AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 272

110TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 110–131

TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2008

JULY 16, 2007.—Ordered to be printed

Mrs. MURRAY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1789]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1789) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amounts of new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 2008

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	$51,112,233,000
Amount of 2007 appropriations	48,176,366,000
Amount of 2008 budget estimate	47,999,562,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2007 appropriations	+2,935,867,000
2008 budget estimate	+3,112,671,000

36–671 PDF

CONTENTS

	Page
Transparency in Congressional Directives	3
Program, Project, and Activity	3
Reprogramming Guidelines	4
Congressional Budget Justifications	5
Title I: Department of Transportation:	
Office of the Secretary	7
Federal Aviation Administration	19
Federal Highway Administration	50
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	65
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	75
Federal Railroad Administration	87
Federal Transit Administration	99
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	116
Maritime Administration	117
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	122
Research and Innovative Technology Administration	125
Bureau of Transportation Statistics	126
Office of Inspector General	127
Surface Transportation Board	128
General Provisions—Department of Transportation	128
Title II: Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
Office of the Secretary	130
Executive Operations	131
Public and Indian Housing	137
Community Planning and Development	146
Housing Programs	167
Federal Housing Administration	171
Government National Mortgage Association	173
Policy Development and Research	174
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	177
Office of Lead Hazard Control	179
Management and Administration	181
Office of Inspector General	182
Working Capital Fund	182
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight	183
Administrative Provisions	183
Title III: Independent Agencies:	
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board	186
Federal Maritime Commission	186
National Transportation Safety Board	187
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	189
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	190
Title IV: General Provisions This Act	192
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	193
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	194
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate	195
Budgetary Impact Statement	205
Comparative Statement	206

TRANSPARENCY IN CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVES

On January 18, 2007, the Senate passed S. 1, The Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007, by a vote of 96–2. While the Committee awaits final action on this legislation, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee issued interim requirements to ensure that the goals of S. 1 are in place for the appropriations bills for fiscal year 2008.

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power of the purse. The Committee believes strongly that Congress should make the decisions on how to allocate the people's money. In order to improve transparency and accountability in the process of approving earmarks (as defined in S. 1) in appropriations measures, each Committee report includes, for each earmark:

—(1) the name of the Member(s) making the request, and where appropriate, the President;

—(2) the name and location of the intended recipient or, if there is no specifically intended recipient, the intended location of the activity; and

—(3) the purpose of such earmark.

The term "congressional earmark" means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator, providing, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific state, locality or congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative, formula-driven, or competitive award process.

For each earmark, a Member is required to provide a certification that neither the Member (nor his or her spouse) has a pecuniary interest in such earmark, consistent with Senate Rule XXXVII(4). Such certifications are available to the public at http://appropriations.senate.gov/senators.cfm or go to appropriations.senate.gov and click on "Members".

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2008, 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" [PPA] 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, shall be applied equally to each budget item that is listed under said account 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.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee includes a provision (sec. 405) establishing the authority by which funding available to the agencies funded by this Act may be reprogrammed for other purposes. The provision specifically requires the advanced approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of any proposal to reprogram funds that: (1) creates a new program; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity [PPA]; (3) increases funds or personnel for any PPA for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress; (4) proposes to redirect funds that were directed in such reports for a specific activity to a different purpose; (5) augments an existing PPA in excess of $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; (6) reduces an existing PPA by $5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less; or (7) creates, reorganizes, or restructures offices different from the congressional budget justifications or the table at the end of the Committee report, whichever is more detailed.

The Committee retains the requirement that each agency submit an operating plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than 60 days after enactment of this act to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming and transfer authorities provided in this act. Specifically, each agency should provide a table for each appropriation with columns displaying the budget request; adjustments made by Congress; adjustments for rescissions, if appropriate; and the fiscal year enacted level. The table shall delineate the appropriation both by object class and by PPA. The report must also identify items of special congressional interest.

The Committee expects the agencies and bureaus to submit reprogramming requests in a timely manner and to provide a thorough explanation of the proposed reallocations, including a detailed justification of increases and reductions and the specific impact the proposed changes will have on the budget request for the following fiscal year. Except in emergency situations, reprogramming requests should be submitted no later than June 30.

The Committee expects each agency to manage its programs and activities within the amounts appropriated by Congress. The Committee reminds agencies that reprogramming requests should be submitted only in the case of an unforeseeable emergency or a situation that could not have been anticipated when formulating the budget request for the current fiscal year. Further, the Committee notes that when a Department or agency submits a reprogramming or transfer request to the Committees on Appropriations and does not receive identical responses from the House and Senate, it is the responsibility of the Department to reconcile the House and Senate

differences before proceeding, and if reconciliation is not possible, to consider the request to reprogram funds unapproved.

The Committee would also like to clarify that this section applies to Working Capital Funds and Forfeiture Funds and that no funds may be obligated from such funds to augment programs, projects or activities for which appropriations have been specifically rejected by the Congress, or to increase funds or personnel for any PPA above the amounts appropriated by this Act.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS

While the Committee supports the concept of the Program Assessment Rating Tool [PART] as a method for evaluating programs by linking performance, goals, and benchmarks with funding decisions, the process has failed largely through the inability of the administration to establish meaningful benchmarks and program goals that can be used as a valid measure for the success of a program and its funding requirements/needs. In too many cases, the PART analysis appears to be overly subjective and designed to reach certain preconceived conclusions about a program's validity and accomplishments and its budget needs.

This approach reduces PART's value as a tool for measuring the contributions of a program and to what extent a program should be funded. More troubling, OMB and Federal agencies have tended to accommodate an increasing amount of PART performance data in the budget justifications by eliminating fundamental and objective programmatic budget data that is critical to the work of the Committee. This trend has made it increasingly difficult for the Committee to perform a meaningful review of budget justifications, including the ability to conduct necessary budget oversight work as well as the ability to reach valid and comprehensive funding decisions absent a substantial amount of additional review and budget analysis.

Budget justifications are prepared not for the use of the agency, but instead are the primary tool used by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations to evaluate the resource requirements and fiscal needs of agencies. The Committee is aware that the format and presentation of budget materials is largely left to the agency within presentation objectives set forth by OMB. In fact, OMB Circular A–11, part 6 specifically states that the "agency should consult with your congressional committees beforehand to ensure their awareness of your plans to modify the format of agency budget documents." The Committee is disappointed that none of the agencies funded under this act have recently heeded this direction. Nevertheless, the Committee expects all the budget justification to provide the data needed to make appropriate and meaningful funding decisions.

While the Committee values the inclusion of performance data and presentations, it is important to ensure that, in the implementation of the PART analysis, vital budget information that the Committee needs is not lost. Therefore, the Committee directs that justifications submitted with the fiscal year 2009 budget request by agencies funded under this act must contain the customary level of detailed data and explanatory statements to support the appropriations requests at the level of detail contained in the funding table

included at the end of the report. Among other items, agencies shall provide a detailed discussion of proposed new initiatives, proposed changes in the agency's financial plan from prior year enactment, and detailed data on all programs and comprehensive information on any office or agency restructurings. At a minimum, each agency must also provide adequate justification for funding and staffing changes for each individual office and materials that compare programs, projects, and activities that are proposed for fiscal year 2009 to the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

The Committee is aware that the analytical materials required for review by the Committee are unique to each agency in this act. Therefore, the Committee expects that the each agency will coordinate with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in advance on its planned presentation for its budget justification materials in support of the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

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 comprised of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary immediate and support offices; the Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, including the offices of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs and the Assistant Secretary for Transportation for Policy; three Assistant Secretarial offices for Budget and Programs, Governmental Affairs, and Administration; and the Offices of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response, Chief Information Officer, the General Counsel and Public Affairs. The Office of the Secretary also includes the Department's Office of Civil Rights and the Department's Working Capital Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$84,551,850
Budget estimate, 2008	96,196,936
Committee recommendation	95,197,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation finances the costs of policy development and central supervisory and coordinating functions necessary for the overall planning and direction of the Department. It covers the immediate secretarial offices and the offices of the under secretary, assistant secretaries, general counsel and other support offices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of $95,197,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, including $60,000 for reception and representation expenses. The recommendation is $999,936 less than the budget request and $10,645,150 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The accompanying bill authorizes the Secretary to transfer up to 5 percent of the funds from any Office of the Secretary to another. The Committee recommendation continues language that permits up to $2,500,000 of fees to be credited to the Office of the Secretary for salaries and expenses.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendation in comparison to the fiscal year 2007 enacted level and the budget estimate:

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 request	
Immediate Office of the Secretary	$2,196,870	$2,314,274	$2,314,274
Office of the Deputy Secretary	697,120	736,833	736,833
Office of the General Counsel	15,148,070	16,219,099	18,719,099
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	11,635,050	12,374,050	11,874,050
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	8,465,100	10,416,963	10,416,963
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	2,290,570	2,384,312	2,384,312
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	21,879,740	26,007,990	24,007,990
Office of Public Affairs	1,908,450	1,987,803	1,987,803
Executive Secretariat	1,440,630	1,534,557	1,534,557
Board of Contract Appeals	695,830	.....	.....
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	1,263,550	1,334,596	1,334,596
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	5,129,720	8,299,072	8,299,072
Office of the Chief Information Officer	11,801,150	12,587,387	11,587,000
Total, Salaries and Expenses	84,551,850	96,196,936	95,197,000

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Secretary of Transportation provides leadership and has the primary responsibility to provide overall planning, direction, and control of the Department.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $2,314,274 for fiscal year 2008 for the Immediate Office of the Secretary. The recommendation is the same as the budget request and $117,404 greater than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Deputy Secretary has the primary responsibility of assisting the Secretary in the overall planning and direction of the Department.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $736,833 for the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary, which is identical to the budget request and $39,713 greater than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of the General Counsel provides legal services to the Office of the Secretary including the conduct of aviation regulatory proceedings and aviation consumer activities and coordinates and reviews the legal work in the chief counsels' offices of the operating administrations. The General Counsel is the chief legal officer of the Department of Transportation and the final authority within the Department on all legal questions.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $18,719,099 for expenses of the Office of the General Counsel for fiscal year 2008. The recommended funding level is $2,500,000 more than the budget request and $3,571,029 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The Committee has provided $2,500,000 in addition to the budget request in order to increase enforcement activities to better protect air travel consumers. The Committee is aware that most airline consumer complaints to the U.S. Department of Transportation are not investigated, but rather are simply tallied and published monthly. The administration has indicated that current budgets for the Office of Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings limit the number of investigations performed to only those involving complaints related to civil rights issues or service received by disabled passengers. However, many observers, including the USDOT Inspector General, have recommended that the USDOT should take a more active role in overseeing airline customer service, including investigation of more types of airline traveler consumer complaints, including flight cancellations.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR POLICY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Under Secretary for Policy is the chief policy officer of the Department and is responsible to the Secretary for the analysis, development, and review of policies and plans for domestic and international transportation matters. The Office administers the economic regulatory functions regarding the airline industry and is responsible for international aviation programs, the essential air service program, airline fitness licensing, acquisitions, international route awards, computerized reservation systems, and special investigations such as airline delays.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For fiscal year 2008, the Committee recommends $11,874,050 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Policy. The recommended funding level is $500,000 less than the budget request and $239,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BUDGET AND PROGRAMS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs is the principal staff advisor to the Secretary on the development, review, presentation, and execution 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $10,416,963 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, the same as the budget request and $1,951,863 over the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs advises the Secretary on all congressional and intergovernmental activities and on all departmental legislative initiatives and other relationships with Members of Congress. The Assistant Secretary 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 decisionmaking process.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of $2,384,312 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, an amount equal to the budget request and $93,742 over the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Administration is responsible for establishing policies and procedures, setting guidelines, working with the operating administrations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department in human resource management, security and administrative management, real and personal property management, and acquisition and grants management.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $24,007,990 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration. The recommended funding level is $2,000,000 less than the buget request and $2,128,250 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Director of Public Affairs is the principal advisor to the Secretary and other senior departmental officials and news media on public affairs questions. The Office issues news releases, articles, fact sheets, briefing materials, publications, and audiovisual materials. It also provides information to the Secretary on opinions and reactions of the public and news media on transportation programs and issues. It arranges news conferences and provides speeches, talking points, and byline articles for the Secretary and other senior departmental officials, and arranges the Secretary's scheduling.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $1,987,803 for the Office of Public Affairs, which is the same amount as the budget request and $79,353 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Executive Secretariat assists the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary in carrying out their management functions and responsibilities by controlling and coordinating internal and external written materials.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $1,534,557 for the Executive Secretariat. The recommendation is identical to the budget request and $93,927 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The primary responsibility of the Board of Contract Appeals was 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee does not recommend funding for the Board of Contract Appeals for fiscal year 2008 because the program was transferred to the General Services Administration in April 2007.

OFFICE OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $1,334,596 an amount equal to the budget request and $71,046 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE, SECURITY AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response keeps the Secretary and his advisors informed on intelligence and security issues pertaining to transportation. The office also provides support to the Secretary for his statutory and administrative

responsibilities in the areas of emergency preparedness, response, and recovery functions. Further, the office ensures that transportation policy and programs support the national objectives of general welfare, economic growth and stability, and the security of the Unites States.

The Office of Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response is at the forefront of the Department's response to transportation-related emergencies. To prepare for such events, the office coordinates and conducts the Department's participation in national and regional exercise and training for emergency personnel; administers the Department's Continuity of Government and Continuity of Operations programs; and coordinates DOT's role in select international contingency plan and response initiatives. Additionally, the office provides direct emergency response and recovery support through the National Response Plan [NRP] and operates the Department's Crisis Management Center [CMC], a facility that monitors the Nation's transportation system 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and is the Department's focal point during emergencies.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $8,299,072 for the Office of Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response. The recommendation is equal to the request and $3,169,352 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee approves the request for four additional FTEs to carry out the emergency response functions of the office.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of the Chief Information Officer [OCIO] serves as the principal adviser to the Secretary on matters involving information resources and information systems management.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $11,587,000, which is $999,986 less than the budget request and $213,749 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2007	$8,527,000
Budget estimate, 2008	9,140,900
Committee recommendation	9,140,900

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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 dis-

crimination in federally operated and federally assisted transportation programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a funding level of $9,140,900 for the Office of Civil Rights for fiscal year 2008. The recommendation is identical to the budget request and is $613,900 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2007	$14,893,000
Budget estimate, 2008	9,115,000
Committee recommendation	14,115,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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 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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $14,115,000 for transportation planning, research, and development, which is $5,000,000 more than the budget request and $778,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee directs funding to be allocated to the following projects that are listed below:

TPR&D

Project name	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Virtual Accident and Injury Reconstruction Center, Mississippi State University, Mississippi.	$2,250,000	Cochran
UVM Advanced Ground Penetrating Radar Systems, Vermont	1,000,000	Leahy
Transportation and Public Safety Traffic Information Exchange Pilot Project, Delaware.	500,000	Carper/Biden
SR–520 Innovative Water Quality Protection Project, Washington	500,000	Murray/Cantwell
Inland Pacific Hub Analysis Project, Washington	250,000	Murray
Washington State University Freight Transportation Policy Institute, Washington.	500,000	Murray

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Limitation, 2007	$118,014,000
Budget estimate, 2008 [1]	.....
Committee recommendation	128,094,000

[1] Proposed without limitation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Working Capital Fund [WCF] provides common administrative services to the Department's operating administrations and other Federal entities. The services are centrally performed in the interest of economy and efficiency and are funded through nego-

tiated agreements with Department operating administrations and other Federal customers and are billed on a fee-for-service basis to the maximum extent possible.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation of $128,094,000 on activities financed through the Working Capital Fund. The budget request proposes to remove the obligation limitation on the Working Capital Fund for services to the operating administrations of the Department. The Committee, however, insists that the discipline of an annual limitation is necessary to keep assessments and services of the Working Capital Fund in line with costs. As in past years, the bill specificies that the limitation shall apply only to the Department and not to services provided by other entities. The Committee directs that services shall be provided on a competitive basis to the maximum extent possible.

The Committee believes that the Department of Transportation should provide greater transparency in its budget justifications for the WCF as well as the OST offices that provide WCF services. For example, the justifications for the WCF do not indicate the sources of funding for the WCF. In addition, although only a small portion of the budgets for the Office of the Chief Information Officer and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration are funded from direct appropriations, the justifications for those offices do not present the balance of funding between direct appropriations and reimbursements through the WCF.

The Committee notes the Office of the Inspector General [OIG] published a report on March 31, 2005 that discussed the lack of clarity in the budget for the Office of the Chief Information Officer. In this report, the OIG recommended that "the OCIO disclose the full range of OCIO responsibilities and other sources of funding, including the departmental Working Capital Fund, in future-year budget submissions." The Committee is looking forward to the upcoming report of the OIG on the budget for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, which the Committee expects will discuss issues similar to those raised in the 2005 report.

In order to see greater transparency in the budget request, the Committee directs the Department to provide the following information in its fiscal year 2009 budget justifications: the amount of funding for the Office of the Chief Information Officer and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration from direct appropriations, and the amount of funding for those two offices from WCF reimbursements; a clear description of the WCF work that is completed under the appropriations cap, exempt from the cap, and completed under reimbursable agreements; and full supporting information for any request to lift the appropriations cap, including an inventory of work that cannot be supplied due to the cap.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

	Appropriations	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Appropriations, 2007	$892,500	($18,367,000)
Budget estimate, 2008	891,000	(18,367,000)
Committee recommendation	891,000	(18,367,000)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Minority Business Resource Center of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization provides assistance in obtaining short-term working capital for disadvantaged, minority, and women-owned businesses. The program enables qualified businesses to obtain loans at prime interest rates for transportation-related projects. As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account records the subsidy costs associated with guaranteed loans for this program as well as administrative expenses of this program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $370,000 to cover the subsidy costs for guaranteed loans and $521,000 for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program. The recommendation is the same as the budget estimate and it is $1,500,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee also recommends a limitation on guaranteed loans of $18,367,000 the same amount as the budget request and the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

Appropriations, 2007	$2,970,000
Budget estimate, 2008	2,970,000
Committee recommendation	2,970,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides contractual support to assist small, women-owned, Native American, and other disadvantaged business firms in securing contracts and subcontracts arising out of transportation-related 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 Department-wide goals and not just OST purposes.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $2,970,000 for grants and contractual support provided under this program for fiscal year 2008. The recommendation is the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

	Appropriations	Mandatory [1]	Total
Appropriations, 2007 [1]	$59,400,000	$50,000,000	$109,400,000
Budget estimate, 2008	.....	50,000,000	50,000,000
Committee recommendation	60,000,000	50,000,000	110,000,000

[1] From overflight fees or funds otherwise provided to the Federal Aviation Administration pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 41742.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides additional funding for the Essential Air Service [EAS] program, which was created as a 10-year transition program to continue air service to communities that had received federally mandated air service prior to deregulation of commercial aviation in 1978. The program currently provides subsidies to air carriers serving small communities that meet certain criteria.

The Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–264) authorized the collection of user fees for services provided by the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] to aircraft that neither take off from, nor land in, the United States. These are commonly known as overflight fees. In addition, the act stipulated that the first $50,000,000 of annual fee collections must be used to finance the EAS program. In the event of a shortfall in fees, the law requires FAA to make up the difference from other funds available to the agency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For fiscal year 2008, the administration proposes no appropriated funds for the EAS program, although the budget includes $50,000,000 for the EAS program to be funded by overflight fees collected by the FAA. The Committee recommendation provides a total of $110,000,000 for the Essential Air Service program, which is comprised of an appropriation under this heading of $60,000,000 and $50,000,000 derived from overflight fees or funds otherwise available to the FAA. The Committee recommendation is $60,000,000 more than the budget estimate and $600,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. Based on the latest projections from the Department of Transportation, the funding level that the Committee recommends is sufficient to continue air service during fiscal year 2008 for every community currently receiving service through the EAS program as of February 1, 2007.

The Committee rejects a proposal in the budget request that would restructure the EAS program. The proposal would change the program by eliminating the "minimum requirements" for eligibility that are currently in place, allowing EAS funds to be used for ground transportation, and establishing a ranking of eligible communities in order to determine the order in which they would receive assistance.

The following table reflects the points currently receiving service and the annual rates as of February 1, 2007 in the continental United States and Hawaii.

SUBSIDIZED EAS COMMUNITIES AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 2007

[Excludes Communities in Alaska]

States/Communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S,M,or L) [1]	Avg. Daily Enplnmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/06)	Ann. Sbsdy Rates at 5/1/2007	Subsidy per Passenger	Total Psgrs (YE 12/31/06)
ALABAMA: Muscle Shoals/Florence	60	19.5	$1,504,929	$123.04	12,231
ARIZONA:					
Kingman	103	7.5	1,001,989	212.20	4,722
Page	280	18.7	1,057,655	90.31	11,712

SUBSIDIZED EAS COMMUNITIES AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 2007—Continued

[Excludes Communities in Alaska]

States/Communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S,M,or L) [1]	Avg. Daily Enplnmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/06)	Ann. Sbsdy Rates at 5/1/2007	Subsidy per Passenger	Total Psgrs (YE 12/31/06)
Prescott	102	11.5	1,001,989	138.68	7,225
Show Low	168	14.8	779,325	84.01	9,277
ARKANSAS:					
El Dorado	108	6.0	937,385	250.04	3,749
Harrison	77	14.6	1,406,078	154.09	9,125
Hot Springs	53	12.1	1,015,500	133.88	7,585
Jonesboro	79	10.2	937,385	146.97	6,378
CALIFORNIA:					
Crescent City	362	35.7	957,025	42.84	22,339
Merced	55	25.0	799,604	51.15	15,634
Visalia	44	13.9	799,604	92.21	8,672
COLORADO:					
Alamosa	162	19.3	1,150,268	95.35	12,064
Cortez	258	29.9	796,577	42.59	18,705
Pueblo	43	11.2	780,997	111.13	7,028
GEORGIA: Athens	72	19.9	624,679	50.16	12,454
ILLINOIS:					
Decatur	120	45.7	1,350,256	47.21	28,604
Marion	122	36.0	1,126,810	50.06	22,507
Quincy	108	24.8	1,532,891	98.64	15,540
IOWA:					
Burlington	96	24.9	943,793	60.51	15,598
Fort Dodge	94	21.7	1,080,386	79.38	13,611
Mason City	128	38.0	1,080,386	45.37	23,815
KANSAS:					
Dodge City	149	16.0	1,379,419	137.60	10,025
Garden City	201	33.0	1,733,997	84.01	20,640
Great Bend	120	2.6	621,945	380.16	1,636
Hays	180	29.5	1,540,392	83.40	18,470
Liberal	153	12.6	1,008,582	127.67	7,900
Manhattan	120	34.6	487,004	22.47	21,675
Salina	93	5.9	487,004	130.95	3,719
KENTUCKY: Owensboro	105	14.6	906,262	98.86	9,167
MAINE:					
Augusta	68	13.5	1,190,864	166.08	8,460
Bar Harbor	157	32.1	1,190,864	59.19	20,119
Presque Isle	276	51.7	1,201,476	37.11	32,380
Rockland	80	20.4	1,190,864	93.27	12,768
MARYLAND: Hagerstown	60	18.7	854,452	72.96	11,711
MICHIGAN:					
Escanaba	114	32.4	908,903	44.79	20,291
Ironwood	218	10.5	409,242	62.51	6,547
Iron Mountain	101	24.8	602,761	38.89	15,500
Manistee	180	10.2	776,051	121.79	6,372
MINNESOTA:					
Hibbing/Chisholm	178	29.0	1,279,329	70.40	18,172
Thief River Falls	302	10.6	777,709	116.83	6,657
MISSISSIPPI: Laurel/Hattiesburg	90	42.7	917,129	34.33	26,714
MISSOURI:					
Cape Girardeau	123	24.7	1,434,915	92.69	15,480
Columbia	117	42.5	598,751	22.49	26,625
Fort Leonard Wood	86	26.4	519,858	31.42	16,543
Joplin	72	35.1	849,757	38.69	21,964
Kirksville	137	5.5	627,100	182.93	3,428
MONTANA:					
Glasgow	280	5.7	922,103	258.00	3,574
Glendive	223	3.4	922,103	439.10	2,100
Havre	248	4.8	922,103	305.53	3,018
Lewistown	125	2.2	922,103	671.60	1,373
Miles City	146	3.8	922,103	389.57	2,367
Sidney	273	10.1	1,306,313	206.27	6,333

SUBSIDIZED EAS COMMUNITIES AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 2007—Continued

[Excludes Communities in Alaska]

States/Communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S,M,or L) [1]	Avg. Daily Enplnmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/06)	Ann. Sbsdy Rates at 5/1/2007	Subsidy per Passenger	Total Psgrs (YE 12/31/06)
West Yellowstone	315	12.2	247,122	32.35	7,638
Wolf Point	293	5.6	922,103	261.00	3,533
NEBRASKA:					
Alliance	256	5.6	655,898	188.15	3,486
Chadron	311	7.2	655,898	145.30	4,514
Grand Island	140	23.9	1,377,877	92.26	14,934
Kearney	181	27.3	897,142	52.49	17,093
McCook	271	7.8	918,585	188.97	4,861
North Platte	277	26.0	976,026	59.97	16,276
Scottsbluff	109	29.0	520,137	28.65	18,155
NEVADA: Ely	237	([2])	647,709	([2])	([2])
NEW HAMPSHIRE: Lebanon	75	30.7	1,069,606	55.62	19,229
NEW MEXICO:					
Alamogordo	91	([3])	717,506	([3])	([3])
Carlsbad	141	11.4	599,671	84.34	7,110
Clovis	103	7.5	859,057	183.79	4,674
Hobbs	90	5.9	519,614	141.05	3,684
Silver City	133	7.4	859,057	184.27	4,662
NEW YORK:					
Jamestown	76	14.4	1,217,414	134.77	9,033
Massena	143	9.4	699,302	119.21	5,866
Ogdensburg	123	5.3	699,302	211.14	3,312
Plattsburgh	78	6.5	853,378	209.26	4,078
Saranac Lake	126	9.2	853,378	148.72	5,738
Watertown	65	13.0	699,302	85.72	8,158
NORTH DAKOTA:					
Devils Lake	405	10.5	1,329,858	202.66	6,562
Dickinson	319	17.4	1,696,977	156.02	10,877
Jamestown	332	7.6	1,351,677	284.80	4,746
OREGON: Pendleton	195	23.4	748,440	51.10	14,648
PENNSYLVANIA:					
Altoona	108	19.7	893,774	72.62	12,307
Bradford	77	11.2	1,217,414	174.09	6,993
Du Bois	112	26.9	599,271	35.62	16,824
Johnstown	82	32.8	464,777	22.62	20,544
Lancaster	66	21.3	1,377,257	103.14	13,353
Oil City/Franklin	86	6.1	741,346	193.41	3,833
PUERTO RICO:					
Mayaguez	105	12.0	688,551	92.02	7,483
Ponce	77	13.7	622,056	72.62	[4] 8,566
SOUTH DAKOTA:					
Brookings	206	3.6	1,212,400	543.92	2,229
Huron	279	5.2	793,733	243.10	3,265
Watertown	207	19.0	1,211,589	102.07	11,870
TENNESSEE: Jackson	85	10.9	906,262	132.75	6,827
TEXAS: Victoria	108	27.7	510,185	29.38	17,367
UTAH:					
Cedar City	178	23.2	897,535	61.93	14,492
Moab	240	5.7	1,298,784	362.89	3,579
Vernal	174	6.4	562,720	139.88	4,023
VERMONT: Rutland	118	6.9	849,705	195.92	4,337
VIRGINIA: Staunton	133	17.0	1,389,727	130.81	10,624
WEST VIRGINIA:					
Beckley	181	7.5	1,930,759	412.12	4,685
Clarksburg	.....	12.0	547,532	72.99	7,501
Greenbrier/Lewisburg	172	14.8	685,040	74.09	[5] 9,246
Morgantown	.....	14.6	547,532	59.72	9,168
Parkersburg	.....	20.2	1,326,850	104.67	12,676
WYOMING:					
Laramie	144	28.9	487,516	26.99	18,061

SUBSIDIZED EAS COMMUNITIES AS OF FEBRUARY 1, 2007—Continued

[Excludes Communities in Alaska]

States/Communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S,M,or L) [1]	Avg. Daily Enplnmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/06)	Ann. Sbsdy Rates at 5/1/2007	Subsidy per Passenger	Total Psgrs (YE 12/31/06)
Worland	164	8.3	972,757	187.21	5,196

[1] Hub classifications are subject to change annually based on the changes in enplanement levels at the specific hub and at all airports Nationwide.
[2] Reliable data not available from the Bureau of Transportation Statistics.
[3] Service hiatus.
[4] Cape Air Traffic only.
[5] Air Midwest traffic only.

COMPENSATION FOR AIR CARRIERS

(RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2007	−$50,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	−22,000,000
Committee recommendation	−22,000,000

The Committee recommends a rescission of $22,000,000 from this account in fiscal year 2008. This rescission level is the same as the budget request and $28,000,000 larger than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The funds recommended for rescission are in excess of the amount determined to be needed for eligible payments to air carriers.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Section 101 authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to transfer to the account called "Minority Business Outreach" unexpended balances from the bonding assistance program funded out of the account "Office of the Secretary, Salaries and Expenses."

