,625,000
National driver register	2,000,000
Office of the Administrator	4,493,000
General administration	10,417,000
Grant administration reimbursement	−9,973,000
Total	161,400,000

Agencywide adjustments.—Due to budgetary constraints and the Committee's view that additional funds should be allocated to safe-

ty programs, the Committee does not include the $890,000 requested for new permanent staff positions and denies the request to increase the number of FTE's from 621 to 635. The Committee also has reduced $1,376,000 for operating expenses. The Committee is confident that NHTSA can reduce cost growth in its headquarter operating expenses by limiting travel to the fiscal year 1999 level and implementing a variety of management initiatives, such as restraining rent, computer support, and administrative support.

SAFETY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

New Car Assessment Program.—The bill includes $2,830,000 to evaluate vehicle performance in crash tests and provide vehicle safety and crash test information to the public. The Committee recommends providing the same level of funding as the fiscal year 1999 level and is $362,000 more than the administration's revised budget request. The Committee expects NHTSA to conduct enough crash tests to provide consumer information on the majority of vehicles. The Committee denies the request to expand NCAP beyond the fiscal year 1999 test procedures.

Uniform tire quality grading standards.—The Committee has included a prohibition that has been included in previous appropriations acts, on any rulemaking which would require that passenger car tires be labeled to indicate their low rolling resistance, or fuel economy characteristics. The Committee has included this provision because the need for such labels has not been adequately justified and the additional costs associated with this proposal would likely be prohibitive.

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

Impaired Driving.—The Committee commends NHTSA for focusing research on the costs, benefits, and impacts of 0.08 Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) laws and its efforts to reduce impaired driving by young adults between 21 and 34 years old. Sufficient funds are included in the fiscal year 2000 Committee recommendation to continue research on the effectiveness of 0.08 BAC laws. There is a similar need for research that would assist state legislators as they decide whether to adopt repeat offender and open container statutes. Under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, states that have not enacted such laws by October 1, 2000 lose federal construction funds. NHTSA should be prepared to report next year on the progress made in each area.

Safe Communities.—The Committee has deleted funding for the safe communities program. The program has not been funded since completion of the three-year pilot program, and the Committee asserts that the program duplicates other, more worthy agency programs and safety grants.

Emergency Medical Services.—In 1998, NHTSA began a collaborative effort to develop a national standards curriculum for emergency medical services personnel on the pre-hospital treatment of severe head injury. There are approximately 1.6 million severe head injuries annually, the majority of which are caused by motor vehicle accidents. Within the emergency medical services program, the Committee has included $1,000,000 to initiate the third phase

of the head injury pre-hospital protocols. Pre-hospital management of traumatic brain injury through a comprehensive education and training program for the first 14 states will be serviced by training centers in Northern Virginia (Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Kentucky and the District of Columbia) and Birmingham, Alabama (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Tennessee). This educational effort will be directed toward the EMS trainers at the local level, the EMS Medical Directors of each ambulance company, the State EMS Directors, State EMS Advisory Committee, and each state's Commissioner of Health. The Committee encourages NHTSA to continue to work with the Aitken Neuroscience Center during this phase of the program.

Highway Safety Research.—The Committee is concerned with the increased occurrence of aggressive driving by motorist, especially in the Washington capital region. To address this persistent problem, the Committee has included $2,000,000 for the Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration, on behalf of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, to development and implement a regional education and driver modification program. The Committee also is concerned about the overall lack of attention given to rural motor vehicle accidents and the unique aspects of assessing and treating trauma patients in rural areas. Some factors that are unique to rural crash victims are greater travel distances, delayed notification of emergency medical services, inadequate physician training, and proximity to appropriate trauma centers. The Committee has included $1,750,000 to initiate a project at the University of South Alabama that utilizes a multi-disciplinary team to manage rural vehicular trauma victims. As part of the project, other factors relevant to care of rural vehicular trauma patients should be considered, including the role of aeromedical evacuation, facilitation of consultation with trauma surgeons through telemedicine, facilitation of interstate transport, and outreach to local community hospitals.

Driver's License Identification.—The Committee has included bill language similar to the fiscal year 1999 conference report which delays implementation of a provision requiring states to display social security numbers on driver's licenses and conform with federal uniform features for driver's licenses. The Committee has deleted $264,000 that was associated with this program out of concern for individual privacy and the preemption of state authority.

Emerging Issues.—The Committee continues to be concerned about children who gain access to the trunk of a vehicle and are not able to escape, even if they entered through the back seat inside the passenger compartment. Many of these children die from suffocation, heat stroke, or hypothermia. Within the funds provided for emerging issues, the Committee directs NHTSA to thoroughly study this issue. The report should provide data on the number of trunk entrapments that resulted in death, analyze historical trends, and if possible, to compile, and recommend strategies, including truck latch release buttons, to reduce such incidents. The report is requested by March 31, 2000.

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Biomechanics.—The Committee has included full funding for the Crash Injury Reduction and Engineering Network (CIREN). The Committee continues to support the effort to link eight trauma centers to vehicle engineers in order to study the cause, effects and results of crashes. The network consists of centers located at: R. Adams Cowley Shock Trauma Center, Baltimore, Maryland; the University of Medicine & Dentistry, Newark, New Jersey; the Children's National Medical Center, Washington, DC; the Lehman Injury Research Center at the University of Miami School of Medicine, Miami, Florida; the University of Michigan Medical Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan; the Harborview Injury Prevention Center, Seattle, Washington; the San Diego County Trauma System, San Diego, California; and the Mercedes-Benz CIREN Center.

The Committee also has provided $2,200,000 to fund the development of a comprehensive, integrated research program in injury sciences at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). The injury sciences program will develop new and improving methods of preventing, treating, and mitigating the effects of injuries associated with motor vehicle accidents. The program will focus on three aspects of crash impact research: modify driver behavior to reduce the likelihood of a vehicle accident, minimize the risk of crash injuries in the event of a crash, and reduce the risk or mortality and morbidity, including diffuse axonal injury.

State Data Program.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for the Yellowstone County Traffic Safety Commission which is developing with the assistance of Montana State University a network linking emergency medical service (EMS) data with the Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System (CODES) to evaluate traffic safety protocols and highway management. Data in the system will be used to further assess the effect of occupant protection systems, impact of speed limits on highway safety, and the validity of various EMS protocols in crash survival.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER

The National Driver Register [NDR] is a central repository of information on individuals whose licenses to operate a motor vehicle have been revoked, suspended, canceled, or denied. The NDR also contains information on persons who have been convicted of serious traffic-related violations such as driving while impaired by alcohol or other drugs. State driver licensing officials query the NDR when individuals apply for a license, for the purpose of determining whether driving privileges have been withdrawn by other States. Other organizations such as the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration also use NDR license data in hiring and certification decisions in overall U.S. transportation operations.

The bill includes $2,000,000 for the NDR.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	206,800,000
Committee recommendation	214,300,000

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century authorized the following State grant programs: Highway Safety Program, the Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grant Program, the Occupant Protection Incentive Grant Program, and the State Highway Safety Data Grant Program. Under the Highway Safety Program, grant allocations are determined on the basis of a statutory formula established under 20 U.S.C. 402. Individual States use this funding in national priority areas established by Congress which have the greatest potential for achieving safety improvements and reducing traffic crashes, fatalities, and injuries. The Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grant Program encourages States to enact stiffer laws and implement stronger programs to detect and remove impaired drivers from the roads. The occupant protection program encourages States to promote and strengthen occupant protection initiatives. The State Highway Safety Data Grants Program encourages States to improve their collection and dissemination of important highway safety data.

The Committee recommends an appropriation for liquidation of contract authorization of $206,800,000 for the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of these grant programs.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century also established the child passenger protection education grant program which is subject to appropriations. All of the evidence indicates that between 70 and 90 percent of child safety seats are incorrectly installed or otherwise misused. The Committee supports providing grants that train safety professionals on all aspects of proper child restraint use and educate the public on the installation, selection, and placement of child safety seats. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes $7,500,000 to fully implement the section 405(b) grant program.

The Committee has included a provision prohibiting the use of section 402 funds for construction, rehabilitation or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local, or private buildings or structures.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The bill includes language limiting the obligations to be incurred under the various highway traffic safety grants programs. Separate obligation limitations are included in the bill with the following funding allocations:

	Fiscal year 1999 enacted	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Highway safety programs	$150,000,000	$152,800,000	$152,800,000
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants	35,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000
Occupant protection incentive grants	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Child passenger protection education grants [1]		(7,500,000)	(7,500,000)
State highway safety data grants	5,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Total	200,000,000	206,800,000	206,800,000

[1] The budget request proposes to fund child passenger occupant protection education grants with funds from revenue aligned budget authority transferred to NHTSA operations and research.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Summary of Fiscal Year 2000 Program

The Federal Railroad Administration [FRA] became an operating administration within the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967. It incorporated the Bureau of Railroad Safety from the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation from the Department of Commerce, and the Alaska Railroad from the Department of the Interior. The Federal Railroad Administration is responsible for planning, developing, and administering programs to achieve safe operating and mechanical practices in the railroad industry. Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) and other financial assistance programs to rehabilitate and improve the railroad industry's physical infrastructure are also administered by the Federal Railroad Administration.

The Committee recommends new appropriations and obligation limitations totaling $729,653,000 for the activities of the Federal Railroad Administration for fiscal year 2000. This is $17,049,000 less than the budget request. In addition to these appropriated Federal funds, $1,091,810,000 will be paid to Amtrak in fiscal year 1999 by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 977 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	1999 enacted [1]	2000 budget estimate	
Safety and operations [2]		$95,462,000	$91,789,000
Office of the Administrator	$21,215,000		
Railroad safety	61,488,000		
Railroad research and development [3]	22,364,000	21,800,000	22,364,000
Next generation high-speed rail	20,494,000	12,000,000	20,500,000
Alaska railroad rehabilitation	38,000,000		14,000,000
Rhode Island rail development	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Capital grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation	609,230,000	570,976,000	571,000,000
Amtrak Reform Council [4]	(450,000)	(750,000)	(950,000)
RABA rail initiatives [5]		35,400,000	

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	1999 enacted [1]	2000 budget estimate	
Total budgetary resources	777,791,000	745,638,000	729,653,000

[1] Excludes reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277; also excludes funds paid to Amtrak pursuant to section 977 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997.
[2] Fiscal year 2000 includes $66,461,000 proposed rail safety user fees.
[3] Fiscal year 2000 includes $21,300,000 proposed rail safety user fees.
[4] The Amtrak Reform Council is an independent oversight commission. Funding is provided through a general provision, and is not part of the FRA budget.
[5] Proposed to be funded from revenue aligned budget authority.

User fees.—Consistent with the Committee's position outlined in the Office of the Secretary chapter of the report, the administration's legislative proposal to impose user fees on rail safety and research services has not been included.

Safety and Operations

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	($85,574,000)
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	95,462,000
Committee recommendation	91,789,000

[1] Reflects comparable funding appropriated in the following 4 accounts: Office of the Administrator; Railroad Safety; a portion of the Research and Development account; and a portion of the Next Generation High Speed Rail account.
[2] Includes $66,461,000 proposed rail safety user fees.

The Administration is proposing restructuring the Federal Railroad Administration salary and expense accounts by consolidating all of FRA's corporate resources from four separate appropriations into a single appropriation titled Safety and Operations. The Safety and Operations account provides support for FRA rail safety activities and all other administrative and operating activities related to staff and programs. The presentation of all FRA staffing and operations in a single account is consistent with account structures in other DOT agencies, and would allow FRA to track its program and support costs separately. The Committee supports this restructuring, but maintains its authority to set and control staffing levels associated with the four primary personnel functions at FRA.

The following table reflects the comparable fiscal year 1999 funding and the fiscal year 2000 Committee recommendation:

	Fiscal year 1999 enacted	Fiscal year 2000 projected request	Fiscal year 2000 Committee recommendation
Office of the Administrator (includes contract support, ARR liabilities, TASC reduction)	$20,846,000	$28,379,000	$26,405,000
(FTE)	(152)	(156)	(153)
Railroad safety	$61,488,000	$63,860,000	$62,254,000
(FTE)	(558)	(573)	(559.5)
Administration of research and development	$2,646,000	$2,601,000	$2,550,000
(FTE)	(18.5)	(19)	(18.5)
Administration of high speed rail	$594,000	$622,000	$580,000
(FTE)	(5)	(5.5)	(5)
Total Safety and Operations	$85,574,000	$95,462,000	$91,789,000
(FTE)	(733.5)	(753.5)	(736)

Within the total program level of $91,789,000, the FRA Administrator is provided the flexibility to shift administrative and personnel funds within the four offices (Office of the Administrator, railroad safety, administration of research and development, and administration of high-speed rail), within a ten percent limitation of the amounts specified above. Shifts of administrative funds in excess of that limitation shall require the approval of both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

The bill includes a provision which transfers $1,000,000 in safety and operations funds to the Department of Transportation Office of Inspector General, for audits and investigations of rail-related issues and systems.

Budget presentation.—To ensure that the Committee is given adequate information to exercise appropriate oversight of FRA's resources and staff allocations, the Committee directs that FRA include in the fiscal year 2001 budget justification staffing and dollar breakouts of the safety and operations offices, as displayed above. In addition, the supporting documentation in the fiscal year 2001 budget justification shall be of the same level of detail as that specified in the fiscal year 1999 budget.

Staffing increases.—The FRA has requested 15 new positions in fiscal year 2000, for a total of $2,788,000 in associated personnel costs. The Committee recommendation provides funding for 4 of these requested positions: 3 new positions in the area of railroad safety (+$288,000). One of the new railroad safety positions shall be for a highway engineer to increase the capabilities of the agency in grade crossing safety.

Information technology initiative.—FRA requested $1,542,000 for hardware, software and personnel (2 new positions) for new information technology systems. The Committee has provided funding for 1 new position and half of the requested funding for associated hardware, software, and contractor consulting costs for the upgraded telecommunications infrastructure (+$771,000).

The Committee directs the FRA to submit a detailed spending plan indicating the total costs and improvements necessary to upgrade the agency's information technology systems. This plan shall include a timetable and project benchmarks, with all fiscal year 2001 and out year costs specified by activity. This plan shall be submitted as a supplemental justification in the FRA fiscal year 2001 budget justification.

Travel.—A total increase of $770,000 above the enacted level is requested for staff travel. Some of this increase is associated with new safety inspection and enforcement staff brought on board in fiscal year 1999 and some is associated with the requested new staffing positions, as well as an overall increase in travel. The Committee supports flexibility for FRA safety-related staff travel throughout and among the regions but has decreased this request by $415,000, based on fewer new staff than were requested by the administration.

Operation Lifesaver.—The Committee recommends $950,000 for Operation Lifesaver, which is $650,000 above the administration's requested level. The Federal Highway Administration provides $500,000 annually from the Surface Transportation Program safety set-aside to cover Operation Lifesaver salaries, benefits and over-

head costs. Of the appropriated funds provided herein, $600,000 is provided to support Operation Lifesaver's 49 active State programs and national safety initiatives. The Committee has also included $350,000 to support initial work on a new, national, multi-year public service campaign to increase awareness of highway-rail grade crossing safety and trespass prevention. The Committee stresses the importance of implementing a unified campaign that has the financial and technical support of the railroad industry, FRA, and the law enforcement community.

Grade crossing safety.—In addition to the grant to Operation Lifesaver, FRA plans to utilize approximately $2,500,000 from the safety and operations account for grade crossing safety activities, supporting such activities as a police officer detail, outreach to law enforcement and judicial organizations, and supporting the national highway-rail crossing inventory. The Committee fully endorses these activities. In addition, within available safety and operations funds other than those already identified to support grade crossing safety, the Committee directs that $350,000 be made available to initiate an evaluation assessing the costs, benefits, and impacts of state grade crossing safety laws. These evaluations should be coordinated with and help establish the basis for FRA's initiative to develop model state laws to promote grade crossing safety. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has extensive experience in evaluating state traffic laws, and should manage this effort, with assistance provided by FRA and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). In this evaluation, "best practices" and innovative strategies used by states or local communities to improve grade crossing safety should be identified, and successful enforcement, education, and engineering activities should be highlighted. The Committee also requests that in the course of this analysis, FRA, FHWA and NHTSA encourage states to use a portion of their Section 402 highway safety grant funds to improve grade crossing safety.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$21,215,000
Budget estimate, 2000	([2])
Committee recommendation	([2])

[1] Excludes reduction of $369,000 for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277
[2] Funding is presented in the proposed safety and operations account.

RAILROAD SAFETY

Appropriations, 1999	$61,488,000
Budget estimate, 2000	([1])
Committee recommendation	([1])

[1] Funding is presented in the proposed safety and operations account.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1999	$22,364,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [1] [2]	21,800,000
Committee recommendation	22,364,000

[1] Excludes administrative expenses to be funded in the proposed safety and operations account.
[2] Includes $21,300,000 proposed rail safety user fees.

The Federal Railroad Administration's Railroad Research and Development Program provides for research in the development of safety and performance standards for high-speed rail and the evaluation of their role in the Nation's transportation infrastructure. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $22,364,000 for railroad research and development, $564,000 more than the administration's requested level.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the following funding levels for the Railroad research and development programs:

Equipment, operation, and hazardous materials	$10,114,000
Track and vehicle track interaction	6,950,000
Safety of high speed ground transportation	4,800,000
R&D facilities	500,000

Equipment, operation, and hazardous materials.—The Committee recommends a program funding level of $10,114,000, which is $1,064,000 more than the administration's request. Within this amount, $1,500,000 shall be for a full-scale crash test of rail passenger equipment at the Transportation Test Center [TTC] near Pueblo, CO. This testing will include dynamic and static tests using donated passenger car equipment. The overall objectives of these tests are to demonstrate the effectiveness and crashworthiness of cab car and coach car structural designs and the effectiveness of occupant protection strategies. This is an ongoing test program that is jointly administered by the FRA and the Association of American Railroads (AAR).

Additionally, within this amount, three safety research programs will be funded: $500,000 for the Center for Advanced Vehicle Technologies at the University of Alabama, to develop vehicle proximity alert systems and other sensor and electromagnetic devices that address crossing safety train/vehicle combination issues; and $500,000 for research to be performed jointly by Marshall University and the University of Nebraska. This research shall focus on real time monitoring of track subsurface stability; detection of track "weak spots" and the development of metallurgical manufacturing techniques to minimize such "weak spots". Additionally, within this amount, $500,000 shall be provided for a Montana State University at Bozeman pilot program to provide real-time diagnostic monitoring of rail rolling stock using differential global positioning system technology.