Section 102 prohibits the Office of the Secretary of Transportation from obligating funds originally provided to a modal administration in order to approve assessments or reimbursable agreements, unless the Department follows the regular process for the reprogramming of funds, including congressional notification.

Section 103 prohibits the use of funds for an EAS local participation program.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal Aviation Administration is responsible for the safe movement of civil aviation and the evolution of a national system of airports. The Federal Government's regulatory role in civil aviation began with the creation of an Aeronautics Branch within the Department of Commerce pursuant to the Air Commerce Act of 1926. This act instructed the agency to foster air commerce; designate and establish airways; establish, operate, and maintain aids to navigation; arrange for research and development to improve such aids; issue airworthiness certificates for aircraft and major aircraft components; and investigate civil aviation accidents. In the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, these activities were transferred to a new, independent agency named the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Congress streamlined regulatory oversight in 1957 with the creation of two separate agencies, the Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board. When the Department of Transportation [DOT] began its operations in 1967, the Federal Aviation Agency was renamed the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] and became one of several modal administrations within DOT. The Civil Aeronautics Board was later phased out with enactment of the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, and ceased to exist in 1984. Responsibility for the investigation of civil aviation accidents was given to the National Transportation Safety Board in 1967. FAA's mission expanded in 1995 with the transfer of the Office of Commercial Space Transportation from the Office of the Secretary, and decreased in December 2001 with the transfer of civil aviation security activities to the new Transportation Security Administration.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The total recommended program level for the FAA for fiscal year 2008 amounts to $14,940,420,000, which is $246,969,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The current budget structure for the FAA includes distinct accounts to pay for the operations of the agency (Operations), and the agency's capital expenditures (Facilities and Equipment). The FAA budget justification for fiscal year 2008 propose to restructure these two accounts along the lines of business of the agency. Under this proposal, one account would pay for the Air Traffic Organization, including both the operating and capital expenses of the organization. Another account, Safety and Operations, would pay for both the operating and capital expenses of the Aviation Safety office and other offices within the FAA. This new budget structure is consistent with the reauthorization proposal submitted by the President in February of this year. The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation has reported legislation that would authorize FAA programs through fiscal year 2011, and the Commerce Committee bill continues to authorize FAA programs under the existing account structure. As such, the Committee has also followed the current account structure for its appropriations recommendations for 2008. All of the information presented below, including the display of President's budget estimates for fiscal year 2008, follows the existing structure.

In addition to changes to the FAA budget structure, the reauthorization proposal submitted by the President this year would make significant changes to the financing of FAA programs. The proposal would replace the current system of aviation taxes with a new user fee system, and it would provide the FAA with the authority to borrow up to $5,000,000,000 from the Treasury. Such borrowing would be repaid by an automatic increase to one of the newly-proposed user fees. Such borrowing authority would represent a considerable departure from the current financing of almost all FAA spending through direct appropriations.

The Appropriations Committee has played a central role in ensuring that the FAA has the resources it needs to conduct its missions. The Committee has also sought to protect the investment of taxpayer dollars in the FAA by making sure that the agency

spends its resources efficiently. Not only has the Committee cut wasteful spending on ineffective programs, it has also provided additional resources for critically important activities that the agency or the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] had overlooked in its budget requests. As such, the Committee believes that any degradation in the Committee's ability to annually set programmatic spending levels and oversee the agency's spending habits as part of the reauthorization process should be strenuously resisted.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations for fiscal year 2008 excluding rescissions:

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
Operations:			
General fund appropriation	$2,746,317,000	$2,601,372,000	$2,361,203,000
Trust fund appropriation	5,627,900,000	6,124,411,000	6,400,580,000
Facilities and equipment	2,516,920,000	2,461,566,000	2,516,920,000
Research, engineering, and development:			
General fund appropriation	130,234,000	122,867,000	148,800,000
Trust fund appropriation		17,133,000	
Grants-in-aid for airports	3,514,500,000	2,750,000,000	3,514,500,000
Total	14,535,871,000	14,077,349,000	14,940,420,000

OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2007	$8,374,217,000
Budget estimate, 2008	8,725,783,000
Committee recommendation	8,761,783,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides funds for the operation, maintenance, communications, and logistical support of the air traffic control and air navigation systems. It also covers administrative and managerial costs for the FAA's regulatory, international, commercial space, medical, engineering and development programs, as well as policy oversight and agency management functions. The operations appropriation includes the following major activities: (1) the air traffic organization which operates, on a 24-hour daily basis, the national air traffic system, including the establishment and maintenance of a national system of aids to navigation, the development and distribution of aeronautical charts and the administration of acquisition, and research and development programs; (2) the regulation and certification activities including establishment and surveillance of civil air regulations to assure safety and development of standards, rules and regulations governing the physical fitness of airmen as well as the administration of an aviation medical research program; (3) the office of commercial space transportation; and (4) headquarters, administration and other staff and support offices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of $8,761,783,000 for FAA operations. This funding level is $43,209,783 more than the budget request, and $387,566,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee recommendation derives $6,400,580,000 of

the appropriation from the airport and airway trust fund. The trust fund level is equal to the budget estimate. The balance of the appropriation will be drawn from the general fund of the Treasury.

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

The Committee continues three provisions enacted in prior years relating to premium pay, aeronautical charting and cartography, and Government-issued credit cards.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendation in comparison to the budget estimate and fiscal year 2007 enacted level:

FAA OPERATIONS

	Fiscal year		Committee recommendations
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
Air Traffic Organization	$6,739,761,000	$6,964,813,000	$6,964,813,000
Aviation Safety	1,003,410,000	1,056,103,364	1,092,103,000
Commercial Space Transportation	11,696,000	12,837,437	12,837,437
Financial Services	76,289,000	103,848,661	103,848,661
Human Resource Management	85,738,000	91,214,239	91,214,239
Region and Center Operations	275,797,000	290,872,359	290,872,359
Staff Offices	145,524,000	166,541,633	166,541,633
Information Services	36,002,000	39,552,285	39,552,285
TOTAL	8,374,217,000	8,725,783,000	8,761,783,000

AIR TRAFFIC ORGANIZATION

The Committee recommends $6,964,813,000 for the Air Traffic Organization to operate and maintain the national air traffic control system. The recommended level is equal to the budget estimate, and equal to the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee is confident that the recommended funding level is sufficient to continue safe and efficient management of the National Airspace System [NAS].

Air Traffic Controller Contract.—Last year, after failing to reach an agreement on a new contract through the collective bargaining process, the Administrator used questionable statutory authority to impose a new pay structure and work rules on the air traffic controller workforce. Several issues regarding the imposition of these terms are unresolved and tension between the controllers and FAA management remains at its worst point since the PATCO strike. The Committee believes that the current tenor of labor-management relations at the agency is not at all in the best interest of the FAA safety mission and the ability of the agency to tackle its most vexing challenges. As such, the Committee expects the Administrator to work aggressively to resolve the conflict over the controller's contract immediately.

Air Traffic Controller Staffing.—The bill includes a provision that requires the FAA to submit to Congress its annual air traffic controller workforce plan by March 31 of each year. The original controller workforce plan was submitted to Congress in December 2004. Although the agency promised that the plan would be up-

dated annually, the Committee had to wait until June 2006 before receiving any update to that plan. Since that time, the Committee has not received the 2007 update. The Committee directs the FAA to submit its 2007 plan immediately. The Committee also directs the FAA to include in each update to the controller workforce plan annual information on the total number of air traffic controllers that the agency projects for its workforce in addition to providing the estimated losses and planned hires to the controller workforce. Under the terms of the provision in the bill, the agency's budget will be effectively fined for each day after March 31 that the report is not submitted.

The Committee believes that a fully staffed controller workforce is critical to maintaining the safety of the air transportation system. However, the Committee is concerned that the FAA will not be able to reach its staffing goals for the current fiscal year, placing the goals for fiscal year 2008 in further jeopardy. As illustrated by the table below, the FAA expected to lose 1,197 air traffic controllers this year, and it hopes to hire 1,386 controllers in order fill those vacancies and increase its total staff level to 14,807. However, a little over halfway through fiscal year 2007, the FAA had already lost 900 controllers, or 75 percent of the total number of controller losses that the agency had projected for the entire year. The FAA also underestimated the number of controller losses to the workforce for both fiscal years 2005 and 2006. If controller losses continue to occur at this rate, the FAA will have to hire a total of 1,732 controllers this year in order to meet its workforce goal. That hiring total is 346 more controllers than the FAA had planned to hire before the end of the fiscal year. While the agency insists that it can still meet its end-of-year on-board strength goal for this year, the Committee will continue to monitor this situation carefully. The safety of our skies makes it essential that the FAA's hard hiring targets be viewed as a mandate on the agency, not as some amorphous goal that can slip from year to year.



Alien Species Action Plan [ASAP].—The Committee recommends $1,600,000 to continue the implementation of the Alien Species Action Plan which was adopted by the FAA as part of its August 26,

1998, record of decision approving certain improvements at Kahului Airport on the Island of Maui. These funds will be used to execute capital projects and continue the operational requirements imposed by the ASAP. Requested by Senator Inouye.

AVIATION SAFETY

The Committee recommends $1,092,103,000 for aviation safety. The recommendation is $35,999,636, more than the budget request, and $88,693,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Staffing levels for the Flight Standards and Aircraft Certification Offices.—The Committee has again increased funding for aviation safety in order to boost critical safety staff in the Office of Aviation Flight Standards [AFS] and the Office of Aircraft Certification [AIR]. The bill continues to prohibit the FAA from reprogramming or transferring these funds to any other activity. The Committee expects the FAA to hire 364 additional safety staff with this increase in funding. With this additional funding and the increase in safety staff, the FAA will be able to raise the total number of safety staff on board in fiscal year 2008 from 6,912 to 7,276. The Committee directs the FAA to report to the Committee on a quarterly basis on the agency's progress toward accomplishing the goal of retaining 7,276 safety inspectors in fiscal year 2008.

The Committee is gravely concerned that the FAA has not maintained the level of staffing in its flight standards and aircraft certification offices necessary to meet the demands of overseeing the safety of today's aviation industry. As with the staffing goals for air traffic controllers, if the FAA is unable to achieve its stated goals for the current fiscal year, then the agency also places its staffing goals for fiscal year 2008 in jeopardy. As detailed in the table below, the FAA expected to lose 467 flight standards and aircraft certification staff this year, and it hopes to hire 576 staff members in order to fill those vacancies and increase its total staff level to 6,671. Now, 8 months through fiscal year 2007, the FAA has lost 371 members of its safety staff, representing about 80 percent of the total number of staff members that the agency had estimated to lose over the entire year. In contrast, the FAA has hired only 179 new safety inspectors, representing just 31 percent of the total number of new hires the agency had planned to bring on board this year.

If inspector losses continue to occur at the current rate, the FAA will have to hire 487 new safety inspectors during the last 4 months of the fiscal year, a hiring target which is more than twice the number of inspectors the agency has been able to hire for the first 8 months of the year. As with the agency's controller goals, the FAA insists that it will meet the 2007 inspector goal. The Committee will continue to monitor the situation and encourages the FAA to manage its hiring in a more stable manner so that these end-of-year surges in hiring are not necessary.



For 3 out of the past 6 years, the Committee has provided more funding than the FAA has requested to pay the salaries and boost the number of essential safety staff working in the flight standards and aircraft certification offices. The Committee has invested these resources because it believes that the work of these offices is critical to maintaining a safe air transportation system. For fiscal year 2008, this Committee is again adding more funds. Some $16,000,000 of this funding will be needed simply to retain the additional personnel for which the Committee added funding for the current fiscal year. However, an additional $20,000,000 is also provided to boost inspecter staffing to address the agency's most critical safety vulnerabilities. In testimony presented on June 20 to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, the Deputy Associate Administrator for Aviation Safety explained that the additional resources provided by the Committee have been essential to her office's efforts to meet all of its mission requirements. The Committee commends the candor of the Deputy Associate Administrator and hopes that the FAA, in future budget requests, will seek sufficient resources to adequately staff the flight standards and aircraft certification offices.

Aviation Safety Workforce Plan.—The bill includes a provision that requires the FAA to submit to Congress annual updates to its safety staff workforce plan by March 31 of each year. As in the case of the requirement for the controller workforce plan, the agency's budget will be effectively fined for each day after March 31 that the report is not submitted. The Committee directs the FAA to include in these updates annual information on the total number of staff that the agency projects will work in its safety offices, the estimated losses to its safety workforce, and the number of safety inspectors the agency plans to hire in each year. The Committee further directs that the FAA publish this information for its safety staff in its entirety, as well as individually for the flight standards office and the aircraft certification office.

The Committee continues to be frustrated by the failure of the FAA to provide timely information on its hiring practices for the safety offices. Last year, the Committee expressed its disappointment that the FAA had not yet followed directions published in the

statement of managers of the 2006 act that instructed the FAA to provide semi-annual reports on its safety staff. This year, the FAA failed to respond to directions that the agency submit a workforce plan for its flight standards and aircraft certification staff by March 1. The FAA finally submitted such a plan in May, 2 months late, and only after the Administrator was questioned on her safety staffing levels at a hearing before the Committee.

Safety Oversight in a Changing Industry.—Air carriers continue to increase the amount of repair work that they outsource to other firms. In the decade from 1996 to 2006, the share of total carrier maintenance expenditures that was outsourced grew from 37 percent to 64 percent. The following chart illustrates this growth (data provided by the Office of the Inspector General):



Outsourced maintenance work has come to include the repair of critical components such as landing gear and engine overhauls, as well as heavy airframe maintenance checks, which involve the complete teardown and overhaul of an aircraft. Furthermore, more of this outsourced work is being completed overseas where the FAA cannot maintain the same level of oversight that the agency can bring to bear within the United States.

In separate testimony before the Committee and before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the DOT Inspector General raised serious concerns over the ability of the FAA to oversee airline maintenance and guarantee its quality. Specifically, the Inspector General noted that the FAA does not know all the locations where air carriers are having maintenance work conducted. He noted further that the FAA does not conduct the same level of oversight over outsourced maintenance that the agency conducts over maintenance work performed by air carriers in-house. Finally, the Inspector General noted that the FAA does not have an adequate system for placing its safety inspectors where they are actually needed around the globe.

Perhaps most damning was the following observation of the Inspector General in which he maintained that carriers have been de-

liberately directing maintenance activities to certain overseas facilities precisely because of the absence of sufficient FAA oversight: "We identified over 1,400 non-certified repair facilities performing maintenance, and more than 100 of these facilities were located in foreign countries, such as Aruba, Belize, Bermuda, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, and Mexico. It is important to note that in many instances, air carriers contracted with facilities in these locations to ensure that they had a maintenance source in locations where there were no FAA-certificated repair stations available."

The FAA has tried to allay these concerns by pointing out that the agency must still certify the air carriers themselves, including certification that the air carrier has its own system for overseeing outsourced maintenance work. The concerns of the Committee, however, are not allayed when it hears the Inspector General testify that air carriers often rely on telephone contact to monitor the work conducted at non-certified repair stations. These same carriers often assign on-site representatives to oversee the work performed at repair stations that are certified.

The Committee is aware that the FAA has begun to develop a more sophisticated model that will allow the agency to place its safety inspectors at locations where they will perform most effectively. This effort follows on the heels of a study by the National Research Council that showed that the FAA uses an antiquated method of locating its safety inspectors. Although the Committee understands that the model will be complex, the Committee encourages the FAA to build the model expeditiously. The Committee also directs the FAA to submit within 90 days a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that delineates its schedule for completing the model and fully utilizing it. The report will specify milestones with deadline dates for the development and completion of the model including the dates when the model can be expected to be fully utilized to dictate the location of all inspector resources.

Medallion Program.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 to continue the medallion five star shield program, a key safety initiative in the FAA's current strategic plan for reducing general aviation accidents in Alaska. Requested by Senator Stevens.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2007	$2,516,920,000
Budget estimate, 2008	2,462,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,516,920,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Facilities and Equipment [F&E] appropriation provides funding for modernizing and improving air traffic control and airway facilities, equipment, and systems. The appropriation also finances major capital investments required by other agency programs, experimental research and development facilities, and other improvements to enhance the safety and capacity of the national airspace system [NAS]. The program aims to keep pace with the

increasing demands of aeronautical activity and remain in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration's comprehensive 5-year capital investment plan [CIP].

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,516,920,000 for the Facilities and Equipment of the Federal Aviation Administration. The Committee recommendation is $54,920,000 more than the budget estimate and equal to the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The bill provides that $2,056,947,000 shall be available for obligation until September 30, 2010, and $459,973,000 shall be available until September 30, 2008.

Rebaselining; Accountability and Transparency in FAA Procurements.—

> "It stings when I listen to criticisms about the FAA that are based on something that happened 10 or 20 or 30 years ago. In the last few years, we have achieved enormous management efficiencies, and at the end of fiscal year 2006, 97 percent of our major capital projects were on time and on budget."
>
> FAA Administrator Marion Blakey,
> Hartford, Connecticut,
> April 5, 2007

> "As we speak . . . 100 percent of our major capital programs are on schedule and on budget"
>
> FAA Administrator Marion Blakey,
> Testimony before the Committee,
> May 10, 2007

> "This rebaselining process explains why the Wide Area Augmentation System, according to the FAA's logic, is still on budget, even through its costs have grown from $892,000,000 to over $3,000,000,000 since 1998"
>
> DOT Inspector General Calvin Scovel,
> Testimony before the Committee,
> May 10, 2007

> "A simple statement that it is on time and on budget doesn't capture that evolution, and certainly, the taxpayer and the Congress will be interested in that entire story, rather than just the sound bite."
>
> DOT Inspector General Calvin Scovel,
> Testimony before the Committee,
> May 10, 2007

Much attention has been focused on the need for the FAA to replace its current air traffic control infrastructure with a "next generation" [NextGen] system that employs the most modern satellite-based technologies to allow the agency to get maximum use of the available airspace to accommodate the expected growth in air travel. The Committee is supportive of the agency's migration to NextGen technologies and has, on a number of occasions, funded such technologies without the benefit of a budget request from the FAA. However, if the FAA is going to successfully deploy NextGen in a fiscally prudent and timely manner, it will be essential that the agency continue to make significant strides in improving its procurement processes.

As made clear by the statements cited above, the FAA Administrator believes that her agency has "achieved enormous management efficiencies" that give rise to a near-perfect procurement record for timely, cost-controlled acquisitions. While the Committee certainly agrees that management improvements have been made at the FAA, the Committee is not convinced that such improvements should be characterized as "enormous." The Committee certainly questions the Administrator's representations that the agency is enjoying a near-perfect record in purchasing critical new systems in a timely and cost-controlled manner.

During oversight hearings held in May of this year, the Committee pursued in detail the process through which the FAA "rebaselines" the estimated cost and schedule for major procurements. "Rebaselining" is a process through which the FAA completes a thorough examination of a capital program, reconsiders if the program justifies its costs, and makes adjustments to the schedule and budget of the program. The FAA begins a rebaselining process if a capital program appears in danger of missing its schedule or exceeding its budget by 10 percent or more. The Committee does not question the wisdom of rebaselining major capital projects that are behind schedule and over cost. Indeed, given the FAA's long troubled history with major procurements, the Committee commends both the Office of the Secretary and the President's Office of Management and Budget [OMB] for insisting that the FAA rebaseline procurements when appropriate. What the Committee questions in the strongest possible terms is the agency's practice of using the rebaselining process to "wipe the slate clean"—using the process to ignore skyrocketing costs or dramatic delays that may just be a few months old—all so that the agency can claim "enormous management efficiencies" and a near-perfect procurement record.

The numbers speak for themselves. Of the 37 major procurements that the FAA evaluates in claiming its near-perfect procurement record, more than 25 percent of them have had their schedules and budget revised by the agency since the initial project contracts were signed. These projects include: Airport Surface Detection Equipment—Model X; Airport Surveillance Radar 11; Aviation Surface Weather Observation System; FAA Telecommunications Infrastructure; Free Flight Phase II; Integrated Terminal Weather System; NAS Infrastructure Management System; Next Generation Air/Ground Communications; Standard Terminal Automation and Replacement; and Wide Area Augmentation System.

The graphs displayed below illustrate separately the expansion of schedule and cost for these 10 programs—programs that the Administrator now claims are on-time and on-budget. Lest it be asserted that these figures misrepresent the FAA's more recent record in managing and controlling these programs, each graph below provides the cost- and schedule-growth figures in two ways. One bar details the level of schedule or cost growth since each program's inception. The other bar details the level of such growth just since 2001.





Through the rebaselining process, just since 2001, the FAA has added 296 months, or over 25 percent, to the original schedules for these programs. The FAA has added almost $1,700,000,000, or 26 percent, to the total cost of those programs over the same timeframe. When you look to the agency's record going back to the inception of each of these programs, the FAA has added almost 400 months to their schedules, an increase of about 46 percent. Over the same timeframe, the FAA also has added more than

$5,000,000,000 to their costs. That represents cost growth of 109 percent.

The Committee reemphasizes its view that rebaselining is an important tool for the FAA to monitor the performance of its major procurements. It should help prevent some of the multi-billion dollar debacles of the distant past in which the agency took far too long to recognize the true risk involved in procurements that, in the end, produced little or no benefit for the taxpayer. That said, the Committee has no intention of ignoring FAA cost and schedule estimates that may be just a few years or a few months old in evaluating the agency's procurement performance. The Committee believes that the key to the FAA improving that performance is continued oversight and aggressive program management that holds vendors and project managers to clearly defined goals and responsibilities. The key does not lie in a rebaselining process that allows the agency to annually "lower the bar" for itself.

Definition of Program Success.—In testimony before the Committee, the DOT Inspector General pointed out that the agency is periodically reporting that certain acquisitions have reached a successful completion simply when a procured piece of equipment has been delivered to its assigned site. This practice is in contrast to reporting success only when the device is fully installed, operational, and providing its intended benefits to the flying public. To the Administrator's credit, the IG's testimony would indicate that this misquided reporting practice is now more the exception than the rule. This practice is reminiscent of testimony taken by the Committee in 2006 in which it was revealed that certain FAA managers were granted bonuses based on the rate at which new telecommunications links were being installed rather than based on the rate at which the replaced telecommunications lines were being disconnected—the point at which the taxpayer actually began to enjoy savings. The Committee agrees with the Inspector General that a new expensive piece of navigational equipment is of no use to the public while it is still sitting in a crate. As such, the Committee expects the Administrator to present budgets that are balanced between procurement, installation and training costs so that recently-procured equipment can be deployed rapidly and utilized completely by fully trained agency personnel. The Committee also asks the Administrator to continue to make rapid progress in reporting program success based only on the full utilization of procured equipment, not simply on the delivery of that equipment to its intended site.

Budget Activities Format.—The Committee directs that the fiscal year 2009 budget request for the Facilities and Equipment account conform to the same organizational structure of budget activities as displayed below.

The Committee's recommended distribution of funds for each of the budget activities funded by the appropriation follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

	2007 actual	2008 estimate	Committee recommendation
Activity 1, Engineering, Development, Testing and Evaluation:			
Advanced Technology Development and Prototype	$39,067,000	$37,800,000	$39,800,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

	2007 actual	2008 estimate	Committee recommendation
Safe Flight 21	12,900,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
Aeronautical Data Link (ADL) Applications	1,000,000	1,000,000	.....
Next Generation Very High Frequency Air/Ground Communications System (NEXCOM)	25,000,000	30,400,000	30,400,000
Traffic Management Advisor (TMA)	37,600,000	15,400,000	15,400,000
Louisville International Airport Demonstration Projects	.....	.....	2,000,000
NAS Improvements of System Support Laboratory	1,198,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Technical Center Facilities	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Technical Center Building and Plant Support	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
System-Wide Information Management	24,000,000	21,300,000	24,300,000
ADS-B NAS Wide Implementation	80,000,000	85,650,000	97,354,000
NextGen Network Enabled Weather	.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
Data Communications for Trajectory Based Operations (NextGen)	.....	7,400,000	7,400,000
Next Generations Transportation System Technology Demonstration	.....	50,000,000	50,000,000
Next Generation Integrated Airport	.....	.....	3,000,000
Total, Activity 1	236,965,000	290,150,000	310,854,000
Activity 2, Procurement and Modernization of Air Traffic Control Facilities and Equipment:			
En Route Programs:			
En Route Automation Program (ERAM)	376,553,000	368,750,000	368,750,000
En Route Communications Gateway (ECG)	4,200,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
En Route System Modification	27,500,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
Next Generation Weather Radar (NEXRAD)	2,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Weather and Radar Processor (WARP)	7,400,000	.....	.....
ARTCC Building Improvement/Plant Improvement	51,000,000	52,900,000	52,900,000
Air Traffic Management (ATM)	78,850,000	90,600,000	90,600,000
Air/Ground Communications Infrastructure	18,788,000	29,200,000	26,200,000
ATC Beacon Interrogator (ATCBI)—Replacement	16,400,000	20,200,000	20,200,000
Air Traffic Control En Route Radar Facilities—Improve	5,000,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
En Route Communications and Control Fac—Improve	1,883,769	.....	.....
Voice Switching and Control System (VSCS)	16,900,000	15,700,000	15,700,000
Integrated Terminal Weather System (ITWS)	20,900,000	13,200,000	13,200,000
Wind Hazard Detection Equipment	.....	.....	1,100,000
FAA Telecommunications Infrastructure	31,175,171	8,500,000	8,500,000
Oceanic Automation System	31,350,000	53,100,000	53,100,000
ATOMS Local Area/Wide Area Network	6,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Corridor Weather Integrated System (CWIS)	.....	2,100,000	2,100,000
San Juan Radar Approach Control	.....	8,000,000	8,000,000
MilOps	.....	1,600,000	1,600,000
Automated Detection and Processing Terminal (ADAPT)	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
ATCSCC Infrastructure Planning	.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
Volcano Monitoring	.....	1,000,000	3,000,000
Terminal Programs:			
Airport Surface Detection Equipment (ASDE—X)	70,600,000	37,900,000	37,900,000
Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR)—Provide	12,500,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Terminal Automation Modernization Phase 1	49,200,000	31,200,000	31,200,000
Terminal Automation Modernization/Replacement Program (TAMR Phase 2)	30,450,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
Terminal Automation Modernization Program	13,800,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities—Replace	124,000,000	150,600,000	166,700,000
ATCT/Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) Facilities—Improve	48,833,563	47,000,000	47,000,000
Terminal Voice Switch Replace/Enhance Terminal Voice	11,300,000	12,300,000	12,300,000
NAS Facilities OSHA and Environmental Standards Compliance	25,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Airport Surveillance Radar (ASR–9)	15,900,000	6,300,000	11,300,000
Terminal Digital Radar (ASR–11)	44,050,000	20,300,000	20,300,000
Multilateration Air Traffic Surveillance	.....	.....	1,000,000
Radar Relocation	.....	.....	1,500,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

	2007 actual	2008 estimate	Committee recommendation
DOD/FAA Facilities Transfer	2,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Precision Runway Monitors	2,600,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Terminal Radar (ASR)—Improve	2,022,848	.....	.....
Terminal Communications—Improve	1,348,887	.....	.....
Runway Status Lights	5,713,854	5,300,000	5,300,000
National Airspace System Voice Switch (NVS)	500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Weather System Processor	1,000,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Voice Recorder Replacement Program	.....	5,900,000	10,500,000
Houston Area Air Traffic System (HAATS)	.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
NAS Infrastructure Management System (NIMS)	5,000,000	.....	.....
Flight Service Programs:			
Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS)	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
FSAS Operational and Supportability Implementation System (OASIS)	8,300,000	.....	.....
Flight Service Station (FSS) Modernization	6,152,002	5,100,000	5,100,000
Landing and Navigational Aids Program:			
VHF Omnidirectional Radio Range (VOR) with Distance Measuring Equipment (DME)	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Instrument Landing System (ILS) Establish/Upgrade	6,005,000	9,000,000	14,950,000
Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS)	122,400,000	115,900,000	115,900,000
Runway Visual Range	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Navigation and Landing Aids—Improve	4,270,933	.....	.....
Approach Lighting System Improvement Pgm (ALSIP)	15,000,000	15,000,000	18,000,000
Distance Measuring Equipment—Sustain	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Visual Navaids—Establish/Expand	2,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Instrument Approach Procedures Automation (IAPA)	9,300,000	17,800,000	17,800,000
Navigation and Landing Aids—SLEP	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
VASI Replacement-Replace with Precision Approach Path Indicator	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Other ATC Facilities Programs:			
Fuel Storage Tank Replacement and Monitoring	5,800,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
FAA Buildings and Equipment	13,257,933	13,700,000	13,700,000
Air Navigational Aids and ATC Facilities (Local Projects)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Aircraft and Related Equipment Program	11,000,000	9,800,000	9,800,000
Computer Aided Engineering and Graphics (CAEG) Modernization	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Airport Cable Loop System—Sustained Support	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Alaska NAS Interfacility Communications System (ANICS)	2,240,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Facilities Decommissioning	500,000	8,000,000	5,400,000
Electrical Power Systems—Sustain/Support	43,593,040	41,000,000	38,000,000
Flight Standards Aircraft	.....	9,000,000	9,000,000
Energy Management and Efficiency Compliance	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, Activity 2	1,449,338,000	1,364,950,000	1,396,600,000
Activity 3, Procurement Modernization of Non-Air Traffic Control Facilities and Equipment:			
Support Programs:			
Hazardous Materials Management	20,000,000	18,200,000	18,200,000
Aviation Safety Analysis System (ASAS)	14,500,000	16,900,000	16,900,000
Logistics Support Systems and Facilities (LSSF)	1,000,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
Test Equipment—Maint Support for Replacement	1,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
NAS Recovery Communications (RCOM)	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Facility Security Risk Management	25,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
Information Security	19,800,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
System Approach for Safety Oversight (SASO)	17,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000
Center for Aviation Safety Research	.....	.....	3,000,000
Aviation Safety Knowledge Management Environment (ASKME)	4,600,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Training, Equipment and Facilities:			
Aeronautical Center Infrastructure Modernization	13,800,000	5,393,000	5,393,000
National Airspace System Training Facilities	14,000,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Distance Learning	1,500,000	1,400,000	1,400,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

	2007 actual	2008 estimate	Committee recommendation
National Airspace System (NAS) Training—Simulator	.....	14,600,000	14,600,000
Total, Activity 3	143,000,000	129,493,000	132,493,000
Activity 4, Facilities and Equipment Mission Support:			
System Engineering and Development Support	30,700,000	30,200,000	30,200,000
Program Support Leases	45,000,000	44,000,000	40,000,000
Logistics Support Services (LSS)	7,900,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center—Leases	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
Transition Engineering Support	27,980,000	10,700,000	10,700,000
Frequency and Spectrum Engineering	4,500,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
Technical Support Services Contract (TSSC)	35,220,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Resource Tracking Program	1,700,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Center for Advanced Aviation System Development	81,000,000	74,200,000	78,200,000
NOTAMS and Aeronautical Information Programs	4,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Permanent Change of Station Moves	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total, Activity 4	251,500,000	217,000,000	217,000,000
Activity 5, Personnel Compensation, Benefits, and Travel: Personnel and Related Expenses	436,117,000	459,973,000	459,973,000
Total, All Activities	2,516,920,000	2,461,566,000	2,516,920,000

ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION

Runway Obstruction Warning System.—The Committee recommends an increase of $2,000,000 for the ATDP budget line to continue development, enhancement, and evaluation of the Runway Obstruction Warning System at the test bed at Gulfport-Biloxi Airport. Requested by Senator Cochran.

Safe Flight 21.—The Committee recommends $17,000,000 for Safe Flight 21. These funds are critical to increasing flight safety and reducing the number of fatal accidents in Alaska and other areas. This program has proved to be invaluable in regards to testing and developing new technologies that benefit the entire National Airspace System, especially in regards to ADS–B and other NextGen initiatives. Requested by Senator Stevens.

Aeronautical Data Link [ADL] Applications.—The Committee has not provided funding for Aeronautical Data Link applications through the Facilities and Equipment account as it appears that these expenditures are more operational in nature. Adequate funding has been provided in the Operations account to cover these costs.

Next Generation VHF Air/Ground Communications [NEXCOM].—The Committee has provided $30,400,000 for the Next Generation VHF Air/Ground Communications System [NEXCOM]. Under NEXCOM, the FAA is modernizing its air-to-ground communications equipment. While providing the full amount requested, the Committee remains disappointed with the program's slow rate of progress. The delays with the FTI program discussed above have had a negative impact on the development of this program, which is essential to any next generation air transportation system. At the end of 2005, the FAA rebaselined NEXCOM and delayed the full implementation of the program by

2 years. This delay was due largely to the fact that the FAA had to reallocate too much of its NEXCOM workforce to reforming the FTI program. As it builds the next generation system of air transportation, the FAA increasingly will be responsible for managing a larger portfolio of sophisticated capital programs. The Committee expects the FAA to manage each of these programs more responsibly than it has to date so that the deployment of the next generation system does not fall further behind.

Louisville International Airport Demonstration Projects.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for demonstration projects at Louisville International Airport. These funds will be used for vital technology demonstrations, such as Surface Management System and Aircraft Surface Moving Map Display capabilities. These technology demonstrations will assist in the transition to the next step of ADS–B implementation, enabling continuous descent approaches during nighttime arrivals. Requested by Senator McConnell.

System-Wide Information Management/Mobile Objects Technology.—The Committee recommends $24,300,000 for the System-Wide Information Management [SWIM] program. The funding level is $3,000,000 more than the budget request, and $300,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The FAA has identified the SWIM program as the foundation for building the next generation air transportation system. Under SWIM, the FAA is developing a networked architecture that will enable all users of the national airspace to share information efficiently.

The value of SWIM lies in its overall architecture rather than in its connectivity to any individual system. Therefore, the Committee directs the FAA to submit a report within 90 days of enactment that provides detailed information on how much of the SWIM budget has and will remain within the program office for the development of its core architecture versus the amount of funding that has and will be distributed to other program offices to establish individual connectivity. This report should also include an explanation of how the FAA will ensure connectivity between SWIM and all of the other systems or programs that need to be connected to it. The Committee requests the FAA to provide greater detail in its fiscal year 2009 budget justification as to how much of the request for the SWIM budget would be utilized by other program offices. Within the amount provided for this program, the Committee directs that the $3,000,000 provided above the budget request be used for an evaluation and a demonstration of the capability of integrating mobile objects technology with the ongoing SWIM program. Requested by Senators Murray and Cantwell.

Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast NAS Wide Implementation.—The Committee is again providing more funding than the level requested for the Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast [ADS–B] program. The funding level provided, $97,354,000, is $11,704,000 more than the budget request and $17,354,000 more than the comparable fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The FAA his identified ADS–B as a "transformational" program for developing the next generation air transportation system. Under the ADS–B program, the FAA is developing satellite-based technology that will allow aircraft to broadcast their precise loca-

tion, identification, and flight plan information to ground facilities as well as to other aircraft.

The Committee is pleased to see that the FAA recognizes the central role that ADS–B technology will play in the development of the next generation air transportation system. However, the Committee remains concerned that the FAA maintains a short-sighted view of the program by focusing its resources on developing ground-to-air capabilities without laying an adequate foundation for implementing air-to-air capabilities. While the ground-to-air technology will improve the safety and efficiency of the national airspace, the "transformational" power of the ADS–B technology will not be fully realized until the air-to-air technology is implemented.

The Committee therefore directs the FAA to use the additional $11,704,000 provided for this program to expedite the development of air-to-air capabilities and bring those capabilities into service. The Committee does not recommend providing this additional $11,704,000 in order to increase the total cost of the program, but rather to bring the air-to-air capabilities to service more expeditiously.

The Committee was pleased with the Administrator's testimony in which she reiterated her intention to require the installation of ADS–B technology across the universe of NAS users. The Committee was initially perplexed by reports that, in seeking vendors for the ADS–B technology, the FAA asked competitors to supply information on how their proposed solution would incentivize and encourage NAS users to equip with ADS–B. This technology will only reach its full potential for safety and efficiency if all users are required to participate. The sooner that participation is required, the sooner the system will achieve the promised safety and efficiency benefits. The Committee looks forward to reviewing the Administrator's proposed rule that will stipulate the agency's proposed installation timetable. That proposed rule, the Administrator testified, will be published in the fall of 2007.

NextGen Integrated Airport.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the NextGen Integrated Airport project, to be located at Daytona Beach International Airport. This project is intended to provide for a national testing site for the technologies to be tested and deployed as part of the Next Generation Air Transportation System [NGATS]. The project is currently sponsored by both Embry Riddle Aeronautical University and some but not all of the potential vendors that might be expected to participate in NGATS. With the contribution of taxpayer funds toward this initiative, the Committee expects the FAA to ensure that measures are in place to guarantee that all potential vendors have the opportunity to benefit fully from this facility. Requested by Senator Bill Nelson.

PROCUREMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

En Route Automation Modernization.—The Committee recommends $368,750,000 for the En Route Automation Modernization [ERAM] program. The funding level is equal to the budget request, and $7,803,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

According to the capital investment plan of the FAA, fiscal year 2008 will be the peak year of funding for this program. The Committee expects to see lower budget requests for ERAM in future years.

Under the ERAM program, the FAA is replacing the computer network for the air traffic control facilities that manage high-altitude traffic. Modernizing this network is critical to allowing FAA to continue managing air traffic effectively. It is also an essential component of moving the FAA into the next generation of air traffic control. The Committee commends the FAA for, thus far, succeeding in managing this large and complicated program within its budget and schedule. A large part of the success of this program is due to the willingness of the FAA to follow sound management practices such as delineating all of the program requirements before signing a contract with an outside vendor. The FAA has not used these management practices as frequently or effectively on other agency procurements.

The Committee understands that the most complicated work under the ERAM program must be completed over the next couple of years. Because ERAM is expected to serve as a foundation for many other next generation automation programs, any increase in the cost of ERAM or slip in its schedule could have a direct impact on the overall pace of developing the next generation system. The Committee urges the FAA to continue following sound management practices in order to ensure the success of this important program.

Air/Ground Communications Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $26,200,000 for Air/Ground Communications Infrastructure. The amount provided is $3,000,000 less than the budget request. The Committee expects the FAA to accommodate this funding level by slowing slightly the Communications Facilities Expansion [CFE] program. The FAA anticipates that its most critical communications projects can be accomplished within the $6,000,000 provided for CFE for fiscal year 2008.

Wind Hazard Detection Equipment, Nevada.—The Committee recommends $1,100,000 for the purchase of Wind Tracer Wind Hazard Detection equipment, the transportation of this equipment from Colorado to Nevada, the installation of the equipment at McCarran International Airport, and the training of FAA staff on the equipment's use and maintenance. Wind Tracer is laser-driven equipment that measures winds, wind hazards, and turbulence in airport terminal areas in dry and clear air. The equipment allows detection and alerting of events such as dry micro-bursts, wind shears, and gust fronts. Requested by Senator Reid.

Stand Alone Weather Sensors.—The Committee notes that the budget does not request funding for the Stand Alone Weather Sensors program. The Committee is concerned that significant taxpayer funds have been spent on this program only to have the FAA warehouse important weather monitoring stations for class C airports nationwide. The Committee directs the FAA Administrator to submit a report by March 15, 2008, to the Committee detailing the number of SAWS systems purchased and deployed, improvements in flight safety at deployed airports, safety impacts at class C airports yet to receive SAWS systems, accounting of current class C airports, and the FAA's plan to proceed with the original intent of

SAWS deployment at all class C airports. Requested by Senator Murray.

FAA Telecommunications Infrastructure.—The Committee recommends $8,500,000 for the FAA Telecommunications Infrastructure [FTI] program. The funding level is equal to the budget request, and $22,675,171 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The FTI program encompasses the replacement and modernization of the telecommunications infrastructure at FAA facilities. The FTI program was designed to bring about operational savings for the FAA by quickly moving the agency to a more efficient and less expensive array of communications equipment. The Committee expects that it will see the final investment of funds for the FTI program in the fiscal year 2009 budget request.

The FTI program is on the Administrator's list of major capital projects that is "on-time" and "on-budget." Yet, just last year the FTI program had to be rebaselined because it had fallen behind schedule and exceeded its expected costs. The FAA extended its schedule by 1 full year, and the costs of the program have grown by more than $113,000,000. The program delays have forced the FAA to divert about $65,000,000 in unbudgeted operating costs to maintaining antiquated phones lines for an additional year because the new system is still not fully operational. This $65,000,000 could have been spent on higher priority concerns including boosting the safety staff of the FAA. Since the justification for the entire FTI program rests on moving quickly from one telecommunications system to the next, it is of utmost importance that FAA not have to rebaseline this program again.

Senior management at the FAA have taken responsibility for some of the troubles with the FTI program by admitting that they did not give clear direction to FAA field personnel as to the importance of quickly making the transition to the new infrastructure. The Committee respects such candor, but remains concerned about the capability of the FAA to manage its capital programs efficiently. In order to meet the current schedule for FTI, management at the FAA needs to ensure the rapid transition of a large backlog of services and guarantee the reliability of the new communications service.

Volcano Monitoring.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the Volcano Monitoring program, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request. The Alaska Volcano Monitoring/Observatory program provides vital volcanic hazard monitoring equipment to monitor ash plumes and volcanic activity throughout Alaska. With adequate monitoring technologies in place, flights can be diverted away from problem areas and disruptions and fatalities can be avoided. Requested by Senator Stevens.

Airport Surface Detection Equipment—Model X.—The Committee recommends $37,900,000 for the Airport Surface Detection Equipment—Model X [ASDE–X] program. This funding level is equal to the budget request, and $32,700,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Runway incursions continue to be one of the most critical safety concerns of the aviation industry. The most deadly aviation accident in the world was a runway incursion that killed 583 people as two passenger jumbo jets collided on a Canary Islands airport

in March 1977. The National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB] has continued to call for the FAA to address runway incursions on its "Most Wanted" list ever since the Board began its list in 1990. Under the ASDE–X program, the FAA is developing equipment that is designed to prevent runway incursions by providing air traffic controllers with more accurate and detailed information about the current situation on airport surfaces. This program represents the FAA's primary response to the NTSB. The Board, however, still characterizes the response of the agency as "open" and "unacceptable," and the Committee is disappointed in how the FAA has managed the ASDE–X program.

Although it is on the list of on-time and on-budget programs, the FAA rebaselined the program in September 2005. At the time of the rebaselining, the FAA added 53 months to the program schedule and $44,900,000 to its budget. The rebaselining, however, was even more significant in terms of how it restructured the goals of the entire program. The FAA decided that the agency could put the ASDE–X equipment to better use by installing it at large and medium airports rather than at small airports. Through the rebaselining process, the FAA dropped its target of installing ASDE–3 and ASDE–X technology at 59 large, medium and small airports, and the agency replaced it with a new target of installing ASDE–X at 35 large and medium airports. Fifteen airports are not receiving any equipment following this rebaselining. The ASDE–X program illustrates the misleading nature of reporting on rebaselined programs as though they were simply on-time and on-budget. ASDE–X not only has a new schedule and budget, but it is serving a completely different purpose. In short, ASDE–X is no longer the same program.

The Inspector General for the Department of Transportation testified before the Committee on May 10, saying that since the rebaselining in 2005, the ASDE–X program continues to fall behind schedule and experience cost increases. The Inspector General noted, ". . . the cost to acquire and install some ASDE–X activities has increased by $94,000,000 since the 2005 re-baseline. To stay within the revised baseline, FAA offset this cost by decreasing planned expenditures funds [sic] for seven other program activities, such as construction for later deployment sites." The Inspector General also explained that the FAA is not meeting its deadlines for installing ASDE–X equipment. The Committee no longer believes that the ASDE–X schedule or budget is realistic, and the Committee is concerned that the FAA continues to redefine the ASDE–X program in order to maintain the illusion that its schedule and budget are still relevant.

The ASDE–X program is also an example where the agency has developed poor measures of program success. The FAA says that the program is on track to complete its last deployment by February 2011. However, the intermediate benchmarks that the FAA has developed to measure the progress of the program relate only to the delivery of ASDE–X equipment at each airport site. These benchmarks do not relate to the actual operation of ASDE–X equipment at those airports. The Committee notes that, to date, the FAA has needed an average of 11 months between the delivery of the ASDE–X equipment and its full operation. As mentioned earlier in

this report, new expensive pieces of equipment are of no use to the public unless they are fully operational. The Committee directs the FAA to develop deadlines for the initial operating capability and the operational readiness date for each of the remaining ASDE–X sites, and submit this information to the Committee. In addition, the FAA is directed to report to the Committee when the agency makes any substantial change to its schedule or budget for the ASDE–X program.

As the program continues to experience trouble with its schedule and budget, the Committee is discouraged by the FAA's slow progress in achieving the goals of the program. The ASDE–X equipment functions poorly in rainy and inclement weather, the precise conditions under which air traffic controllers need assistance in order to prevent runway incursions. The ASDE–X equipment also does not yet provide any assistance to air traffic controllers for situations in which runways intersect or taxiways converge. These situations are common at airports, and were part of the original definition of the ASDE–X program. The Committee is concerned that the ASDE–X program will deliver less than promised even while it takes longer and costs more to complete.

The performance of the ASDE–X equipment in rainy weather is of particular concern as the Committee hears numerous reports of significant trouble with this aspect of the program at the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport (SeaTac). Difficulties at SeaTac have led air traffic controllers to send a ground vehicle to the end of runway during foggy conditions in order to confirm that a false reading from ASDE–X was not, in fact, an aircraft. Controllers have been required to fill out hundreds of forms documenting such false alarms, and eventually the controllers lost confidence in its value, especially in rainy conditions. The Committee will continue to follow the development of ASDE–X at the Seattle airport, and urges the FAA to take all necessary steps to make the equipment an effective tool for the airport's air traffic controllers as soon as possible.

The Committee is further discouraged by the failure of the FAA to take a disciplined approach to contracting with outside vendors on the ASDE–X program. The FAA entered into a cost-plus contract for most of the ASDE–X program, even while the program requirements were not well defined. In fact, the agency entered into fixed-price contract elements only for 41 percent of the program, mostly involving the procurement of the ASDE–X equipment. The FAA must manage the ASDE–X program more effectively than it has to date if this technology is going to serve its purpose and reduce the likelihood of runway incursions.

Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities Replacement.—The Committee recommendation includes $166,700,000 for new and replacement air traffic control tower [ATCT] and ATCT/TRACON consolidation projects, an increase of $16,100,000 from the budget request.

Location	Amount	Requested by
Collin County Regional Airport at McKinney, TX—Tower Replacement	+$1,500,000	Hutchison/Cornyn
Palm Springs Airport, CA—Tower Construction	+1,500,000	Boxer
Barnstable Municipal Airport, MA—Tower Construction	+4,000,000	Kennedy/Kerry
Nantucket Memorial Airport, MA—Tower Replacement	+4,000,000	Kennedy/Kerry
Greenwood Airport, MS—Tower Construction	+1,500,000	Lott/Cochran

Location	Amount	Requested by
Gulfport-Biloxi International Airport, MS—Tower Replacement	+3,600,000	Cochran

Kona, HI Tower Replacement Project.—The Committee remains concerned with the FAA's progress in replacing the aging air traffic control tower at Kona International Airport at Keahole, Hawaii. The Committee first appropriated funds for the replacement of this wooden structure in fiscal year 2005. Yet the FAA is only now beginning work to develop a site for the new facility. The Committee understands that the FAA will be ready to contract for the full construction of this project in 2009 and expects the FAA to request in its 2009 budget all the funds necessary to award this contract as expeditiously as possible. The Committee will not entertain any further requests by the Administrator to reprogram funds already appropriated for this project to other tower sites.

Chicago O'Hare Modernization Program.—The Committee directs the FAA to negotiate a construction-leaseback agreement with the O'Hare Modernization Program [OMP]. This agreement should represent an agreement between the OMP and the FAA for the reimbursement of funds to the OMP for costs related to the design and construction of the new airport traffic control tower [ATCT] at Chicago O'Hare International Airport. This can be accommodated through a construction-leaseback program similar to the agreement in place between the FAA and Washington Dulles International Airport. Requested by Senator Durbin.

Airport Surveillance Radar [ASR–9].—The Committee has provided $11,300,000 for the Airport Surveillance Radar—Model 9 [ASR–9] program. The amount provided is $5,000,000 more than the budget request. The Committee's monitoring of the needs of the O'Hare Modernization Project [OMP] indicate that this additional funding will be needed to site and install an additional ASR–9 at O'Hare to address the capacity demands that will be created by the project.

Multilateration Air Traffic Surveillance, Provo, Utah.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for preliminary site analysis, survey, and construction of a Multilateration Air Traffic Surveillance System to meet the unique radar coverage needs of the region around Provo Municipal Airport, Utah. The Committee has been concerned for several years regarding the level of radar coverage being provided for the mountainous areas around Provo, Utah, and is encouraged by the idea of using multilateration technologies to provide a safe, cost effective solution to Provo's needs. The Committee directs the FAA to work toward developing a solution that addresses the unique topographical challenges presented in and around Provo Municipal. Requested by Senators Bennett and Hatch.

Radar Relocation, Bismarck Municipal Airport, North Dakota.—The Committee recommends $1,500,000 for the relocation of an ASR–8 radar at Bismarck Municipal Airport, North Dakota. Requested by Senators Dorgan and Conrad.

Terminal Radar, Santa Fe, New Mexico.—The Committee is aware of the desire for a terminal radar to serve the region of Santa Fe, New Mexico. The Committee encourages the FAA to

work with Santa Fe and the State of New Mexico to improve radar coverage for the area. Requested by Senator Bingaman.

Voice Recorder Replacement Program [VRRP].—The Committee has provided $10,500,000 for the Voice Recorder Replacement Program. The amount provided is $4,600,000 more than the budget request. The Committee is concerned by indications that this important program may not be progressing at a rate to enable all installations to be completed on schedule. As such, the Committee has added this additional funding to accelerate the installation of this equipment beyond the current rate.

Flight Service Stations Modernization.—The Committee recommends $5,100,000 for Flight Service Stations [FSS] Modernization. The funding level is the same as the budget request, and $1,052,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. Under FSS Modernization, the FAA has transitioned the operation of most of its flight service stations to a private vendor. This program also included the upgrade and consolidation of many of these facilities.

The Committee is disappointed to hear reports of poor service levels in those flight service stations that were transitioned to a private vendor and consolidated. The most significant problems have included system outages, unanswered and dropped phone calls, excessive hold times, and poor quality briefings. Furthermore, many pilots complain that employees at the service stations are unable to provide weather information, file a flight plan, or supply critical notices to airmen. These problems threaten the safety of the general aviation community. Although these services have been contracted out to a private vendor, the Committee hold the FAA accountable to its promise of improved service. The Committee expects the FAA to take responsibility for this program and to resolve these issues quickly.

The Committee is also concerned about an issue raised by the FAA's management of its fiscal year 2007 resources. The FAA has had more flexibility in allocating its funds for fiscal year 2007 than it has had in previous fiscal years. FAA used this flexibility to spend $8,085,106 in additional funds on FSS-related needs that the agency never disclosed to the Committee before reallocating for the needs of this program. Of this total addition to FSS-related funding, only $152,002 shows up under the FSS line item. The rest of the funding increase is masked in lines for FAA buildings and equipment, transition engineering and support, technical support services contract, and under the FTA Telecommunications Infrastructure program.

The funds reallocated for FSS-related needs will cover the cost of repairing facilities, as well as moving, modifying, and installing equipment. The FAA anticipated all of these needs since the beginning of the program, and yet did not estimate any of their costs in the original budget for the FSS program. Although the FAA could not know in advance the exact number of consolidations that would occur under FSS, the design of the program rested on the agency achieving a minimum number of consolidations. The Committee is frustrated with the FAA's failure to disclose the true costs of the FSS program, and refusal to make a good faith effort at estimating all of its needs. The Committee expects that in the future the FAA

will avoid obscuring costs in this manner for the FSS program or for any other capital program in its budget.

The Committee has funded the budget request for FSS modernization for fiscal year 2008. Consistent with the budget request, these funds will be used solely to modernize stations in Alaska. Such stations were prohibited by law from being included in the FAA's privatization of this activity.

Instrument Landing System [ILS] Establishment.—The Committee recommends $14,950,000 for establishment of instrument landing systems. Adjustments to the budget request are as follows:

Location	Amount	Requested by
Alliance Municipal Airport, NE	+$700,000	Nelson, Ben
Council Bluffs Municipal Airport, IA	+2,450,000	Harkin/Grassley
Aiken Municipal Airport, SC	+1,300,000	Graham
Piedmont Triad International Airport, NC	+1,500,000	Burr

Approach Lighting System Improvement Program [ALSIP].—The Committee recommends $18,000,000 for the procurement and installation of frangible approach lighting equipment including high intensity approach lighting system with sequenced flashing lights [ALSF–2] and medium intensity approach lighting system [MALSR]. The amount provided is $3,000,000 more than the budget request. These additional resources shall be used to continue the program of providing lighting systems at rural airfields throughout Alaska. Requested by Senator Stevens.

Alaskan NAS Interfacility Communications System [ANICS].—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Alaskan NAS Interfacility Communications System [ANICS]. The ANICS program plays a major role in increased flight safety in Alaska through providing updates and technical refreshes of old communications equipment to ensure that communication systems are reliable. Requested by Senator Stevens.

Facilities Decommissioning—NDB.—The Committee recommends $5,400,000 for the Facilities Decommissioning program, a decrease of $2,600,000 from the administration's request. The Committee believes that the most cost beneficial sites can be accomplished within the funds provided.

Electrical Power System—Sustain and Support.—The Committee recommends $38,000,000 for the Electrical Power Systems program, a decrease of $3,000,000 from the administration's request. The Committee expects the FAA to reorder projects within this program so that those projects with the strongest cost-benefit ratios can be executed in fiscal year 2008. This reduction is not expected to have any impact on National Airspace System [NAS] operations.

Center for Aviation Safety Research.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the Center for Aviation Safety Research, Missouri, to focus on issues such as safety management systems, safety culture, maintenance resource management and crew management for commercial, corporate and private aviation. Requested by Senator Bond.

Program Support Leases.—The Committee recommends $40,000,000 for program support leases. The amount provided is $4,000,000 less than the administration's request. The Committee is encouraged by FAA's ability to reduce lease costs for Air Traffic

Control equipment. The funds provided are adequate to meet all of FAA's program support leases through fiscal year 2008.

Center for Advanced Aviation System Development [CAASD].—The Committee has provided additional funding beyond the President's budget request for a number of programs that are central to the deployment of the Next Generation Air Traffic Control System [NGATS]. These initiatives include additional funding for ADS–B, the SWIM program and the NextGen integrated airport initiative. The Committee is also providing a total of $78,200,000 to provide for additional positions at the Center for Advanced Aviation System Development to provide the Administrator with the technical expertise necessary to ensure the rapid deployment of NextGen technologies.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2007	$130,234,000
Budget estimate, 2008	140,000,000
Committee recommendation	148,800,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Research, Engineering and Development [RE&D] appropriation provides funding for long-term research, engineering and development programs to improve the air traffic control system by increasing its safety and capacity, as well as reducing the environmental impacts of air traffic, as authorized by the Airport and Airway Improvement Act and the Federal Aviation Act, as amended. The programs are designed to meet the expected air traffic demands of the future and to promote flight safety through improvements in facilities, equipment, techniques, and procedures in order to ensure that the system will safely and efficiently handle future volumes of aircraft traffic.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $148,800,000 for the FAA's research, engineering, and development activities. The recommended level of funding is $8,800,000 more than the budget request and $18,566,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

A table showing the fiscal year 2007 enacted level, the fiscal year 2008 budget estimate, and the Committee recommendation follows:

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
Improve Aviation Safety:			
Fire Research and Safety	$6,638,000	$7,350,000	$7,350,000
Propulsion and Fuel System	4,048,000	4,086,000	4,086,000
Advance Material/Structural Safety	2,843,000	2,713,000	7,713,000
Atmospheric Hazards/Digital System Safety	3,848,000	3,574,000	3,574,000
Aging Aircraft	18,621,000	14,931,000	16,431,000
Aircraft Catastrophic Failure Prevention Research	1,512,000	2,202,000	2,202,000
System Integration Human Factors	7,999,000	9,651,000	9,151,000
Analysis	5,292,000	9,517,000	9,517,000
Air Traffic Control/Technical Operations Human Factors	9,654,000	10,254,000	10,054,000

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT—Continued

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
Aeromedical Research	7,032,000	6,780,000	7,780,000
Weather Program	19,545,000	16,888,000	16,888,000
Unmanned Aircraft System	1,200,000	3,310,000	2,810,000
Improve Efficency:			
Joint Program and Development Office	18,100,000	14,321,000	14,321,000
Wake Turbulence	3,066,000	10,755,000	13,755,000
GPSCivil Requirements	.....	3,600,000	3,100,000
Reduce Environmental Impacts: Environmental and Energy	16,018,000	15,469,000	15,469,000
Mission Support:			
System Planning and Resource Management	1,388,000	1,184,000	1,184,000
William J. Hughes Technical Center Laboratory Facility	3,430,000	3,415,000	3,415,000
RE&D Total	130,234,000	140,000,000	148,800,000

IMPROVE AVIATION SAFETY

Advance Material/Structural Safety

The Committee recommends $7,713,000 for advanced material/structural safety, an increase of $5,000,000 more than the budget request and $4,870,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Advance Materials in Transport Aircraft Structures [AMTAS].—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 to support and improve ongoing composite and advanced material research at the Advance Materials in Transport Aircraft Structures Center in Seattle, Washington. Requested by Senator Murray.

Advanced Materials and Manufacturing Innovation Center [AMMIC].—The Committee recommends $750,000 to support continued integrated research, training and technology innovations in advanced manufacturing and materials science at the AMMIC center in Edmonds, Washington. Requested by Senator Murray.

Jet Engine Technology [JET] Inspection, Iowa.—The Committee recommends $750,000 for the development of advanced inspection techniques of jet engine components and materials. The jet engine technology [JET] inspection program will ensure that the use of a new materials and design approaches aimed at improving fuel efficiency still maintains an adequate margin of safety. Requested by Senators Harkin and Grassley.

Support of Aircraft Fleet Evaluation Research [SAFER], Iowa.—The Committee recommends $500,000 to advance the development of inspection technologies aimed at supporting the continued airworthiness of the commercial airline fleet. The majority of inspection research supported by the FAA has addressed issues associated with aging aircraft. However, as older aircraft are replaced by a new generation of aircraft designed for greater fuel efficiency, it will be increasingly important to inspect new designs and innovative materials systems for their airworthiness. Requested by Senators Harkin and Grassley.