Track and vehicle-track interaction.—The Committee recommends a program funding level of $6,950,000, $500,000 less than the administration's request. Within this amount, $500,000 shall be used to work with the University of Missouri-Rolla on advanced composite materials use in repairing and rehabilitating rail bridges. Aging rail bridges are increasingly being required to handle heavier axial loads and higher train speeds. The University of Missouri-Rolla has played a leading role in exploring new technologies in advanced composite materials that will help prolong the functional lifespan of bridges and reduce maintenance costs in the long term.

The FRA requested $500,000 in new/expanded program funding for testing of an on-board locomotive communications bus to foster

interoperability of positive train control (PTC) systems. This project was initiated in fiscal year 1997 under a cooperative agreement with Conrail on behalf of themselves, Norfolk Southern and CSX railroads, and is now in the third phase, which involves intensive testing of on-board wiring harness and communications software protocols which interface with four different automatic train control systems on Norfolk Southern rail line between Harrisburg, PA and Manassas, VA. The Committee strongly supports this ongoing project, but has moved the program funding from the "Railroad research and development" account to the "Next generation high-speed rail" account, in order to consolidate all the PTC program elements within the same office.

Safety of high-speed ground transportation.—The Committee recommends a program funding level of $4,800,000, the same level as the administration's request.

Research and development facilities.—The Committee recommends a funding level of $500,000 for R&D facilities, the same level as the administration's request. The Committee has not yet received a response from FRA to the directive in Senate Report 105–249 that FRA include in the fiscal year 2000 budget justification a description of FRA's track research vehicle needs, and an analysis of whether the FRA could utilize the AAR track research vehicle that is current onsite at TTC. The Committee directs that FRA not obligate any of the fiscal year 2000 research and development facilities funds provided herein for T–6 track research vehicle-related expenses until this analysis has been submitted to the Committee in letter form.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING PROGRAM

Section 502 of Public Law 94–210, as amended authorizes obligation guarantees for meeting the long-term capital needs of private railroads. Railroads utilize this funding mechanism to finance major new facilities and rehabilitation or consolidation of current facilities. No appropriations or new loan guarantee commitments are proposed in fiscal year 2000.

The Rail Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program, as established in section 7203 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century [TEA21], will enable the Secretary of Transportation to provide loans and loan guarantees to State and local governments, Government-sponsored authorities and corporations, railroads and joint ventures to acquire, improve, or rehabilitate intermodal or rail equipment or facilities, including track, bridges, yards, and shops.

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL

Appropriations, 1999	$20,494,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [1]	12,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,500,000

[1] Excludes administrative expenses to be funded in the proposed safety and operations account.

The Committee has provided $20,500,000 in general fund appropriations for the High-Speed Ground Transportation [HSGT] Pro-

gram. The amount provided is $8,500,000 more than the administration's request.

The Committee first provided funding for the Next Generation High-Speed Rail [NGHSR] Program in fiscal year 1995. The program funds high-speed rail research, development, and technology programs that are aimed at demonstrations to foster high-speed passenger service on corridors throughout the country.

High-speed rail crossing improvement program.—In section 1103 of TEA21, an automatic set-aside of $5,250,000 a year from surface transportation program safety funds is made available for the elimination of rail-highway crossing hazards. A limited number of rail corridors are eligible for these funds. Of these set-aside funds, the Committee directs that $1,000,000 be used to mitigate grade crossing hazards on the gulf coast corridor between Mobile, AL and New Orleans, LA, $1,000,000 be used to mitigate grade crossing hazards on the Stampede Pass rail corridor near Yakima, Washington, and $1,000,000 be used to mitigate grade crossing hazards on the Midwest Regional Corridor within the State of Wisconsin. In addition to the automatic set-aside funding, $15,000,000 in general funds is authorized to be appropriated for these purposes. The administration has proposed that $15,000,000 from transferred revenue aligned budget authority funds be used for high-speed rail grade crossing mitigation. Section 7201 of TEA21 provides a more general authorization of the high-speed rail program at a total level of $35,000,000 in general funds each year through fiscal year 2001.

The Committee recommends the following funding levels for the Next generation high-speed rail programs:

Train control systems	$7,300,000
High-speed non-electric locomotives	8,000,000
Grade crossing hazard mitigation	4,000,000
Track/structures technology	1,200,000

Train control systems.—The administration has proposed that $10,000,000 from transferred revenue aligned budget authority funds be used for two positive train control demonstration projects: a flexible block high-speed train control system on the Chicago-St. Louis corridor ($7,000,000); and an incremental train control system on a segment of the Detroit-Chicago corridor ($3,000,000).

The Committee has provided a total of $7,300,000 for positive train control demonstration projects. Of these funds, no less than $5,000,000 shall be for the Alaska Railroad positive train control project (discussed below) and no less than $1,000,000 shall be for the Transportation Safety Research Alliance (TSRA) advanced integrated technology system, which will provide continuous direction, movement, and highway crossing controls for the rail freight industry.

Alaska Railroad positive train control research and implementation.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for the third and final phase of the Alaska Railroad's ongoing efforts to implement a collision avoidance positive train control system over the entire Alaska Railroad system. These funds will help fund a satellite-based communications and tracking system that will provide positive train separation for all locomotives and track vehicles, and precision train control with movement-pass planning capabilities. This project, once completed, will be more than a demonstration

project—it will be a fully operational PTC system, providing the FRA and rail industry with an invaluable baseline reference for other positive train control system development projects.

High-speed nonelectric locomotives.—The Committee has provided a total of $8,000,000 for the high-speed, nonelectric locomotive program. This is $1,200,000 more than the level requested by the administration. The funds for these programs focus on the demonstration of a high-speed, lightweight fossil fuel locomotive that will be able to facilitate the testing of an advanced locomotive propulsion system [ALPS]. The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the prototype locomotive demonstration and $5,000,000 for the ALPS program.

Grade crossing hazard mitigation.—The Committee recommends $4,000,000 for grade crossing hazard mitigation initiatives, the level requested by the administration.

Track/structures technology.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 for the track/structures technology program, the same level as the administration's request.

ALASKA RAILROAD REHABILITATION

Appropriations, 1999	$38,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	.....
Committee recommendation	14,000,000

The Committee has included a total of $14,000,000 for rail safety and infrastructure improvements benefiting passenger operations of the Alaska railroad. This railroad extends 470 miles from Seward through Anchorage, the largest city in Alaska, to the interior town of Fairbanks. It carries both passengers and freight, and provides a critical transportation link for passengers and cargo traveling through difficult terrain and harsh climatic conditions. Of the $14,000,000 provided in the bill, $10,000,000 will be used to continue the railroad's multiyear effort to reduce the backlog of deferred track maintenance and related capital rehabilitation. The remaining $4,000,000 will be applied to projects in and around Anchorage to double track the railroad's system in the metropolitan area. Double tracking is an important step towards rail-based transit in Anchorage. In addition, the rail system has become congested in the Anchorage area, particularly with shipments of high-value freight such as low-sulphur coal and jet fuel. The railroad has always provided a substantial non-Federal match for past Federal appropriations, and will continue to do so.

RHODE ISLAND RAIL DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1999	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for construction of a third track paralleling the Northeast corridor for the 22-mile stretch between Quonset Point/Davisville and Central Falls, RI. This project is an initiative supported by the administration and Amtrak, to avoid mixing freight traffic and high-speed passenger rail service and to provide sufficient clearance to accommodate double-stack freight cars.

To date, this project has received $28,000,000 in Federal funds. Construction on the rehabilitation of track between Boston Switch and Atwells should be completed by the summer of 2000. Construction to add a third track along selected stretches of 13 miles of the NEC mainline between Cranston and Davisville is scheduled to begin in the spring of 2000.

CAPITAL GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK)

Appropriations, 1999	$609,230,000
Budget estimate, 2000	570,976,000
Committee recommendation	571,000,000

For fiscal year 2000, the administration has requested an appropriation of $570,976,000 for capital funding with the same flexibility in spending its capital grant as provided to transit grantees. These funds would be in addition to the $1,091,810,000 in fiscal year 2000 TRA funds, adding to a total of $1,622,810,000 in federal funds for fiscal year 2000.

Amtrak appropriations history—1971–99

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	*Annual total*
1971–72	40.0
1973	170.0
1974	149.1
1975	276.5
1976	471.2
Transition quarter (fiscal year change)	180.0
1977	800.7
1978	1,116.0
1979	1,234.0
1980	1,223.4
1981	1,246.3
1982	905.0
1983	815.0
1984	816.4
1985	707.6
1986	602.7
1987	618.5
1988	608.3
1989	603.6
1990	629.1
1991	798.9
1992	861.2
1993	846.1
1993 supplemental appropriations	45.0
1994	922.2
1995	972.0
1996	750.0
1997	760.0
Omnibus consolidated appropriations 1997	82.5
1998 (Taxpayer Relief Act)	1,091.8
1998 (appropriations, Amtrak operations and Northeast corridor improvement program)	594.0
1999 Taxpayer Relief Act	1,091.8
1999 Appropriations	609.2
Total	22,638.1

SOURCE.—Amtrak Strategic Business Plan, fiscal year 1998–2000 (September 23, 1997).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $571,000,000 for Amtrak capital grants in fiscal year 2000. This is the same funding level requested by Amtrak, and is $24,000 more than the funding level requested by the administration. The reason for this discrepancy between requests has not been explained by either FRA or Amtrak. The amount provided is $38,230,000 less than the fiscal year 1999 appropriated level.

Amtrak's financial situation remains precarious. According to the Corporation's financial management office, the railroad will end fiscal year 1999 with a cash loss requiring short-term borrowing of $512,000,000. The Committee acknowledges that the Corporation is taking some of the necessary steps to improve its financial condition, including the formation of cost-sharing partnerships with states, the expansion of high-value mail and express services, and the contracting out food services operations. Even so, Amtrak's financial condition will continue to suffer due to the low ridership and high operating costs associated with its long distance trains. A significant portion of Amtrak's operating expenses are associated with labor costs—costs that have continued to rise over and above the levels assumed in Amtrak's business plans from prior years. Amtrak has continued to sign labor agreements with its unions based on the "pattern" embodied in the agreement reached with the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees (BMWE). These "pattern" agreements have kept the increase in labor costs below the levels experienced in the freight rail industry. While these increased labor costs are now accounted for in Amtrak's latest strategic business plan, they will continue to rise. These costs, along with other cost areas where savings have yet to materialize, such as electric power, will exacerbate Amtrak's challenge in improving their bottom line over the long term.

Market Based Network Analysis.—Amtrak is performing a Market Based Network Analysis (MBNA) of existing passenger rail ridership, revenue, operating characteristics, cost and financial performance of the existing routes on Amtrak's system. This analysis will include market research of the intercity travel market, the physical constraints to changes in train frequency or speeds, and mail/express service potential. Using this information, Amtrak will analyze different service alternatives, including route restructuring and modification, frequency changes, route expansions, and route eliminations.

The MBNA will be competed in late summer 1999, so that Amtrak can incorporate the resulting network redesign, capital investment requirements, implementation process and time frame, and financial impact into the fiscal year 2000 Strategic Business Plan, which is scheduled for publication in October 1999. The Committee believes that this analysis can be an important tool for Amtrak's Board, the Amtrak Reform Council, and Congress in making decisions that will affect the railroad's future. The Committee directs that Amtrak make the MBNA available to House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Commerce Committee before publication of the fiscal year 2000 Strategic Business Plan.

Northeast Corridor high-speed service.—In late calendar year 1999, Amtrak plans to phase in its "Acela Express" high-speed electrified service between Boston, New York and Washington, DC. Amtrak has stated that travel time between New York and Washington will decrease from the current three hours to as little as 2 hours 30 minutes; travel time between New York and Boston will drop from the current 4 hours 45 minutes to as little as three hours. When fully operational (December 2000), Amtrak has projected that this new Northeast corridor service will generate $180,000,000 annually in net revenues, which the railroad expects to turn back to the Corporation to offset losses on other non-profitable lines.

In preparation for this new service, especially north of New Haven, where train service has heretofore been non-electric, Amtrak has initiated a comprehensive program to brief all fire, police, and rescue personnel in communities along the railroad and to give presentations in area schools regarding the danger of playing near the tracks. Amtrak plans to contact every school and all fire, police and rescue personnel prior to start-up of new electrified service. The Committee recognizes these efforts, and asks that Amtrak work with the affected Northeast corridor communities, as well as state transit officials and owners of the track, to identify danger spots and install perimeter fencing along the corridor where needed. In particular, Amtrak should continue to focus on increased community coordination in urbanized areas where there have been problems or where community concerns have been expressed, such as Attleboro, Foxboro, Mansfield, and Sharon, Massachusetts. Where possible, Amtrak should seek to install the necessary fencing for these areas prior to the initiation of high-speed electrified service.

On the south end of the Northeast corridor, between Washington, D.C. and New York, the track, signals, electric catenary and overhead wire are much older, and are in need of replacement or upgrade. The Committee directs that Amtrak provide a letter report to the Committees on Appropriations before August 27, 1999, describing in detail the planned infrastructure improvements along the south end of the corridor in the States of Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. The report should provide descriptions of work needed, cost estimates, and a timetable with benchmarks. The report should include any current or expected cost-sharing arrangements with the states, other railroads, or any other sources.

Los Angeles to Las Vegas service.—There is currently no passenger rail service between Los Angeles and Las Vegas. A preliminary agreement has been reached with the Union Pacific Railroad over the magnitude and scope of the infrastructure improvements along the UP's line that will allow implementation of passenger service. A second track would be installed on the UP mainline between Cima and Kelso, a distance of just over 20 miles, at an estimated cost of $28,000,000. Amtrak's fiscal years 1998 and 1999 capital budgets included $14,000,000 to initiate this service; UP will be responsible for the remainder of the costs associated with making the necessary track and infrastructure upgrades. A unique partnership arrangement with local businesses, who will buy a

large number of seats per year, guarantees a passenger-related revenue stream. This service may be initiated as early as mid–2000, and will have a travel time of five hours thirty minutes to cover the 270 mile distance between the two cities.

Southern Pines, NC railroad station.—The Committee notes with satisfaction the commitment that the railroad has made to full participation in the restoration of the historic Southern Pines railroad station. Amtrak is negotiating with CSX Railroad for ownership of the property, and if all goes as planned, will begin performing work on the station this summer.

Amtrak service in Vermont.—The Committee understands that there are communities interested in future Amtrak service between Hoosick Falls, New York and Burlington, Vermont. The Committee directs that Amtrak provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by September 30, 1999, on the capital costs necessary to upgrade the line to passenger rail standards for Amtrak service.

RAIL INITIATIVES—TRUST FUND

Appropriations, 1999	.....
Budget estimate, 2000	$35,400,000
Committee recommendation	.....

[1] Proposed to be funded from revenue aligned budget authority.

The Administration is proposing a rail initiatives account to be funded from revenue aligned budget authority. The budget proposal includes $15,000,000 for high speed rail grade crossing; $10,000,000 for positive train control (2 demonstration projects); and $10,400,000 for the Nationwide Differential Global Position System (NDGPS). The Committee has not endorsed the administration's requested treatment of revenue aligned budget authority funds. However, the Committee has provided $7,300,000 in appropriated general funds for position train control activities within the "Next generation high-speed rail" account. The only funding available for high-speed rail grade crossings is that drawn down from the highway safety set-aside, an amount of $5,250,000 a year. The Committee has also provided funding for the NDGPS within the Federal-aid Highway program, which is fully discussed in the Federal Highway Administration section of the report.

AMTRAK REFORM COUNCIL

Appropriations, 1999	$450,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [1]	750,000
Committee recommendation	950,000

[1] The Council is an independent entity. Its funding is presented within the FRA for display purposes only.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $950,000 for necessary expenses of the Amtrak Reform Council [ARC]. Initial funding for the ARC was provided in the fiscal year 1998 supplemental appropriations bill, Public Law 105–174; in the fiscal year 1999 transportation appropriations act, $450,000 was appropriated for the Council. For fiscal year 2000, the administration has requested an appropriation of $750,000, but the Council has sent up an independent budget request for $1,300,000. Because the Council

is an independent commission, the Committee's appropriation of $950,000 is not provided within the FRA's budget, but is provided in a general provision (section 331) of the bill.

The ARC was established by the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 [ARAA]. The Council consists of 11 members, including four Senate appointees, four House appointees, two Presidential appointees, and the Secretary of Transportation.

Under the ARAA, the responsibilities of the ARC include evaluating Amtrak's performance and making recommendations to Congress and Amtrak for achieving further cost containment, productivity improvements, and financial reforms. In addition, fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill language expanded the Council's statutory responsibilities to include its views on any routes or services that Amtrak's route analysis data indicate should be closed or realigned.

As a practical matter, the ARC is a temporary commission. After October 2000, the Commission must make a determination on whether or not Amtrak can meet the financial goals outlined in the ARAA. If the ARC determines these goals cannot be met, they must then submit a restructuring plan, and Amtrak must submit a liquidation plan.

The Committee's recommended funding level, $950,000, will allow the ARC to decisively move forward in performing its tasks and responsibilities. These funds are available for 2 years, through September 30, 2001.

During fiscal year 1999, the Council has hired a small permanent and part-time staff consisting of an executive director and assistant to the executive director, a senior attorney, administrative specialist, and administrative assistant. The Council also plans to bring on a senior-level transportation economist/financial analyst and a transportation industry analyst. Both the administration and the Council have requested that Congress lift its current restriction on the hiring of outside consultants. This provision was put in place to prevent potential conflicts of interest and keep ARC costs to a minimum. The Committee directs that not more than $200,000 of the funds herein appropriated be used for outside consultant services. These contractual services shall not exceed the annual cost of an SES level IV direct compensation on a per FTE basis.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2000 PROGRAM

The Federal Transit Administration was established as a component of the Department of Transportation by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, effective July 1, 1968, which transferred most of the functions and programs under the Federal Transit Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 302; 49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The missions of the Federal Transit Administration are: to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods; to encourage the planning and establishment of urban and rural transportation services needed for economical and desirable development; to provide mobility for transit dependents in both metropolitan and rural areas; to maximize productivity of transportation systems; and to provide as-

sistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such services and systems.