National Institute for Aviation Research.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the National Institute for Aviation Research at Wichita State University, Kansas, to upgrade equipment

and facilities for the Institute's Advanced Materials Research program. Requested by Senator Brownback.

Aging Aircraft

The Committee recommends $16,431,000 for aging aircraft, an increase of $1,000,000 more than the budget request and $2,190,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Research on Small Aircraft, Kansas.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for research at the National Institute for Aviation Research, Wichita State University, to research the effects of aging on small aircraft. Requested by Senators Brownback and Roberts.

Airframe Maintenance Technology AAS Degree Program, Delaware.—The Committee recommends $500,000 to implement at the Delaware Technical and Community College an FAA-approved Airframe Maintenance Technology AAS Degree program. The recommended funding will provide the start-up equipment and tooling necessary for outfitting the classrooms and labs before the program is able to accept students. Requested by Senator Carper.

Aeromedical Research

The Committee recommends $7,780,000 for aeromedical research, an increase of $1,000,000 more than the budget request and $748,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee continues to be concerned about the issue of flight attendant fatigue, and whether current regulations provide adequate rest time for flight attendants. Pursuant to the Committee's request in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2005, the FAA submitted a report in July 2006 on the impact of the minimum rest requirements of FAR 121.467 and FAR 135.273. The study was limited in nature; however, the report stated that flight attendants are "experiencing fatigue and tiredness and as such, (fatigue) is a salient issue warranting further evaluation." In order to gain a fuller understanding of the impact of fatigue on flight attendants, the Committee directs FAA to utilize $1,000,000 of its appropriation for CAMI to carry out its recommendations for further study of this problem. The Committee directs CAMI to submit a report to Congress not later than December 31, 2009, and expects the report to include analysis in the six areas that CAMI identified in its report of July 2006; a survey of field operations, a focused study of incident reports, field research on the effects of fatigue, a validation of models for assessing flight attendant fatigue, international policies and practices, and the potential benefits of training.

IMPROVE EFFICIENCY

Wake Turbulence

The Committee recommends $13,755,000 for wake turbulence, an increase of $3,000,000 more than the budget request and $10,689,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee is providing the increase of $3,000,000 to the budget request for Spiroid Winglet Fuel Efficiency Research. The spiroid research project will explore next generation winglet designs and tech-

nologies to enhance wing lift and stability, and to generate increased aircraft fuel efficiency. Requested by Senator Murray.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Limitation, 2007	$4,399,000,000	$3,514,500,000
Budget estimate, 2008	4,300,000,000	2,750,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,399,000,000	3,514,500,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Funding for grants-in-aid to airports pays for capital improvements at the Nation's airports, including those investments that emphasize capacity development, safety improvements, and security needs. Other priority areas for funding under this program include improvements to runway safety areas that do not conform to FAA standards, investments that are designed to reduce runway incursions, and aircraft noise compatibility planning and programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $3,514,500,000 for grants-in-aid to airports for fiscal year 2008, which is $764,500,000 more than the budget estimate and equal to the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee recommendation is sufficient to continue the important tasks of enhancing airport and airway safety, ensuring that airport standards continue to be met, maintaining existing airport capacity, and developing additional capacity.

In addition, the Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $4,399,000,000 for grants-in-aid to airports. The recommended level is $99,000,000 above the budget estimate and equal to the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. This appropriation is sufficient to cover the liquidation of all obligations incurred pursuant to the limitation on obligations set forward in the bill.

Airport Discretionary Grants.—Of the funds covered by the obligation limitation in this bill, the Committee directs FAA to provide funding, out of available resources, for those projects listed in the table below in the corresponding amounts. The Committee agrees that State apportionment funds may be construed as discretionary funds for the purposes of implementing this provision. To the maximum extent possible, the Administrator should work to ensure that airport sponsors for these projects first use available entitlement funds to finance the projects. However, the FAA should not require sponsors to apply carryover entitlement to discretionary projects funded in the coming year, but only those entitlements applicable to the fiscal year 2008 obligation limitation. The Committee further directs that the specific funding allocated in the table below shall not diminish or prejudice the application of a spe-

cific airport or geographic region to receive other AIP discretionary grants or multi-year letters of intent.

State	Airport Name	Project Description	Amount	Requested by
AK	Akutan	Construction of an airport	$3,500,000	Stevens
AL	Franklin Field	Land acquisition, design and construction, relocation and extension of the existing runway and renovation of airport facility.	2,250,000	Shelby
AR	Northwest Arkansas Regional	Construct second landing surface	4,000,000	Lincoln/Pryor
AR	Texarkana Regional—Webb Field	Construct new Aircraft Firefighting and Rescue Station.	1,000,000	Lincoln/Pryor
AZ	Phoenix Sky Harbor International	Taxiway/ramp airfield improvements	750,000	Kyl
CO	Denver International	Concrete repairs to three runways	3,000,000	Salazar
ID	Boise	Planning, design, and construction to widen and lengthen Runway 9/27.	1,250,000	Craig/Crapo
IL	Lake in the Hills	Relocation of parallel taxiway	1,000,000	Durbin
IL	Lewis University	Extension of runway and taxiway	1,000,000	Durbin/ Obama
IL	Waukegan Regional	Runway extension, land acquisition and environmental study.	1,000,000	Durbin
IN	Fort Wayne International	Install guidance signs	250,000	Bayh/Lugar
KS	Manhattan Regional	Runway safety area improvements	2,000,000	Brownback
KY	Louisville International	Widen runway 17R–35L to accommodate Group VI aircraft.	3,250,000	McConnell
LA	Alexandria International	Runway extension and upgrades	1,000,000	Vitter/ Landrieu
MI	Capital City	Relocation of DeWitt Road and purchase of land for runway extension.	5,000,000	Stabenow/ Levin
MI	MBS International	New terminal building	2,000,000	Stabenow/ Levin
MN	St. Cloud	Land acquisition	1,500,000	Coleman/ Klobuchar
MO	Columbia Regional	Widen and extend runway 13–31	2,700,000	Bond
MO	Eldon Model Airpark	Construct runway 18/36—Phase I	420,000	Bond
MO	Max B. Swisher Skyhave	Update and expand runway and terminal.	1,380,000	Bond
MS	Gulfport-Biloxi	Taxiway construction and rehabilitation, noise mitigation.	2,100,000	Cochran/Lott
MS	Jackson-Evers International	Rehabilitation and extension of taxiways and runways.	2,100,000	Cochran
MS	John Bell Williams	Runway extension and taxiway	2,000,000	Lott
MS	Tunica	Runway and parallel taxi extension and paving.	1,300,000	Cochran
NC	Statesville Regional	Improve and extend runways, ramp areas, and taxiways.	1,000,000	Dole/Burr
ND	Grand Forks International	Construction of a runway	2,000,000	Conrad/Dorgan
NE	Airport Authority of the County of Scotts Bluff.	Maintenance of Airport runways and taxiways, safety factors.	1,000,000	Nelson, Ben
NM	Albuquerque International Sunport	Construction of aircraft parking ramp	2,000,000	Domenici/ Bingaman
NV	Carson City	Replace pavement and realignment of the single runway.	3,000,000	Reid
NY	Niagara Falls International	Construct new terminal apron	2,500,000	Schumer/ Clinton
OR	McNary Field	Expand runway capacity	1,500,000	Wyden/Smith
OR	Roberts Field, Redmond Municipal	Expand the terminal	3,750,000	Wyden/Smith
PA	Erie International	Extend Runway 06–24	1,500,000	Specter
TN	Upper Cumberland Regional	Complete runway and taxiway extensions.	1,000,000	Alexander
TX	San Marcos Municipal	Terminal and t-hangar construction	2,250,000	Hutchison
VT	Rutland State Airport	Installation of MALSR lighting and an instrument landing system.	2,000,000	Leahy
VT	Vermont Statewide	Various improvements	1,500,000	Sanders

State	Airport Name	Project Description	Amount	Requested by
WI	Chippewa Valley Regional	Redesign terminal; improve terminal; and airside and landside improvements.	3,250,000	Kohl
WV	West Virginia Statewide	Various improvements	6,000,000	Byrd

Administrative Expenses.—The Committee recommends $80,676,000 to cover administrative expenses. This funding level is $170 less than the budget estimate, and $5,705,170 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Airport Cooperative Research.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for the airport cooperative research program. This funding level is equal to the budget estimate, and equal to fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Airport Technology.—The Committee recommends $18,712,000 for airport technology research. This funding level is $74 less than the budget request, and $842,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

Small Community Air Service Development.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 to administer to the Small Community Air Service Development Program. This funding level is equal to fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The budget estimate did not include funding for this program.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Rescission, 2007	$621,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	185,500,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a rescission of contract authorization of $185,500,000 of unobligated balances of contract authority.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Section 110 limits the number of technical staff years at the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development to no more than 375 in fiscal year 2007.

Section 111 prohibits funds in this act to be used to adopt guidelines or regulations requiring airport sponsors to provide the FAA "without cost" buildings, maintenance, or space for FAA services. The prohibition does not apply to negotiations between the FAA and airport sponsors concerning "below market" rates for such services or to grant assurances that require airport sponsors to provide land without cost to the FAA for air traffic control facilities.

Section 112 permits the Administrator to reimburse FAA appropriations for amounts made available for 49 U.S.C. 41742(a)(1) as fees are collected and credited under 49 U.S.C. 45303.

Section 113 allows funds received to reimburse the FAA for providing technical assistance to foreign aviation authorities to be credited to the Operations account.

Section 114 extends the terms and conditions of the aviation insurance program, commonly known as "war risk insurance," and the limitation on air carrier liability for third party claims arising out of acts of terrorism.

Section 115 includes legislative provisions pertaining to the retirement age of commercial pilots.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The principal mission of the Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] is, in partnership with State and local governments, to foster the development of a safe, efficient, and effective highway and intermodal system nationwide including access to and within national forests, national parks, indian lands and other public lands.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Under the Committee recommendations, a total program level of $40,256,051,359 would be provided for the activities of the Federal Highway Administration in fiscal year 2007. The recommendation is $670,975,955 more than the budget request, and $275,970,324 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations (excluding rescissions):

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
Federal-aid highway program obligation limitation	$39,086,464,683	$39,585,075,404	$40,216,051,359
Pay raise (section 11 of Public Law 110–5)	2,794,352		
Emergency relief program (Public Law 110–28)	871,022,000		
Appalachian development highway system	19,800,000		20,000,000
Delta regional transportation development			20,000,000
Total	39,980,081,035	39,585,075,404	40,256,051,359

The Committee is acutely concerned that the current balances and projected receipts to the Highway Trust Fund are not sufficient to continue funding the levels authorized for the Federal-aid highway program or the important highway and motor carrier safety programs through fiscal year 2009. The chart below displays projections by the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget of balances to the Highway Trust Fund if the authorized levels are provided for the pertinent highway and safety programs.



In testimony before the Committee on February 8, the Secretary acknowledged that "The highway funding problem is not going to go away, nor can we put it off until the last minute. So as we go through this budget process, I hope to start working with Congress now on solutions for long-term funding." The Committee concurs in the Secretary's observation even though it hasn't heard any concrete ideas or solutions offered by the Secretary since her statement. This problem must be addressed urgently so that the Committee can adequately fund the Nation's highway infrastructure needs in fiscal year 2009. Absent adequate revenues to replenish the trust fund, the Congress could be required to dramatically and precipitously cut highway investments nationwide simply to keep the trust fund solvent. For that reason, the Committee was pleased to receive the written assurances from the bipartisan leadership of the Senate Finance Committee, stating that they are "dedicated to finding the necessary revenues to keep the Highway Trust Fund whole for the life of the current authorization." The urgency of addressing this problem in the near term cannot be overstated.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$360,991,620
Budget estimate, 2008	384,556,000
Committee recommendation	377,556,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This limitation on obligations provides for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Highway Administration for program management, direction, and coordination; engineering guidance to Federal and State agencies; and advisory and support services in field offices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $377,556,000 for administrative expenses of the agency. This limitation is $7,000,000 less than the budget request and $16,564,380 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Of the total obligation limitation requested by the FHWA for administrative expenses, the agency has asked for just over $15,000,000 in order to fill 210 vacant positions. These vacancies are primarily for engineers, planners, financial managers, and other specialists. Of the total number of vacancies, 106 are located at FHWA headquarters.

The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the agency to fill its most critical vacancies. The Committee also directs the FHWA to submit within 90 days a detailed staffing plan, which includes target staffing levels at both headquarters offices and in the field, the location and job title of each vacancy, and an explanation for how the specified increases to the agency staffing level would improve the operations of the FHWA. The staffing plan should detail actions that the FHWA intends to take during fiscal year 2008, as well as further needs that the agency hopes to address through the fiscal year 2009 budget process.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Limitation, 2007	$39,086,464,683
Budget estimate, 2008	39,585,075,404
Committee recommendation	40,216,051,359

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal-aid highways program provides financial support to States and localities for development, construction, and repair of highways and bridges through grants. The program is financed from the Highway Trust Fund and most of the funds are distributed through apportionments and allocations to States. Title 23 of the United States Code and other supporting legislation provide authority for the various activities of the FHWA. Funding is provided by contract authority, with program levels established by annual limitations on obligations set in appropriations acts.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends limiting fiscal year 2008 Federal-aid highways obligations to $40,216,051,359, which is $630,975,955 more than the budget request, and $1,129,586,676 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Within the overall limitation on fiscal year 2008 Federal-aid highway obligations, the Committee recommends limiting fiscal year 2008 obligations on transportation research to $429,800,000. The recommendation is equal to the budget request, and it is consistent with the authorized level. This specific limitation controls spending for the transportation research and technology programs of the FHWA, and it includes the intelligent transportation sys-

tems; surface transportation research; technology deployment, training and education; university transportation research; and the Bureau of Transportation Statistics.

The Committee also recommends funding the Congestion Initiative at the Department of Transportation at a level of $135,775,955. The Congestion Initiative includes several discreet elements that are designed to mitigate the impact of traffic congestion in metropolitan areas and along significant transportation corridors. The largest element of the initiative is the creation of urban partnerships between the Department of Transportation and metropolitan areas that promise to implement a comprehensive plan involving congestion pricing, transit services, telecommuting and flexible work schedules, and the use of innovative technology. Other important elements of the initiative include work to facilitate multi-state transportation corridors ("Corridors of the Future"), the focus of technical support on severe bottlenecks to freight transportation, and the innovative use of technology to mitigate traffic congestion.

The Committee commends the Department for taking an active role in addressing the important issue in congestion. The Committee also acknowledges the personal involvement and level of effort that the Secretary has taken in the development of this initiative.

The Committee cannot fund this initiative in the manner proposed by the President—namely, by redirecting resources that have already been dedicated to other priority transportation projects, as requested by the Department. The Congressional Budget Office has disqualified this option as a legitimate budget-neutral offset for this initiative. In addition, the Committee does not support cancelling other projects in order to fund this initiative. Rather, the Committee has funded this initiative by redirecting resources not yet apportioned under the Revenue Alligned Budget Authority [RABA] program.

Consistent with the Secretary's initiative, the bill includes a provision requested in the budget that allows the FHWA to collect and spend fees in order to pay for the services of expert firms in the field of municipal and project finance to assist the agency in the provision of TIFIA credit instruments.

The following table displays the amount of obligation limitation that was distributed to each State in fiscal year 2007, that would be distributed to each State under the FHWA budget request, and that would be distributed to each State under the funding level recommended by the Committee:

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION TO THE STATES

State	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
ALABAMA	$616,549,671	$654,741,253	$654,741,253
ALASKA	268,984,812	297,610,036	297,610,036
ARIZONA	608,319,903	608,413,742	608,413,742
ARKANSAS	383,105,107	415,595,114	415,595,114
CALIFORNIA	2,688,344,086	3,159,864,049	3,159,864,049
COLORADO	409,183,629	445,670,512	445,670,512
CONNECTICUT	406,571,023	430,384,239	430,384,239

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION TO THE STATES—Continued

State	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
DELAWARE	121,181,507	131,983,190	131,983,190
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	126,497,742	132,894,607	132,894,607
FLORIDA	1,585,543,079	1,570,688,196	1,570,688,196
GEORGIA	1,094,488,911	1,157,564,829	1,157,564,829
HAWAII	130,305,474	136,856,219	136,856,219
IDAHO	228,508,722	242,576,028	242,576,028
ILLINOIS	1,033,163,070	1,141,333,677	1,141,333,677
INDIANA	795,042,623	832,814,575	832,814,575
IOWA	336,721,931	361,576,329	361,576,329
KANSAS	315,685,096	332,551,764	332,551,764
KENTUCKY	533,868,416	565,490,861	565,490,861
LOUISIANA	469,195,077	513,550,231	513,550,231
MAINE	139,579,368	150,404,519	150,404,519
MARYLAND	500,894,869	515,237,935	515,237,935
MASSACHUSETTS	511,837,402	541,940,579	541,940,579
MICHIGAN	930,935,426	1,051,713,308	1,051,713,308
MINNESOTA	485,585,015	568,542,874	568,542,874
MISSISSIPPI	367,255,281	391,510,985	391,510,985
MISSOURI	713,638,452	774,002,714	774,002,714
MONTANA	294,932,864	313,280,274	313,280,274
NEBRASKA	228,415,038	243,676,747	243,676,747
NEVADA	214,993,211	212,990,680	212,990,680
NEW HAMPSHIRE	140,780,427	147,522,240	147,522,240
NEW JERSEY	841,313,477	849,381,509	849,381,509
NEW MEXICO	290,061,270	314,985,665	314,985,665
NEW YORK	1,396,086,909	1,464,779,677	1,464,779,677
NORTH CAROLINA	894,013,564	939,625,320	939,625,320
NORTH DAKOTA	193,341,246	206,034,763	206,034,763
OHIO	1,114,854,934	1,216,841,504	1,216,841,504
OKLAHOMA	470,595,869	504,360,313	504,360,313
OREGON	347,705,929	377,344,456	377,344,456
PENNSYLVANIA	1,389,376,513	1,454,518,380	1,454,518,380
RHODE ISLAND	155,183,242	163,100,734	163,100,734
SOUTH CAROLINA	523,952,440	524,665,948	524,665,948
SOUTH DAKOTA	202,817,995	220,787,059	220,787,059
TENNESSEE	675,192,691	708,483,718	708,483,718
TEXAS	2,639,825,359	2,671,100,705	2,671,100,705
UTAH	225,317,398	235,723,736	235,723,736
VERMONT	130,067,666	143,414,064	143,414,064
VIRGINIA	835,037,989	868,661,604	868,661,604
WASHINGTON	529,894,520	566,928,375	566,928,375
WEST VIRGINIA	330,173,460	356,146,435	356,146,435
WISCONSIN	601,107,544	638,231,517	638,231,517
WYOMING	201,565,716	225,244,884	225,244,884
SUBTOTAL	30,667,592,963	32,693,342,672	32,693,342,672
High Priority Projects	2,731,211,503	2,824,012,800	2,824,012,800
Allocated Programs	5,687,660,217	4,067,719,932	4,067,719,932
TOTAL	39,086,464,683	39,585,075,404	39,585,075,404

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS PROGRAMS

The roads and bridges that make up our Nation's highway infrastructure are built, operated, and maintained through the joint efforts of Federal, State, and local governments. States have much flexibility to use Federal-aid highway funds to best meet their individual needs and priorities, with FHWA's assistance and oversight.

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA–LU], the highway, highway safety, and transit authorization through fiscal year 2009, makes

Federal-aid highways funds available in various categories of spending.

The following table reflects an estimated distribution of obligations among the largest of the Federal-aid highway program categories, and the table is followed by a more detailed discussion of many of the categories of Federal-aid highway spending: (The obligation limitation recommended by the Committee is applicable to most of these program categories, but the resources for certain categories of spending are exempt from the limitation).

ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS AMONG MAJOR CATEGORIES OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SPENDING

[In millions of dollars]

Federal-aid highway category	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
Spending subject to obligation limitation:			
National highway system	6,770	8,237	8,237
Interstate maintenance	4,541	5,525	5,525
Surface transportation program	8,288	9,906	9,906
Bridge replacement and rehabilitation	4,123	5,017	5,017
Congestion mitigation and air quality improvement	1,077	1,081	1,081
Highway safety improvement	321	322	322
Equity Bonus	2,524	2,734	2,734
Transportation infrastructure finance and innovation	131	93	93
High priority projects	2,536	1,295	1,295
Projects of national and regional significance	433	306	306
Other categories of spending	8,870	5,206	5,206
Subtotal	39,614	39,722	39,722
Spending exempt from obligation limitation:			
Emergency relief	192	123	123
Equity bonus	719	671	671
Priority projects from previous authorization bills	92	49	49
Direct loan reestimate	7	.....	.....
Subtotal	1,010	843	843
Emergency relief (from supplemental authority)	583	.....	.....
Reimbursable program	120	120	120
Total obligations	41,327	40,685	40,685

National Highway System [NHS].—The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA] of 1991 authorized the NHS, which was subsequently established as a 161,000 mile road system by the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. This system serves major population centers, intermodal transportation facilities, international border crossings, and major destinations. The NHS program provides funding for this system consisting of roads that are of primary Federal interest. The NHS consists of the current Interstate, other rural principal arterials, urban freeways and connecting urban principal arterials, and facilities on the Defense Department's designated Strategic Highway Network, and roads connecting the NHS to intermodal facilities. The Federal share for the NHS program is generally 80 percent, subject to the sliding scale adjustment, with an availability period of 4 years.

Interstate Maintenance [IM].—The 46,876 mile Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways retains

a separate identity within the NHS. The IM program finances projects to rehabilitate, restore, resurface and reconstruct the Interstate system. Reconstruction that increases capacity, other than HOV lanes, is not eligible for IM funds. The Federal share for the IM program is 90 percent, subject to the sliding scale adjustment, and funds are available for 4 years.

Within the funding available to the interstate maintenance discretionary program, funds are to be made available to the following projects and activities:

INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE

Project name	Committee recommendation	Requested by
I–225 at Colfax Avenue and 17th Avenue, CO	$1,000,000	Salazar/Allard
Brent Spence Bridge Study, OH	1,000,000	Brown/Voinovich
City of Columbus Interstate 70/71 Cap Project, OH	500,000	Voinovich
Columbia River Crossing, OR	1,000,000	Smith, G./Wyden
Fairview Street/I–385 Interchange, SC	500,000	Graham, L
Fernley Interchange at I–80, NV	1,000,000	Ensign
Green River Area Transportation Corridor 2025 Plan, KY	500,000	Bunning
H–1 Improvements Kinau and Lusitana Ramps Project, HI	5,000,000	Inouye
I–15 Bluff Street Interchange, UT	1,000,000	Hatch/Bennett
I–15 Helena Custer Avenue Interchange, MT	1,500,000	Tester/Baucus
I–15 Widening and Interchanges, Las Vegas, NV	1,000,000	Ensign/Reid
I–29/52nd Avenue Interchange, ND	1,000,000	Conrad/Dorgan
I–295, Exit 4 Improvement Project, ME	500,000	Collins/Snowe
I–40/I–77 interchange in Iredell County, NC	1,000,000	Dole
I–49 North, LA	1,000,000	Vitter/Landrieu
I–5/I–205 Salmon Creek Interchange Project, WA	1,000,000	Murray/Cantwell
I–5/Port of Tacoma Interchange Improvement Project, WA	1,000,000	Murray/Cantwell
I–5/SR510 Lacey Interchange Improvement Project, WA	500,000	Murray/Cantwell
I–71 Corridor Access Improvements in Cincinnati, OH	500,000	Voinovich
I–80, Westbound Bridge over Missouri River, NE	1,000,000	Hagel
I–84 Burnt River Canyon, OR	2,000,000	Wyden/Smith G
I–84, Curtis Road to Broadway Interchange Widening, ID	1,500,000	Crapo/Craig
I–85 at CR 98/Gabbettville Road, Troup Co., GA	1,500,000	Chambliss
I–95 in Cumberland, Harnett, and Johnston Counties, NC	1,000,000	Dole
I–95/US 301 Interchange, SC	500,000	Graham, L
IH–35W Congestion Relief, TX	500,000	Hutchison
Improvement of Highland Pike (KY 1072) To Farrell Drive, KY	500,000	Bunning
Interstate 25 Reconstruction, Glenrock to Casper Hat Six Section, WY	1,000,000	Enzi/Thomas
Interstate 29 Reconstruction/Utility Relocation, Sioux City, IA	1,500,000	Grassley/Harkin
Interstate 69/Great River Bridge: Highway 65-MS Highway 1, AR	4,000,000	Lincoln/Pryor
Meadowood Interchange Complex, NV	500,000	Reid
Southern Nevada Beltway Interchanges, NV	1,500,000	Reid/Ensign
Turnpike Improvements Project, DE	2,000,000	Biden/Carper
US 278 Corridor Construction, SC	500,000	Graham, L

Surface Transportation Program [STP].—STP is a flexible program that may be used by States and localities for projects on any Federal-aid highway, bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, and intracity and intercity bus terminals and facilities. A portion of STP funds are set aside for transportation enhancements and State suballocations are provided. The Federal share for STP is generally 80 percent, subject to the sliding scale adjustment, with a 4-year availability period.

Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation.—The bridge program enables States to improve the condition of their bridges through replacement, rehabilitation, and systematic preventive maintenance. The funds are available for use on all bridges, including those on roads functionally classified as rural minor collectors and as local.

Bridge program funds have a 4-year period of availability with a Federal share for all projects, except those on the Interstate System, of 80 percent, subject to the sliding scale adjustment. For those bridges on the Interstate System, the Federal share is 90 percent, subject to the sliding scale adjustment.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program [CMAQ].—The CMAQ program directs funds toward transportation projects and programs to help meet and maintain national ambient air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. A minimum one-half percent of the apportionment is guaranteed to each State.

Highway Safety Improvement Program [HSIP].—The highway infrastructure safety program features strategic safety planning and performance. The program also devotes additional resources and supports innovative approaches to reducing highway fatalities and injuries on all public roads.

Federal Lands Highways.—This category funds improvements for forest highways; park roads and parkways; Indian reservation roads; and refuge roads. The Federal lands highway program provides for transportation planning, research, engineering, and construction of highways, roads, parkways, and transit facilities that provide access to or within public lands, national parks, and Indian reservations.

Within the funding available for the Federal lands highway program, funds are to be made available to the following projects and activities:

FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
116th Street NE Interchange Improvement Project, Tulalip Tribes, WA	$1,500,000	Murray/Cantwell
17-Mile Road Reconstruction, Wind River Indian Reservation, WY	3,000,000	Enzi/Thomas
Bear River Access Road Forest Street Improvements Project, UT	1,250,000	Hatch/Bennett
BIA Route 14 (Gooseneck Road)—Oglala Sioux Tribe, SD	1,692,000	Johnson
BIA Route 27—Oglala Sioux Tribe, SD	1,000,000	Johnson
BRAC-related Improvements in Harford County, MD	3,000,000	Mikulski/Cardin
City of Rocks Back Country Byway, ID	3,000,000	Crapo/Craig
Federal Lands Program, State of Hawaii	1,500,000	Inouye
Fidalgo Bay Road Improvement Project, Samish Tribe, WA	500,000	Murray/Cantwell
Hoover Dam Bypass Bridge, AZ	3,000,000	Kyl
I–80 at Vista Boulevard and McCarran Boulevard, NV	1,000,000	Reid
Kenel Road Rehabilitation and Resurfacing—Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, SD	2,000,000	Johnson
MD355 Corridor Improvement from Woodmont Avenue to I–495 or other improvements necessitated by BRAC-realignment at Bethesda Naval Hospital, MD.	3,000,000	Mikulski/Cardin
Pave from the Sitting Bull Monument to US 12 and from US 12 to north of SD 1806P from SD 1806 to the end of the pavement in Wakpala, SD.	848,000	Thune
Safety Project on the Environmental Effects of Dust Suppressant Chemicals on Federal Lands Highways, MO.	1,750,000	Bond
SD 44 and SD 73, Paving in Jackson and Mellette Counties, SD	900,000	Thune
Skokomish Tribe Access Road and US–101 Realignment, WA	1,000,000	Murray/Cantwell
SR–160 Blue Diamond Highway—Clark and Nye Counties, NV	3,000,000	Ensign/Reid
State Highway 150 (US 160 N. to Great Sand Dunes), CO	3,000,000	Salazar/Allard
US 212, Paving from Eagle Butte to East of the SD 63 East Junction, Serving Cheyenne River Reservation, SD.	1,000,000	Thune/Johnson
Vermont Federal Lands Projects, VT	500,000	Leahy
West Jemez Bypass Construction, Los Alamos County, NM	2,000,000	Bingaman

Equity Bonus.—The equity bonus program provides additional funds to States to ensure that each State's total funding from apportioned programs and for High Priority Projects meets certain equity considerations. Each State is guaranteed a minimum rate of return on its share of contributions to the highway account of the Highway Trust Fund, and a minimum increase relative to the average dollar amount of apportionments under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, or TEA–21. Certain States will maintain the share of total apportionments they each received during TEA–21. An open-ended authorization is provided, ensuring that there will be sufficient funds to meet the objectives of the equity bonus. Of the total amount of funds provided for this program, each year $639,000,000 is exempt from the obligation limitation recommended by the Committee.

Emergency Relief [ER].—Section 125 of title 23, United States Code, provides $100,000,000 annually for the ER program. This funding is not subject to the obligation limitation recommended by the Committee. This program provides funds for the repair or reconstruction of Federal-aid highways and bridges and federally owned roads and bridges that have suffered serious damage as the result of natural disasters or catastrophic failures. The ER program supplements the commitment of resources by States, their political subdivisions, or Federal agencies to help pay for unusually heavy expenses resulting from extraordinary conditions.

Highways for Life.—This program provides funding to demonstrate and promote state-of-the-art technologies, elevated performance standards, and new business practices in the highway construction process that result in improved safety, faster construction, reduced congestion from construction, and improved quality and user satisfaction by inviting innovation, new technologies, and new practices to be used in highway construction and operations.

The Committee is concerned that an existing Federal regulation, 23 CFR 635.411, may serve to limit the development of new products and discourage innovation in highway construction and operations. Known as the "proprietary products" rule, this regulation imposes broad restrictions against the States' ability to use proprietary methods, materials, and equipment on Federal-aid projects. As a result, States may find it difficult or impossible to utilize innovative methods, materials, or equipment on Federal-aid projects, even when such innovations would improve safety, reduce congestion, or increase the quality and durability of the State's road network.

The Committee urges the Secretary to review 23 CFR 635.411 and take action to ensure that the regulation does not unnecessarily impede or delay any State's decision to utilize innovative methods, materials, or equipment that could improve safety, reduce congestion, or increase the quality and durability of highways.

Ferry Boats and Ferry Terminal Facilities.—This program provides funding for the construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities.

Within the funding available to the ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities program, funds are to be made available to the following projects and activities:

FERRY BOATS AND FERRY TERMINAL FACILITIES

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Ferry Wahkiakum Replacement, WA	$200,000	Murray/Cantwell
Glen Cove Ferry Terminal, NY	1,000,000	Schumer/Clinton
Haverstraw Ferry Terminal, NY	400,000	Clinton/Schumer
Kitsap Transit, Rich-Passage Wake Impact Study, WA	2,200,000	Murray/Cantwell
North Carolina Statewide Ferry System, NC	3,100,000	Dole
Oak Bluffs Terminal Reconstruction Project, MA	1,000,000	Kennedy/Kerry
Port of Detroit Public Dock and Terminal Project, MI	3,500,000	Levin/Stabenow
River Ferry Boat Transportation Program, City of Oklahoma City, OK	2,500,000	Inhofe
San Francisco Bay Area Water Transit Ferry Boat, CA	1,000,000	Feinstein
Swan's Island Ferry Facilities, ME	2,500,000	Collins/Snowe
Vashon Island Passenger Ferry, WA	600,000	Murray/Cantwell

National Scenic Byways.—This program provides funding for roads that are designated by the Secretary of Transportation as All American Roads [AAR] or National Scenic Byways [NSB]. These roads have outstanding scenic, historic, cultural, natural, recreational, and archaeological qualities.

Transportation and Community and System Preservation [TCSP].—The TCSP program provides grants to States and local governments for planning, developing, and implementing strategies to integrate transportation and community and system preservation plans and practices. These grants may be used to improve the efficiency of the transportation system; reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment; reduce the need for costly future investments in public infrastructure; and provide efficient access to jobs, services, and centers of trade.

Within the funding available to the transportation and community and system preservation program, funds are to be made available to the following projects and activities:

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY AND SYSTEM PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Access road to the Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Raleigh County, Beckley, WV.	$1,400,000	Byrd
Clayton Pedestrian Grade Separation, Johnston County, NC	525,000	Burr
Cobb Parkway Expansion, GA	500,000	Isakson
Connersville Intermodal Study, Connersville, IN	500,000	Lugar
Construction and Improvements to County Road One (RS–209) south of I–70 to K–32, Leavenworth County, KS.	500,000	Roberts
Des Moines Creek Trail Access Project, WA	500,000	Murray/Cantwell
Downtown Development Authority Streetscape, Dahlonega, GA	500,000	Chambliss
Ellsworth Air Force Base Road Improvement, SD	1,000,000	Thune
Flats East Bank Road Relocations and Improvements Project, OH	500,000	Voinovich/Brown
Fort Knox Park & Ride Express on US 31W, KY	500,000	Bunning
Hofstra University's Safe and Sustainable Campus Plan, NY	1,000,000	Schumer/Clinton
I–10 Widening in Western Maricopa County, AZ	500,000	Kyl
I–25 at State Highway 16 (Fort Carson Gate 20), CO	3,000,000	Salazar/Allard
I–5 North Macadam Ramp & Street Capacity Improvements, OR	500,000	Smith, G./Wyden
Illinois Trails, IL	3,000,000	Durbin/Obama
Jefferson Park Avenue Project, Charlottesville, VA	500,000	Warner/Webb
Newark Downtown Core Redevelopment District, NJ	1,000,000	Lautenberg/Menendez
Olympic Discovery Trail/Elwha River Pedestrian Bridge, WA	575,000	Murray
Pigeon Creek Greenway Passage: Phase I, Evansville, IN	1,000,000	Bayh
Reconstruction of Bangor Street, ME	500,000	Collins/Snowe
Robinson Grade Separation, City of Norman, OK	500,000	Inhofe
Separated Grade Crossing for Torrington, WY	500,000	Enzi/Thomas

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY AND SYSTEM PRESERVATION PROGRAM—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Signal Synchronization System; Baton Rouge, LA	500,000	Vitter
TH 14 from the city of Waseca to I–35 in Owatonna, MN	500,000	Coleman/Klobuchar
US Highway 63 Reconstruction, Waterloo, IA	500,000	Grassley
US 169 Highway Widening Environmental Assessment, City of Owasso, OK	500,000	Inhofe
US 17 in Beaufort County, NC	500,000	Dole
US Highway 212 Expansion—Chaska to Norwood Young America, Carver County, MN.	1,000,000	Klobuchar
US–30, Columbus Viaduct, NE	500,000	Hagel
US–30, McCammon to Topaz Bridge, ID	500,000	Crapo
White Pond Drive Expansion, OH	1,000,000	Brown

Illinois Trails.—The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the Illinois Department of Transportation [IDOT] for various transportation enhancement projects throughout the State. The Committees expect IDOT to provide funds to the following projects: Aurora bike train, Urbana to Danville Trail, Cal-Sag Greenway Bike Trail, Harrisburg to Eldorado Bike Trail, Grand Illinois Trail, Village of Carbon Cliff, General Dacey Trail—Phase 2, SIU—Edwardsville Morris Bike Trail, Great River Trail near Savanna, Village of Manteno Greenways Trail System and Springfield bike trail. Requested by Senators Durbin and Obama.

Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation [TIFIA].—The TIFIA credit program provides funds to assist in the development of major infrastructure facilities through greater non-Federal and private sector participation, building on public willingness to dedicate future revenues or user fees in order to receive transportation benefits earlier than would be possible under traditional funding techniques. The TIFIA program provides secured loans, loan guarantees, and standby lines of credit that may be drawn upon to supplement project revenues, if needed, during the first 10 years of project operations.

As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account records, for this program, the subsidy costs associated with the direct loans, loan guarantees, and lines of credit obligated in 1992 and beyond (including modifications of direct loans or loan guarantees that resulted from obligations or commitments in any year), as well as administrative expenses of this program. The subsidy amounts are estimated on present value basis; the administrative expenses are estimated on a cash basis.

Appalachian Development Highway System.—This program makes funds available to construct highways and access roads under section 201 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. Under SAFETEA–LU, funding is authorized for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009, is available until expended, and is distributed among the 13 eligible States based on the latest available cost-to-complete estimate prepared by the Appalachian Regional Commission.

High Priority Projects.—Funds are provided for specific projects identified in SAFETEA–LU. Over 5,000 projects are identified, each with a specified amount of funding over the 5 years of SAFETEA–LU.

Projects of National and Regional Significance.—This program provides funding for specific projects of national or regional importance listed in SAFETEA–LU.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2007	$36,032,343,903
Budget estimate, 2008	38,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	40,955,051,359

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $40,955,051,359. The recommended level is $2,955,051,359 more than the budget request and is necessary to pay outstanding obligations from various highway accounts pursuant to this and prior appropriations acts.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(RESCISSION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The bill rescinds $2,890,000,000 of the unobligated balances of funds apportioned to the States under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, excluding safety programs and funds set aside within the State for population areas. The Committee directs the FHWA to administer the rescission by allowing each State the maximum flexibility in making adjustments among the apportioned highway programs.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Appropriations, 2007	$19,800,000
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Funding for the Appalachian Development Highway System [ADHS] is authorized under section 1069(y) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (Public Law 102–240). The ADHS program provides funds for the construction of the Appalachian corridor highways in the 13 States that comprise the Appalachian region. These highways, in many instances, are intended to replace some of the most deficient and dangerous segments of rural roadway in America.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for corridor H in West Virginia of the Appalachian Development Highway System [ADHS]. The recommended amount is $200,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

DELTA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2007	
Budget estimate, 2008	
Committee recommendation	$20,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Funding for the Delta Regional Transportation Development Program is authorized under section 1308 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109–59). The Delta Regional Transportation Development Program provides funds to support and encourage multi-state transportation planning and corridor development, provide for transportation project development, facilitate transportation decisionmaking and support transportation construction in the eight States comprising the Delta Region (Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for the Delta Regional Transportation Development Program. The Committee directs funding be allocated to the following projects that are listed below:

Project name	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Canton Parkway, MS	$3,800,000	Cochran
Caruthersville Downtown Infrastructure Road Redevelopment, Caruthersville, MO.	500,000	Bond
Greenville Street Revitalization, MS	1,500,000	Cochran
Highway 67 (Wappapello Bridge) Four-Lane Improvement Project, MO; Ozark Regional Foothills Planning Commission.	3,000,000	Bond
I–20 South Frontage Rd., Vicksburg, MS	1,500,000	Cochran
Marks Airport, MS	1,000,000	Cochran
Newburg Bridge Replacement, MO	240,000	Bond
Route AB Route Extension, MO; Cape Girardeau County, MO	760,000	Bond
Route AB/Nash Road Improvement Project, MO; Bootheel Regional Planning Commission.	1,000,000	Bond
Route D Road Improvement Project, MO; Bootheel Regional Planning Commission, MO.	2,500,000	Bond
Route EE Road/ Multi-Modal Improvement Project, MO; Bootheel Regional Planning Commission.	1,000,000	Bond
Route Y Safety Improvement Project, MO' Bootheel Regional Planning Commission.	1,000,000	Bond
Statesman Blvd. and Trail, MS	2,200,000	Cochran

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Section 120 distributes obligation authority among Federal-aid highway programs.

Section 121 continues a provision that credits funds received by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics to the Federal-aid highways account.

Section 122 rescinds certain funds that are unavailable for use on administrative expenses.

Section 123 rescinds certain funds from the TIFIA program.

Section 124 designates funds made available under this section for the projects and competitive initiatives specified as follows:

The Committee recommends $135,775,955 for the Secretary to carry out the National Strategy to Reduce Congestion on America's

Transportation Network, including Urban Partnerships, Corridors of the Future, and other programs that support this initiative.

The Committee notes that communities selected to become an Urban Partner with the Department of Transportation must commit themselves to a comprehensive plan that must include each of the following elements: congestion pricing, improved transit services, telecommuting and flexible work schedules, and the use of innovative technology. While the initial request for additional funding for the Urban Partnerships Agreements would have focused resources solely on congestion pricing activities, the Committee believes that strength of the Urban Partnerships lies in its comprehensive nature. Therefore, the Committee directs that funding made available under this section that the Secretary uses for Urban Partnerships, be made available for any of the partnership elements rather than focused on only one of those elements.

The Committee recommends that funding made available under this section be made available to the following projects and activities:

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
21st Century Parks Project in Louisville, KY	$6,000,000	McConnell
500 South, I–15 to Redwood Road, UT	1,000,000	Bennett/Hatch
87th Street Parkway Improvements, Lenexa, KS	1,000,000	Brownback
A–B Street Corridor Connector, WA	1,800,000	Murray
American Parkway, PA	3,000,000	Specter/Casey
Baton Rouge Riverfront Development and Levee Pedestrian and Bike Path, LA.	1,000,000	Landrieu
Battleship New Jersey Access Road (Clinton Street) Repaving Project, NJ	630,000	Menendez/Lautenberg
Big Pasco Industrial Center Intermodal Project, Phase 4, WA	900,000	Murray/Cantwell
Blue Earth CSAH 12 Extension/TH 14 Interchange, MN	2,000,000	Klobuchar/Coleman
Bossier Parish Congestion Relief Program, LA	3,000,000	Landrieu/Vitter
Brewery Grade/Highway 30 Intersection and Flour Mill Property Redevelopment, OR.	1,000,000	Wyden/Smith, G
Bridge over Broadway, Missoula to Rattlesnake National Recreation Area, MT	1,000,000	Baucus/Tester
Bridge Replacements, McKinley County, NM	500,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Bristol Street Widening, Orange County, CA	1,000,000	Feinstein
Caraway Bridge Overpass, AR	2,000,000	Lincoln/Pryor
CEMAR Trail, IA	500,000	Harkin
Chittenden County Road Improvement Projects in Colchester (VT Route 15/Campus Road), Essex Junction (VT Route 15), and Milton (US Route 7), VT.	2,500,000	Leahy
City of Granite Falls Freight Access Project, WA	1,500,000	Murray/Cantwell
City of Riverside Grade Separations, CA	1,000,000	Boxer/Feinstein
City of Rocks Back Country Byway, ID	2,000,000	Craig/Crapo
City of Tuscaloosa Downtown Revitalization Project, AL—Twenty First Avenue Phase I and University Boulevard Phase III, AL.	6,000,000	Shelby
Clinton Street Bridge Replacement, City of Fort Wayne, IN	1,000,000	Bayh/Lugar
Coal Creek Parkway Corridor Completion Project, WA	1,000,000	Murray
Coalfields Expressway, WV	5,000,000	Byrd
Cold Storage Spur Line, IA	1,000,000	Harkin
College of Southern Idaho Student Safety Initiative, ID	800,000	Craig/Crapo
DelTrac Integrated Transportation Management System, DE	1,200,000	Biden/Carper
Denali Commission, Alaska for transportation infrastructure projects throughout rural Alaska.	10,000,000	Stevens
Design, engineering, environmental assessment and initial construction of East Aztec Arterial Route, NM.	1,000,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Dillerville Rail Yard Relocation, PA	1,500,000	Specter/Casey
East Brandon Bypass, MS	1,000,000	Lott
East Carson Street Widening, PA	1,500,000	Specter/Casey
East Loop, TX	600,000	Hutchison
East Metropolitan Corridor, MS	3,300,000	Cochran/Lott

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
East Texas Higher Speed Rail Feasibility Study, TX	650,000	Hutchison
FM509 Extension, TX	1,000,000	Hutchison/Cornyn
Friant Road Widening, Fresno County, CA	1,000,000	Feinstein
Grand Avenue Underpass, Chicago, IL	2,000,000	Obama
Granite Street Reconstruction Project, NH	1,500,000	Gregg
Grant City Downtown Square Street Improvements, MO	500,000	Bond
Gwynns Falls Trail/CSX Bridge, MD	500,000	Cardin
Hanford Reach National Monument Transportation Improvements, WA	1,000,000	Murray/Cantwell
Heart of America Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge, MO	750,000	Bond
Henderson Lake Mead Parkway, NV	200,000	Reid
High Priority Corridor 31 of the National Highway System in southwestern, PA.	1,000,000	Casey
Highway 13 at Broadmoor Intersection in Springfield, MO	500,000	Bond
Highway 13 Bypass, MO	3,000,000	Bond
Highway 9 4-Lane Corridor, MS	3,000,000	Cochran
Hobbs East Bypass Project, NM	1,000,000	Domenici/Bingaman
I 15/I 215 North to Apex Interchange, NV	1,300,000	Reid/Ensign
I–15 Auxiliary Lanes, Kaysville to 31st Street, UT	2,000,000	Bennett/Hatch
I–25 and State Highway 16 Interchange—Fort Carson, CO	2,000,000	Allard/Salazar
I–355 Corridor Improvement Project, IL	500,000	Durbin
I–55/Gluckstadt Interchange Improvements, MS	2,000,000	Lott/Cochran
I–69, LA	4,000,000	Landrieu/Vitter
I–69, US–77 Upgrades from Harlingen to I–37, TX	750,000	Hutchison
I–70 Viaduct Realignment, Topeka, KS	500,000	Brownback
I–81 Rebuild/Expansion, PA	2,000,000	Specter/Casey
I–84, Exit 29 (Franklin Road) Local Systems Improvement, ID	800,000	Craig/Crapo
I–95/Fairfax County Parkway Interchange at Newington Road, VA	3,000,000	Webb
Icicle Station Project, Leavenworth, WA	300,000	Murray
Improvements to Route 266 and Interchange with Interstate 44, MO	3,000,000	Bond
Interchange Construction at US–73 and 20th Street, Leavenworth, KS	1,000,000	Brownback
Intersection Rehabilitation and Improvements, US24 and Marlatt Avenue, Manhattan, KS.	1,000,000	Brownback/Roberts
Interstate 10 Service Road Corridor, Lake Charles, LA	2,000,000	Landrieu/Vitter
Interstate 430/630: Interchange Modification, AR	4,000,000	Lincoln/Pryor
Interstate 68 Access Road—Monongalia County, WV	2,300,000	Byrd
Interstate 69, TN	3,000,000	Alexander
Joe Dice Suspension Bridge, MO	750,000	Bond
Kalispell Bypass, MT	6,000,000	Tester/Baucus
King Coal Highway, WV	5,000,000	Byrd
Las Cruces Downtown Revitalization, NM	2,000,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Lewis and Clark Legacy Trail, ND	800,000	Conrad/Dorgan
Lewiston Partnership Project, ID	400,000	Craig/Crapo
Lincoln Avenue Grade Separation Project, WA	1,500,000	Murray/Cantwell
Little Bay Bridges/Spaulding Turnpike, NH	2,500,000	Gregg
Mahan Drive Phase II, Leon County, FL	1,000,000	Nelson, Bill
Martin Bluff Road, MS	2,000,000	Lott
Mountain Edge Parkway Environmental Assessment, Las Vegas, NV	1,000,000	Reid
New Alignment South Bridge, MO	1,500,000	Bond
North Main Street Streetscape Enhancements, CT	350,000	Dodd/Lieberman
Northside Drive, Clinton, MS	4,000,000	Cochran
Northwest Arkansas Western Beltway, AR	1,000,000	Lincoln/Pryor
Northwest Loop Access Road, Sandoval County, NM	1,000,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Paducah Waterfront Development Project, KY	4,000,000	McConnell
Palm Bay Parkway Project, FL	3,000,000	Nelson, Bill
Paseo Street Corridor Improvements, MO	750,000	Bond
Paw Paw Bends Trail, Morgan County, WV	1,000,000	Byrd
Pedestrian Plaza improvements at the Connecticut Science Center in Hartford, CT.	1,000,000	Lieberman/Dodd
Pinnacle Aeropark, Wayne County, MI	1,000,000	Stabenow/Levin
Pinon Hills Boulevard East and Animas River Bridge, NM	1,500,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Port Huron, NAFTA Corridor Congestion Mitigation Project, Phase I, MI	1,000,000	Stabenow/Levin
Port of Wilmington Rail Improvement Project, DE	1,500,000	Carper/Biden
Post Street Centennial Trail and Utility Bridge, WA	2,000,000	Murray/Cantwell

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES—Continued

Project	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Reading Lighting & Streetscape Enhancement Initiative, PA	250,000	Casey
Realignment of Saddle Creek Road, NE	2,000,000	Nelson, Ben/Hagel
Reconstruction of Two Interchanges on I–235, Wichita, KS	1,000,000	Brownback
Reconstruction of US–50 in Reno County, KS	1,500,000	Brownback
Reconstruction of US50, Gray County, KS	500,000	Brownback
Redevelopment of Front Street and Constitution Way in Hartford, CT	2,000,000	Lieberman
Reno Rail Access Corridor Enhancements, NV	500,000	Reid/Ensign
Renovation of Monument Circle, Indianapolis, IN	500,000	Bayh/Lugar
Revitalization and redevelopment of the Hamlet of Brewerton, NY	1,000,000	Schumer/Clinton
River Tech Boulevard Road Construction, Moline, IL	1,500,000	Durbin/Obama
San Juan County Road 3900, NM	1,000,000	Domenici/Bingaman
San Juan County Road CR 7500, NM	500,000	Domenici/Bingaman
SD 11 and SD 42 in Sioux Falls, SD	3,000,000	Johnson
Shiloh Road Corridor, Billings, MT	7,000,000	Baucus/Tester
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology connector road, SD	500,000	Johnson/Thune
South Lake Union Streetcar Project Capital Improvements, WA	1,150,000	Murray/Cantwell
Southeast Connector Extension from SE 6th Street to SE 14th Street, IA	3,500,000	Harkin/Grassley
Southwest Rochelle Truck Loop, Ogle County, IL	150,000	Obama
SR304/Bremerton Transportation Center, WA	250,000	Murray/Cantwell
Star Landing Road Corridor, DeSoto County, MS	2,400,000	Cochran/Lott
State Route 437 By-Pass in Bedford County, TN	1,000,000	Alexander
Tacoma Rail Mountain Division Track Improvements, WA	1,100,000	Murray/Cantwell
U.S. 2 Safety Improvements, WA	500,000	Murray/Cantwell
U.S. 287 at Lamar, Colorado: Ports-to-Plains, CO	2,000,000	Salazar/Allard
U.S. 54 Corridor Expansion, MO	1,000,000	Bond
U.S. 60 Corridor Improvements, MO	750,000	Bond
U.S. 63 and Gans Road Overpass, MO	1,000,000	Bond
U.S. Highway 49/Highway 7 Connector, MS	3,320,000	Cochran
U.S. Route 30/Harrisburg Pike Gateway Interchange Project, PA	2,000,000	Specter
Uptown St. Joseph Transportation District, MO	2,000,000	Bond
Urban Collector Road, Jackson and Harrison Counties, MS	2,400,000	Cochran
US 11 Corridor Improvements, St. Tammany Parish, LA	3,000,000	Landrieu/Vitter
US 54 Greensburg, KS	500,000	Brownback
US Route 1/SR 123 Interchange Improvements, Prince William County, VA	3,000,000	Webb
Valley View Business Park Access Road, PA	1,000,000	Casey
Vermont Downtown Streetscape & Sidewalk Improvements in Springfield, Derby Line, Bristol, Stamford, Franklin, VT.	1,000,000	Leahy
Village Plaza Streets and Drainage, Village of Angel Fire, NM	200,000	Domenici
Wadsworth Interchange/State Highway 128, CO	1,000,000	Allard/Salazar
West Lea Street Improvements, Carlsbad, NM	300,000	Domenici/Bingaman
West Vancouver Freight Access Project, WA	2,000,000	Murray / Cantwell
West Viginia Route 2 Improvements, WV	9,500,000	Byrd
West Virginia Route 9, WV	10,000,000	Byrd

Section 125 provides requirements for any waiver of Buy American requirements.

Section 126 permits funds made available in a prior appropriations act for the construction of the North Shore Road in North Carolina to be available for an alternate purpose. Requested by Senator Alexander.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration [FMCSA] was established within the Department of Transportation by the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act [MCSIA] (Public Law 106–159) in December 1999. Prior to this legislation, motor carrier safety re-

sponsibilities were under the jurisdiction of the Federal Highway Administration.

FMCSA's mission is to promote safe commercial motor vehicle operation, and reduce truck and bus crashes. The agency also is charged with reducing fatalities associated with commercial motor vehicles through education, regulation, enforcement, research and innovative technology, thereby achieving a safer and more secure transportation environment. Additionally, FMCSA is responsible for ensuring that all commercial vehicles entering the United States along its southern and northern borders comply with all Federal motor carrier safety and hazardous materials regulations.

Agency resources and activities are expected to contribute to safety in commercial vehicle operations through enforcement, including the use of stronger enforcement measures against safety violators; expedited safety regulation; technology innovation; improvements in information systems; training; and improvements to commercial driver's license testing, recordkeeping, and sanctions. To accomplish these activities, FMCSA is expected to work closely with Federal, State, and local enforcement agencies, the motor carrier industry, highway safety organizations, and individual citizens.

MCSIA and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA–LU] provides funding authorizations for FMCSA's Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs and Motor Carrier Safety Grants. Under these authorizations, funding supports FMCSA's expanded scope as authorized by the USA PATRIOT Act, which created new and enhanced security measures.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a level of $531,469,553 for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. This level is $3,469,553 more than the level requested by the President and $10,967,553 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. It is also $3,469,553 more than the level authorized in SAFETEA–LU.

The Committee is greatly concerned with the growing number of fatalities on our Nation's highways. In April of this year, the Committee took testimony from the FMCSA Administrator on rising highway fatalities. The hearing was designed to assess the role of the Nation's leading highway safety agencies in addressing and reversing the growing number of highway fatalities. While there was a slight decrease in large truck fatalities in 2005 after several years of increases, FMCSA has been unable for the last several years to achieve the dramatic decreases necessary to meet the large truck fatality targets articulated in the agency's performance goals.

The agency has acknowledged that it is struggling to achieve results. The agency's budget documents for fiscal year 2008 concede that the most recent data available indicate that "FMCSA may have reached a maximum outcome potential with the current program activities and procedures that are in place." The agency says that it is looking for ways to achieve better outcomes, and is undertaking an overhaul of its compliance and enforcement programs as part of its Comprehensive Safety Analysis [CSA] 2010 initiative. While supportive of this initiative, the Committee does not believe that the American people have to wait until 2010 to see real im-

provements in motor carrier safety. Rather, FMCSA should be aggressively addressing the challenges that undermine its ability to meet its stated fatality reduction goals in the near term.

Fatality Rate Calculation.—The Committee was disappointed to learn that the Department has abandoned its goal of achieving one fatality per 100 million vehicle miles traveled [VMT] in fiscal year 2008, delaying the goal instead until fiscal year 2011. Moreover, the Committee is concerned that, in weakening its goals, the Department is also changing how large truck fatality rates are calculated. In changing its methodology, FMCSA may be making it difficult to determine whether the agency is making real progress toward its now-delayed fatality goal. As such, the Committee directs FMCSA to continue to calculate fatality rates using truck miles traveled in addition to the other measures the agency may choose so that the Committee can evaluate accurately whether the agency is making real progress toward its goal for 2011.

New Performance Measures.—While measuring FMCSA's ability to save lives is an important performance indicator, the Committee also believes that this measure alone does not allow the Congress or the agency to measure the effectiveness of FMCSA's programs in improving compliance with motor carrier safety regulations.





The charts above display the results of inspections conducted by Federal and State officials in 2006. The data show that over seventy percent of drivers and vehicles inspected have at least one violation. Even more troubling is that 22 percent, or more than 1 out of every 5, drivers or vehicles inspected were in such deficient condition that they were immediately ordered off the road.

In testimony before the Committee, the Administrator agreed that this high out-of-service rate was unacceptable. However, he also noted that these inspections are targeting the riskiest vehicles and drivers. The Committee applauds the Administrator's to use a data-driven system to most effectively target its efforts and resources on the riskiest carriers. But the Committee also expects that the Administrator will use his inspection and enforcement data as a tool to evaluate his success or failure in improving overall industry compliance with the agency's safety regulations. Toward that end, the Committee requests FMCSA submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations 180 days after the enactment of this act a plan for the establishment and implementation of quantifiable measures of agency effectiveness that incorporate the agency's enforcement and inspection data. This plan should set performance targets within reasonable timeframes for improved compliance and explain with specificity how the agency's programs will bring about those improvements. FMCSA is then asked to display its progress toward these stated goals as part of its annual budget submissions to the Committee.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Limitation, 2007	$223,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008 (limitation)	228,000,000
Committee recommendation	231,469,553

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides the necessary resources to support motor carrier safety program activities and maintain the agency's administrative infrastructure. Funding supports nationwide motor carrier safety and consumer enforcement efforts, including Federal safety enforcement activities at the U.S./Mexico border to ensure that Mexican carriers entering the United States are in compliance with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations. Resources are also provided to fund motor carrier regulatory development and implementation, information management, research and technology, safety education and outreach, and the 24-hour safety and consumer telephone hotline.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $231,469,553 for FMCSA's Operations and Programs. The recommendation is $8,469,553 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level and $3,469,553 more than the budget request. This level is also $3,469,553 more than the authorized limitation. The Committee is providing FMCSA additional obligation authority to allow the agency to use unobligated balances in this account provided in previous years.

The bill specifies that $7,550,000 for the research and technology program is available for obligation until September 30, 2010.

OPERATING EXPENSES

The Committee recommends $174,628,553 for operating expenses. This level is $1,969,553 more than the President's request and $23,521,553 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The President's budget requested over $7,000,000, which the Committee has provided, to pay for personnel compensation and benefits necessary to make adjustments in grade structure that had been improperly calculated in prior years. In addition, the Committee has provided an additional $1,969,553 that is to be used only to pay for the annualization of the 22 positions included in the fiscal year 2007 budget in order to support SAFETEA–LU initiatives and for additional enforcement personnel.