The current authorization for the programs funded by the Federal Transit Administration is contained in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. In addition to the "guaranteed" level of funds under the mass transit discretionary budget category, the administration proposes funding of $291,270,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

Under the Committee recommendation, a total program level of $5,797,000,000 would be provided for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration for fiscal year 2000, which is the same obligation limitation authorized under the mass transit category in TEA–21.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations compared to fiscal year 2000 and the administration's request:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	1999 enacted [1]	2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Administrative expenses	54,000	60,000	60,000
Formula grants [2]	2,850,000	3,310,270	3,098,000
University transportation research	6,000	6,000	6,000
Transit planning and research [3]	98,000	111,000	107,000
Capital investment grants	2,257,000	2,451,000	2,451,000
Job access and reverse commute grants [4]	75,000	150,000	75,000
Washington Metro	50,000		
Total	5,390,000	6,088,270	5,797,000

[1] Excludes reductions for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277; excludes rescission of discretionary grant contract authority; also excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.

[2] The Fiscal Year 1999 enacted level excludes transfers of $50,800,000 to the capital investment grants program and the Office of Inspector General; the budget proposal includes $212,270,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

[3] The budget proposal includes $4,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

[4] The budget proposal includes $75,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

Administrative Expenses

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$10,800,000	$43,200,000	$54,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	12,000,000	48,000,000	60,000,000
Committee recommendation	12,000,000	48,000,000	60,000,000

[1] Excludes reduction of $912,000 for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277. Excludes supplemental funding of $250,000 for Y2K.

[2] Excludes proposed transfer of $1,700,000 to Inspector General for audit reimbursements.

The Committee recommends a total of $60,000,000 in budget resources funds for administrative expenses.

Last year the Committee directed the OIG to track the progress of all fixed guideway projects of national significance and perform audits of those experiencing cost, schedule, or financing problems. To continue this work in fiscal year 2000, the administration proposes reimbursing the OIG $1,700,000 from FTA's administrative expenses account. The Committee endorses this proposed transfer, and has provided a total of $9,000,000 in transferred FTA administrative funds, for audits and investigations of all transit-related

issues and systems. This level reflects the percentage of total Office of Inspector General work performed in the transit area.

FORMULA GRANTS

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$570,000,000	$2,280,000,000	$2,850,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	619,600,000	2,690,000,000	3,310,270,000
Committee recommendation	619,600,000	2,478,400,000	3,098,000,000

[1] Excludes $800,000 in oversight funds transferred to OIG. Also excludes $50,000,000 transferred to capital investment grants.
[2] Includes $212,300,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

Formula grants to States and local agencies funded under this heading fall into four categories: urbanized area formula grants (U.S.C. sec. 5307); clean fuels formula grants (U.S.C. sec. 5308); formula grants and loans for special needs of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities (U.S.C. sec. 5310); and formula grants for other than urbanized areas (U.S.C. sec. 5311). In addition, set asides of formula funds are directed to: a new grant program for intercity bus operators to finance Americans With Disabilities Act [ADA] accessibility costs; and the Alaska Railroad for improvements to its passenger operations. The administration has proposed that $212,270,000 in revenue aligned budget authority funds be transferred to the transit formula grants account. Of these funds, FTA proposes that $25,000,000 be used to meet the transportation needs of the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City, $20,000,000 be used for the Long Island Railroad East Side Access new starts project, and that an additional $1,300,000 be made available for intercity bus ADA compliance costs. The remainder of the transferred RABA funds would go to the three formula programs. The Committee has not approved any transfer of RABA funds, and thereby does not approve this request. However, the Committee recognizes the Administration's interest in supporting the transportation needs associated with the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, Utah. Accordingly, the Committee has provided for these transportation functions within the framework of the bus and bus facilities and new systems categories.

Transit Equity Provision.—The bill includes a general provision (section 321) which prevents any state from receiving more than 12.5 percent of the aggregate formula and capital investment grants programs' funds. The following illustrative table shows the enacted fiscal year 1999 funding levels for the transit formula and capital investment grants programs, and the percentage share each state received. The bill's transit equity provision would decrease the state's formula grants allocations by the amount needed to bring the aggregate total down to 12.5 percent of the national total. These recovered funds would be redistributed to the remaining states in equal measure, to the states' section 5307 formula grants programs, for use on any eligible capital transit project.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION FISCAL YEAR 1999 APPORTIONMENT FOR FORMULA PROGRAMS (BY STATE)

State	Section						State total selected FTA programs	State percentage of total
	5307 Urbanized area	5311 Non-urbanized area	5310 Elderly & persons with disability	5309 New starts	5309 Fixed guideway modernization	5309 Bus allocation		
Alabama	$11,402,391	$4,250,030	$1,160,647	$1,000,000	.....	$23,840,000	$41,653,068	0.82
Alaska	[1] 7,005,198	633,771	185,871	5,200,000	.....	7,500,000	20,524,840	.40
American Samoa	.....	90,332	52,397	.....	.....	.....	142,729	.....
Arizona	28,888,298	1,860,551	1,023,763	5,000,000	$1,286,274	7,000,000	45,058,886	.88
Arkansas	4,440,818	3,397,723	812,084	1,000,000	.....	3,060,000	12,710,625	.25
California	407,141,247	8,292,733	6,271,268	146,980,000	86,945,465	40,555,004	696,185,717	13.64
Colorado	31,721,677	1,770,167	794,916	41,000,000	1,080,875	8,675,001	85,042,636	1.67
Connecticut	40,094,714	1,605,709	910,339	3,500,000	34,799,686	7,550,000	88,460,448	1.73
Delaware	5,374,860	400,586	278,659	.....	666,931	1,000,000	7,721,036	.15
District of Columbia	22,289,751	.....	276,620	.....	32,038,246	7,350,000	61,954,617	1.21
Florida	125,722,610	5,330,935	4,233,062	28,500,000	11,094,890	19,500,000	194,381,497	3.81
Georgia	47,626,007	6,213,996	1,503,895	53,610,000	14,967,672	15,500,000	139,421,570	2.73
Guam	.....	257,155	132,972	.....	.....	.....	390,127	.01
Hawaii	20,138,902	697,426	353,457	8,200,000	532,305	3,250,000	33,172,090	.65
Idaho	2,624,831	1,407,037	361,628	.....	.....	.....	4,393,496	.09
Illinois	177,939,272	5,700,995	2,737,694	44,000,000	106,700,651	9,300,000	346,378,612	6.79
Indiana	28,246,378	5,507,032	1,438,171	3,000,000	7,161,958	7,700,000	53,053,539	1.04
Iowa	8,358,254	3,542,177	872,739	250,000	.....	6,685,001	19,708,171	.39
Kansas	6,741,540	2,817,690	732,264	1,000,000	.....	2,000,000	13,291,494	.26
Kentucky	14,624,420	4,651,390	1,112,476	.....	.....	5,300,000	25,688,286	.50
Louisiana	23,302,797	3,847,036	1,116,063	24,000,000	2,323,293	11,000,000	65,589,189	1.28
Maine	1,882,950	1,856,345	451,211	.....	.....	.....	4,190,506	.08
Maryland	64,030,500	2,317,558	1,121,323	20,541,000	19,950,711	10,000,000	117,961,092	2.31
Massachusetts	97,891,042	2,483,718	1,613,444	56,233,000	60,214,839	13,728,000	232,164,043	4.55
Michigan	52,081,684	6,726,332	2,342,839	200,000	321,028	10,600,000	72,271,883	1.42
Minnesota	25,669,254	3,870,615	1,137,080	17,000,000	2,452,324	17,500,000	67,629,273	1.32
Mississippi	3,996,738	3,777,218	789,061	.....	.....	5,500,000	14,063,017	.28
Missouri	28,734,839	4,508,270	1,458,410	1,000,000	1,527,879	11,750,000	48,979,398	.96
Montana	1,986,212	1,139,811	332,096	.....	.....	1,500,000	4,958,119	.10

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION FISCAL YEAR 1999 APPORTIONMENT FOR FORMULA PROGRAMS (BY STATE)—Continued

State	Section						State total selected FTA programs	State percentage of total
	5307 Urbanized area	5311 Non-urbanized area	5310 Elderly & persons with disability	5309 New starts	5309 Fixed guideway modernization	5309 Bus allocation		
Nebraska	7,027,667	1,719,830	517,396	1,000,000	.....	.....	10,264,893	.20
Nevada	15,156,521	561,498	385,885	4,000,000	.....	6,115,001	26,218,905	.51
New Hampshire	2,782,848	1,486,701	364,757	.....	.....	2,770,000	7,404,306	.15
New Jersey	149,068,196	2,125,667	1,936,285	77,000,000	82,332,792	11,750,000	324,212,940	6.35
New Mexico	5,913,740	1,671,096	455,491	5,000,000	.....	5,750,000	18,790,327	.37
New York	445,307,544	7,482,603	4,481,782	24,000,000	303,962,647	27,950,000	813,184,576	15.93
North Carolina	22,314,616	7,948,734	1,709,831	13,000,000	.....	10,161,001	55,134,182	1.08
North Dakota	1,936,178	842,941	283,256	.....	.....	2,000,000	5,062,375	.10
Northern Marianas	.....	83,712	52,189	.....	.....	.....	135,901	.....
Ohio	72,640,731	8,092,364	2,856,940	8,500,000	14,917,615	13,450,000	120,457,650	2.36
Oklahoma	9,356,223	3,459,402	960,541	.....	.....	5,000,000	18,776,166	.37
Oregon	22,341,456	2,746,796	893,273	25,718,000	2,284,605	8,550,000	62,534,130	1.22
Pennsylvania	123,375,552	9,027,117	3,424,587	10,000,000	94,236,678	32,966,003	273,029,937	5.35
Puerto Rico	39,747,536	2,697,587	847,585	20,000,000	1,336,512	950,000	65,579,220	1.28
Rhode Island	7,828,479	345,565	402,028	.....	1,813,989	5,450,000	15,840,061	.31
South Carolina	9,623,540	3,978,381	928,595	2,200,000	.....	4,570,000	21,300,516	.42
South Dakota	1,396,700	1,027,479	305,582	.....	.....	5,300,000	8,029,761	.16
Tennessee	18,715,967	5,135,635	1,369,761	4,700,000	59,037	2,000,000	31,980,400	.63
Texas	136,324,426	10,842,756	3,536,745	90,670,000	4,488,746	17,000,000	262,862,673	5.15
Utah	17,314,841	778,886	424,725	75,000,000	.....	10,300,000	103,818,452	2.03
Vermont	701,941	918,655	253,268	2,000,000	.....	4,000,000	7,873,864	.15
Virgin Islands	.....	196,622	135,122	.....	.....	.....	331,744	.01
Virginia	48,405,321	4,553,238	1,424,809	27,000,000	467,604	13,950,000	95,800,972	1.88
Washington	71,241,720	3,190,397	1,278,234	47,250,000	12,320,187	22,700,000	157,980,538	3.09
West Virginia	3,384,125	2,712,757	679,558	4,000,000	.....	14,500,000	25,276,440	.50
Wisconsin	30,207,820	4,687,326	1,304,931	500,000	514,561	16,875,001	54,089,639	1.06
Wyoming	969,869	655,575	215,996	.....	.....	.....	1,841,440	.04
Unallocated	.....	.....	.....	48,000	.....	.....	48,000	.....

Total	2,553,040,741	177,923,658	67,035,601	902,800,000	902,800,000	501,400,000	5,105,000,000	100.00
Over-the-Road Bus Accessibility	2,000,000						2,000,000	
Grand Total	2,555,040,741	177,923,658	67,035,601	902,800,000	902,800,000	501,400,000	5,107,000,000	

[1] Includes $4,849,950 appropriated for the Alaska Railroad.

Within the total funding level of $3,098,000,000, the statutory distribution of these formula grants is allocated among these categories as follows:

Urbanized areas (sec. 5307)	$2,772,890,281
Clean fuels (sec. 5308)	50,000,000
Elderly and disabled (sec. 5310)	72,946,801
Nonurbanized areas (sec. 5311)	193,612,968
Over-the-Road Bus Program	3,700,000
Alaska railroad	4,849,950

The following table displays the State-by-State distribution of the formula program funds within each of the program categories:

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, FISCAL YEAR 2000 GUARANTEED LEVEL APPORTIONMENT FOR FORMULA PROGRAMS (BY STATE)

State	Section 5307 urbanized area	Section 5311 nonurbanized area	Section 5310 elderly and persons with disabilities	Total formula programs
Alabama	$12,345,815	$4,601,674	$1,262,364	$18,209,853
Alaska [1]	7,159,272	686,209	191,850	8,037,331
American Samoa		97,806	52,632	150,438
Arizona	31,278,488	2,014,492	1,112,036	34,405,016
Arkansas	4,808,246	3,678,847	879,566	9,366,659
California	440,827,753	8,978,871	6,874,937	456,681,561
Colorado	34,346,300	1,916,629	860,712	37,123,641
Connecticut	43,412,116	1,738,563	987,472	46,138,151
Delaware	5,819,571	433,730	293,751	6,547,052
District of Columbia	24,133,985		291,511	24,425,496
Florida	136,124,791	5,772,011	4,636,540	146,533,342
Georgia	51,566,541	6,728,137	1,639,325	59,934,003
Guam		278,431	133,754	412,185
Hawaii	21,805,177	755,131	375,895	22,936,203
Idaho	2,842,008	1,523,454	384,869	4,750,331
Illinois	192,661,811	6,172,689	2,994,303	201,828,803
Indiana	30,583,459	5,962,678	1,567,146	38,113,283
Iowa	9,049,807	3,835,253	946,179	13,831,239
Kansas	7,299,329	3,050,822	791,908	11,142,059
Kentucky	15,834,432	5,036,242	1,209,462	22,080,136
Louisiana	25,230,847	4,165,337	1,213,401	30,609,585
Maine	2,038,744	2,009,937	483,251	4,531,932
Maryland	69,328,328	2,509,310	1,219,178	73,056,816
Massachusetts	105,990,461	2,689,218	1,759,633	110,439,312
Michigan	56,390,876	7,282,862	2,560,666	66,234,404
Minnesota	27,793,106	4,190,867	1,236,483	33,220,456
Mississippi	4,327,424	4,089,742	854,282	9,271,448
Missouri	31,112,334	4,881,280	1,589,372	37,582,986
Montana	2,150,550	1,234,118	352,436	3,737,104
Nebraska	7,609,130	1,862,127	555,935	10,027,192
Nevada	16,410,558	607,956	411,508	17,430,022
New Hampshire	3,013,098	1,609,709	388,305	5,011,112
New Jersey	161,401,967	2,301,543	2,114,182	165,817,692
New Mexico	6,403,038	1,809,361	487,951	8,700,350
New York	482,151,901	8,101,711	4,909,688	495,163,300
North Carolina	24,160,905	8,606,405	1,865,487	34,632,797
North Dakota	2,096,375	912,685	298,799	3,307,859
Northern Marianas		90,638	52,404	143,042
Ohio	78,650,959	8,761,919	3,125,261	90,538,139
Oklahoma	10,130,348	3,745,630	1,042,604	14,918,582
Oregon	24,189,968	2,974,063	968,730	28,132,761

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, FISCAL YEAR 2000 GUARANTEED LEVEL APPORTIONMENT FOR FORMULA PROGRAMS (BY STATE)—Continued

State	Section 5307 urbanized area	Section 5311 nonurbanized area	Section 5310 elderly and persons with disabilities	Total formula programs
Pennsylvania	133,583,533	9,774,012	3,748,659	147,106,204
Puerto Rico	43,036,204	2,920,782	918,554	46,875,540
Rhode Island	8,476,199	374,157	429,237	9,279,593
South Carolina	10,419,785	4,307,549	1,007,521	15,734,855
South Dakota	1,512,262	1,112,492	323,318	2,948,072
Tennessee	20,264,508	5,560,553	1,492,017	27,317,078
Texas	147,603,791	11,739,874	3,871,834	163,215,499
Utah	18,747,454	843,330	454,162	20,044,946
Vermont	760,019	994,664	265,866	2,020,549
Virgin Islands		212,891	136,116	349,007
Virginia	52,410,334	4,929,969	1,552,472	58,892,775
Washington	77,136,196	3,454,367	1,391,500	81,982,063
West Virginia	3,664,123	2,937,208	734,024	7,335,355
Wisconsin	32,707,189	5,075,151	1,420,820	39,203,160
Wyoming	1,050,115	709,817	224,933	1,984,865
Unallocated				
Subtotal	2,763,851,530	192,644,903	72,946,801	3,029,443,234
Oversight	13,888,701	968,065		14,856,766
Total	2,777,740,231	193,612,968	72,946,801	3,044,300,000
Clean Fuels				50,000,000
Over-the-Road Bus Accessibility				3,700,000
Grand Total				3,098,000,000

[1] Includes $4,849,950 for the Alaska Railroad improvements to passenger operations.

University Transportation Research

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 1999	$1,200,000	$4,800,000	$6,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	1,200,000	4,800,000	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,200,000	4,800,000	6,000,000

Section 5505 of TEA21 provides authorization for the university transportation research program. The purpose of the university transportation research program is to become a national resource and focal point for the support and conduct of research and training concerning the transportation of passengers and property. Funds provided under the FTA university transportation research program are transferred to and managed by the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), combined with a transfer from the Federal Highway Administration of $27,250,000. The transit university transportation research program funds are statutorily available only to the following universities: University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Morgan State University, and North Carolina State University.

The Committee action provides $6,000,000 for the university transportation research program, the same level as provided in fiscal year 1999.

TRANSIT PLANNING AND RESEARCH

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 1999	$19,800,000	$78,200,000	$98,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [1]	21,000,000	90,000,000	111,000,000
Committee recommendation	21,000,000	86,000,000	107,000,000

[1] Includes $4,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

The Committee action provides $107,000,000 for transit planning and research. The bill contains language specifying that $49,632,000 shall be available for the metropolitan planning program; $5,250,000 for the rural transit assistance program; $29,500,000 for the national planning and research program; $10,368,000 for the State planning and research program; $8,250,000 for transit cooperative research; and $4,000,000 for the National Transit Institute. Under the national component of the program, the Federal Transit Administration is a catalyst in the research, development, and deployment of transportation methods and technologies addressing such issues as accessibility for the disabled, air quality, and traffic congestion service and operational improvements. Funds for the State and local component of the program will ensure that all localities have sufficient funds to improve the State and local planning process and to participate in research efforts with regional applications.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendation:

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	1999 program level	2000 budget estimate	
Metropolitan planning	$43,841,600	$49,632,000	$49,632,000
Rural transit assistance program	5,250,000	5,250,000	5,250,000
State planning and research program	9,158,400	10,368,000	10,368,000
Transit cooperative research program	8,250,000	8,250,000	8,250,000
National Transit Institute	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
National planning and research program [1]	27,500,000	33,500,000	29,500,000
Total	98,000,000	111,000,000	107,000,000

[1] Fiscal Year 2000 includes $4,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM

Transit Data Base.—The Committee is concerned that the Transit Data Base contains data that is unreliable and/or unusable. Transit Data Base information collected from federal grantees, which is used for the purposes of allocating federal formula grants and sharing operational data throughout the industry, is chronically late (published up to three years after receipt) and noticeably error-ridden. It is also apparent to the Committee that the scope of the information collected is insufficient to provide government, industry and academic institutions with useful operating characteristics and performance statistics of transit systems nationwide.

The Committee directs the FTA to initiate a contract with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to design a new Transit Data Base, comprised of operational statistics, performance measurements and other financial data necessary to fulfill FTA's responsibilities for distributing formula grants, while providing government, industry, academic institutions, and others with meaningful data for data sharing and benchmark purposes. In designing the new Transit Data Base, special attention should be paid to developing clear instructions for those agencies that must submit data and employing computer-based electronic data storage and access techniques. FTA is directed to execute such an agreement with NAS within 30 days of enactment of the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill, using available research funds from the Transit cooperative research program.

FTA shall submit the recommended Transit Data Base design to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and to the General Services Administration for review within 180 days of enactment, and subsequent to that review, shall publish the new Transit Data Base design in the Federal Register, and incorporate the new design in the fiscal year 2001 cycle of federal grantee reports.

Over-the-road bus accessibility compliance issues.—The Committee is concerned that the TEA21 formula program which makes grants to intercity bus operators to assist with the costs of Americans with Disabilities Act and Clean Air Act compliance may be insufficient to meet the national needs of these operators, who provide essential, affordable intercity transportation, particularly in rural areas. The guaranteed funding level for this program is $3,700,000 in fiscal year 2000; and under TEA21, a 50 percent match by the operator is required for eligible acquisition costs. The Committee directs the transit cooperative research program to perform an analysis of the over-the-road bus accessibility program, including data on the total capital needs of these operators to comply with ADA; compliance deadlines; and a discussion of the appropriateness of the matching fund requirement. This report shall be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee by March 1, 2000.

NATIONAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

The FTA has requested that $11,600,000 of its national planning and research program be spent on equipment and infrastructure research activities. Of this program level, TEA21 earmarks $7,000,000 for four projects. In addition to these four projects and within the equipment and infrastructure program, the Committee directs that the two following projects receive the specified levels of funding:

Zinc air battery research.—The Committee directs that FTA provide $1,500,000 to continue and expand the zinc-air bus demonstration project in Las Vegas, NV. This ongoing program will help FTA assess the relative merits of emerging clean-air transportation technologies.

Calstart clean fuel alternative vehicles.—The Committee directs that FTA provide $1,000,000 to the Calstart advanced transit systems and electric vehicle program. The Calstart advanced transportation technology consortium has ongoing clean fuel technology projects at airports, and is also working on the development of clean ferries technologies.

Electric vehicle information sharing and technology transfer program.—The FTA has requested that $3,600,000 of its national planning and research program be spent on information management and technology activities. Of the requested funds, the Committee believes that the proposed international technical assistance and small business innovation research programs are not timely initiatives, and directs that the $500,000 associated with these requests, in combination with $500,000 from the human resources program, be utilized to establish a new electric vehicle information sharing and technology transfer program. This $1,000,000 grant shall be made available to the Electric Power Research Institute and the Electric Vehicle Association of the Americas, for the purpose of conducting a technology transfer and information and data collection program for battery electric and hybrid electric buses. These funds shall be leveraged through cost sharing. Of those electric and hybrid electric bus projects funded in fiscal year 1999 and prior years' appropriations, and those electric bus projects which receive funds through the fiscal year 2000 appropriations, the Secretary shall encourage the project sponsors to participate in this technology transfer program so that information gathered and technology assessments while conducting the project can be gathered and disseminated to other agencies and authorities interested in using these new technologies. These grant funds shall be used for data and information collection, distribution of such information through public workshops, Internet distribution, and other means of widespread public dissemination.

Portland, ME independent transportation network.—The FTA has requested that $2,500,000 of its national planning and research program be spent on planning and project development activities. Within this program level, the Committee directs that $500,000 be provided for the Portland, ME independent transportation network, a regional program which seeks to address the mobility needs of an aging population, who are increasingly unable to drive safely and are often stranded in rural and suburban locations that lack the density for traditional mass transit.

Wheeling, WV mobility study.—The Committee directs that FTA provide $250,000 to the appropriate officials in Wheeling, WV for the preparation of a mobility study to determine the transportation improvements that will be necessary as part of the continued development of the Wheeling National Heritage area and the central business district of the city of Wheeling.

Utah advanced traffic management system.—Within the overall national planning and research program, FTA is directed to provide $3,000,000 for the transit component of Utah's advanced traffic management system. This integrated ITS project will greatly assist local traffic authorities in managing both local and out-of-state spectator traffic at the 2002 Winter Olympics, and the ITS infra-

structure will remain in place to assist the Salt Lake City region with future traffic management needs.

Trans-Hudson tunnel feasibility study.—Section 3030 of TEA21 authorizes a study of the feasibility of building a Trans-Hudson tunnel for increased rail access between New Jersey and New York City. FTA has requested new funding in fiscal year 2000 for research and analysis on different subway tunnel design and construction methods. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for a feasibility study of a Hudson River tunnel, which shall incorporate an analysis of the different tunnel technology options available and appropriate to the Hudson River's specific geological and hydrostatic characteristics.

In addition to the initiatives listed above, the Committee reaffirms the transit planning and research grants from the national program that were contained in sec. 3012 of the Transportation Equity Act for fiscal year 2000:

Washoe County, NV, transit technology	$1,250,000
Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority advanced electric transit buses and related infrastructure	1,500,000
Palm Springs, CA, fuel cell buses	1,500,000
Gloucester, MA, intermodal technology center	1,500,000
Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority advanced propulsion control system	3,000,000
Project ACTION	3,000,000

TRUST FUND SHARE OF EXPENSES

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999	$4,251,800,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [1]	4,929,270,000
Committee recommendation	4,638,000,000

[1] Includes $291,270,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee has provided $4,638,000,000 in liquidating cash for the trust fund share of transit expenses associated with the following programs: administrative expenses, formula grants, university transportation research, transit planning and research, job access and reverse commute grants, and capital investment grants. This level of funds is equal to the total budget authority from the highway trust fund inside the transit firewall as outlined in the transportation discretionary spending guarantee subtitle of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

	General funds	Trust funds	Total
Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$501,400,000	$1,805,600,000	$2,307,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	490,200,000	1,960,800,000	2,451,000,000
Committee recommendation	490,200,000	1,960,800,000	2,451,000,000

[1] Includes $50,000,000 transferred from formula grants pursuant to Public Law 105–277.

Section 5309 of 49 U.S.C. authorizes discretionary grants or loans to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof to be used in financing mass transportation investments. Investments may include construction of new fixed guideway systems and exten-

sions to existing guideway systems; major bus fleet expansions and bus facility construction; and fixed guideway expenditures for existing systems.

The Committee action provides a level of $2,451,000,000. Within this total, $1,960,800,000 is from the "Mass transit" account of the highway trust fund, and no more than $490,200,000 shall be appropriated from general funds. The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

	1999 program level	Fiscal year 2000 budget estimate	Committee recommendations
Bus and bus facilities [1]	$501,400,000	$490,200,000	$490,200,000
Fixed guideway modernization	902,800,000	980,400,000	980,400,000
New systems and new extensions	902,800,000	980,400,000	980,400,000
Total	2,307,000,000	2,451,000,000	2,451,000,000

[1] Fiscal year 1999 includes $50,000,000 transferred from formula grants.

Three-year availability of section 3 discretionary funds.—The Committee has redistributed unallocated discretionary bus and new starts funds from projects which were funded in the fiscal year 1997 Transportation appropriations bill (Public Law 104–205) and previous acts making these funds available for reallocation in fiscal year 2000. As in previous years, a general provision (sec. 317) is included which limits funding availability for these fiscal year 2000 capital investment funds, except fixed-guideway modernization funds, to 3 years from enactment.

Under the 3-year availability rule, funding provided in fiscal year 1997 for the following bus and bus-related projects will lapse if the grant recipients do not obligate the remaining unobligated funds by September 30, 1999:

	Remaining unobligated funds
Little Rock, AR	$992,500
Fairfield City, CA	1,389,500
Foothill, CA	4,053,837
North Orange County, CA	198,500
Norwalk, CA	192,500
Riverside County, CA	992,500
Santa Cruz MTD, CA	1,985,000
Sonoma County, CA	992,500
Thousand Oaks, CA	595,500
Statewide, DE	5,195,478
Miami Beach, FL	992,500
Chatham, GA	1,052,050
Statewide, LA	9,794,315
Boston, MA	672,500
Statewide, MI	4,122,500
Jackson, MS buses and facilities	992,500
Jackson, MS downtown multimodal center	3,473,750
St. Louis, MO	1,736,875
Buffalo, NY	992,500
New Rochelle, NY	1,235,000
Syracuse, NY	1,985,000
Hood River, OR	173,688
Salem, OR	1,836,125
Erie, PA	1,985,000
Spartanburg, SC	1,488,750
El Paso, TX	139,988
Galveston, TX	496,250

	Remaining unobligated funds
Liberty, Montgomery, Polk Counties, TX	1,013,170
Burlington, VT	1,488,750
Reston, VA	496,250
Virginia Beach, VA	992,500
Everett, WA	2,977,500

In addition, under the 3-year availability rule, funding provided in fiscal year 1997 for the following new fixed guideway systems projects will lapse if the grant recipients do not obligate the remaining unobligated funds by September 30, 1999:

	Remaining unobligated funds
Dallas—RAILTRAN	$15,140,000
Houston—Regional Bus	40,310,000
St. Louis—Metrolink	3,400,000
New Orleans—Canal Street LRT	7,940,000
Little Rock—River Rail Project	1,810,000
North Carolina—Research Triangle Transit Plan	700,000
San Diego—Mid Coast Corridor	1,490,000
Hartford-Griffin LRT Project	990,000
Alaska—Ketchikan Ferry Project	6,340,000
Burlington to Charlotte, VT Commuter Rail	990,000
Jackson, MS—Intermodal Corridor	5,460,000
New York—Whitehall Ferry Terminal	1,670,000
Virginia Railway Express—Commuter Rail Project	2,980,000

The Committee urges the grant recipients noted above to move swiftly to obligate these funds. When the transportation appropriations conferees meet later this year, any unobligated funds in the bus or new systems accounts that were earmarked in fiscal year 1997 or prior will be available for reprogramming under the 3-year availability rule.

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES

The Committee recommendation for bus and bus facilities funding is $490,200,000, which is 20 percent of the total made available for capital investment grants. These funds may be used to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities. There are three set-asides within the allocation of funds for discretionary bus and bus facilities $3,000,000 is made available for the Altoona, PA, bus testing facility; $50,000,000 is made available only for grants that meet the 49 U.S.C. section 5308 Clean Fuels Formula Grant Program standards, and $4,850,000 is made available for qualifying fuel cell bus projects. In addition, TEA21 includes bus and bus facility projects with a minimum level of funding under the "guaranteed" funding level for the mass transit discretionary budget category.

The Committee has included bill language that delineates a number of eligible bus and bus facilities projects, and directs the Federal Transit Administrator to submit to the congressional appropriations and authorizing committees, within 60 days of enactment of the fiscal year 2000 appropriations legislation, a grant recommendation list choosing from among the projects listed in the appropriations bill. This list is inclusive of all bus and bus facilities projects that were included in the TEA21 legislation (sec. 3031), as well as projects that have been brought to the Appropriations Com-

mittee's attention as being meritorious and in need of Federal assistance.

2001 Special Olympics Winter Games buses and transit facilities, Anchorage, Alaska

Adrian buses and bus facilities, Michigan

Alabama statewide rural bus needs, Alabama

Alameda-Conta Costa Transit District project, California

Albany train station/intermodal facility, New York

Albuquerque SOLAR computerized transit management system, New Mexico

Albuquerque Westside transit maintenance facility, New Mexico

Albuquerque, buses, paratransit vehicles, and bus facility, New Mexico

Alexandria Union Station transit center, Virginia

Alexandria, bus maintenance facility and Crystal City canopy project, Virginia

Allegheny County buses, Pennsylvania

Altoona bus testing facility, Pennsylvania

Altoona, Metro Transit Authority buses and transit system improvements, Pennsylvania

Ames transit facility expansion, Iowa

Anchorage Ship Creek intermodal facility, Alaska

Arkansas Highway and Transit Department buses, Arkansas

Arkansas state safety and preventative maintenace facility, Arkansas

Armstrong County-Mid-County, PA bus facilities and buses, Pennsylvania

Atlanta, MARTA buses, Georgia

Attleboro intermodal transit facility, Massachusetts

Austin buses, Texas

Babylon Intermodal Center, New York

Baldwin Rural Area Transportation System buses, Alabama

Ballston Metro access improvements, Virginia

Bay/Saginaw buses and bus facilities, Michigan

Beaumont Municipal Transit System buses and bus facilities, Texas

Beaver County bus facility, Pennsylvania

Ben Franklin transit buses and bus facilities, Richland, Washington

Billings buses and bus facilities, Montana

Birmingham intermodal facility, Alabama

Birmingham-Jefferson County buses, Alabama

Blue Water buses and bus facilities, Michigan

Boston Government Center transit center, Massachusetts

Boston Logan Airport intermodal transit connector, Massachusetts

Boulder/Denver, RTD buses, Colorado

Brazos Transit Authority buses and bus facilities, Texas

Brea shuttle buses, California

Bremerton multimodal center—Sinclair's Landing, Washington

Brigham City and Payson regional park and ride lots/transit centers, Utah

Brockton intermodal transportation center, Massachusetts

Buffalo, Auditorium Intermodal Center, New York

Burlington ferry terminal improvements, Vermont
Burlington multimodal center, Vermont
Cambria County, bus facilities and buses, Pennsylvania
Cedar Rapids intermodal facility, Iowa
Central Ohio Transit Authority vehicle locator system, Ohio
Centre Area Transportation Authority buses, Pennsylvania
Chattanooga Southern Regional Alternative fuel bus program, Georgia
Chester County, Paoli Transportation Center, Pennsylvania
Chittenden County Transportation Authority buses, Vermont
Clallam Transit multimodal center, Sequim, Washington
Clark County Regional Transportation Commission buses and bus facilities, Nevada
Cleveland, Triskett Garage bus maintenance facility, Ohio
Clinton transit facility expansion, Iowa
Colorado buses and bus facilities, Colorado
Columbia Bus replacement, South Carolina
Columbia buses and vans, Missouri
Compton Renaissance Transit System shelters and facilities, California
Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Authority buses and bus facilities, Texas
Corvallis buses and automated passenger information system, Oregon
Culver City, CityBus buses, California
Dallas Area Rapid Transit buses, Texas
Davis, Unitrans transit maintenance facility, California
Dayton, Multimodal Transportation Center, Ohio
Daytona Beach, Intermodal Center, Florida
Deerfield Valley Transit Authority buses, Vermont
Denver 16th Street Intermodal Center
Denver, Stapleton Intermodal Center, Colorado
Des Moines transit facilities, Iowa
Detroit buses and bus facilities, Michigan
Dothan Wiregrass Transit Authority vehicles and transit facility, Alabama
Dulles Corridor park and ride, Virginia
Duluth, Transit Authority community circulation vehicles, Minnesota
Duluth, Transit Authority intelligent transportation systems, Minnesota
Duluth, Transit Authority Transit Hub, Minnesota
Dutchess County, Loop System buses, New York
El Paso Sun Metro buses, Texas
Elliott Bay Water Taxi ferry purchase, Washington
Erie, Metropolitan Transit Authority buses, Pennsylvania
Escambia County buses and bus facility, Alabama
Essex Junction multimodal station rehabilitation, Vermont
Everett transit bus replacement, Washington
Everett, Multimodal Transportation Center, Washington
Fairbanks intermodal rail/bus transfer facility, Alaska
Fairfield Transit, Solano County buses, California
Fayette County, intermodal facilities and buses, Pennsylvania

Fayetteville, University of Arkansas Transit System buses, Arkansas
Flint buses and bus facilities, Michigan
Florence, University of North Alabama pedestrian walkways, Alabama
Folsom multimodal facility, California
Fort Dodge, Intermodal Facility (Phase II), Iowa
Fort Worth bus and paratransit vehicle project, Texas
Fort Worth Transit Authority corridor redevelopment program, Texas
Franklin County buses and bus facilities, Missouri
Fuel cell bus and bus facilities program, Georgetown University, District/Columbia
Gainesville buses and equipment, Florida
Galveston buses and bus facilities, Texas
Gary, Transit Consortium buses, Indiana
Georgia Regional Transportation Authority buses, Georgia
Georgia statewide buses and bus-related facilities, Georgia
Gloucester intermodal transportation center, Massachusetts
Grand Rapids Area Transit Authority downtown transit transfer center, Michigan
Greensboro multimodal center, North Carolina
Greensboro, Transit Authority buses, North Carolina
Harrison County multimodal center, Mississippi
Hawaii buses and bus facilities
Healdsburg, intermodal facility, California
Hillsborough Area Regional Transity Authority, Ybor buses and bus facilities, Florida
Honolulu, bus facility and buses, Hawaii
Hot Springs, transportation depot and plaza, Arkansas
Houston buses and bus facilities, Texas
Huntington Beach buses and bus facilities, California
Huntington intermodal facility, West Virginia
Huntsville Airport international intermodal center, Alabama
Huntsville Space and Rocket Center intermodal center, Alabama
Huntsville, transit facility, Alabama
Hyannis intermodal transportation center, Massachusetts
I–5 Corridor intermodal transit centers, California
Illinois statewide buses and bus-related equipment, Illinois
Indianapolis buses, Indiana
Inglewood Market Street bus facility/LAX shuttle service, California
Iowa City multi-use parking facility and transit hub, Iowa
Iowa statewide buses and bus facilities, Iowa
Iowa/Illinois Transit Consortium bus safety and security, Iowa
Isabella buses and bus facilities, Michigan
Ithaca intermodal transportation center, New York
Ithaca, TCAT bus technology improvements, New York
Jackson County buses and bus facilities, Missouri
Jackson J-TRAN buses and facilities, Mississippi
Jacksonville buses and bus facilities, Florida
Juneau downtown mass transit facility, Alaska
Kalamazoo downtown bus transfer center, Michigan