Comprehensive Safety Analysis [CSA] 2010.—The President's budget for fiscal year 2008 includes a request of $5,600,000 for CSA 2010, the agency's initiative to overhaul and improve its oversight and enforcement programs. This funding is intended to continue FMCSA's efforts to develop new systems and software, rulemakings and policies, and training. The agency also proposes to continue to engage the major industry stakeholders in the process by conducting public listening sessions leading up to an operational test of the CSA 2010 model in four States.

FMCSA has told the Committee and the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB] that this initiative should satisfy NTSB's longstanding recommendation that FMCSA improve the safety of motor carrier operations by altering the safety fitness rating system in order to prevent unsafe drivers and vehicles from continuing to operate. This recommendation has been on NTSB's "Most Wanted" list since 2000, and is classified by NTSB as having an "open-

unacceptable response" status. The Committee is concerned that FMCSA has had this recommendation for 7 years and has yet to take appropriate actions to address program deficiencies and satisfy the NTSB recommendation. This underscores the need to move with urgency to implement the necessary changes to improve FMCSA's programs.

For this reason, the Committee is concerned that the agency is not yet taking all the appropriate and expeditious steps necessary to ensure all the safety benefits promised by CSA 2010. For example, implementation of CSA 2010 will require the agency to conduct several rulemakings. Yet the agency is still developing regulatory text and no new rules to launch this initiative have been proposed. Given that the DOT IG has found that it takes FMCSA an average of 2.3 years to complete major rulemakings, the Committee is concerned with FMCSA's ability to successfully implement this critical initiative by 2010. Moreover, the Committee believes that the agency should be implementing changes on an ongoing basis in order to make incremental safety improvements prior to 2010. Up to this point, the agency has offered limited information about when and how these safety benefits will be realized.

The Committee has included all the funding requested in order to move the initiative forward. However, the Committee wants to ensure that the funding will achieve real benefits in motor carrier safety in the near term. Therefore, FMCSA is directed to submit a comprehensive plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for the implementation of the CSA 2010 initiative 90 days after the enactment of this act. This plan must include milestones and dates for completion of critical tasks, which will allow the Committee to evaluate FMCSA's progress toward full implementation of this initiative by 2010. In addition, the plan should detail what benefits will result from the funding provided in fiscal year 2008. Following the submission of the plan, FMCSA is directed to update the Committees every 6 months on the implementation of CSA 2010. These updates should include detailed information on policy changes being implemented or planned to improve the operations of FMCSA, both in the near and long term; the ability of the agency to meet its milestones on time; and how the agency is implementing policy changes in the field. Furthermore, the Committee directs GAO to monitor FMCSA's progress in carrying out the implementation plan, and to brief the Committee regularly on its findings.

Compliance Review Process.—The Compliance Review [CR] is a critical enforcement tool that FMCSA uses to rate and evaluate the adequacy of the operations and safety of the Nation's motor carriers. During a hearing this year, the Committee examined a fatal accident that revealed some serious flaws with the compliance review process. The accident, which occurred on the Capital Beltway (I–495/I–95), involved a trucker who had accumulated traffic citations in seven States, and was driving on a suspended license at the time of the accident. The driver was in the employ of "BK Trucking", a registered motor carrier which had undergone a full scale compliance review by FMCSA a little more than 3 weeks prior to the accident. This review found a few problems with log books but otherwise found no violations that the agency described

as "critical" or "acute." Immediately following the fatality, however, another compliance review was conducted on the same firm. That review found multiple violations and resulted in fines totaling $77,000.

The Committee is deeply troubled that, despite the fact that this motor carrier was identified by FMCSA as being "high risk," the carrier was able to verbally explain away discrepancies discovered by FMCSA's investigator as part of the first compliance review. During the Committee's hearing, the Administrator shared this concern and pledged to address the issues that were raised by this tragic incident. The Committee therefore directs FMCSA to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations 30 days after the reporting of this bill on the results of the agency's internal review of this incident. Moreover, the Committee also directs FMCSA to report on how these issues are being addressed as it relates to the compliance review process, as well as the training and diligence of its investigators.

High Risk Carriers.—The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA–LU], signed by the President in 2005, included a requirement that compliance reviews [CR] be completed on motor carriers that are determined to pose the highest safety risk based on FMCSA data. Specifically, it was required that reviews be conducted on motor carriers rated as category "A" or "B" or the highest priority carriers to inspect based on safety data, for 2 consecutive months. The Committee is concerned that FMCSA has not been able to meet this requirement.

While part of the problem may be insufficient inspection resources, it is equally clear that part of the problem is insufficient training in the field regarding the necessity of prioritizing these high-risk motor carriers.

In order to address the agency's inability to satisfy its obligation, FMCSA issued a new policy in April 2007 to clarify how field staff should effectively prioritize the riskiest carriers for compliance reviews. The Committee hopes that this new policy will result in an improved ability to meet this critical safety requirement. In addition, the Committee has provided additional resources for FMCSA's operations budget and directs that of this amount, $1,000,000 be used by FMCSA to ensure that the agency is conducting compliance reviews on high risk carriers as required by law. Furthermore, the agency is directed to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations quarterly updates on its ability to meet this requirement.

Repeat Violators.—A system that seeks to attack the highest risk carriers must inevitably focus on those that continually flout safety violations—repeat offenders. The Committee was therefore concerned by a report by the Department of Transportation [DOT] Inspector General [IG], which found that FMCSA did not consistently use its authority to implement sanctions against repeat violators. FMCSA has committed to the DOT IG that it will strengthen its policies to ensure that repeat offenders are subject to the maximum fines. The Committee directs the DOT IG to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the success of

FMCSA's policies in satisfying this recommendation, as well as how these policies are being implemented in the field.

ADA Compliance of Curbside Motor Coach Operators.—The Committee is greatly dismayed by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's continuing failure to exercise the Department's authority to deny operating authority to interstate bus companies that are unwilling or unable to comply to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA]. DOT's regulations under 49 CFR Part 37, Subpart H requires accessibility to over-the-road buses for people with disabilities. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit rejected FMCSA's assertion that it did not have the authority to deny bus operators registration on these grounds and remanded the case to FMCSA for further interpretation of the statutory language. In the many months that have passed since that decision, no action has been taken by FMCSA. The Committee expects FMCSA to take immediate action to implement the Court's decision without further delay. That action should ensure that discrimination against people with disabilities precludes bus operators from registering as interstate motor carriers to the same extent to which other forms of discrimination and serious safety violations preclude such registration. The Committee further directs the Secretary of Transportation to provide a letter report to the Committee no later than 30 days following the reporting of this bill to explain how she and her Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administrator have implemented the Circuit Court decision and the Committee's directive.

PROGRAM EXPENSES

The Committee recommends $56,841,000 for FMCSA's program expenses. Funding is provided for the programs as follows:

	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	Committee recommendation
Research & Technology	$10,296,000	$7,550,000	$7,550,000
Information Management	43,175,000	33,329,000	34,329,000
Regulatory Development	12,455,000	9,462,000	9,962,000
Outreach and Education	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
CMV Operations Grants	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

Regulatory and Standards Development.—The Committee has provided $9,962,000 for regulatory and standards development, which is $2,493,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level and $500,000 more than the President's request. The Committee notes that the agency has a backlog of over 40 pending regulatory actions. Given the importance of these regulations, the Committee was troubled by the decrease in funding for this program. Therefore the Committee has provided additional funding to be used to support regulatory development. Within this allocation, the Committee has denied funding for the new activity of "organizational assessment", as it appears to be duplicative of the CSA 2010 initiative. While it is important to assess and improve organizational effectiveness, the Committee believes that given the agency's tight budget, this funding is better spent in support of the program's other activities, such as medical oversight improvement.

Information Management.—FMCSA is approaching its enforcement mission using a data-driven approach to identify and target

the riskiest motor carriers. While the agency has made improvements in its data quality, the DOT IG has argued that FMCSA must make additional improvements in data quality in order to properly rank and target motor carriers for reviews and inspection. Therefore, the Committee is concerned by the large funding reduction proposed in the budget for the Information Management program for fiscal year 2008. The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for information management and directs FMCSA to use this funding exclusively to improve data quality and data access capabilities.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2007	$294,000,000	$294,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	300,000,000	300,000,000
Committee recommendation	300,000,000	300,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides the necessary resources for Federal grants to support State compliance, enforcement, and other programs. Grants are also provided to States for enforcement efforts at both the southern and northern borders to ensure that all points of entry into the United States are fortified with comprehensive safety measures; improvement of State commercial driver's license [CDL] oversight activities to prevent unqualified drivers from being issued CDLs; and the Performance Registration Information Systems and Management [PRISM] program, which links State motor vehicle registration systems with carrier safety data in order to identify unsafe commercial motor carriers.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The Committee recommends a liquidation of contract authorization of $300,000,000 for the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out motor carrier safety grant programs. The Committee recommendation is consistent with the budget estimate and the contract authorization for this program under SAFETEA–LU.

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $300,000,000 for motor carrier safety grants. The recommended limitation is consistent with the budget estimate and the amount authorized under SAFETEA–LU. The Committee recommendation is $14,820,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee recommends a separate limitation for each grant pro-

gram funded under this account with the following funding allocations:

	Amount
Motor carrier safety assistance program [MCSAP]	$202,000,000
Commercial driver's license and driver improvement program	25,000,000
Border enforcement grants	32,000,000
Performance and registration information system management [PRISM] grants	5,000,000
Commercial vehicle information systems and networks [CVISN] grants	25,000,000
Safety Data Improvement	3,000,000
CDLIS	8,000,000

PRISM.—The performance and registration information system management [PRISM] grants program seeks to ensure that unsafe motor carriers cannot resume interstate operations after being ordered by FMCSA to cease operations. The Committee believes that this program can be an integral part of improving the safety of motor carriers operating on our Nation's highways. However, the Committee is concerned that, despite the fact that FMCSA anticipates that nearly all of the States will have PRISM grant agreements in fiscal year 2008, FMCSA's stated goal is that only 30 States will actually use the tool to suspend, revoke, or deny license plates based on FMCSA prohibition on interstate operations. The Committee is concerned as to why this tool will not be used more fully and seeks a better understanding of the issues surrounding full implementation of this program. Therefore, the Committee directs GAO to evaluate the extent to which the program has enhanced the ability of both the States and FMCSA to identify unsafe motor carriers and take effective enforcement action; what opportunities exist to fully implement the program nationally; and what oversight FMCSA is providing to ensure that the program's purpose is being achieved.

Oversight of MCSAP.—The FMCSA relies on its State and local partners to assist the agency in the enforcement of motor carrier regulations. FMCSA anticipates that in fiscal year 2008, there will be approximately 2 million driver and vehicle inspections; 3,700 compliance reviews; and 26,500 new entrant audits conducted by the States. FMCSA supports the efforts by providing grant money to the States. In order to receive this funding, each State must demonstrate that it has adequate motor carrier regulations and must submit a Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan [CVSP], which is reviewed and approved by FMCSA. The Committee notes that a GAO report issued in December 2005 questioned whether FMCSA was providing an adequate level of oversight to the MCSAP program. The Committee understands that FMCSA is responding to GAO's recommendations. The Committee wants to ensure that this funding is being used to effectively reduce highway fatalities and improve the safety of our Nation's highways, and looks forward to the GAO's follow up report on this topic.

The bill also rescinds $11,260,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations acts.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

The bill rescinds $32,187,720 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations acts.

NATIONAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY PROGRAM

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

The bill rescinds $5,212,858 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations acts.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Section 130 subjects the funds in this act to section 350 of Public Law 107–87 in order to ensure the safety of all cross-border long haul operations conducted by Mexican-domiciled commercial carriers.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] is responsible for motor vehicle safety, highway safety behavioral programs, and the motor vehicle information and automobile fuel economy programs. The Federal Government's regulatory role in motor vehicle and highway safety began in September 1966 with the enactment of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (codified as chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code) and the Highway Safety Act of 1966 (codified as chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code). The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 instructs the Secretary to reduce traffic crashes and deaths and injuries resulting from traffic crashes; establish motor vehicle safety standards for motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment in interstate commerce; carry out needed safety research and development; and expand the National Driver Register. The Highway Safety Act of 1966 instructs the Secretary to increase highway safety by providing for a coordinated national highway safety program through financial assistance to the States.

In October 1966, these activities, originally under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, were transferred to the Department of Transportation, to be carried out through the National Traffic Safety Bureau. In March 1970, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] was established as a separate organizational entity in the Department. It succeeded the National Highway Safety Bureau, which previously had administered traffic and highway safety functions as an organizational unit of the Federal Highway Administration.

NHTSA's mission was expanded in October 1972 with the enactment of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (now codified as chapters 321, 323, 325, 327, 329, and 331 of title 49, United States Code). This act as originally enacted, instructs the Secretary to establish low-speed collision bumper standards, consumer information activities, and odometer regulations. Three major amendments to this act have been enacted: (1) a December 1975 amendment directs the Secretary to set and administer mandatory automotive fuel economy standards; (2) an October 1984 amendment directs the Secretary to require certain passenger motor vehicles and their major replacement parts to be marked with identifying numbers or symbols; and (3) an October 1992 amendment directs the Secretary to set and administer automobile content labeling requirements.

NHTSA's current programs are authorized in five major laws: (1) the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code); (2) the Highway Safety Act (chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code); (3) the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act [MVICSA] (part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code); (4) the National Driver Register Act of 1982; and (5) the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA–LU].

The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act provides for the establishment and enforcement of safety standards for vehicles and associated equipment and the conduct of supporting research, including the acquisition of required testing facilities and the operation of the National Driver Register, which was reauthorized by the National Driver Register Act of 1982.

The Highway Safety Act provides for coordinated national highway safety programs (section 402 of title 23, United States Code) to be carried out by the States and for highway safety research, development, and demonstration programs (section 403 of title 23, United States Code). The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–690) authorized a new drunk driving prevention program (section 410 of title 23, United States Code) to make grants to States to implement and enforce drunk driving prevention programs.

SAFETEA–LU, which was enacted on August 10, 2005, either reauthorized or added new authorizations for the full range of NHTSA programs for fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $835,406,000 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA]. This funding is $2,406,000 more than the President's request and $14,674,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted [1]	2008 estimate	
Operations and research	$228,982,430	$229,750,000	$232,156,000
National Driver Register	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Highway traffic safety grants	587,750,000	599,250,000	599,250,000

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted [1]	2008 estimate	
Total	820,732,430	833,000,000	835,406,000

In August 2006, the latest data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System [FARS] was released by NHTSA. The data showed that in 2005 highway fatalities numbered 43,443. This represents the highest number of fatalities since 1990. Even more disconcerting than the raw number of fatalities was the fact that, for the first time in 10 years, the rate of fatalities as measured against 100 million vehicles miles traveled [VMT] also increased. This should be viewed as a setback for the Department and for NHTSA.

Despite these dire numbers, the President's budget for fiscal year 2008 offered no bold or innovative proposals to improve highway safety. Instead, the administration weakened its stated goal of achieving 1 fatality per 100 million VMT in 2008, and delayed it until 2011. While the Secretary has maintained the administration's commitment to achieving this goal, this must be demonstrated with clearly articulated strategies that will enable the Department to meet this fatality goal in 2011.

The chart below displays the targets and outcomes for fatalities per million VMT. Given the trends displayed and the aggressive goal for 1 fatality per 100 million VMT, the Committee is concerned that, absent new tools and approaches, the Department and the agency will once again fail to achieve this important goal in 2011.



In testimony before the Committee, the Secretary pledged to personally go back and redouble efforts in order to work on these safety issues. It is critically important that this pledge is supported by demonstrated actions. NHTSA's role in improving highway safety is crucial and the Committee expects the agency to provide the necessary leadership in developing new strategies that address the challenges in reducing the highway fatalities.

As such, the Committee directs NHTSA to submit a report to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations 180 days after the enactment of this act on how it is redoubling its efforts, and how its programs will enable the Department to achieve the goal of 1 fatality per 100 million VMT in 2011. This report should address both the behavioral and vehicle safety programs of the agency. Moreover, the report should demonstrate how the agency is acting expeditiously, and not merely repeat activities currently being undertaken. The Committee wants to see how the agency's programs are going to result in reductions in the number of fatalities both in the near and long term. The Committee is especially interested in the agency's work in the areas where FARS data indicate the agency is struggling to make gains, such as motorcycle and alcohol-related fatalities.

Highway fatalities account for over 90 percent of all transportation-related fatalities and it remains the leading cause of death and disability for Americans age 3 through 33. The States have an important role to play in successfully reducing the number of highway fatalities, but NHTSA must be a leader in this effort. The

agency must move with a sense of urgency and renewed commitment to finding innovative solutions—both through its behavioral and vehicle safety programs—to reverse this tragic trend of rising highway fatalities.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2007	$228,982,430
Budget estimate, 2008	229,750,000
Committee recommendation	232,156,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

These programs support traffic safety programs and related research, demonstrations, technical assistance, and national leadership for highway safety programs conducted by State and local government, the private sector, universities, research units, and various safety associations and organizations. These highway safety programs emphasize alcohol and drug countermeasures, vehicle occupant protection, traffic law enforcement, emergency medical and trauma care systems, traffic records and licensing, State and community traffic safety evaluations, motorcycle riders, pedestrian and bicycle safety, pupil transportation, distracted and drowsy driving, young and older driver safety programs, and development of improved accident investigation procedures.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has provided $232,156,000 for Operations and Research. This level is $3,174,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level and $2,406,000 more than the budget request. The funding provided supports the behavioral and vehicle safety programs of NHTSA, $124,406,000 is derived from the General Fund and $107,750,000 is derived from the Highway Trust Fund, as authorized in SAFETEA–LU.

The Committee recommends funds to be distributed to the following program activities in the following amounts:

	Amount
Safety Performance	$13,518,000
Enforcement	18,277,000
Highway Safety Programs	43,715,000
Research and Analysis	66,178,000
Administrative Expenses	90,468,000

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Committee recommends $90,468,000 for administrative and related operating expenses associated with carrying out the agency's Behavioral Research program as authorized by section 403 of title 23, U.S.C. and with Vehicle Research program as authorized by chapter 301 of title 49, and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, U.S.C.

Budget Documentation.—The Committee has directed NHTSA to submit a report on the agency's plans for helping the Department achieve the goal of 1 fatality per 100 million VMT by 2011, including new initiatives and proposals that will enable the agency to

meet that goal. NHTSA should integrate detailed plans set out in this report into its fiscal year 2009 performance budget.

SAFETY PERFORMANCE

New Car Assessment Program [NCAP].—NCAP is a tool used by NHTSA to inform consumers about the comparative safety of cars, and has encouraged manufacturers to make safer cars. While the program is critical to improving the safety of vehicles, the Government Accountability Office observed in a report to the Committee in 2005 that the program needs to change to maintain its relevance. The Committee was therefore pleased by the Secretary's announcement in January that the agency plans to improve vehicle crash tests and the five star rating program in order to evolve with the times and technology. The Committee expects that NHTSA will include detailed information on the modifications the agency is planning to NCAP, how these changes will improve the program, and the timeline for implementation of these changes as part of the agency's 2009 performance budget.

Tire Pressure Monitoring Systems.—The TREAD Act included a requirement that the Secretary of Transportation issue a rule mandating that new motor vehicles have a warning system to alert operators when a tire is significantly under-inflated. In April 2005, NHTSA fulfilled the requirement of the TREAD Act by publishing a final rule that requires Tire Pressure Monitoring Systems [TPMS] to be installed in every new vehicle by model year 2006. NHTSA notes the potential of TPMS in preventing injury, saving lives and improving fuel economy. However, the Committee is concerned that these impacts may be undermined if consumers do not fully understand the technology. Therefore, the Committee provides NHTSA with $750,000 and directs NHTSA to carry out a consumer education campaign that would assist drivers in understanding new TPMS technologies, their purpose, and the valuable safety information that they provide. Requested by Senators Levin and Stabenow.

LATCH.—In order to standardize the way that child restraints are attached to vehicles without using seat belts, NHTSA promulgated a rule that became effective in September 2002. As a result, the Lower Anchors and Tethers for Children [LATCH] installation system was created and has been in the marketplace since the regulation was issued. However, a recent report by NHTSA demonstrated that the current technology is confusing for parents. The Committee understands that NHTSA is taking measures to address this issue both by examining vehicle standards and through a public education campaign. The Committee applauds the agency's effort to move to address this important safety issue. The Committee further requests that the agency include information on the activities and actions planned to address the problems with the LATCH system in the agency's fiscal year 2009 budget.

SAFETY ASSURANCE

The Committee includes $18,277,000 for NHTSA's enforcement activities consistent with the budget request. This funding supports the agency's efforts to ensure the safety of vehicles on our roads by enforcing compliance with safety standards and investigating safe-

ty-related defects in motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment. This program also supports the enforcement of Federal odometer laws and encourages the enforcement of State odometer laws.

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM

The Committee recommends funds to be distributed to the following program activities in the following amounts:

	Amount
Impaired Driving	$11,400,000
Drug Impaired Driving	1,488,000
Pedestrians/Bicycle/Pupil Transportation	1,665,000
Older Driver Safety	1,700,000
Motorcycle Safety	992,000
National Occupant Protection	11,132,000
Enforcement and Justice Services	2,699,000
Emergency Medical Services	2,320,000
Enhance 9–1–1 Act Implementation and NEMSIS	2,250,000
Driver Licensing	1,002,000
Highway Safety Research [1]	11,346,000
Emerging Traffic Safety Issues	588,000
International Programs	100,000

[1] This amount includes $4,967,000 from the Highway Traffic Grants Administrative Expenses

Seat Belt Usage.—Seat belts have proven to be one of the most effective tools in reducing highway fatalities. NHTSA estimates that seat belts saved 15,632 lives in 2005 and that an additional 5,328 lives could have been saved if motor vehicle occupants had been wearing seat belts. Strong seat belt laws coupled with strong enforcement has proven effective in improving seat belt usage and saving lives. However, today only 26 States and the District of Columbia have primary seat belt laws. The enactment of primary seat belt laws has been on the National Transportation Safety Board's "Most Wanted" list for States since 1998. Under a provision in SAFETEA–LU, the Secretary and the Administrator have the ability to go to States to work for the implementation of primary seat belt laws. In testimony before the Committee, the Secretary stated that she had personally gone out to States to encourage the enactment of primary seat belt laws.

The Committee believes that it is critical that the Secretary and the Administrator be engaged in this effort and directs the agency to submit quarterly reports on the actions taken by the agency to work towards the implementation of primary seat belt laws in all States.

Impaired Driving.—The Committee has provided $11,400,000 for the impaired driving program. This level is $194,000 more than the President's request and $100,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee has provided this additional funding based on the FARS data that showed an increase in the number of alcohol-related fatalities. In May of this year, NHTSA released preliminary Fatality Analysis Reporting Systems [FARS] data for 2006. These projections for highway fatalities in 2006 revealed some disturbing trends in the area of alcohol-related fatalities. After fatalities rose by 4 percent above the 2004 level, projections for 2006 indicate that the number will grow by an additional 2.4 percent 2005—this would represent the highest number of alcohol-related fatalities since 1992. In light of these numbers, the Com-

mittee cannot support reducing funding for this important safety program, as requested by the agency.

The Committee was pleased that in testimony before the Committee, the NHTSA Administrator spoke of the agency's renewed commitment to reducing alcohol-related fatalities. The Committee supports NHTSA's active leadership in the Campaign to Eliminate Drunk Driving, which has brought together law enforcement, policymakers, MADD, auto manufacturers and responsible distilled spirits companies with the goal of eliminating alcohol-impaired driving. The campaign is based on the principal that a combination of tough laws, aggressive enforcement, increased deployment of interlock technologies and the continuation of the national media campaign will save lives. The Committee encourages NHTSA's involvement in the development of voluntary vehicle-based technologies, as supported under the Campaign, which will accurately detect if a driver is impaired and prevent that driver from operating the vehicle. The Committee looks forward to seeing the recommendations of the newly-established Blue Ribbon Panel for the Development of Advanced Alcohol Detection Technology.

Motorcycle Safety.—Early 2006 data indicate that for the ninth consecutive year, motorcycle fatalities are projected to increase. This represents an increase of 125 percent since 1997. It is clear from the data that the old solutions to this problem are not working and that significant efforts are needed to make real strides in reducing motorcycle fatalities. The Committee has included the President's request for additional funding for this program and includes a level of $992,000 for the motorcycle safety program, which is $192,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

In testimony before the Committee the NHTSA Administrator discussed the importance of helmet use and training. Supporting this idea, in February, the Secretary encouraged manufacturers to provide free or discounted rider training or helmets with the purchase of motorcycles sold in the United States. While the Committee agrees that helmet use and training are important, the Committee questions if improving access to training and helmets will be sufficient to achieve the dramatic reductions in motorcycle fatalities that have proven so challenging for the agency.

In order to more fully understand the impact of the agency's efforts to reduce the number of motorcycle fatalities, the Committee directs NHTSA to submit a report to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations 90 days after the enactment of this act, outlining specific activities that the agency will undertake in order to change this pattern of increasing motorcycle fatalities. This report should include how the activities funded by the agency are resulting in fewer motorcycle fatalities. As part of this report, the agency should include the specific activities that will be undertaken as a result of the increased funding provided by the Committee. Further, NHTSA should include in this report how manufacturers are responding to the Secretary's request to provide free or discounted helmets and training, and what impact this is having on helmet use and fatality reductions.

The Committee also notes that the NTSB held a public forum on motorcycle safety in September 2006. The Committee encourages the agency to look at recommendations that may result from this

forum and work to implement these strategies and recommendations where possible.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Programs.—The Committee is concerned by the reduction in funding for the pedestrian, bicycle and pupil transportation program. FARS data from 2005 showed an increase in the number of pedestrian fatalities, and projections for 2006 indicate further increases in bicycle fatalities. The Committee has included a funding level of $1,665,000. This level is $212,000 more than the request and consistent with the level provided in fiscal year 2007.

National EMS Information System.—The Committee continues to support efforts to develop a national database for the collection of EMS data. The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for the National Emergency Medical Services Information System [NEMSIS], which is $750,000 more than the requested level. This funding is for the implementation of the database by the National Center for Statistics and Analysis [NCSA] and for the continued support of the NEMSIS Technical Assistance Center. The Committee believes that a comprehensive EMS system is critical in providing prompt, quality care to automobile crash victims.

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Crash Avoidance and Human-Vehicle Performance.—The Committee applauds NHTSA's announcement that it will require all vehicles to have electronic stability control, which is expected to save up to 10,000 lives annually. In addition, the NHTSA Administrator testified before the Committee about the importance of researching and deploying crash avoidance technologies. The Committee supports these efforts and believes it is critical to continue research into other promising technologies that will improve the safety of vehicles. As part of the agency's fiscal year 2009 budget, the Committee directs NHTSA to provide detailed information on the crash avoidance technologies that are being researched and tested. This should include identifications of which technologies show the most promise of saving a substantial number of lives. In addition, the agency should submit proposed timelines for research completion and the possible deployment of promising technologies. In developing these timeframes, the Committee encourages the agency to be mindful that as technology continues to evolve, it is critical that the agency move at a pace that will allow the agency to be the leader in developing and promoting safety-related technologies.

Plastic and Composite Vehicles.—The Committee recognizes the development of plastics and polymer-based composites in the automotive industry and the important role these technologies play in improving automobile performance. The Committee recommends an additional $500,000 to continue development of a roadmap for Lightweight Plastic and Composite Intensive Vehicles [PCIV] research to examine possible safety benefits. The program will help facilitate a foundation of cooperation between DOT, the Department of Energy and industry stakeholders for the development of safety-centered approaches for future lightweight automotive design. Requested by Senator Murray.

Vehicle Backover Avoidance.—As part of the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill, the Committee directed NHTSA to conduct a

study of vehicle backover avoidance technology. That report was finalized in November 2006. While NHTSA identified some challenges with the current technologies, the agency also identified areas for further action. NHTSA noted that its future plans included: conducting additional human factors research; developing test procedures for evaluating system effectiveness, improving backover data collection methods; and working with industry on continued research and development on backover technologies. The Committee supports NHTSA's efforts to continue to pursue this safety issue, and looks forward to the recommendations that may result from its continued examination of this issue.

Motorcycle Fatality Rate Calculation.—In addition to changing its fatality rate goals, the Department has changed the way that motorcycle fatality rates are being calculated. The budget proposes to shift from measuring motorcycle accidents against VMT, to measuring fatalities against the number of motorcycle registrations. However, in changing the calculation, it becomes difficult to evaluate the real progress that NHTSA is making in meeting its goal of reducing fatalities. Therefore, while NHTSA may begin to use this new measure, in this time of transition, NHTSA is directed to continue including fatality rates based on VMT in order to enable the Committee to have an accurate comparative measure of its progress.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2007	$4,000,000	$4,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	4,000,000	4,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,000,000	4,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding to implement and operate the Problem Driver Pointer System [PDPS] and improve traffic safety by assisting State motor vehicle administrators in communicating effectively and efficiently with other States to identify drivers whose licenses have been suspended or revoked for serious traffic offenses such as driving under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The Committee recommends a liquidation of contract authorization of $4,000,000 for payment on obligations incurred in carryout provisions of the National Driver Register Act. The recommended liquidating cash appropriation is equal to the budget estimate and is equal to the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $4,000,000 for the National Driver Register. The recommended limitation is the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2007	$587,750,000	$587,750,000
Budget estimate, 2008	599,250,000	599,250,000
Committee recommendation	599,250,000	599,250,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

SAFETEA–LU reauthorizes three State grant programs: highway safety programs, occupant protection incentive grants, and alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures incentive grants; and authorizes for the first time an additional five State programs: safety belt performance grants, State traffic safety information systems improvement grants, high visibility enforcement program, child safety and child booster seat safety incentive grants, and motorcyclist safety grants.