Kansas City Area Transit Authority buses and Troost transit center, Missouri
Kansas Public Transit Association buses and bus facilities, Kansas
Killington-Sherburne satellite bus facility, Vermont
King Country Metro King Street Station, Washington
King County Metro Atlantic and Central buses, Washington
King County park and ride expansion, Washington
Lackawanna County Transit System buses, Pennsylvania
Lake Tahoe CNG buses, Nevada
Lake Tahoe/Tahoe Basin buses and bus facilities, California
Lakeland, Citrus Connection transit vehicles and related equipment, Florida
Lane County, Bus Rapid Transit, Oregon
Lansing, CATA buses, Michigan
Las Cruces buses and bus facilities, New Mexico
Las Cruces intermodal transportation plaza, New Mexico
Las Vegas intermodal transit transfer facility, Nevada
Las Vegas South Strip intermodal facility, Nevada
Lincoln County Transit District buses, Oregon
Lincoln Star Tran bus facility, Nebraska
Little Rock River Market and College Station transfer facility, Arkansas
Little Rock, Central Arkansas Transit buses, Arkansas
Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority buses, California
Livermore automatic vehicle locator program, California
Long Island, CNG transit vehicles and facilities and bus replacement, New York
Los Angeles County Metropolitan transportation authority buses, California
Los Angeles Foothill Transit buses and bus facilities, California
Los Angeles Municipal Transit Operators Coalition, California
Los Angeles, Union Station Gateway Intermodal Transit Center, California
Louisiana statewide buses and bus-related facilities, Louisiana
Lowell performing arts center transit transfer facility, Massachusetts
Lufkin intermodal center, Texas
Maryland statewide alternative fuel buses, Maryland
Maryland statewide bus facilities and buses, Maryland
Mason City Region 2 office and maintenance transit facility, Iowa
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority buses, Massachusetts
Merrimack Valley Regional Transit Authority bus facilities, Massachusetts
Miami Beach multimodal transit center, Florida
Miami Beach, electric shuttle service, Florida
Miami-Dade Northeast transit center, Florida
Miami-Dade Transit buses, Florida
Michigan State University campus boarding centers, Michigan
Michigan statewide buses, Michigan
Mid-Columbia Council of Governments minivans, Oregon
Milwaukee County, buses, Wisconsin
Mineola/Hicksville, LIRR intermodal centers, New York

Missoula buses and bus facilities, Montana
Missouri statewide bus and bus facilities, Missouri
Mobile buses, Alabama
Mobile waterfront terminal complex, Alabama
Modesto, bus maintenance facility, California
Monterey, Monterey-Salinas buses, California
Monterey, Monterey-Salinas transit refueling facility, California
Montgomery Moulton Street intermodal center, Alabama
Montgomery Union Station intermodal center and buses, Alabama
Mount Vernon, buses and bus related facilities, Washington
Mukilteo multimodal terminal ferry and transit project, Washington
New Castle County buses and bus facilities, Delaware
New Hampshire statewide transit systems, New Hampshire
New Haven bus facility, Connecticut
New Jersey Transit alternative fuel buses, New Jersey
New Jersey Transit jitney shuttle buses, New Jersey
New Mexico State University park and ride facilities, New Mexico
New York City Midtown West 38th Street Ferry Terminal, New York
New York, West 72nd St. Intermodal Station, New York
Newark Passaic River bridge and arena pedestrian walkway, New Jersey
Newark, Morris & Essex Station access and buses, New Jersey
Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority buses, New York
North Carolina statewide buses and bus facilities, North Carolina
North Dakota statewide buses and bus-related facilities, North Dakota
North San Diego County transit district buses, California
North Star Borough intermodal facility, Alaska
Northern New Mexico Transit Express/Park and Ride buses, New Mexico
Northstar Corridor, Intermodal Facilities and buses, Minnesota
Norwich buses, Connecticut
OATS Transit, Missouri
Ogden Intermodal Center, Utah
Ohio Public Transit Association buses and bus facilities, Ohio
Oklahoma statewide bus facilities and buses, Oklahoma
Olympic Peninsula International Gateway Transportation Center, Washington
Omaha Missouri River transit pedestrian facility, Nebraska
Ontonagon buses and bus facilities, Michigan
Orlando Intermodal Facility, Florida
Orlando, Lynx buses and bus facilities, Florida
Palm Beach County Palmtran buses, Florida
Palmdale multimodal center, California
Park City Intermodal Center, Utah
Pee Dee buses and facilities, South Carolina
Penn's Landing ferry vehicles, Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania Commonwealth combined bus and facilities, Pennsylvania

Perris bus maintenance facility, California
Philadelphia, Frankford Transportation Center, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Intermodal 30th Street Station, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PHLASH shuttle buses, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, SEPTA Center City improvements, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, SEPTA Paoli transportation center, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, SEPTA Girard Avenue intermodal transportation centers, Pennsylvania
Phoenix bus and bus facilities, Arizona
Pierce County Transit buses and bus facilities, Washington
Pittsfield intermodal center, Massachusetts
Port of Corpus Christi ferry infrastructure and ferry purchase, Texas
Port of St. Bernard intermodal facility, Louisiana
Portland, Tri-Met bus maintenance facility, Oregon
Portland, Tri-Met buses, Oregon
Prince William County bus replacement, Virginia
Providence, buses and bus maintenance facility, Rhode Island
Reading, BARTA Intermodal Transportation Facility, Pennsylvania
Rensselaer intermodal bus facility, New York
Rhode Island Public Transit Authority buses, Rhode Island
Richmond, GRTC bus maintenance facility, Virginia
Riverside Transit Agency buses and facilities, California
Robinson, Towne Center Intermodal Facility, Pennsylvania
Sacramento CNG buses, California
Salem Area Mass Ttransit System buses, Oregon
Salt Lake City hybrid electric vehicle bus purchase, Utah
Salt Lake City International Airport transit parking and transfer center, Utah
Salt Lake City Olympics bus facilities, Utah
Salt Lake City Olympics regional park and ride lots, Utah
Salt Lake City Olympics transit bus loan project, Utah
San Bernardino buses, California
San Bernardino County Mountain area Regional Transit Authority fueling stations, California
San Diego MTD buses and bus facilities, California
San Francisco, Islais Creek maintenance facility, California
San Joaquin buses and bus facilities, Stockton, California
San Juan Intermodal access, Puerto Rico
San Marcos Capital Area Rural Transportation System (CARTS) intermodal project, Texas
Sandy buses, Oregon
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit district bus facilities, California
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority buses and bus facilities, California
Santa Clarita buses, California
Santa Cruz metropolitan bus facilities, California
Santa Fe CNG buses, New Mexico
Santa Fe paratransit/computer systems, New Mexico
Santa Marie organization of transportation helpers minibuses, California

Savannah/Chatham Area transit bus transfer centers and buses, Georgia
Seattle Sound Transit buses and bus facilities, Washington
Seattle, intermodal transportation terminal, Washington
SMART buses and bus facilities, Michigan
Snohomish County, Community Transit buses, equipment and facilities, Washington
Solano Links intercity transit OTR bus purchase, California
Somerset County bus facilities and buses, Pennsylvania
South Amboy, Regional Intermodal Transportation Initiative, New Jersey
South Bend, Urban Intermodal Transportation Facility, Indiana
South Carolina statewide bus and bus facility.
South Carolina Virtual Transit Enterprise, South Carolina
South Dakota statewide bus facilities and buses, South Dakota
South Metro Area Rapid Transit (SMART) maintenance facility, Oregon
Southeast Missouri transportation service rural, elderly, disabled service, Missouri
Springfield Metro/VRE pedestrian link, Virginia
Springfield, Union Station, Massachusetts
St. Joseph buses and vans, Missouri
St. Louis, Bi-state Intermodal Center, Missouri
St. Louis Bi-State Metro Link buses
Sunset Empire Transit District intermodal transit facility, Oregon
Syracuse CNG buses and facilities, New York
Tacoma Dome, buses and bus facilities, Washington
Tennessee statewide buses and bus facilities, Tennessee
Texas statewide small urban and rural buses, Texas
Topeka Transit offstreet transit transfer center, Kansas
Towamencin Township, Intermodal Bus Transportation Center, Pennsylvania
Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky (TANK) buses, Kentucky
Tucson buses, Arizona
Twin Cities area metro transit buses and bus facilities, Minnesota
Utah Transit Authority buses, Utah
Utah Transit Authority, intermodal facilities, Utah
Utah Transit Authority/Park City Transit, buses, Utah
Utica Union Station, New York
Valley bus and bus facilities, Alabama
Vancouver Clark County (SEATRAN) bus facilities, Washington
Washington County intermodal facilities, Pennsylvania
Washington State DOT combined small transit system buses and bus facilities, Washington
Washington, D.C. Intermodal Transportation Center, District/Columbia
Washoe County transit improvements, Nevada
Waterbury, bus facility, Connecticut
West Falls Church Metro station improvements, Virginia
West Lafayette bus transfer station/terminal (Wabash Landing), Indiana

West Virginia Statewide Intermodal Facility and buses, West Virginia
Westchester County DOT, articulated buses, New York
Westchester County, Bee-Line transit system fareboxes, New York
Westchester County, Bee-Line transit system shuttle buses, New York
Westminster senior citizen vans, California
Westmoreland County, Intermodal Facility, Pennsylvania
Whittier intermodal facility and pedestrian overpass, Alaska
Wilkes-Barre, Intermodal Facility, Pennsylvania
Williamsport bus facility, Pennsylvania
Wisconsin statewide bus facilities and buses, Wisconsin
Worcester, Union Station Intermodal Transportation Center, Massachusetts
Yuma paratransit buses, Arizona

FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION

The Committee recommends a total of $980,400,000 for the modernization of existing rail transit systems. Under TEA21 all of the funds are distributed by formula. The following table itemizes the fiscal year 2000 rail modernization allocations by State:

Fiscal year 2000 section 5309 fixed guideway modernization

State	*Fiscal year 2000 budget*
Arizona	$1,714,915
California	97,447,440
Colorado	1,276,142
Connecticut	35,613,122
Delaware	900,963
District of Columbia	41,405,152
Florida	14,894,671
Georgia	20,056,733
Hawaii	717,140
Illinois	109,835,226
Indiana	7,372,357
Louisiana	2,719,194
Maryland	21,651,851
Massachusetts	63,230,944
Michigan	449,343
Minnesota	2,844,835
Missouri	1,632,113
New Jersey	87,109,545
New York	320,395,319
Ohio	16,007,175
Pennsylvania	95,594,209
Puerto Rico	1,777,215
Oregon	3,059,860
Rhode Island	2,412,069
Tennessee	79,754
Texas	5,696,889
Virginia	464,097
Washington	15,992,245
Wisconsin	696,482
Total	973,047,000
Three-quarter percent oversight	7,353,000
Total appropriation	980,400,000

NEW SYSTEMS

The bill provides $980,400,000 for new starts. These funds are available for major investment studies, preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, project management, oversight, and construction for new systems and extensions. Under section 3009(g) of TEA21, there is an 8-percent statutory cap on the amount made available for activities other than final design and construction—that is, alternatives analysis, environmental impact statements, preliminary engineering, major investment studies, and other predesign and preconstruction activities. Within the total of $980,400,000 for new systems, no more than $78,432,000 may be allocated for these activities.

The Committee has included bill language that delineates a number of eligible new fixed guideway system projects under both of these funding categories, and directs the Federal Transit Administrator to submit to the congressional appropriations and authorizing committees, within 60 days of enactment of the fiscal year 2000 appropriations legislation, a grant recommendation list choosing from among the projects listed in the appropriations bill. The Committee is aware that the administration's budget request includes such a list of requested projects, but believes that the Department should reassess its recommendations in light of the number of authorized projects which have been deemed eligible for funding, both in TEA21 and this appropriations legislation.

The following new fixed guideway systems and extensions to existing systems are eligible to receive funding for final design and construction:

Alaska or Hawaii ferries;

Albuquerque/Greater Albuquerque mass transit project;

Atlanta North Line Extension;

Austin Capital Metro Northwest/North Central Corridor project;

Baltimore Central Light Rail double tracking project;

Boston North-South Rail Link;

Boston Piers Transitway phase 1;

Charlotte North-South corridor transitway project;

Chicago Metra commuter rail extensions;

Chicago Transit Authority Ravenswood and Douglas branch line projects;

Cleveland Euclid Corridor;

Dallas Area Rapid Transit North Central LRT extension;

Dane County, WI commuter rail project;

Denver Southeast Corridor project;

Denver Southwest LRT project;

Fort Lauderdale Tri-Rail commuter rail project;

Galveston rail trolley extension project;

Houston Regional Bus Plan;

Lahaina Harbor, Maui ferries;

Las Vegas Corridor/Clark County regional fixed guideway project;

Little Rock River Rail project;

Long Island Rail Road East Side Access project;

Los Angeles Metro Rail—MOS 3 and Eastside/Mid City corridors;

MARC expansion programs: Silver Spring intermodal center and Penn-Camden rail connection;
Memphis Area Transit Authority medical center extension;
Miami East-West Corridor project;
Miami North 27th Avenue corridor;
New Orleans Airport-CBD commuter rail project;
New Orleans Canal Streetcar Spine;
New Orleans Desire Streetcar;
Newark-Elizabeth rail link project;
Norfolk-Virginia Beach Corridor project;
Northern New Jersey—Hudson-Bergen LRT project;
Orange County Transitway project;
Orlando I–4 Central Florida LRT project;
Philadelphia Schuykill Valley Metro;
Phoenix—Central Phoenix/East Valley Corridor;
Pittsburgh Airborne Shuttle System;
Pittsburgh North Shore—Central Business District corridor;
Pittsburgh State II light rail project;
Port McKenzie-Ship Creek Ferry project;
Portland Westside-Hillsboro Corridor project;
Providence-Boston commuter rail;
Raleigh-Durham—Research Triangle regional rail;
Sacramento South Corridor LRT project;
Salt Lake City South LRT Olympics capacity improvements;
Salt Lake City South LRT project;
Salt Lake City/Airport to University (West-East) light rail project;
Salt Lake City-Ogden-Provo commuter rail project;
San Bernardino MetroLink extension project;
San Diego Mid Coast Corridor;
San Diego Mission Valley East LRT extension project;
San Diego Oceanside-Escondido passenger rail project;
San Francisco BART to Airport extension;
San Jose Tasman LRT project;
San Juan—Tren Urbano;
Seattle Sound Move Link LRT project;
Spokane South Valley Corridor light rail project;
St. Louis—St. Clair County, Illinois LRT project;
Tacoma-Seattle Sounder commuter rail project;
Tampa Bay regional rail system; and the
Twin Cities Transitways Corridors projects.

The following new fixed guideway systems and extensions to existing systems are eligible to receive funding for alternatives analysis and preliminary engineering:

Atlanta—Lindbergh Station to MARTA West Line feasibility study;
Atlanta MARTA South DeKalb comprehensive transit program;
Baltimore Central Downtown MIS;
Bergen County, NJ/Cross County light rail project;
Birmingham, Alabama transit corridor;
Boston North Shore Corridor and Blue Line extension to Beverly;
Boston Urban Ring project;
Bridgeport intermodal corridor project;
Calais, ME Branch Rail Line regional transit program;

Charleston, SC Monobeam corridor project;
Cincinnati Northeast/Northern Kentucky rail line project;
Colorado—Roaring Fork Valley Rail;
Detroit—commuter rail to Detroit metropolitan airport feasibility study;
El Paso—Juarez international fixed guideway;
Girdwood, Alaska commuter rail project;
Harrisburg-Lancaster Capitol Area Transit Corridor 1 commuter rail;
Houston Advanced Transit Program;
Indianapolis Northeast Downtown Corridor project;
Jacksonville fixed guideway corridor;
Johnson County, Kansas I–35 commuter rail project;
Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee rail extension project;
Knoxville to Memphis commuter rail feasibility study;
Los Angeles/City of Sepulveda Douglas Street Green Line connection;
Miami Metrorail Palmetto extension;
Montpelier-St. Albans, VT commuter rail study;
Nashua, NH-Lowell, MA commuter rail project;
New Jersey Trans-Hudson midtown corridor study;
New London waterfront access project;
New York Second Avenue Subway feasibility study;
Northern Indiana South Shore commuter rail project;
Old Saybrook—Hartford Rail Extension;
Philadelphia SEPTA commuter rail, R–3 connection—Elwyn to Wawa;
Philadelphia SEPTA Cross County Metro;
Salt Lake City light rail extensions;
Santa Fe/El Dorado rail link;
Stamford fixed guideway connector;
Stockton Altamont Commuter Rail;
Virginia Railway Express Woodbridge transit access improvements project;
Washington, D.C. Dulles Corridor extension project;
Washington Metro Blue Line extension—Addison Road;
Western Montana regional transportation/commuter rail study; and the
Wilsonville to Washington County, OR connection to Westside.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

There is a total of $980,400,000 available for transit new starts funding in fiscal year 2000. The administration's request includes $668,183,400 for projects with current FTA full funding grant agreements with FTA, 68 percent of the total available funds. Additionally, the administration's request proposes allocating an additional $216,109,600 for seven new starts projects that are currently in preliminary engineering or final design. These projects are expected to complete the engineering and environmental review process by the start of fiscal year 2000. FTA anticipates signing full funding grant agreements with these seven projects some time during fiscal year 2000. The estimated federal share over the life of these new projects is $1,265,800,000. This represents a large incremental increase of "committed" federal funds that will substan-

tially reduce the remaining discretionary funds in this program. The new starts program is already over-subscribed, and the administration's decision to signal future funding commitments in its fiscal year 2000 budget request makes an already tight program much more difficult to manage.

The Committee has a strong inclination to honor the FTA's full funding grant agreements with new starts grantees, provided that there are not dramatic cost, scope, or schedule changes that would have a negative impact on the grantee's ability to meet its responsibilities under the FFGA schedule. The Committee takes an active interest in the progress and status of all new starts projects, most particularly in the FFGA projects, since they represent such a large proportion of the total discretionary funding stream. The annual oversight responsibility of the Appropriations Committee is to protect present and anticipated federal investments.

Currently, 3 of the 14 FFGA projects are experiencing significant cost overruns—that is, the most recent total project cost estimates are higher than the baseline cost estimates included in the full funding grant agreements by a delta of more than $100,000,000. These cost increases can be attributed to a variety of factors. Schedule delays, change orders, higher than expected costs for third party contracts and rights-of-way purchases, enhancements, differing site conditions, and even hurricane delays have contributed to some of these cost overruns. However, two common elements of these troubled full funding grant agreements projects are that original project cost estimates were much lower than actual systems work and contract costs, and that the projects' FFGA consideration was generally concluded before a full and thorough evaluation of the cost and financing estimates. But not all FFGA projects experience disconnects between original estimates and actual costs—in fact, some projects that will complete their full funding grant agreements in fiscal year 2000 will finish on schedule and under budget. Therefore, it is critical that FTA not rush toward signing a full funding grant agreement, and that the project cost estimates, in particular, be scrutinized with care, using every available oversight tool. The Committee is concerned by the administration's pre-emptive announcement of "pipeline" full funding grant agreements in the fiscal year 2000 budget request, and will not accord the same weight to these recommendations as to FFGA projects.

In addition, the Committee will continue the practice of working with projects to manage the federal funding component, and will focus federal discretionary investment on those projects with conservative cost and financing estimates, that are executing their projects plans on schedule and within budget.

Atlanta-MARTA full funding grant agreement.—The Committee directs the Federal Transit Administration to amend the Full Funding Grant Agreement between the FTA and the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA). This amendment should reflect section 3030(d)(2) of TEA21.

Salt Lake City South LRT project.—The Committee recognizes the progress being made on the Salt Lake City South LRT project. Last year, GAO indicated that this project is both ahead of schedule and under budget. Rather than appropriate additional federal

funds for requested capacity improvements, the Committee encourages the FTA to allow the project grantee to utilize any surplus funding to be used for capacity improvements on this line.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND, MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT)

Appropriations, 1999	$2,000,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	1,500,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,500,000,000

The bill includes $1,500,000,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority previously provided in section 5338(b) of 49 U.S.C.

JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE GRANTS

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 1999	$35,000,000	$40,000,000	$75,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [1]	15,000,000	135,000,000	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	15,000,000	60,000,000	75,000,000

[1] Includes $75,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

The Committee recommends $75,000,000 for the Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants program, the level guaranteed under the TEA21 transit category firewall. This program is meant to help welfare reform efforts succeed by providing enhanced transportation services for low-income individuals, including former welfare recipients, traveling to jobs or training centers.

The program makes competitive grants to qualifying metropolitan planning organizations, local governmental authorities, agencies, and nonprofit organizations in urbanized areas with populations greater than 200,000. Grants may not be used for planning or coordination activities.

On May 13, FTA released the fiscal year 1999 Access to Jobs funding to 179 different projects in agencies and organizations in 42 states. The agency received applications representing $108,000,000 worth of requests. The Committee believes that this program should naturally taper down, rather than grow larger from year to year. If in fact these grants provide concrete assistance toward moving from welfare to work, there should be fewer applications for funds in future years rather than more. The administration's request for $150,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 is twice the guaranteed authorization, and likely represents a greater funding stream than the demand warrants.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY [WMATA]

Appropriations, 1999	$50,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000	
Committee recommendation	

Public Law 96–184 (Stark-Harris legislation) enacted January 3, 1980, authorized a total of $1,700,000,000 for construction on the Washington Metrorail System. In addition, the National Capital

Transportation Amendments of 1990, Public Law 101–551, authorized another $1,300,000,000 in Federal capital assistance. Appropriated funds from previous years have completed the Federal commitment to the construction of the 103-mile metrorail system. No new funds are requested for 2000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee has included the following general provisions affecting transit programs:

SEC. 311. This general provision gives FTA the authority to obligate previously provided funds above a particular fiscal year's obligation limitation.

SEC. 317. This general provision provides that capital investment grant funds, other than fixed guideway modernization funds, must be obligated within 3 years, or the associated funds will be available for expenditure and transfer to another capital investment project.

SEC. 318. This general provision has been carried in the appropriations bill for many years. It allows FTA to update account names and transfer the associated funds to the new account structure. This bookkeeping authority is necessary, given that the Transportation Equity Act has restructured the mass transit program.

SEC. 322. This general provision provides the States of Oklahoma and Vermont flexibility in the use of some of their federal transportation funds.

SEC. 327. This general provision directs that discretionary funds previously made available for the Charleston, South Carolina monobeam project may be used to fund any aspect of the project.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (the Corporation) is a wholly owned Government corporation established by the St. Lawrence Seaway Act of May 13, 1954. The Corporation is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and development of the United States portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway between Montreal and Lake Erie. The Corporation's major priorities include: safety, reliability, trade development, and management accountability.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$11,496,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2] (mandatory)	12,042,000
Committee recommendation	11,496,000

[1] Does not include reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.
[2] Assumes enactment of authorizing legislation.

The administration has proposed to restructure the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation as a performance-based organization (PBO). In 1996, the National Performance Review first identified the Corporation as one of nine PBO candidates. As a PBO, the Corporation's funding mechanism would change from annual appropriations to a mandatory formula-based payment that

primarily is determined by a five-year average of international tonnage moved through the Seaway. Consequently, the administration did not seek appropriated funds for the Seaway and instead is requesting a mandatory payment of $12,042,000 from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The bill includes an appropriation of $11,496,000 instead of the mandatory payment as requested. Congress must adopt legislation authorizing an agency to become a PBO. Neither the Committee nor the Department is aware of any current or pending congressional intent to act on PBO authorizing legislation. Until the enactment of authorizing legislation, the Committee will continue to fund the Corporation according to current law.

Although the Committee finds merit in the PBO proposal, the committee remains concerned about certain provisions of the legislation to establish the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation as a PBO. As an organization funded through a mandatory funding mechanism, Congress would no longer have a direct role in determining the level of funding for the Corporation or directing the use of its funds. This would severely undermine Congress' ability to exercise its responsibility to conduct oversight over the agency and allocate funding within broader policy and fiscal goals, such as balancing the Federal budget. Therefore, the Committee directs the administration to submit future St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation budget requests consistent with current law until Congress takes action on PBO authorization legislation.

The Committee has reduced funding from the requested amount by $546,000. Since the 1999 navigation season opened on March 30, vessel traffic through the Saint Lawrence Seaway has declined by 20 percent and is projected to decline by 10 percent overall during the current navigation season. The Corporation has revised its tonnage forecast accordingly, thereby reducing its financial need. The Committee also is confident that this reduction will not affect operations if the Corporation takes advantage of its current personnel level and implements plans to achieve management savings.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

The Research and Special Programs Administration [RSPA] was established by the Secretary of Transportation's organizational changes dated July 20, 1977, and serves as a research, analytical, and technical development arm of the Department for multimodal research and development, as well as special programs. Particular emphasis is given to pipeline transportation and the transportation of hazardous cargo by all modes. In 2000, resources are requested for the management and execution of the Offices of Hazardous Materials Safety, Emergency Transportation, Pipeline Safety, program and administrative support. Funds are also requested for the emergency preparedness grants program. RSPA's two reimbursable programs—Transportation Safety Institute [TSI] and the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center [VNTSC]—support research safety and security programs for all modes of transportation.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$29,280,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	33,340,000
Committee recommendation	30,752,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277. Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.
[2] Includes $4,575,000 proposed fees.

The Committee has provided a total of $30,752,000 for the "Research and special programs" account, $2,588,000 less than the administration's request.

In general, the budget constraints on this bill—which are due both to the highway and transit firewalls in TEA21 and the budget caps assumed in the Budget Resolution—dictate staffing freezes. None of the requested staffing increases have been funded.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

	Fiscal year 1999 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 2000 estimate	Committee recommendation
Hazardous materials safety	$16,063,000	$18,213,000	$16,960,000
(FTE)	(122)	(127)	(122)
Emergency transportation	$997,000	$1,459,000	$1,275,000
(FTE)	(7)	(8)	(7)
Research and technology	$3,676,000	$3,547,000	$3,297,000
(FTE)	(13)	(11)	(11)
Program and administrative support	$8,230,000	$10,121,000	$9,220,000
(FTE)	(45)	(46)	(45)
Total, research and special programs	$28,966,000	$33,340,000	$30,752,000
(FTE)	(187)	(192)	(187)

[1] Includes $314,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277. Excludes supplemental funding for Y2K.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

The Office of Hazardous Materials Safety [HMS] administers a nationwide program of safety regulations to fulfill the Secretary's duty to protect the Nation from the risks to life, health, and property that are inherent in the transportation of hazardous materials by water, air, highway, and railroad. HMS plans, implements, and manages the hazardous materials transportation program consisting of information systems, research and analysis, inspection and enforcement, rulemaking support, training and information dissemination, and emergency procedures.

The Committee recommends $16,960,000 for hazardous materials safety, which is $1,250,000 less than the administration's request.

RSPA's office of hazardous materials safety has requested an increase of 9 new staff members (+4.5 FTEs), who would be distributed to headquarters, each regional inspection and enforcement office, as well as two staff members who would provide support for implementation of the Sanitary Food Transportation Act. Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee has not provided new personnel compensation and benefits funds associated with these proposed new positions, and has decreased the requested PC&B level by −$880,000. The Committee notes that there are currently 12 vacancies within the office of hazardous materials safety, three of

which are in the enforcement area. These inspection/enforcement vacancies should be filled as quickly as possible. The Committee has also decreased the contract programs by −$339,000, allowing an increase in the international standards program to a level of $81,000, but denies the requested program funding for safe food transportation. The Committee has also made a very slight decrease in the agency's request for the research and development program (−$34,000). The following shows the Committee's recommended funding levels for each of the hazardous materials office activities:

Personnel compensation and benefits	$9,757,000
Administrative expenses	1,269,000
Contract programs	3,664,000
Registration program	1,070,000
Research and development	1,200,000
Total, office of hazardous materials safety	16,960,000

EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION

Emergency transportation [ET] programs provide support to the Secretary of Transportation for his statutory and administrative responsibilities in the area of transportation civil emergency preparedness and response. This program develops and coordinates the Department's policies, plans, and programs, in headquarters and the field to provide for emergency preparedness.

ET is responsible for implementing the Transportation Department's National Security Program initiatives, including an assessment of the transportation implications of the changing global threat. The Office also coordinates civil emergency preparedness and response for transportation services during national and regional emergencies, across the entire continuum of crises, including natural catastrophes such as earthquakes, hurricanes and tornados, and international and domestic terrorism. The Office of Emergency Transportation develops crisis management plans to mitigate disasters and implements these plans nationally and regionally in an emergency.

The Committee recommends $1,275,000 for emergency transportation, which is $184,000 less than the administration's request. The administration has requested a new position for the Emergency Transportation office, which the Committee declines to fund. Therefore, personnel compensation and benefits are reduced $100,000 below the requested level. The research and development program is also reduced by $85,000 below the request, although this level will still represent an increase of $100,000 above the enacted program level. The following shows the Committee's recommended funding distribution for the Emergency Transportation office.

Personnel compensation and benefits	$745,000
Administrative expenses	100,000
Contract programs	280,000
Research and development	150,000
Total, office of emergency transportation	1,275,000

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommends $3,297,000 for the Office of Research and Technology, $250,000 less than requested by the administration. The funds provided will help the Department coordinate and strengthen its responsibilities under TEA21, and will help support the R&T corporate management strategy specified in the Department's strategic plan, allow RSPA to support the intergovernmental transportation research coordination responsibilities of the National Science and Technology Council, and support a limited intermodal research program. The reduction of $250,000 should be made from planned "roundtable" outreach programs, which are not necessary to the functions of this office.

National Environmental Respiratory Center.—The unique goal of the National Environmental Respiratory Center to research the health effects of combined pollutants or contaminants is relevant to the Department of Transportation's focus on environmental, and therefore health, consequences of pollutants generated by transportation emissions. To understand the health effects of real-world, highly complex mixtures of air contaminants, NERC will develop identical health data across several complex, man-made mixtures, including those from transportation sources. The Committee urges DOT to collaborate with the National environmental research center on its research strategy so that national transportation system design and policy has the benefit of this important data.

Reimbursable funding from Federal Highway Administration.—The budget request for the office of research and technology proposes to fund three full-time positions through reimbursable funding from FHWA. Historically, RSPA has provided funding for two of these positions in support of the Department's University Transportation Centers (UTC) program. The UTC program has increased dramatically in size and scope under TEA21, and RSPA's responsibility to manage the grant program and conduct annual reviews has, in turn, grown. The Committee has no objection to these three proposed reimbursable positions, to be funded through the Federal Highway Administration by way of a reimbursable agreement between the agencies. The Committee further notes that the research and technology program has decreased its funding request by $129,000 to reflect two fewer positions being paid for by RSPA.

Advanced Vehicle Technologies Program.—The Advanced Vehicle Technologies Program (AVTP) was funded at a level of $14,000,000 in fiscal year 1999. The Department of Defense Advanced Research Programs Agency provided $9,000,000 for AVTP; the Federal Highway Administration provided $5,000,000 from its limitation on general operating expenses. This year, the administration has proposed funding the program at a level of $20,000,000, utilizing funds that are authorized in section 1218 of TEA21 for Magnetic Levitation technology deployment, and transferring them to programs authorized in section 5111 of the Act (the Advanced Vehicle Technologies Program). The Committee strongly objects to this proposed transfer. No funds are provided for the AVTP in this Act.

PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The program support function provides legal, financial, management, and administrative support to the operating offices within RSPA. These support activities include executive direction (Office of the Administrator), program and policy support, civil rights and special programs, legal services and support, and management and administration.

The Committee has provided $9,220,000 for program and administrative support, $901,000 less than the adminstration's request. The administration has requested two new positions for RSPA management and administration—a new Chief Information Officer, and a senior contracting specialist. The Committee does not approve these requested new positions, and has reduced the personnel compensation and benefits request $100,000 below the requested level. Administrative expenses are also reduced below the request (−$407,000), as are contract programs (−$393,000). Because the information officer position is not approved, the information resources management program is cut $235,000 below the requested level, and the budget and financial management program is reduced very slightly below the requested level (−$28,000). The Committee has not provided the requested funding for the Garrett A. Morgan Technology and Transportation Futures program (−$200,000). The Committee believes that there are many national education programs already in place that encourage and enhance math, science, and technology literacy, and the Committee is unaware of an imminent shortage of engineers and other professions in the transportation industries. The following shows the Committee's recommended funding distribution for RSPA program support:

Personnel compensation and benefits	$4,820,000
Administrative expenses	3,300,000
Contract programs	1,100,000
Total, program and administrative support	9,220,000

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OILSPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

	Pipeline safety fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 1999 [1] [2]	$30,400,000	$4,248,000	$34,648,000
Budget estimate, 2000	33,939,000	4,248,000	38,187,000
Committee recommendation [2]	31,400,000	4,704,000	36,104,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $210,000 for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277. Does not include supplemental funding of $150,000 for Y2K.

[2] Pipeline safety funding includes $1,400,000 from reserve fund balances.

The Research and Special Programs Administration is also responsible for the Department's Pipeline Safety Program. This activity is largely financed by user fees assessed to the pipeline operators and by fees paid to the oilspill liability trust fund [OSLTF]. The Pipeline Safety Program promotes the safe, reliable, and environmentally sound transportation of natural gas and hazardous liquids by pipeline. This national program regulates the design, con-

struction, operation, maintenance, and emergency response procedures pertaining to gas and hazardous liquids pipeline systems and liquefied natural gas facilities. Also included is research and development to support the Pipeline Safety Program and grants-in-aid to State agencies that conduct a Pipeline Safety Program.

Pipeline safety reserve fund.—The Committee recommends $1,400,000 to be derived from amounts previously collected in pipeline user fees from interstate liquid and natural gas transmission companies, which are maintained in a reserve fund by RSPA. The current balance of the pipeline safety reserve fund (as of April 1) is $15,367,538, but over the course of the year, some program costs will be warranted out. The fund takes in user fee collections, pays program costs, and also makes adjustments to collections due to over- or underpayments, so the balance varies over the course of each fiscal year. RSPA maintains that a reserve fund balance of at least $11,000,000 is necessary to sustain operations until fees can be collected to replenish the fund. The Committee believes it is appropriate to drawdown against this balance as long as the $11,000,000 level is not breached. The Committee agrees with the authorizing committees and industry that the fiscal year 1999 cap on the portion of the OPS budget that can be raised through pipeline safety user fees—$30,000,000—should not be exceeded.

Oilspill liability trust fund.—The Committee recommends $4,704,000 to be derived from the oilspill liability trust fund for implementation of the Office of Pipeline Safety [OPS] responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 [OPA], $456,000 more than the administration's request. The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation [2]
	1999 enacted [1 2]	2000 estimate	
Operating expenses	$11,655,000	$13,180,000	$12,821,000
Information and analysis	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Risk assessment/technical studies	1,200,000	1,475,000	1,200,000
Compliance	300,000	300,000	300,000
Training and information dissemination	921,000	1,121,000	921,000
Emergency notification	100,000	100,000	100,000
Public education	400,000	200,000	400,000
Risk management and program evaluation	.....	5,000	.....
Implement Oil Pollution Act	2,443,000	2,443,000	2,443,000
Research and development	1,719,000	2,144,000	1,719,000
State grants	13,000,000	13,519,000	12,500,000
Risk management grants	500,000	500,000	500,000
One-call grants	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Damage prevention grants	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Totals	34,438,000	38,187,000	36,104,000

[1] Includes reduction of $210,000 for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277. Excludes $150,000 supplemental funding for Y2K.
[2] Includes $1,400,000 from uncommitted balances in the reserve fund.