SAFETEA–LU established a new safety belt performance incentive grant program under section 406 of title 23, United States Code; SAFETEA–LU also established a new State traffic safety information system improvement program incentive grants program under section 408 of title 23, United States Code; SAFETEA–LU amended the alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures incentive grant program authorized by section 410 of title 23, United States Code; SAFETEA–LU establishes a new program to administer at least two high-visibility traffic safety law enforcement campaigns each year to achieve one or both of the following objectives: (1) reduce alcohol-impaired or drug-impaired operation of motor vehicles; and/or (2) increase the use of safety belts by occupants of motor vehicles.

Motorcyclist Safety.—Section 2010 of SAFETEA–LU established a new program of incentive grants for motorcycle safety training and motorcyclist awareness programs.

Child Safety.—Section 2011 of SAFETEA–LU established a new incentive grant program these grants may be used only for child safety seat and child restraint programs.

Grant Administrative Expenses.—Section 2001(a)(11) of SAFETEA–LU provides funding for salaries and operating expenses related to the administration of the grants programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The Committee recommends an appropriation for liquidation of contract authorization of $599,250,000 for payment on obligations incurred in carryout provision of the highway traffic safety grant programs. The Committee recommendation is consistent with the amount of contract authorization for highway traffic safety grant programs under SAFETEA–LU. The recommended liquidating cash appropriation is equal to the budget estimate and $11,500,000 more than fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $599,250,000 for the highway traffic safety grant programs funded under this heading. The recommended limitation is equal to the budget estimate and $11,500,000 more than fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The Committee continues to recommend 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.

The Committee recommends a separate limitation on obligations for administrative expenses and for each grant program as follows:

	Amount
Highway Safety Programs (section 402)	$225,000,000
Occupant Protection Incentive Grants (section 405)	25,000 000
Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grant Program (section 410)	131,000,000
High Visibility Enforcement Program (section 2009)	29,000,000
Motorcyclist Safety (section 2010)	6,000,000
State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements (408)	34,500,000
Child Safety and Child Booster Seat Safety Incentive (section 2011)	6,000,000
Safety Belt Performance Grants (406)	124,500,000
Administrative Expenses	18,250,000

Alcohol-Impaired Driving Traffic Safety Program.—In response to a request from the Committee, the Department of Transportation Inspector General conducted an audit of NHTSA's Impaired Driving grant program. The audit found that NHTSA needed to develop better performance measures in order to determine the effectiveness of the Federal funding spent on these initiatives. The Committee believes that it is critical that NHTSA work with States to develop and monitor implementation strategies for its impaired driving program. With alcohol-related fatalities increasing, it is critical that the agency fully understand effective strategies for reducing impaired driving fatalities, as well as the challenges that States face so that the agency can make improvements to the program. As such, the Committee encourages NHTSA to move as quickly as possibly to fulfill the recommendations of the DOT IG. The Committee also requests that the DOT IG continue to monitor NHTSA's progress in meeting these recommendations and brief the Committee on its findings.

High Visibility Enforcement.—The Committee continues to support the efforts of NHTSA to combine law enforcement and paid ad-

vertisement to increase seat belt use and decrease impaired driving. The agency conducted three high visibility campaigns with the funding provided in 2006. Over the Memorial Day holiday, the agency conducted its "Click It or Ticket" high visibility enforcement mobilization aimed at increasing seat belt usage. The Committee was also encouraged by NHTSA's increased efforts on impaired driving in 2006. The agency conducted two mobilizations around impaired driving. The first mobilization, conducted over Labor Day, included the rollout of the agency's new impaired driving slogan "Drunk Driving. Over the Limit. Under Arrest." In addition, the first holiday impaired-driving mobilization occurred in December. The Committee expects the agency to continue its efforts with these important mobilizations.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Section 140 allows $130,000 of obligation authority for section 402 of title 23 U.S.C. to be available to pay for travel and expenses for State management reviews and highway safety staff core competency development training.

Section 141 includes a provision that rescinds $12,197,113.60 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under the heading "Operations and Research" in prior appropriations acts.

Section 142 includes a provision that rescinds $119,914.61 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under the heading "National Driver Register" in prior appropriations acts.

Section 143 includes a provision that rescinds $10,528,958 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under the heading "Highway Traffic Safety Grants" in prior appropriations acts.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

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.

SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2007	$150,271,312
Budget estimate, 2008	148,472,000
Committee recommendation	151,186,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Safety and Operations account provides support for FRA rail safety activities and all other administrative and operating activities related to staff and programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $151,186,000 for Safety and Operations for fiscal year 2008, which is $2,714,000 more than the budget request and $914,688 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. Of this amount the bill specifies that, $12,268,890 remains available until expended.

The Committee is disappointed that the administration did not put a higher priority on funding railroad safety and requested fewer resources for this account for 2008. The Committee believes that funding the Safety and Operations account at the requested level would prevent rail safety inspectors from being able to conduct their work and travel to railroad sites across the country. Travel for the purposes of inspector training would also be undermined. Furthermore, according to the budget justifications submitted by the agency, the budget request would force the FRA to delay filling certain important staff vacancies for a period of 6 months. The Committee believes such budgeting gimmicks are irresponsible. The Committee is happy to debate the administration as to whether or not these positions are important to the agency's mission. But it cannot find any logic behind a policy of deliberately keeping the positions vacant for a temporary period of time, as is requested in the budget. The Committee has made the following adjustments to the budget request.

	Amount
Reject delay in replacing vacancies	+$629,000
Reject travel reductions, including inspector travel	+1,785,000
Evaluation of penalty effectiveness	+300,000

Evaluation of Penalty Effectiveness.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the FRA to hire an independent consultant to complete an impartial evaluation of the effectiveness of the how the agency uses its authority to impose penalties in enforcing its regulations and improving railroad safety. Imposing penalties is a central enforcement mechanism of the FRA. However, as noted in recent reports by the Government Accountability Office, the FRA has not systematically studied the effectiveness of how the agency uses this authority.

As illustrated in chart below, the FRA has processed an average of well over 5,000 violations every year for the past 5 years. The agency responds to most of these violations by imposing a financial penalty on the responsible party. After imposing the penalty, the FRA often enters negotiations over the level of the penalty with the responsible party, and the agency is willing to lower the penalty in exchange for commitments to make safety improvements. Over the 2002–2005 period, the FRA imposed an average of $17,434,755 in penalties. The agency then collected an average of $10,247,048 over the same period, a difference of $7,187,707. (The FRA has not completed negotiations over penalties assessed in 2006.) The Com-

mittee respects the priority that the FRA places on obtaining these commitments to improve safety, but the Committee questions if this strategy is the most effective way to improve the overall safety of the railroad industry over the long term.



The evaluation funded in the bill should include, but not be limited to, an examination of the frequency with which FRA imposes penalties, the level of penalties that FRA initially imposes, and the use of negotiations to lower penalty levels in exchange for commitments to improve safety. The evaluation should also include an assessment of whether individual carrier commitments actually translated into measurable safety improvements, an assessment of the FRA's ability to determine whether such measurable improvements were made, and an assessment as to how the FRA allows a railroad's performance in this area to influence the agency's discounting of penalties in the future. The Committee directs the FRA to report within 90 days on its schedule for the completion of the evaluation, and to submit a comprehensive report within 18 months on the findings of the evaluation.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2007	$34,524,000
Budget estimate, 2008	32,250,000
Committee recommendation	36,250,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Railroad Research and Development provides for research in the development of safety and performance standards for railroads and the evaluation of their role in the Nation's transportation infrastructure.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $36,250,000 for railroad research and development, which is $4,000,000 more than the budget request and $1,726,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

Within the amount provided, the Committee recommends:

$3,000,000 for the Next Generation Rail Tank Car [NGRTC] program. This program will provide for additional baseline testing of existing rail tank cars and the evaluation of new tank car design prototypes. This research is intended to assist in the development of a new Federal tank car standard in the near term (as requested by Senator Stabenow);

$1,000,000 for the demonstration and deployment of positive train control technology along the Alaska Railroad (as requested by Senator Stevens);

$250,000 for the Constructed Facilities Center at West Virginia University to develop manufactured modules using innovative manufacturing techniques, advanced blast resistant materials and structural systems, and embedded modern sensors (as requested by Senator Byrd); and

$750,000 for Marshall University, in cooperation with the University of Nebraska, to develop a new track stability technology using the actual rail lines in the States as the calibration test beds (as requested by Senator Byrd).

INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL GRANT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	$100,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

The President's budget request includes $100,000,000 for a new capital grant program to encourage State participation in passenger rail service. Under the proposed program, a State or States would apply to the Federal Railroad Administration for grants for up to 50 percent of the cost of capital investments necessary to support improved intercity passenger rail service. The Committee has not provided funding for this program, choosing instead to direct $100,000,000 to a new "Capital Assistance to States Intercity Passenger Rail Service" program. This alternative program will fund similar activities as the President's program but on a reimbursable basis with slightly modified criteria.

PENNSYLVANIA STATION REDEVELOPMENT

(RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	−$9,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

The President's budget request includes a rescission of $9,000,000 from funds that had been previously appropriated for the renovation of the James A. Farley Post Office building as a train station and commercial center. The Committee has rejected the proposed rescission as extensive planning is currently underway to address the station capacity challenges facing Amtrak and

the regional commuter railroads serving midtown Manhattan. The appropriated funding in question may prove to be a necessary component of any Federal contribution toward this regional solution.

CAPITAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES—INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	$100,000,000

The Committee has provided $100,000,000 for capital assistance to States to promote new intercity passenger rail service as well as improve existing passenger rail corridors. This is a new program that was not funded in fiscal year 2007. This program shares many of the objectives of the Intercity Passenger Rail Grant Program included in the President's budget for 2008. As in the case of the President's proposed program, States may apply for grants of up to 50 percent of the cost of capital investments necessary to support improved intercity passenger rail service.

In allocating grant funding under this program, the Federal Railroad Administrator shall give priority to projects to improve rail services that require either little or no Federal operating subsidy, projects where States have made a financial commitment to improve the safety of highway/rail grade crossings over which the passenger service operates, and projects that involve a commitment by freight railroads of financial resources commensurate with the benefit expected to their operations. The Committee recognizes that their may be improvements funded under this program for which the benefits to passenger rail operations far exceed any benefit expected to freight operations. The Administrator is expected to encourage financial contributions from freight railroads only to the extent that freight operations benefit from the proposed improvements. Funds made available under this program shall be subject to the same terms and conditions relating to labor standards as capital funds made available to Amtrak.

The Committee believes that this program holds promise to alleviate some of the on-time performance problems plaguing Amtrak long-distance and State-supported trains. As such, the proposed program incorporates the identical incentive included in the administration's proposed program; namely, that priority be given to projects that involve a commitment by host freight railroads to an enforceable on-time performance of passenger trains of 80 percent or greater. Also, as in the case of the administration's proposed program, States applying for assistance must first include intercity passenger rail service as an integral part of their statewide transportation planning activities and any capital improvement for which assistance is sought must first appear on the requesting State's Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan [STIP]. Unlike the administration's proposed program, the Capital Grant program will make funding available to States for capital projects only on a reimbursable basis.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK)

The National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) operates intercity passenger rail services in 46 States and the District of Co-

lumbia, in addition to serving as a contractor in various capacities for several commuter rail agencies. Congress created Amtrak in the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–518) in response to private carriers' inability to profitably operate intercity passenger rail service. Thereafter, Amtrak assumed the common carrier obligations of the private railroads in exchange for the right to priority access of their tracks for incremental cost.

For fiscal year 2008, the President's budget request seeks a total of $800,000,000 in direct support for Amtrak, including $300,000,000 in efficiency incentive grants and $500,000,000 in capital grants. The amount requested is $493,550,000 less than the comparable 2007 level—a reduction of almost 40 percent. As in years past, the Committee cannot seriously consider the administration's budget request as a credible proposal since it will do nothing other than bankrupt the railroad. The Department of Transportation Office of Inspector General [OIG] performs quarterly audits on Amtrak's finances and reports the results of those audits to the Committee. During hearings on Amtrak's finances this year, witnesses from the OIG testified that they saw no way that Amtrak could remain viable if funded at the President's requested level. While the administration has testified to their strong commitment to "reform" Amtrak, the fact remains that no such "reforms", merited or not, can occur if the railroad goes into receivership and is required to terminate all intercity passenger rail service. As such, for fiscal year 2008, the Committee has provided $1,370,000,000 for Amtrak's operating and capital needs. The amount provided is $76,450,000 more than the comparable level for fiscal year 2007.

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2007	$490,050,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 300,000,000
Committee recommendation	485,000,000

[1] Included as "efficiency incentive grants"

The Committee provides $485,000,000 for operating grants for Amtrak. The operating grant provides a subsidy to account for the difference between Amtrak's self-generated operating revenues and its total operating costs. The amount provided is $185,000,000 more than the President's request which sought such operating assistance through an efficiency incentive grant program. The amount provided is $5,050,000 less than the comparable amount provided for fiscal year 2007.

On May 22, 2007, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation reported a bill reauthorizing Amtrak with broad bipartisan support. Included within that legislation are numerous reform proposals for the railroad and its operations. Pending the enactment of such a final comprehensive Amtrak reform bill, the Committee has included most of the legislative provisions from prior appropriations acts governing the availability of Amtrak operating subsidies through a route-by-route grant making process approved by the Secretary of Transportation.

Amtrak Efficiency Initiatives/Labor Contracts.—The Committee is greatly disturbed by Amtrak's failure to reach collective bargaining agreements with the majority of Amtrak's workforce. Most

of Amtrak's employees have now gone for more than 7 years without a general wage increase. As such, compensation for a great many Amtrak craftspeople has fallen further and further behind that of craftspeople conducting identical work for freight and commuter railroads. Testimony before the Committee indicates that, in some cases, the extent of this pay differential has reached or exceeded 20 percent. The Amtrak President testified to the Committee that these "big gaps" have made it increasingly difficult to retain the skilled workers the railroad requires. Moreover, these pay gaps have resulted in employee morale reaching an all-time low. The willingness of Amtrak employees to cooperate on important efficiency initiatives has deteriorated badly.

Amtrak's failure to reach a labor settlement is not a result of inadequate Federal funding. To the contrary, salary and benefit costs are derived from Amtrak's operating budget which is financed mostly by self-generated revenues. For each of the last several years, the Committee has provided Amtrak with operating support at or near the levels sought by Amtrak's Board of Directors. Any differences between the larger overall funding requests submitted by Amtrak's Board and actual Federal appropriations have come in the area of the railroad's capital budget.

When it comes to revenue being available for operating costs, Amtrak's self-generated operating revenues have actually exceeded initial company estimates recently due to better-than-expected ticket sales across the entirety of Amtrak's national rail network. While pleased with Amtrak's improved financial performance, the Committee is concerned that these revenues might be directed toward increased capital spending rather than be held in reserve to ensure that all the funds needed for new collective bargaining agreements are immediately available to the railroad. The following chart prepared by the DOT Inspector General displays the railroads better-than-expected operating performance for the current fiscal year:



Amtrak's inability to reach a labor agreement is all the more disturbing in the light of two recent decisions by Amtrak management and its Board of Directors. In late May 2007, Amtrak management sought to institute an across-the-board 10 percent salary increase for Amtrak managers in many specified locations. This came as most of Amtrak's agreement employees entered their eighth year without a general wage increase. Amtrak management hastily cancelled its plan once it came to the attention of the public, the Congress and Amtrak's wage workforce.

In late 2006, the decision was made to provide a lavish "golden parachute" to Amtrak's outgoing interim CEO. Compensation for the interim CEO for calendar year 2006, in combination with an additional recalculated 2006 severance payment that was provided in January of 2007, totaled $478,432.96—an amount that exceeded the salary of the President of the United States by just less than 20 percent. The Committee notes that, under the provisions of section 24315 of title 49, United States Code, Amtrak is required to report to the House of Representatives and the Senate "relevant information about a decision to pay an officer of Amtrak more than the rate for level I of the Executive Schedule . . . " It appears that the entire compensation package of the departed interim CEO may not have been fully reported consistent with this statute. The Committee does not believe that compensation of this amount can possibly be warranted, especially given the overall environment of pay austerity at the railroad. In this regard, the Committee requests that the Amtrak Board of Directors send a letter to the Committee detailing the circumstances that justified this level of compensation to the individual in question. In addition, the Committee requests that the Amtrak Inspector General investigate whether and why this level of compensation was or was not appropriately reported to the House of Representatives and the Senate, as required by law.

Amtrak management is currently considering a series of strategic initiatives to further improve Amtrak's financial performance and reduce the railroad's need for Federal operating subsidies. Almost all of these initiatives will require the cooperation of Amtrak labor. Many of the Amtrak managers who will be charged with executing these initiatives have admitted that, with the current fractious environment at Amtrak, these cost-saving initiatives will have to await a labor compensation settlement with the workforce. As such, both in the interest of fairness and in the interest of moving forward with Amtrak's reform agenda, the Committee directs Amtrak to immediately move to finalize appropriate settlements with its workforce.

Taxpayer-Subsidized Offshoring of Amtrak Jobs.—As part of the development of the appropriations bill providing funding for Amtrak for fiscal year 2007, the Committee included a provision that would immediately terminate Federal funding for Amtrak should the corporation contract for services to be performed overseas that had been provided domestically on or before July 1, 2006. The necessity for this provision was brought about by the Amtrak Board of Directors giving consideration to moving some of Amtrak's reservation customer service functions overseas. In the wake of the Committee's response last year, Amtrak abandoned its plan. The

Committee still considers it unconscionable that the Nation's taxpayer-subsidized national railroad might consider moving jobs overseas. And while the Committee is not aware of any similar proposals being considered by the Amtrak Board, the Committee has included a permanent provision terminating Federal subsidies in the wake of any such action (Sec. 150).

Food and Beverage Service.—The Committee continues to be supportive of Amtrak's efforts to reduce its operating loses stemming from food and beverage service. The forecasted loss for 2007 is expected to be almost 25 percent below the actual loss experienced in 2005. The Committee expects Amtrak to continue to make efforts to reduce this loss while simultaneously working to improve customer satisfaction. The DOT Inspector General is encouraged to continue to monitor these efforts.

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2007	$772,200,000
Budget estimate, 2008	500,000,000
Committee recommendation	885,000,000

The Committee recommends $885,000,000 for capital and debt service grants for Amtrak. Of this amount, not more than $285,000,000 shall be available for debt service payments. The amount provided is $112,800,000 more than the comparable 2007 appropriation and $385,000,000 more than the President's request.

Amtrak capital expenses are dedicated to maintaining Amtrak's capital plant in a state of good repair, keeping aging equipment in safe working order, and overhauling rolling stock to minimize equipment failures. The lion's share of Amtrak's annual capital grant goes toward maintaining the Northeast Corridor due to the railroad's sole ownership of the majority of that corridor. As in the case of Amtrak operating expenses, the Committee has included most of the legislative provisions from prior appropriations acts governing the availability of Amtrak capital grants through a route-by-route grant making process approved by the Secretary of Transportation. Such language may become unnecessary should the Congress enact a comprehensive Amtrak reform bill through the normal legislative process.

On-Time Performance of Amtrak Trains.—The Committee continues to be deeply disappointed with the dismal on-time performance of Amtrak trains outside the Northeast Corridor. The most up-to-date data available indicates that less than 40 percent of Amtrak's long-distance trains arrive at their destination on time. For the month of May 2007, certain routes such as the Palmetto, Silver Star and Capitol Limited services operating over CSX track could barely deliver half their trains within 2 hours of their expected arrival time. Fewer than half of the California Zephyr and Sunset Limited trains operating over Union Pacific track arrived at their destination within 4 hours of their expected arrival time. It is an astonishing testament to the interest of the American public in using Amtrak service that the railroad has been able to boost both passenger counts and passenger-related revenues for the long distance network beyond budgeted expectations given the low likeli-

hood that these passengers will be able to arrive at their destination on time.

While the administration has continually signaled its preference for State-supported passenger rail services over those that require a Federal operating subsidy, it is noteworthy that the on-time performance of many State-supported services is no better and, in many instances, is far worse than Amtrak's subsidized long-distance services. During testimony before the Committee, the Administrator held out the State of North Carolina as an ideal example of State investment in support of intercity rail service. Yet, the State-supported Carolinian service had a pathetic 11.3 percent on-time performance for the month of May and has been unable to arrive on time even one-third of the time for the year to date. It is hard to see how the administration can succeed in enticing ever-greater State participation in intercity passenger service without the dramatic change in operating practices and capital investment that will allow such services to enjoy a reasonable frequency of on-time arrivals.

The chart below displays the on-time performance of Amtrak's trains by route; for the month of May and for the year to date.

ON-TIME PERFORMANCE REPORT—MAY 2007 AND YEAR TO DATE

[In percent]

Service	May 2007	Fiscal year 2007 YTD
Amtrak System	68.9	68.9
Amtrak Premium	87.8	88.3
Acela Express	87.8	88.2
Metroliner [1]	.....	97.5
Amtrak Corridor	82.4	80.0
Keystone	92.3	82.7
Regional	77.7	78.7
Short Distance	65.9	66.3
Capitols	76.3	71.7
Carolinian	11.3	31.1
Cascades	62.9	58.5
Downeaster	54.5	85.6
Empire Corridor	65.7	67.2
Heartland Flyer	27.4	33.5
Hiawatha	86.6	87.0
Hoosier State	25.7	36.8
Illinois	60.0	54.9
Michigan	21.9	32.4
Missouri	12.1	32.0
Pacific Surfliner	78.4	76.1
Pennsylvanian	59.7	68.5
Piedmont	80.0	72.9
San Joaquins	76.1	68.3
Long Distance	37.5	41.0
Auto Train	56.5	52.1
California Zephyr	.....	.....
Capitol Limited	11.3	15.3
Cardinal	22.2	38.5
City of New Orleans	91.9	86.8
Coast Starlight	37.1	20.4
Crescent	35.5	43.4
Empire Builder	87.1	75.2
Lake Shore Ltd	29.0	29.0
Palmetto	11.3	28.2
Silver Meteor	30.6	45.4
Silver Star	12.9	27.2

ON-TIME PERFORMANCE REPORT—MAY 2007 AND YEAR TO DATE—Continued

[In percent]

Service	May 2007	Fiscal year 2007 YTD
Southwest Chief	38.7	66.0
Sunset Limited	11.1	18.3
Texas Eagle	22.6	32.5

[1] On October 30, 2006 the last Metroliner frequency was replaced with Acela Express service.

The Committee appreciates the testimony of the Federal Railroad Administrator in which he acknowledged the on-time performance of Amtrak trains as "one of my top priorities outside of safety itself." The Committee, however, also believes that, in order to have a meaningful impact on this worsening problem, the Administrator must redouble his efforts. The Federal Railroad Administrator must play a central role in tackling this problem, both in his capacity as the Nation's regulator of the freight rail industry and his role as the Secretary's representative to the Amtrak Board of Directors. More than 76 percent of the delays endured by Amtrak's long distance trains are a result of problems associated with the host freight railroad. The causes are primarily interference with active freight traffic. In addition, deferred maintenance on the part of host railroads is commonly resulting in FRA-imposed slow orders that necessarily delay Amtrak trains and freight trains alike. Signal delays are also a contributing factor.

Outside of the Northeast Corridor, Amtrak trains are dispatched by the freight railroads over whose territory they operate. Legal requirements related to this dispatching activity were stipulated in the Rail Passenger Service Act at the time that the Amtrak network was statutorily established to take the money-losing passenger rail lines off the balance sheets of the Nation's freight railroads. Specifically, under section 24308(c) of title 49, United States Code, Amtrak trains have "preference over freight transportation in using a rail line, junction, or crossing" unless the Secretary of Transportation provides a specific exemption to this law.

Given the dismal on-time performance of long-distance Amtrak trains, the Committee seriously questions whether the above-cited provision of the law is being adhered to. Indeed, when the Committee inquired of the Administrator whether the freight railroads were uniformly complying with both the letter and spirit of this law, the Administrator testified that "I don't think there's uniformity in terms of the importance of this among the class 1 railroads." The Administrator's observation appears to be borne out in part by the vastly differing on-time performance of Amtrak trains depending on the host railroad over which they are operating. The following displays the comparative minutes of delay per 10,000 Amtrak train-miles for the six major freight railroads over which Amtrak operates. The figures displayed are for the last three fiscal years and fiscal year 2007 to date. They speak only to the minutes of delay for which the host railroad is determined to be at fault.

For the purpose of these figures, trains that arrive onto a freight railroad's territory hours later than scheduled are only considered to be delayed if they encounter further lengthy delays over that railroad's territory.



In order to address this chronic problem, the Committee has included a provision (sec. 151) requiring the FRA Administrator to develop a comprehensive action plan to address the problem of on-time performance with quantifiable and measurable milestones and submit that plan to the Committee not later than January 1, 2008. The Administrator will then provide quarterly updates to the Committee. Those quarterly reports should include regularly updated quantifiable measures of progress opposite the Administrator's pre-established goals for those measures. The Administrator is also requested to include Amtrak's most recent on-time performance report with each of his quarterly submissions and any other on-time performance data that he thinks best illuminates conditions for the preceding quarter. The Committee also requests, as it did last year, that the DOT Inspector General conduct an audit of railroad dispatching practices to ascertain the extent of industry compliance with section 24308(c) of title 49. This audit should also evaluate Amtrak's operating practices and any hindrances they may present to the ability of freight railroads to dispatch Amtrak trains in a fashion to allow for on-time arrivals.

The Committee has sought to give the Administrator additional tools to address this problem by fully funding a $100,000,000 grant program that is very similar in purpose and structure to the new Intercity Passenger Rail Grant Program included in his budget request. In funding this new initiative, the Committee recognizes that capital improvements and not just dispatching and operational changes are essential to improving the on-time performance of Amtrak trains. Indeed, the Committee notes that it is hoped that certain capital improvement currently being funded by the Union Pacific Railroad will prompt such a dramatic improvement in the on-time performance of Amtrak's Coast Starlight service as to allow

Amtrak to "re-launch" the service with substantially improved ridership and revenues in 2008.

The Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing [RRIF].—The RRIF program was established by Public Law 109–178 to provide direct loans and loan guarantees to State and local governments, government-sponsored entities, or railroads. Credit assistance under the program may be used for rehabilitating or developing rail equipment and facilities. No Federal appropriation is required to implement the program because a non-Federal partner may contribute the subsidy amount required by the Credit Reform Act of 1990 in the form of a credit risk premium. The Committee continues bill language specifying that no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments may be made using Federal funds for the payment of any credit premium amount during fiscal year 2008.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 150 prohibits funds for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation from being available if the Corporation contracts for services at or from any location outside of the United States which were, as of July 1, 2006, performed by a full-time or part-time Amtrak employee within the United States.

Section 151 requires the Federal Railroad Administrator to submit quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on Amtrak on-time performance.

Section 152 allows DOT to purchase promotional items of nominal value for use in certain outreach activities.

Section 153 clarifies the governance of contracts between the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and the State of Maryland.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

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 the productivity and efficiency of transportation systems; and to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such services and systems.

The current authorization for transit programs is contained in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA–LU].

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations compared to the fiscal year 2007 enacted level and the administration's request excluding rescissions:

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2007 enacted	2008 estimate	
Administrative expenses	$85,000,000	$89,300,000	$88,795,000
Formula and bus grants	7,262,775,000	7,871,895,000	7,872,893,000
Research and University Research Centers	61,000,000	61,000,000	65,500,000
Capital investment grants	1,566,000,000	1,399,818,000	1,566,000,000
Transit assistance under Public Law 110–28	35,000,000	.....	.....
Total	9,009,775,000	9,422,013,000	9,593,188,000

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$85,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	89,300,000
Committee recommendation	88,795,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Administrative expenses funds personnel, contract resources, information technology, space management, travel, training, and other administrative expenses necessary to carry out its mission to promote public transportation systems.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of $88,795,000 for the agency's salaries and administrative expenses. The recommended level of funding is $505,000 less than the budget request and $3,795,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The specific levels of funding recommended by the Committee are as follows:

	Committee recommendation
Office of the Administrator	$910,239
Office of Administration	6,353,739
Office of Chief Counsel	4,545,039
Office of Communications and Congressional Affairs	1,480,289
Office of Program Management	8,741,339
Office of Budget and Policy	10,857,698
Office of Research, Demonstration, and Innovation	4,943,589
Office of Civil Rights	3,234,489
Office of Planning	4,458,289
Regional offices	22,551,290
Central Account	20,719,000
Total	88,795,000

The Committee recommendation includes language authorizing the Administrator to transfer funding between offices. Any transfers totaling more than 5 percent of the initial appropriation from this account must be approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations through the usual reprogramming process.

Budget Justifications.—The FTA is directed to submit its fiscal year 2009 congressional justification for administrative expenses by office, with material detailing salaries and expenses, staffing increases, and programmatic initiatives for each office. The Committee has included this same direction in its reports for the past several years and is disappointed that the FTA decided not to include this informatiion in its fiscal year 2008 justifications.