Operating expenses.—The administration did not request any new positions for the Office of Pipeline Safety; however, the Committee's recommendation includes an increase of $1,166,000 in administrative expenses and personnel cost-of-living adjustments and merit increases.

Public education.—The Committee recommends $400,000 for damage prevention public education activities, to accelerate work on the evolving one-call systems public education campaign. This represents a $200,000 increase above the requested level. These funds will be used to leverage private sector funds to advance the national one-call campaign.

The Committee is pleased that the Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) consulted with numerous parties concerned with preventing damage to underground utilities in drafting the "Best Practices" study required by TEA21. By providing leadership to over 150 working volunteers representing one-call systems, underground facility operators, excavators, railroads, and Federal and state agencies, preventing deaths, injuries, property damage and service interruptions. The Committee believes that this group effort, dubbed "Common Ground", has the potential to serve as a basis for a self-sustaining entity that can advance underground damage prevention by identifying and encouraging best practices, providing badly needed public education, and collecting and disseminating information on damage to underground utilities. The Committee directs OPS to use existing resources to support the formation and initial operation of a non-profit organization that will further the work of "Common Ground" and implement other innovative approaches to advance underground damage prevention.

State grants.—Due to stringent budgetary constraints, the Committee has reduced the funding level for state safety grants below the level provided in fiscal year 1999, from $13,000,000 to $12,500,000.

Damage prevention grants.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 in funding, to be derived from the uncommitted balances in the reserve fund, for RSPA's new damage prevention grants program. Reducing outside force damage has long been the office's top-ranked solution to improving pipeline safety. This new grant program will promote best practices to prevent damage to pipelines and other underground infrastructure. RSPA will be holding a public meeting on June 30 to solicit input on criteria for these grants and on the most effective means to encourage best practices in one-call notification systems and other of damage prevention efforts.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

Appropriations, 1999	$200,000
Budget estimate, 2000	200,000
Committee recommendation	200,000

The hazardous materials transportation law (title 49 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) requires RSPA to: (1) develop and implement a reimbursable emergency preparedness grants program; (2) monitor public sector emergency response training and planning and provide technical assistance to States, territories, and Indian tribes; and (3) develop and update periodically a national training curriculum for emergency responders. These activities are financed by receipts received from the hazardous materials shipper and carrier registration fees, which are placed in the emergency preparedness fund.

The hazardous materials transportation law provides permanent appropriations for the emergency preparedness fund for planning and training grants, monitoring and technical assistance, and for administrative expenses. Appropriations, also from the emergency preparedness fund, provide for the training curriculum for emergency responders.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The administration has proposed increasing the annual level of funding under the Hazmat Registration Program from the current program level of $8,000,000 to $14,300,000. Under the current registration program, an annual flat fee of $300 is assessed on carriers that transport: radioactive materials (in any quantity); class A or class B explosives (over 25 kilograms); extremely toxic inhalants (more than 1 liter per package); hazardous material in bulk packaging over 3,500 gallons or 468 cubic feet; or placarded hazardous materials in shipments of over 5,000 pounds. This affects approximately 27,000 shippers and carriers on the Nation's highways, railroads, waterways, and airways. Most of the fees collected under the registration program are used to make training and planning grants to States to improve emergency response to hazardous materials incidents.

Under the administration's proposal, the overall funding for this program would be increased by $6,300,000. In order to pay for this increase, the administration proposes to raise the fee level and broaden the base of registrants. There is a notice of proposed rulemaking pending that would increase the hazmat carrier fees. The proposed rule would increase the number of carriers required to register from about 27,000 to 45,000, and would increase the annual registration fee from $300 to $2,000 for shippers and carriers that are not "small businesses" under Small Business criteria. Small businesses required to register would continue to pay $300 in annual fees.

The Committee is aware that there are some industry concerns about the proposed expansion and increase in the registration program. RSPA is holding a public meeting on the proposed rule May 25, 1999, RSPA is seeking authorization to fund both the hazardous materials grant program and the agency's entire hazardous materials safety program from the increased and expanded registration program (the authorized levels for the two programs would total more than $32,000,000). The Committee believes that a 400-percent increase, from the current $8,000,000 hazmat registration program to a potential $32,000,000 program may represent an unfair burden on the hazardous materials transport community. However, the Committee has not included bill language that would set a ceiling on fee collections for fiscal year 2000 at this stage of the appropriations cycle, but will wait until the industry has had a chance to comment on this new proposed rule.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$43,495,000
Budget estimate, 2000	44,840,000
Committee recommendation	[2] 48,000,000

[1] Does not include reduction of $179,000 for TASC pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277, and transfer of $800,000 from the FTA pursuant to Public Law 105–277.
[2] Includes transfers.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 established the Office of Inspector General [OIG] as an independent and objective organization, with a mission to: (1) conduct and supervise audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Department; (2) provide leadership and recommend policies designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of programs and operations; (3) prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse; and (4) keep the Secretary and Congress currently informed regarding problems and deficiencies.

OIG is divided into two major functional units: the Office of Assistant Inspector General for Auditing and the Office of Assistant Inspector General for Investigations. The assistant inspectors general for auditing and investigations are supported by headquarters and regional staff.

The Committee recommends $48,000,000. The recommended level includes funding for the inspector general to conduct their oversight mission mandated under the Inspector General Act, support the Department's priorities in the areas of safety, strategic investment in transportation infrastructure, and commonsense government, to provide an objective and credible voice on other issues of modal and Departmentwide concern and to respond to emerging issues of congressional concern.

The Inspector General is to be commended for the timeliness and quality of the Office of Inspector General work product. Unlike most of the agencies in the Department, the OIG delivers reports and communications by the requested time, addresses the questions or issues concerned, and generally illuminate issues for congressional, public, or executive branch consideration. The Committee recommendation reflects the value the Committee places on the OIG contribution.

Disadvantaged business enterprises.—The Committee directs the Department of Transportation Inspector General to report to the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees on Transportation not later than 60 days after enactment of this bill on the percentage of businesses which had been certified as disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE) but are no longer eligible under the new regulations; the range and average of the lengths of time that businesses have been certified as DBE's; the average percentage of employees at DBE firms who are disadvantaged compared to the average percentage at non-DBE firms and the range of percentages; and, the part-time and full-time mix at DBE firms.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriation	Required offsetting collections	Allowed offsetting collections	Total potential funding
Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$13,400,000		$2,600,000	$16,000,000
Budget estimate, 2000		($17,000,000)		(17,000,000)
Committee recommendation	15,400,000	(1,600,000)		17,000,000

[1] Excludes reduction of $10,000 pursuant to section 320 of Public Law 105–277.

The Surface Transportation Board was created on January 1, 1996, by Public Law 104–88, the ICC Termination Act of 1995. Consistent with the continued trend toward less regulation of the surface transportation industry, the act abolished the ICC, eliminated certain functions that had previously been implemented by the ICC, transferred core rail and certain other functions to the Board, and transferred motor licensing and certain other motor functions to the FHWA. The Board is specifically responsible for the regulation of the rail and pipeline industries and certain nonlicensing regulation of motor carriers and water carriers. Moreover, the Board, through its exemption authority, is able to promote deregulation administratively on a case-by-case basis. Rail reforms made by the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 also have been continued.

The administration's fiscal year 2000 program request is $17,000,000 to perform key functions under the ICCTA, including rail rate reasonableness oversight; the processing of rail consolidations, abandonments, and other restructuring proposals; and the resolution of motor carrier undercharge matters. Under the administration's proposal this amount would be derived solely from user fees collected pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9701 from the beneficiaries of the Board's activities. However, the Committee is convinced that fully fee financing the STB is not a viable option for fiscal year 1999. Such a proposal would require enactment of legislation and promulgation of new rules that are unlikely to be in place in time to ensure undisrupted funding for the Board. A possible legislative vehicle for such a user fee-based structure would be the reauthorization legislation which the authorizing committees may consider later this year.

The Committee has provided $15,400,000 for activities of the Board, including statutory liability for severance payments. This amount will be augmented by the collection of $1,600,000 in user fees. The Board anticipates collecting up to $1,200,000 from these fees. Bill language has been included to assure that fees received in excess of $1,600,000 shall remain available to the Board but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 2000.

The Committee's recommendation will fund a total of 140 full-time staff equivalent (FTE) positions, if the Board collects the full $1,600,000 in user fees. This increase in FTE above the current level of 135 will provide the Board with the discretion to hire staff in specific offices to replace tenured, retirement-eligible staff prior to their anticipated retirement date. Between now and September 30, 2002, 38 percent of the Board's employees will be eligible for voluntary retirement. The Committee believes that it is important to allow this FTE ceiling increase to give the Board flexibility to

fill positions before the anticipated retirement dates of these more senior staff.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$3,847,000
Budget estimate, 2000	4,633,000
Committee recommendation	4,500,000

[1] Does not include $60,000 emergency funding for Y2K conversion.

The Committee recommends $4,500,000 for the operations of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, $133,000 less than funding level requested by the administration.

The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (the Access Board) is the lead Federal Agency promoting accessibility for all handicapped persons. The Access Board was reauthorized in the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1992, Public Law 102–569. Under this authorization, the Access Board's functions are to ensure compliance with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, and to develop guidelines for and technical assistance to individuals and entities with rights or duties under titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The Access Board establishes minimum accessibility guidelines and requirements for public accommodations and commercial facilities, transit facilities and vehicles, State and local government facilities, children's environments, and recreational facilities. The Access Board also provides technical assistance to Government agencies, public and private organizations, individuals, and businesses on the removal of accessibility barriers.

The Committee's recommendation provides adequate funding to support 30.25 FTE, one FTE less than the fiscal year 1999 staffing level, consistent with the Board's budget request.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1999 [1]	$53,473,000
Budget estimate, 2000 [2]	47,000,000
Committee recommendation	51,500,000

[1] Excludes $2,300,000 in emergency appropriations.
[2] Excludes the President's budget request for $10,000,000 in new user fees.

The Independent Safety Board Act of 1974 established the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB] as an independent Federal agency to promote transportation safety by conducting independent accident investigations. In addition, the act authorizes the Board to make safety recommendations, conduct safety studies, and oversee safety activities of other Government agencies involved in

transportation. The Board also reviews appeals of adverse actions by the Department of Transportation with respect to airmen and seamen certificates and licenses.

The Board has no regulatory authority over the transportation industry. Thus, its effectiveness depends on its reputation for impartial and accurate accident reports, realistic and feasible safety recommendations, and on public confidence in its commitment to improving transportation safety.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Due to budget constraints, the bill includes $51,500,000 for the Safety Board, the same level of funding that was enacted fiscal year 1999 with the exception of costs associated with renting hangar space in Calverton, New York as discussed below. Appropriations to the Safety Board have increased by 26 percent since fiscal year 1997, primarily because of prolonged investigations of the tragic crashes of USAir Flight 427 and TWA Flight 800. The Committee expects the NTSB to continue to investigate accidents and issue safety recommendations and has provided the Safety Board with the flexibility to manage the recommended funding level by controlling discretionary expenditures.

Calverton facility.—The Committee is concerned about the cost to rent hangar space which houses the 94-foot-long reconstruction of the fuselage of the TWA Flight 800 plane wreckage. The Safety Board has spent $13,600,000 to rent the Calverton facility and the budget estimate includes $3,200,000 to cover rent for the first six months of fiscal year 2000. In the fiscal year 1999 supplemental appropriations conference report, the Committee insisted on the statement that "the conferees do not plan to continue funding the rental expenses at the Calverton facility in future years. Accordingly, the Committee has deleted funding for the rental and directs the Safety Board to develop alternatives for housing the TWA Flight 800 wreckage, including options at "no cost to the government." The report is request by August 1, 1999.

User Fees.—The Committee denies the request to collect $10,000,000 in user fees. It is the Committee's understanding that the Safety Board does not have the authority or the resources to collect user fees. Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that requiring the NTSB to levy fees on the industries it investigates will undermine industry confidence in the independence of the Safety Board. The Committee, however, would entertain proposals to charge foreign governments for the costs incurred during investigations conducted at the request of that government, if consistent with U.S. foreign policy goals.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee concurs with the general provisions that apply to the Department of Transportation and related agencies as proposed in the budget, with some changes, deletions, and additions. These are noted below:

SEC. 305. Modifies a requested provision to prohibit the use of funds for the salaries and expenses of more than 100 political and Presidential appointees to the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 310. This provision regarding the allocation of Federal-aid Highway Program funds is continued with modifications to reflect the passage of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century [TEA21].

SEC. 315. Retains provision prohibiting the use of funds to award multiyear contracts for production end items that include certain specified provisions. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 316. Includes provision that prohibits the use of funds in this act for activities designed to influence Congress on legislation or appropriations except through proper, official channels.

SEC. 319. Includes provision which the administration had requested be deleted that reduces the funds provided for the Transportation Administrative Service Center.

SEC. 321. Includes provision which prevents any state from receiving more than 12.5 percent of the aggregate transit formula and capital investment grants national program funds.

SEC. 322. Includes a provision allowing the States of Oklahoma and Vermont flexible use of transportation funds.

SEC. 324. Includes provision which the administration had requested be deleted that limits the amount available for advisory committees to $1,000,000.

SEC. 327. Includes provision similar to language carried in the fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill which allows capital transit grant funds to be used for any aspect of Charleston, SC monobeam corridor project.

SEC. 329. Modifies a requested provision regarding rebates, refunds, incentive payments, and minor fees received by the Department from travel management centers, charge card programs, and other sources, making such funds available until December 31, 2000.

SEC. 331. Modifies provision requested by the administration relating to funding for the Amtrak Reform Council.

SEC. 332. Includes provision which the administration had requested be deleted, which was carried in previous appropriations acts, providing a limitation on transfers of funds among the offices of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

SEC. 333. Includes a provision which the administration had requested be deleted, which prohibits the Department of Transpor-

tation from creating "peanut-free zones" aboard domestic aircraft, absent fulfilling certain conditions.

SEC. 334. Includes a provision which is similar to language carried in the fiscal year 1999 transportation appropriations act, relating to the execution of certain Olympics-related projects.

SEC. 335. Includes a provision which requires the Federal Transit Administration to inform the Committees on Appropriations when the agency approves a new full funding grant agreement.

SEC. 336. Includes a provision which is similar to language carried in the fiscal year 1999 transportation appropriations act, relating to state highway funding flexibility.

SEC. 337. Includes a provision which allows the Department of Transportation to enter into a fractional aircraft ownership demonstration.

SEC. 338. Includes a provision regarding the terms of a land conveyance of property held by the United States Coast Guard.

SEC. 339. Includes a provision which prevents the distribution of personal data and photographs from drivers licenses without express written consent of the individual.

SEC. 340. Includes a provision providing for the completion of the National Advanced Driving Simulator.

SEC. 341. Includes a provision making technical changes to a highway project authorized in Public Law 102–240.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

United States Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	$2,772,000,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	370,426,000
Environmental compliance and restoration	12,450,000
Retired pay	730,327,000
Reserve training	72,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation	17,000,000
Federal Aviation Administration:	
Operations	5,857,450,000
Facilities and equipment	2,045,652,000
Research, engineering, and development	150,000,000
Grants-in-aid to airports	1,300,000,000
Federal Railroad Administration: Railroad safety	91,789,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	11,496,000
Research and Special Programs Administration: Research and Special Programs	30,752,000
Surface Transportation Board	17,000,000

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee ordered reported en bloc, an original fiscal year 2000 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, and S. 1143, an original fiscal year 2000 Transportation Appropriations bill, both subject to amendment and subject to the section 302 budget allocation, by a recorded vote of 27–1, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Stevens	Mrs. Feinstein
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. Craig	

Mrs. Hutchison
Mr. Kyl
Mr. Byrd
Mr. Inouye
Mr. Hollings
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Lautenberg
Mr. Harkin
Ms. Mikulski
Mr. Reid
Mr. Kohl
Mrs. Murray
Mr. Dorgan
Mr. Durbin

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

In compliance with this rule, the following changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

TITLE 49—TRANSPORTATION

* * * * * * *

SUBTITLE III—GENERAL AND INTERMODAL PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 53—MASS TRANSPORTATION

* * * * * * *

§ 5309. Discretionary grants and loans

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) Letters of Intent, Full Financing Grant Agreements, and EarlySystems Work Agreements

(1)(A) The Secretary of Transportation may issue a letter of intent to an applicant announcing an intention to obligate, for a project under this section, an amount from future available budget authority specified in law that is not more than the amount stipulated as the financial participation of the Secretary in the project.

The amount shall be sufficient to complete at least an operable segment when a letter is issued for a fixed guideway project.

(B) At least 30 days before issuing a letter under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the Secretary of Transportation shall notify in writing the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate *and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations* of the proposed issuance of the letter.

* * * * * * *

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1991, PUBLIC LAW 102–240

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1107. INNOVATIVE PROJECTS.

(a) * * *

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS.—The Secretary is authorized to carry out the innovative projects described in this subsection. Subject to subsection (c), there is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for fiscal years 1992 through 1997 to carry out each such project the amount listed for each such project:

CITY/STATE	INNOVATIVE PROJECTS	AMOUNT in millions
1. Cadiz, Ohio	Construction of 4-lane Limited Access Highway from Cadiz, OH to Interstate 70 Interchange at St. Clarisville, OH along U.S. Rt. 250	20.0
* * *	* * *	*
6. Maryland	[Construction of a replacement bridge at Watervale Bridge #63, Harford County, MD] *For improvements to Bottom Road Bridge, Vinegar Hill Road Bridge and Southampton Road Bridge, Harford County, MD*	1.1

* * * * * * *

TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY, PUBLIC LAW 105–178

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle A—Authorizations and Programs

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1212. MISCELLANEOUS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) PROJECT FLEXIBILITY FOR MINNESOTA *AND NEW JERSEY*.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds allocated for a project in the State of Minnesota *or the State of New Jersey* under section 117 of title 23, United States Code, may be obligated for any other project in the State for which funds are so allocated; except that the total amount of funds authorized for any project for which funds are so allocated shall not be reduced.

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 3021. PILOT PROGRAM FOR INTERCITY RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT FROM MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a [single-State] pilot program to determine the benefits of using funds from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund for intercity passenger rail. [Any assistance provided to the State of Oklahoma or the State of Vermont under sections 5307 and 5311 of title 49, United States Code] *The funds made available to the State of Oklahoma and the State of Vermont to carry out sections 5307 and 5311 of title 49, United States Code and sections 133 and 149 of title 23, United States Code*, during fiscal years 1998 through 2003 may be used for capital improvements to, and operating assistance for, intercity passenger rail service.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2002, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate a report on the pilot program established under this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an evaluation of the effect of the pilot program on alternative forms of transportation within the State of Oklahoma and the State of Vermont;

(B) an evaluation of the effect of the program on operators of mass transportation and their passengers;

(C) a calculation of the amount of Federal assistance provided under this section transferred for the provision of intercity passenger rail service; and

(D) an estimate of the benefits to intercity passenger rail service, including the number of passengers served,

the number of route miles covered, and the number of localities served by intercity passenger rail service.

(c) GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Amtrak employees employed in the railroad passenger service authorized by this section shall be afforded the same labor protections afforded other Amtrak employees under the terms of their employment contracts.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93–344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in 2000: Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies:				
General purpose discretionary	12,034	12,034	14,226	[1] 14,226
Highways	.....	.....	24,574	24,574
Mass transit	.....	.....	4,117	4,114
Violent crime reduction	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mandatory	721	721	717	717
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2000	.....	.....	.....	[2] 17,520
2001	.....	.....	.....	16,411
2002	.....	.....	.....	7,358
2003	.....	.....	.....	3,456
2004 and future year	.....	.....	.....	3,501
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2000 in bill	NA	1,204	NA	8,228

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses:					
Immediate Office of the Secretary	1,624	1,967	1,900	+276	−67
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	585	612	600	+15	−12
Office of the General Counsel	8,750	9,150	9,000	+250	−150
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy	2,808	2,924	2,900	+92	−24
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs	7,650	7,732	7,700	+50	−32
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	6,349	6,790	6,870	+521	+80
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	1,941	2,039	2,000	+59	−39
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	19,722	18,847	18,600	−1,122	−247
Office of Public Affairs	1,565	1,836	1,800	+235	−36
Executive Secretariat	1,047	1,102	1,110	+63	+8
Board of Contract Appeals	561	520	560	−1	+40
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	1,020	1,222	1,222	+202	.....
Office of Intelligence and Security	1,036	1,574	.....	−1,036	−1,574
Office of the Chief Information Officer	4,875	5,075	5,100	+225	+25
Office of Intermodalism	957	1,187	.....	−957	−1,187
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy and Intermodalism	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	60,490	62,577	59,362	−1,128	−3,215
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(7,754)	.....	.....	(−7,754)	.....
Office of Civil Rights	6,966	7,742	7,200	+234	−542
Transportation planning, research, and development	9,000	6,275	3,300	−5,700	−2,975
Transportation Administrative Service Center	(124,124)	(229,953)	(169,953)	(+45,829)	(−60,000)

Minority business resource center program	1,900	1,900	1,900	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(13,775)	(13,775)	(13,775)	.....	.....
Minority business outreach	2,900	2,900	2,900	.....	.....
Total, Office of the Secretary	81,256	81,394	74,662	−6,594	−6,732
Coast Guard					
Operating expenses	2,400,000	2,607,039	2,238,000	−162,000	−369,039
Defense function	300,000	334,000	534,000	+234,000	+200,000
Title I—Readiness (emergency funding)	(100,000)	.....	.....	(−100,000)	.....
Title IV—Counterdrug (emergency funding)	(16,300)	.....	.....	(−16,300)	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(27,715)	.....	.....	(−27,715)	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(4,058)	.....	.....	(−4,058)	.....
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:					
Vessels	219,923	165,760	123,560	−96,363	−42,200
Aircraft	35,700	22,110	33,210	−2,490	+11,100
Other equipment	36,569	53,726	52,726	+16,157	−1,000
Shore facilities and aids to navigation facilities	54,823	55,800	63,800	+8,977	+8,000
Personnel and related support	48,450	52,930	52,930	+4,480	.....
Deepwater replacement project revolving fund	.....	.....	44,200	+44,200	+44,200
Subtotal, A C and I appropriations	395,465	350,326	370,426	−25,039	+20,100
Acquisition, construction, and improvements Title I—Counterdrug (emergency funding)	(100,000)	.....	.....	(−100,000)	.....
Hurricane Georges (emergency funding)	(12,600)	.....	.....	(−12,600)	.....
Title IV—Counterdrug (emergency funding)	(117,400)	.....	.....	(−117,400)	.....
Environmental compliance and restoration	21,000	19,500	12,450	−8,550	−7,050
Alteration of bridges	14,000	.....	14,000	.....	+14,000
Retired pay	684,000	730,327	730,327	+46,327	.....
Reserve training	69,000	72,000	72,000	+3,000	.....
Title I—Readiness (emergency funding)	(5,000)	.....	.....	(−5,000)	.....
Research, development, test, and evaluation	12,000	21,709	17,000	+5,000	−4,709
Title I—Readiness (emergency funding)	(5,000)	.....	.....	(−5,000)	.....
Total, Coast Guard	3,895,465	4,134,901	3,988,203	+92,738	−146,698

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations (airport and Airway trust fund)	5,562,558	6,039,000	5,857,450	+294,892	−181,550
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(14,946)			(−14,946)	
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(13,852)			(−13,852)	
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	1,900,000	2,319,000	2,045,652	+145,652	−273,348
Title II—Antiterrorism (emergency funding)	(100,000)			(−100,000)	
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(106,612)			(−106,612)	
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(15,521)			(−15,521)	
Rescission			−299,500	−299,500	−299,500
Aviation insurance revolving fund					
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	150,000	173,000	150,000		−23,000
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(147)			(−147)	
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(220)			(−220)	
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,600,000)	(1,750,000)	(1,750,000)	(+150,000)	
(Limitation on obligations)	(1,950,000)	(1,600,000)	(2,000,000)	(+50,000)	(+400,000)
(Obligation limitation reduction) (Public Law 105–277)			(−290,000)	(−290,000)	(−290,000)
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	7,612,558	8,531,000	8,053,102	+440,544	−477,898
(Limitations on obligations)	(1,950,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,710,000)	(−240,000)	(+110,000)
Total budgetary resources	(9,562,558)	(10,131,000)	(9,763,102)	(+200,544)	(−367,898)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses	(327,413)	(344,616)	(370,000)	(+42,587)	(+25,384)
Highway safety initiative			(14,500)	(+14,500)	(+14,500)

Section 405(b) grant	.....	.....	(7,500)	(+7,500)	(+7,500)
Limitation on transportation research	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Limitation on obligations)	(25,511,000)	(26,245,000)	(26,245,000)	(+734,000)	.....
Domestic Discretionary	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Revenue aligned budget authority) (RABA)	.....	(1,456,350)	(1,456,350)	(+1,456,350)	.....
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(−452,120)	.....	.....	(+452,120)
(Adjustment)	.....	(63,000)	.....	.....	(−63,000)
Subtotal, limitation on obligations	(25,511,000)	(27,312,230)	(27,701,350)	(+2,190,350)	(+389,120)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(−291,931)	.....
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(24,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,300,000)	(+2,300,000)	(+300,000)
National motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(100,000)	(105,000)	(105,000)	(+5,000)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(100,000)	(105,000)	(105,000)	(+5,000)	.....
National motor carrier safety program (highway trust fund)	.....	50,000	50,000	+50,000	.....
Additional provisions—Division A Public Law 105–277: Surface transportation projects	332,000	.....	.....	−332,000	.....
Total, Federal Highway Administration	332,000	50,000	50,000	−282,000	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(25,611,000)	(27,417,230)	(27,806,350)	(+2,195,350)	(+389,120)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(−291,931)	.....
Total budgetary resources	(27,367,047)	(28,599,346)	(28,988,466)	(+1,621,419)	(+389,120)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund)	87,400	.....	72,900	−14,500	+72,900
Operations and research (highway trust fund):					
(Limitation on obligations)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)	.....	.....
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(125,450)	.....	.....	(−125,450)
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(72,000)	(197,450)	(72,000)	.....	(−125,450)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(752)	.....	.....	(−752)	.....
National Driver Register (highway trust fund)	2,000	2,000	2,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Operations and research	(162,152)	(199,450)	(146,900)	(−15,252)	(−52,550)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(200,000)	(206,800)	(206,800)	(+6,800)	.....
(Limitation on obligations):					
Highway safety programs (Sec. 402)	(150,000)	(152,800)	(152,800)	(+2,800)	.....
Occupant protection incentive grants (Sec. 405)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	.....	.....
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (Sec. 410)	(35,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(+1,000)	.....
State Highway safety data grants (Sec. 411)	(5,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	(+3,000)	.....
Child passenger protection education grants (by transfer)	.....	(7,500)	(7,500)	(+7,500)	.....
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin	89,400	2,000	74,900	−14,500	+72,900
(Limitations on obligations)	(272,000)	(404,250)	(278,800)	(+6,800)	(−125,450)
Total budgetary resources	(361,400)	(406,250)	(353,700)	(−7,700)	(−52,550)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Office of the Administrator	21,215	.....	.....	−21,215	.....
Railroad safety	61,488	.....	.....	−61,488	.....
Safety and operations	.....	95,462	91,789	+91,789	−3,673
Offsetting collections (user fees)	.....	−66,461	.....	.....	+66,461
Subtotal	82,703	29,001	91,789	+9,086	+62,788
Railroad research and development	22,364	21,800	22,364	.....	+564
Offsetting collections (user fees)	.....	−21,300	.....	.....	+21,300
Next generation high-speed rail	20,494	12,000	20,500	+6	+8,500
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation	10,000	.....	14,000	+4,000	+14,000
Alaska Railroad capital improvements (Division A)	28,000	.....	.....	−28,000	.....

Rhode Island Rail Development	5,000	10,000	10,000	+5,000	.....
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	609,230	570,976	571,000	−38,230	+24
Rail initiative trust fund (Highway Trust Fund) (RABA transfer under Title III):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	.....	(35,400)	.....	.....	(−35,400)
(Limitation on obligations)	.....	(35,400)	.....	.....	(−35,400)
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	777,791	622,477	729,653	−48,138	+107,176
(Limitations on obligations)	.....	(35,400)	.....	.....	(−35,400)
Total budgetary resources	(777,791)	(657,877)	(729,653)	(−48,138)	(+71,776)
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses	10,800	12,000	12,000	+1,200	.....
Administrative expenses (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(43,200)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(+4,800)	.....
Subtotal, Administrative expenses	(54,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(+6,000)	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(250)	.....	.....	(−250)	.....
Formula grants	570,000	619,600	619,600	+49,600	.....
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Limitation on obligations)	(2,280,000)	(2,478,400)	(2,478,400)	(+198,400)	.....
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(212,270)	.....	.....	(−212,270)
Subtotal, Formula grants	(2,850,000)	(3,310,270)	(3,098,000)	(+248,000)	(−212,270)
University transportation research	1,200	1,200	1,200	.....	.....
University transportation research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Acct) (limitation on obligations)	(4,800)	(4,800)	(4,800)	.....	.....
Subtotal, University transportation research	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	.....	.....
Transit planning and research (general fund)	19,800	21,000	21,000	+1,200	.....
Transit planning and research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account):					
(Limitation on obligations)	(78,200)	(86,000)	(86,000)	(+7,800)	.....
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(4,000)	.....	.....	(−4,000)
Subtotal, Transit planning and research	(98,000)	(111,000)	(107,000)	(+9,000)	(−4,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
Rural transportation assistance	(5,250)	(5,250)	(5,250)	.....	.....
National transit institute	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	.....	.....
Transit cooperative research	(8,250)	(8,250)	(8,250)	.....	.....
Metropolitan planning	(43,842)	(49,632)	(49,632)	(+5,790)	.....
State planning and research	(9,158)	(10,368)	(10,368)	(+1,210)	.....
National planning and research	(27,500)	(33,500)	(29,500)	(+2,000)	(−4,000)
Subtotal	(98,000)	(111,000)	(107,000)	(+9,000)	(−4,000)
Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,251,800)	(4,929,270)	(4,638,000)	(+386,200)	(−291,270)
Capital investment grants (general fund)	451,400	490,200	490,200	+38,800	.....
Capital investment grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(1,805,600)	(1,960,800)	(1,960,800)	(+155,200)	.....
Subtotal, Capital investment grants	(2,257,000)	(2,451,000)	(2,451,000)	(+194,000)	.....
(Fixed guideway modernization)	(902,800)	(980,400)	(980,400)	(+77,600)	.....
(Buses and bus-related facilities)	(451,400)	(490,200)	(490,200)	(+38,800)	.....
(New starts)	(902,800)	(980,400)	(980,400)	(+77,600)	.....
Subtotal	(2,257,000)	(2,451,000)	(2,451,000)	(+194,000)	.....
Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(2,000,000)	.....	.....	(−2,000,000)	.....
Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (liquidation of contract authorization)	.....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+1,500,000)	.....
Job access and reverse commute grants (general fund)	35,000	15,000	15,000	−20,000	.....

(Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(40,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(+20,000)	.....
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(75,000)	.....	.....	(−75,000)
Subtotal, Job access and reverse commute grants	(75,000)	(150,000)	(75,000)	.....	(−75,000)
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (general fund)	50,000	.....	.....	−50,000	.....
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,138,200	1,159,000	1,159,000	+20,800	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(4,251,800)	(4,929,270)	(4,638,000)	(+386,200)	(−291,270)
Total budgetary resources	(5,390,000)	(6,088,270)	(5,797,000)	(+407,000)	(−291,270)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	11,496	.....	11,496	.....	+11,496
Mandatory proposal	.....	(12,042)	.....	.....	(−12,042)
Subtotal	(11,496)	(12,042)	(11,496)	.....	(−546)
Research and Special Programs Administration					
Research and special programs	.....	33,340	.....	.....	−33,340
Hazardous materials safety	16,063	.....	16,960	+897	+16,960
Emergency transportation	997	.....	1,275	+278	+1,275
Research and technology	3,676	.....	3,297	−379	+3,297
Program and administrative support	8,544	.....	9,220	+676	+9,220
Subtotal, research and special programs	29,280	33,340	30,752	+1,472	−2,588
Offsetting collections (user fees)	.....	−4,575	.....	.....	+4,575
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(182)	.....	.....	(−182)	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(100)	.....	.....	(−100)	.....
Pipeline safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	29,000	33,939	30,000	+1,000	−3,939
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	4,248	4,248	4,704	+456	+456
Pipeline safety reserve	(1,400)	.....	(1,400)	.....	(+1,400)
Subtotal, Pipeline safety	33,248	38,187	34,704	+1,456	−3,483
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(150)	.....	.....	(−150)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1999 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1999 appropriation	Budget estimate
Emergency preparedness grants:					
Emergency preparedness fund	200	200	200	.....	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(11,000)	.....	(11,000)	.....	(+11,000)
Total, Research and Special Programs Admin	62,728	67,152	65,656	+2,928	−1,496
(Limitations on obligations)	(11,000)	.....	(11,000)	.....	(+11,000)
Total budgetary resources	(73,728)	(67,152)	(76,656)	(+2,928)	(+9,504)
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	43,495	44,840	5,000	−38,495	−39,840
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and expenses	16,000	14,400	15,400	−600	+1,000
Offsetting collections	−2,600	−14,400	.....	+2,600	+14,400
General Provisions					
Transportation Administrative Service Center reduction	−15,000	.....	−60,000	−45,000	−60,000
Transit discretionary grants (rescission of contract authorization)	(−392,000)	.....	.....	(+392,000)	.....
National Aviation Review Commission (rescission)	(−849)	.....	.....	(+849)	.....
Amtrak Reform Council	450	750	950	+500	+200
Urban discretionary grants (rescission)	(−4,026)	.....	.....	(+4,026)	.....
State Flexibility	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Net total, title I, Department of Transportation	14,294,923	14,693,514	13,868,522	−426,401	−824,992
Appropriations	(14,043,239)	(14,693,514)	(14,168,022)	(+124,783)	(−525,492)
Rescissions	(−396,875)	.....	(−299,500)	(+97,375)	(−299,500)

Emergency appropriations	(648,559)	.....	.....	(−648,559)	.....
(By transfer)	.....	(7,500)	(7,500)	(+7,500)	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(32,095,800)	(34,386,150)	(34,444,150)	(+2,348,350)	(+58,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(−291,931)	.....
Net total budgetary resources	(47,814,770)	(50,211,780)	(49,444,788)	(+1,630,018)	(−766,992)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board					
Salaries and expenses	3,847	4,633	4,500	+653	−133
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(60)	.....	.....	(−60)	.....
National Transportation Safety Board					
Salaries and expenses	53,473	57,000	51,500	−1,973	−5,500
Offsetting collections	.....	−10,000	.....	.....	+10,000
Emergency fund	(1,000)	.....	(1,000)	.....	(+1,000)
Total, National Transportation Safety Board	53,473	47,000	51,500	−1,973	+4,500
Total, title II, Related Agencies	58,380	51,633	57,000	−1,380	+5,367
Appropriations	(57,320)	(51,633)	(56,000)	(−1,320)	(+4,367)
Emergency appropriations	(1,060)	.....	(1,000)	(−60)	(+1,000)
Net total appropriations	14,353,303	14,745,147	13,925,522	−427,781	−819,625
Appropriations	(14,100,559)	(14,745,147)	(14,224,022)	(+123,463)	(−521,125)
Rescissions	(−396,875)	.....	(−299,500)	(+97,375)	(−299,500)
Emergency appropriations	(649,619)	.....	(1,000)	(−648,619)	(+1,000)
(By transfer)	.....	(7,500)	(7,500)	(+7,500)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(32,095,800)	(34,386,150)	(34,444,150)	(+2,348,350)	(+58,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(−291,931)	.....
Net total budgetary resources	(47,873,150)	(50,263,413)	(49,501,788)	(+1,628,638)	(−761,625)

○