Project Management Oversight Activities.—The Committee directs FTA to continue to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations the quarterly FMO and PMO reports for each project with a full funding grant agreement.

To further support oversight activities, the bill continues a provision requiring FTA to reimburse the DOT Office of Inspector General [OIG] $2,000,000 for costs associated with audits and investigations of transit-related issues, including reviews of new fixed guideway systems. This reimbursement must come from funds available for the execution of contracts. Over the past several years, the OIG has provided critical oversight of a number transit projects and FTA activities, which the Committee has found invaluable. The Committee anticipates that the Inspector General will continue such activities in fiscal year 2008.

Full Funding Grant Agreements [FFGAs].—TEA–21, as amended, requires that FTA notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, as well as the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Banking, 60 days before executing a full funding grant agreement. In its notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Committee directs FTA to submit the following information: (1) a copy of the proposed full funding grant agreement; (2) the total and annual Federal appropriations required for the project; (3) the yearly and total Federal appropriations that can be planned or anticipated for future FFGAs for each fiscal year through 2008; (4) a detailed analysis of annual commitments for current and anticipated FFGAs against the program authorization, by individual project; (5) an evaluation of whether the alternatives analysis made by the applicant fully assessed all the viable alternatives; (6) a financial analysis of the project's cost and sponsor's ability to finance the project, which shall be conducted by an independent examiner and which shall include an assessment of the capital cost estimate and finance plan; (7) the source and security of all public and private sector financing; (8) the project's operating plan, which enumerates the project's future revenue and ridership forecasts; and (9) a listing of all planned contingencies and possible risks associated with the project.

The Committee also directs FTA to inform the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in writing 30 days before approving schedule, scope, or budget changes to any full funding grant agreement. Correspondence relating to all changes shall include any budget revisions or program changes that materially alter the project as originally stipulated in the FFGA, including any proposed change in rail car procurement.

The Committee directs FTA to continue to provide a monthly new start project update to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, detailing the status of each project. This update should include FTA's plans and specific milestone schedules for advancing projects, especially those within 2 years of a proposed full funding grant agreement. In addition, FTA should notify the Committees 10 days before any project in the new starts process is given approval by FTA to advance to preliminary engineering or final design.

FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

	Trust fund
Appropriations, 2007	$7,262,775,000
Budget estimate, 2008	7,871,895,000
Committee recommendation	7,872,893,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Formula and Bus Grants account includes funding for the following programs: urbanized area formula grants; clean fuels formula grants; formula grants for special needs of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities; formula grants for non-urbanized areas; job access and reverse commute grants; new freedom grants; growing States and high density States grants; bus and bus facility grants; rail modernization grants; alternatives analysis; alternative transportation in parks and public lands; and the national transit database. In addition, set-asides from formula funds are directed to a grant program for intercity bus operators to finance Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility costs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends limiting obligations in the transit formula and bus grants account in fiscal year 2008 to $7,872,893,000. The recommendation is $998,000 more than the budget request and $610,118,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee also recommends a rescission of $28,660,920 of unobligated balances.

The Committee recommendation maintains the set-aside for project oversight in current law instead of providing an increase for program management of formula funds, as requested. The following table displays the distribution of obligation limitation among the program categories of formula and bus grants:

DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION AMONG MAJOR CATEGORIES OF FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS

Program Category	Amount
Urbanized Area Formula [1]	$4,280,315,210
Over-the-road Bus Program	8,300,000
Elderly and Persons with Disabilities	127,000,000
Nonurbanized Area Formula [1]	506,527,790
Bus and Bus Facility (includes clean fuels)	976,750,000
Fixed Guideway Modernization	1,570,000,000
Job Access and Reverse Commute	156,000,000
New Freedom	87,500,000
National Transit Database	3,500,000
Planning Programs	107,000,000
Alternatives Analysis	25,000,000
Alternative Transportation in Parks and Public Lands	25,000,000

[1] Includes funding for Growing States and High Density States under section 49 U.S.C. 5340.

The following table displays the State-by-State distribution of funds for several of the major program categories in the formula and bus grants account (these distributions are calculated using the formulas set in SAFETEA–LU, the most recent authorization law for transit programs):

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ESTIMATED FISCAL YEAR 2008 APPORTIONMENTS FOR FORMULA GRANTS PROGRAMS (BY STATE)

State	Section 5307 and 5340 Urbanized Area	Section 5311 and 5340 Non-urbanized Area	Section 5310 Special Needs for Elderly and Individuals with Disabilities	Job Access and Reverse Commute	New Freedom	State Total
Alabama	18,967,743	12,505,050	2,204,213	2,703,106	1,434,821	37,814,933
Alaska	23,855,214	5,721,809	289,439	234,562	116,702	30,217,726
American Samoa	.....	214,635	64,387	92,906	19,371	391,299
Arizona	59,724,230	8,929,442	2,303,932	2,991,377	1,527,802	75,476,783
Arkansas	9,415,565	9,546,294	1,415,478	1,589,549	813,858	22,780,744
California	691,715,537	21,543,724	13,479,312	22,127,365	10,852,719	759,718,657
Colorado	59,294,399	7,863,905	1,601,075	1,888,599	1,187,207	71,835,185
Connecticut	70,081,682	2,565,590	1,556,343	1,273,061	1,174,200	76,650,876
Delaware	11,342,311	1,194,470	450,152	298,359	231,376	13,516,668
District of Columbia	79,177,371	.....	387,470	428,660	259,823	80,253,324
Florida	208,396,143	12,951,167	8,596,136	9,374,538	5,818,487	245,136,471
Georgia	77,274,081	16,164,765	3,220,644	4,212,324	2,629,438	103,501,252
Guam	.....	580,149	170,961	93,031	57,482	901,623
Hawaii	28,578,443	1,862,059	625,787	515,987	325,082	31,907,358
Idaho	6,829,596	5,505,962	596,724	711,187	344,775	13,988,244
Illinois	253,306,256	13,392,178	4,975,686	5,700,444	3,858,608	281,233,172
Indiana	42,740,207	12,833,559	2,615,787	2,601,117	1,746,554	62,537,224
Iowa	16,059,951	9,556,364	1,345,585	1,169,311	741,492	28,872,703
Kansas	11,890,843	8,852,889	1,205,523	1,048,633	643,371	23,641,259
Kentucky	20,710,073	12,110,611	2,031,527	2,084,502	996,040	37,932,753
Louisiana	34,079,812	9,718,875	2,022,563	3,265,467	1,432,996	50,519,713
Maine	4,750,881	5,149,622	706,988	570,830	330,824	11,509,145
Maryland	109,118,829	4,724,691	2,150,809	2,005,658	1,674,867	119,674,854
Massachusetts	181,024,866	3,285,706	2,858,085	2,628,832	2,083,996	191,881,485
Michigan	78,385,418	16,374,623	4,137,957	4,498,354	3,095,926	106,492,278
Minnesota	53,536,767	12,034,418	1,894,856	1,598,713	1,067,134	70,131,888
Mississippi	5,954,416	10,918,097	1,419,541	1,647,623	764,714	20,704,391
Missouri	43,556,459	13,072,913	2,497,833	2,524,683	1,482,137	63,134,025
Montana	3,060,474	7,098,096	495,063	515,765	241,364	11,410,762
N. Mariana Islands	755,630	33,042	65,684	142,384	62,035	1,058,775
Nebraska	9,557,161	6,190,959	797,441	634,866	349,932	17,530,359
Nevada	28,399,764	4,645,850	976,323	969,332	591,966	35,583,235
New Hampshire	6,160,135	3,321,519	599,696	398,402	388,728	10,868,480
New Jersey	309,561,264	3,076,698	3,637,272	3,209,208	2,726,446	322,210,888

New Mexico	10,834,647	7,735,130	881,152	1,237,431	463,775	21,152,135
New York	669,306,206	16,557,275	8,633,556	11,033,899	6,204,230	711,735,166
North Carolina	49,145,533	20,776,159	3,602,972	3,793,177	2,384,389	79,702,230
North Dakota	3,828,958	3,747,619	389,871	329,393	164,778	8,460,619
Ohio	101,748,647	18,857,576	4,840,115	5,002,399	3,066,599	133,515,336
Oklahoma	15,521,624	10,655,874	1,670,084	1,838,017	874,177	30,559,776
Oregon	43,285,334	9,221,238	1,547,597	1,659,383	848,530	56,562,082
Pennsylvania	172,007,072	19,101,673	5,714,682	5,678,285	3,789,620	206,291,332
Puerto Rico	53,407,758	1,328,071	1,942,919	7,497,702	1,487,375	65,663,825
Rhode Island	20,047,844	552,195	607,042	527,782	324,383	22,059,246
South Carolina	17,453,605	10,443,148	1,919,464	2,116,457	1,209,118	33,141,792
South Dakota	2,897,309	4,634,250	430,630	353,508	185,724	8,501,421
Tennessee	34,500,192	13,315,850	2,677,558	3,018,780	1,655,401	55,167,781
Texas	227,866,301	31,856,422	7,996,679	14,044,741	6,293,740	288,057,883
Utah	34,521,429	4,540,441	791,467	1,006,569	478,077	41,337,983
Vermont	1,634,892	2,489,667	366,627	211,242	133,277	4,835,705
Virgin Islands	913,853	.....	161,754	93,402	38,338	1,207,347
Virginia	66,365,010	11,756,780	2,824,264	2,886,350	2,000,997	85,833,401
Washington	114,811,537	9,017,146	2,401,029	2,803,102	1,752,413	130,785,227
West Virginia	6,275,737	6,351,174	1,065,301	1,197,152	595,122	15,484,486
Wisconsin	45,711,829	12,715,465	2,192,062	2,133,756	1,490,682	64,243,794
Wyoming	1,637,049	4,384,906	311,903	228,738	111,982	6,674,578
Subtotal	4,250,983,887	483,577,790	126,365,000	154,440,000	86,625,000	5,101,991,677
Oversight	29,331,323	2,190,000	635,000	1,560,000	875,000	34,591,323
Total	4,280,315,210	485,767,790	127,000,000	156,000,000	87,500,000	5,136,583,000
Tribal Transit Program	.....	12,000,000	.....	.....	.....	12,000,000
RTAP	.....	8,760,000	.....	.....	.....	8,760,000
Grand Total	4,280,315,210	506,527,790	127,000,000	156,000,000	87,500,000	5,157,343,000

Limited Extensions of Discretionary Funds.—There have been occasions when the Committee has extended the availability of capital investment funds for longer than the original 3-year availability. The Committee, however, has extended funding for many of these projects for more than 1 fiscal year, in an effort to give transit agencies and FTA the opportunity to spend these funds. The Committee strongly urges FTA to obligate the grants before the commencement of the fiscal year 2008 calendar, as the Committee will not look favorably upon any further requests for an extension of funds past 1 fiscal year. Three, even four, fiscal years is more than an adequate amount of time for project sponsors to obligate the discretionary grants, except in the most unusual of circumstances. Transit agencies are urged not to seek discretionary funding when the work cannot be completed in a 3-year timeframe. In addition, by October 30, 2007, FTA should submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations detailing which of these projects have not obligated the funds, including an explanation of why this could not be achieved.

The availability of these particular funds is extended for 1 additional year, absent further congressional direction. The Committee directs the FTA not to reallocate funds provided in fiscal year 2005 for the following bus and bus facilities projects:

Alaska—Alaska Mental Health Trust bus program
Alaska—Native Medical Center intermodal bus/parking facility
Alaska—Copper River Transit Program
Alaska—Sawmill Creek Intermodal Facility
Alabama—Birmingham Intermodal Facility
Alabama—Jacksonville State University buses
Alabama—Vans, CASA of Marshall County
Arkansas—CATA bus replacement
Colorado—Statewide buses and bus facilities
Connecticut—Bridgeport Intermodal Transportation Center
Hawaii—Rural bus program
Hawaii—Pahoa/Hilo Bus routes
Illinois—Bus facilities for Bloomington, Macomb, Peoria, and Rock Island
Illinois—Downstate Illinois replacement buses
Illinois—Champaign Day Care Center Park-n-Ride
Illinois—City of Chicago's Free Trolley System
Louisiana—Statewide buses and bus facilities
Massachusetts—Springfield Union Station Intermodal facility
Maryland—Glenmont Metrorail parking garage expansion
Maryland—Statewide buses and bus facilities
Michigan—Allegan County Transportation
Missouri—Statewide buss and bus facilities
Missouri—Southern Missouri buses and bus facilities
Mississippi—City of Jackson
Mississippi—Harrison County HOV/Bus rapid transit Canal Road Intermodal Connector
Mississippi—Mississippi Valley State University mass transit program expansion
Montana—Billings public bus and medical transfer facility
New Mexico—West Side transit facility
New York—Rochester Central Bus Terminal

New York—Renaissance Square
Pennsylvania—Ardmore transit center
Pennsylvania—Union/Snyder Transportation Alliance, Union County
Tennessee—Statewide buses and bus facilities
Tennessee—Memphis Airport Intermodal Facility
Texas—Waco Transit Alternative Fueled bus purchase
Texas—Denton Downtown multimodal transit facility
Texas—Laredo Bus Hub and Maintenance Facility
Texas—Bryan/College Station Bus Replacement program
Texas—Corpus Christi buses and bus facilities
Texas—Capitol Metro buses and bus facilities
Texas—Brazos Transit District passenger shelter program
Texas—The Woodlands Capital Cost of Contracting Program
Texas—Capital Metro North Operating Facility
Texas—CNG bus replacement
Texas—Bryan Intermodal Transit Terminal with parking
Texas—El Paso buses
Virginia—Hampton Roads Transit Maintenance Facilities
Virginia—James City County natural gas buses
Washington—King County Metro, King county Airfield Transfer Area
Washington—Community Transit Bus and Van Replacement
Washington—Edmonds Crossing Multimodal Transportation Project.

The Committee directs FTA not to reallocate funds provided in fiscal year 2004 and previous acts for the following bus and bus facilities projects:

Alabama—Birmingham Transit Corridor
Alaska—Sawmill Creek Intermodal Facility
Connecticut—Norwich Intermodal Transportation Center
Iowa—UNI Multimodal Project (2005)
Massachusetts—Springfield Union Station Intermodal facility
Mississippi—Intermodal Facility JIA
Pennsylvania—Pittsburgh Water Taxi
South Dakota—Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe public buses and bus facilities
Vermont—Brattleboro Multimodal
Vermont—Burlington Transit Facilities
Washington—Grant Transit Authority bus facility.

Illinois Statewide Buses.—The Committee provides $7,000,000 to the Illinois Department of Transportation [IDOT] for section 5309 Bus and Bus Facilities grants. The Committee expects IDOT to provide at least $3,500,000 for Downstate Illinois replacement buses in Bloomington, Champaign-Urbana, Danville, Decatur, Peoria, Pekin, Quincy, River Valley, Rockford, Rock Island, Springfield, Madison County, Rides MTD, South Central MTD, Macomb and for Pinecrest Community in Mount Morris, IL. Further, the Committee expects IDOT to provide appropriate funds for bus facilities in Bloomington, Galesburg, River Valley Metro in Kankakee, Macomb, Peoria, and Rock Island, including $250,000 for the Macomb maintenance facility and $250,000 for the Kankakee's River Valley Metro operations facility. Requested by Senator Durbin.

Glenmont Metrorail Parking Garage Expansion, Maryland.—Funds made available for Glenmont Metrorail parking garage expansion, Maryland in the fiscal year 2005 section 5309 bus and bus facilities program shall be made available for Montgomery County, Maryland, to purchase four small buses to provide a commuter shuttle from the Norbeck Park and Ride Lot to the Glenmont station when construction of the new garage at Glenmont begins. These buses will operate on restructured Ride On routes. Requested by Senators Mikulski and Cardin.

Springfield Union Station Intermodal Facility, Massachusetts.—The Committee continues to be supportive of the construction of a new, affordable, intermodal facility in the city of Springfield, Massachusetts. However, the Committee notes that considerable funds already appropriated for this project from as far back as 2002 remain unobligated. Still other funds provided for the project in authorization acts also remain unobligated. The Committee is encouraged by signs that the State and local leadership has sought to jump start the process toward finalizing a new design for this facility that can be accomplished within the funds provided. The Committee asks that the Federal Transit Administration to continue to work with local leaders to expedite this process so that all appropriated funds can be obligated promptly.

West Virginia Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities.—Consistent with the provisions of section 3044 of SAFETEA–LU, the bill includes a total of $5,000,000 for bus and bus facilities within the State of West Virginia for fiscal year 2007.

Metra.—The Committee understands that Metra and the Regional Transportation Authority [RTA] are confined by State law to operate in the six county metropolitan Chicago area. However, due to high population growth rates in the outer collar counties of Northeastern Illinois, and the serious need for reliable transit, the Committee recommends that the State of Illinois amend its RTA Act to incorporate these high growth counties—Boone, DeKalb, Kankakee, Kendall, and Winnebago—that include large metropolitan areas such as Rockford into its area of operation so that Metra can expand into these areas. The Committee is aware of the recent feasibility study and alternatives analysis conducted for Metra service extension to Boon/Winnebago Counties and supports this initiative. Requested by Senator Durbin.

Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority.—The Committee recognizes the creation of the Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority as a means for uniting and addressing collective transit needs in seven counties in West-Central Florida, and encourages its members to work expeditiously to identify next steps, long-term plans, and future initiatives to advance public transit in the Tampa Bay area. Requested by Senator Nelson of Florida.

Hybrid Bus Cost Share.—The Committee has not included a provision to allow FTA to provide grants for 100 percent of the net capital cost of a factory-installed or retrofitted hybrid electric system in a bus as proposed in the budget. The Committee has stressed the importance of hybrid technology buses in the past and remains committed to seeing hybrid technology proliferate throughout the Nation's transit systems. However, the Committee believes that waiving the required match would result in less hybrid buses

being purchased by transit properties, not more. The Committee strongly believes that local share requirements are the best deal for taxpayers when it comes to stretching increasingly scarce Federal resources.

Within the funding available to the bus and bus facilities program, funds are to be made available to the following projects and activities:

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES

Project name	Committee recommendation	Requested by
1st District Bus Replacement and Facilities, MI	$6,000,000	Levin/Stabenow
Acquisition of MARTA Clean Fuel Buses, GA	4,000,000	Chambliss/Isakson
Alabama Senior Transportation Program, AL	1,000,000	Shelby
Albuquerque Transit Facility Rehabilitation, NM	850,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Altoona, Pennsylvania Intermodal Transportation Center, PA	500,000	Casey
Automotive-Based Fuel Cell Hybrid Bus Program, DE	1,500,000	Carper/Biden
BART Intermodal Station Infrastructure Improvements to Improve Bus Safety and Access, CA.	1,000,000	Feinstein
Ben Franklin Transit, Fleet Expansion and Modernization, WA	1,000,000	Murray/Cantwell
Bennington Multi-Modal Facility, VT	500,000	Sanders
Bi-County Transit Center, MD	1,000,000	Mikulski/Cardin
Bridgeport Intermodal Transportation Center, CT	6,000,000	Dodd/Lieberman
Bus and Bus Facilities, City of Roswell, NM	400,000	Bingaman
Bus and Bus Facilities, Grant County, NM	1,500,000	Bingaman
Bus and Bus Facilities, MT	1,000,000	Baucus/Tester
Bus Replacement for Rural Community Transportation of St. Johnsbury, VT	500,000	Sanders
Bus Shuttle Project for Seniors, Irvington, NJ	500,000	Lautenberg/Menendez
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Austin, TX	520,000	Cornyn/Hutchison
CCTA Buses, Facilities and Equipment, VT	4,000,000	Leahy/Sanders
Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority (LYNX), Bus Acquisition, FL	1,589,833	Martinez
Central Maryland Transit Operations Facility, MD	1,000,000	Mikulski/Cardin
City of Mobile's Transit System, AL	2,000,000	Shelby
City of Moultrie Intermodal Facility, Moultrie, GA	500,000	Chambliss
City of Oxford Transit, MS	500,000	Cochran
City of Poughkeepsie Transit Hub, NY	1,000,000	Schumer/Clinton
City Utilities of Springfield Intermodal Transfer Facility, MO	2,000,000	Bond
Clallam Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	280,000	Murray/Cantwell
Clare Country Transit Corporation/Harrison Airport Facility, MI	750,000	Levin/Stabenow
Coast Transit Authority Bus and Bus Facilities, MS	4,000,000	Cochran
Colorado Transit Coalition—Statewide Bus & Bus Facilities, CO	6,000,000	Allard/Salazar
Columbia County Public Transportation Vehicle Replacement, WA	120,000	Murray/Cantwell
Commonwealth Avenue Green Line Station, MA	1,000,000	Kennedy/Kerry
Community Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	1,500,000	Murray/Cantwell
Coralville Intermodal Facility, IA	1,000,000	Harkin/Grassley
CSKT Reservation Transportation Program, MT	350,000	Tester/Baucus
C–TRAN Vehicle Replacement, WA	700,000	Murray/Cantwell
Culver City Multi-Modal Light Rail Station, CA	1,000,000	Feinstein/Boxer
Downtown Transit Center, Indianapolis, IN	2,000,000	Bayh/Lugar
Everett Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	600,000	Murray/Cantwell
Fleet and Capital Items Los Alamos County Transit System, NM	1,000,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Forest Park Circulator/I–64 Closure Alleviation, MO	1,000,000	Bond
Franklin Street Station Restoration (BARTA), PA	1,500,000	Specter
Grays Harbor Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	150,000	Murray/Cantwell
Greater Minnesota Transit Bus and Bus Facilities, MN	4,000,000	Coleman/Klobuchar
Houston Downtown Clean Fuel Transit Initiative, TX	3,000,000	Cornyn
Hybrid-Electric Bus Acquisition (SEPTA), PA	2,500,000	Specter
Idaho Transit Coalition Advanced Public Transportation System Deployment, ID	4,520,000	Crapo/Craig
Illinois Bus and Bus Facilities, IL	7,000,000	Durbin
Intermodal Facilities, UT	6,000,000	Bennett/Hatch
Island Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	600,000	Murray/Cantwell
JATRAN Fleet Replacement, MS	1,500,000	Cochran
Jefferson Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	500,000	Murray/Cantwell
Kansas City Area Transportation Authority Bus Replacement (KCATA), MO	1,000,000	Bond

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Lafayette Multimodal Transportation Facility, LA	1,000,000	Vitter/Landrieu
Lakewood Multi-Modal Facility Phase 1, NJ	2,000,000	Menendez/Lautenberg
Link Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	550,000	Murray/Cantwell
Main Street Bus Rapid Transit Buses, Mesa, AZ	1,000,000	Kyl
Mason Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	400,000	Murray
Mass Transportation Authority, Flint, Michigan Fiscal Year 2008 Bus and Bus Facilities Program, MI.	4,000,000	Levin/Stabenow
Metro Area Transit, Omaha, NE—Video Surveillance Security System for Transit Buses/Americans with Disabilities Act Complementary Paratransit Vehicles, NE.	700,000	Nelson, Ben
Miami-Dade Transit Bus Procurement Plan, FL	1,000,000	Martinez/Nelson, Bill
Minnesota's Union Depot Multi-modal Transit Hub, MN	1,000,000	Klobuchar
Nassau County Hub, NY	2,000,000	Clinton/Schumer
Newark Penn Station Intermodal Improvements, NJ	2,000,000	Menendez/Lautenberg
North Orange/South Seminole ITS Enhanced Circulator, City of Orlando, FL	1,750,000	Nelson, Bill/Martinez
Norwalk Pulse Point Facility Safety Improvements, CT	200,000	Dodd/Lieberman
Norwich Intermodal Transportation Center, CT	3,000,000	Dodd/Lieberman
Pacific Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	50,000	Murray/Cantwell
Paducah Area Transit System, KY	2,000,000	McConnell
Paratransit Vans, Las Cruces, NM	320,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Paratransit Vehicle Replacement, Abliene, TX	480,000	Cornyn/Hutchison
Pierce Transit Penninsula Park and Ride, WA	1,500,000	Murray/Cantwell
Port Angeles International Gateway Project, WA	500,000	Murray
Pullman Transit Maintenance Facility Expansion, WA	800,000	Murray/Cantwell
Reno & Sparks Intermodal Transportation Centers, NV	1,000,000	Reid/Ensign
Replacement Buses for The Westchester County Bee-Line Bus System, NY	1,000,000	Clinton/Schumer
Replacement Buses, Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA), PA	1,000,000	Specter/Casey
Replacement of Fixed Route Transit Buses, DE	1,000,000	Carper/Biden
Rhode Island Public Transit Authority Intelligent Transportation System, RI	2,043,130	Reed
Rural Bus Program for Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai Counties, HI	2,000,000	Inouye
San Antonio VIA Bus Facility Improvements and Bus Fleet Modernization, TX	3,000,000	Hutchison/Cornyn
San Diego Balboa Park Trolleys, CA	500,000	Feinstein/Boxer
Santa Fe Place Transit Center, NM	1,000,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Senior Transportation Connection, OH	1,600,000	Brown
SEPTA Interoperability Communications Initiative, PA	1,000,000	Casey
Small Bus Replacement, St. Cloud Metro Bus, MN	1,000,000	Klobuchar/Coleman
Southeast Missouri Transportation Service (SMTS), MO	1,000,000	Bond
Southside Bus Facility Replacement in Hampton Roads, VA	2,000,000	Warner/Webb
Spokane Transit Smart Bus Technology Modernization, WA	1,000,000	Murray/Cantwell
State of Arkansas—Bus and Bus Facilities for Urban, Rural, and Elderly and Disabled Agencies, AR.	5,000,000	Lincoln/Pryor
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, MO	2,000,000	Bond
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, NV	1,000,000	Ensign/Reid
Statewide Bus and Bus Facility Enhancements, AK	500,000	Stevens/Murkowski
Statewide Bus Replacement, IA	7,000,000	Harkin/Grassley
Statewide Electric Hybrid Bus Initiative by the Indiana Transit Association, IN	4,000,000	Lugar
Statewide Transit, ND	2,000,000	Conrad/Dorgan
Sunset (RTC) Maintenance Facility, NV	1,000,000	Reid
Tennessee Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, TN	6,000,000	Alexander
Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky Bus Replacement Project, KY	1,000,000	McConnell
Transit Vehicle Fleet Upgrades, NM	2,080,000	Domenici/Bingaman
TRANSPO Bus Operations Center, South Bend, IN	1,000,000	Bayh/Lugar
Treasure Valley Transit Facilities, ID	480,000	Craig/Crapo
University Place Intermodal Transit Facility, WA	750,000	Murray
Vans for Vermont Senior Centers, VT	200,000	Sanders
Vermont Statewide Buses, Facilities, and Equipment, VT	1,000,000	Leahy/Sanders
West Orange Township Senior Citizen & Handicapped Shuttle Bus, NJ	200,000	Lautenberg
Wisconsin Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, WI	5,000,000	Kohl
WMATA Bus and Bus Facilities, DC/MD/VA	2,000,000	Warner/Webb
Wyandotte County Unified Government Transit Bus Replacement and Facilities Enhancements, KS.	1,000,000	Roberts

Within the funding available to the alternatives analysis program, funds are to be made available to the following projects and activities:

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Project name	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Downtown Orlando East-West Circulator System, Orlando, Florida	$1,000,000	Martinez/Nelson, Bill
Bus Rapid Transit Improvements, Broward County, Florida	1,000,000	Martinez/Nelson, Bill
Miami-Dade County Metrorail Orange Line Expansion, Florida	2,000,000	Martinez/Nelson, Bill
MARTA Clifton Corridor (Lindbergh-Emory), Georgia	1,000,000	Isakson/Chambliss
Kansas City Light Rail Alternatives Analysis, Missouri	2,500,000	Bond
Charlotte Rapid Transit Expansion Project, North Carolina	1,000,000	Burr
Charlotte Rapid Transit Extension—Northeast Corridor Light Rail Project, North Carolina.	2,750,000	Dole
Southeastern Connecticut Bus Rapid Transit System (CT)	2,000,000	Dodd/Lieberman
Downtown Transit Circulator, Fort Lauderdale, Florida	1,000,000	Nelson, Bill/Martinez
CTA Circle Line, Illinois	5,000,000	Durbin
METRA Connects, Illinois	3,750,000	Durbin/Obama
Northwest New Jersey/Northeast Pennsylvania Commuter Rail Service	2,000,000	Casey/Specter

RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTERS

	General fund
Appropriations, 2007	$61,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	61,000,000
Committee recommendation	65,500,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides financial assistance to support activities that are designed to develop solutions that improve public transportation. As the Federal agency responsible for transit, FTA assumes a leadership role in supporting research intended to identify different strategies to increase ridership, improve personal mobility, minimize automobile fuel consumption and air pollution, and enhance the quality of life in all communities.

FTA may make grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other agreements for research, development, demonstration, and deployment projects, and evaluation of technology of national significance to public transportation. FTA provides transit agencies with research results to help make them better equipped to improve public transportation services and to help public transportation services meet national transportation needs at a minimum cost. FTA assists transit agencies to employ new service methods and technologies that improve their operations and capital efficiencies or improve transit safety and emergency preparedness.

The purpose of the university transportation centers [UTC] program is to foster 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's UTC program are transferred to and managed by the Research and Innovation Technology Administration and combined with a transfer of funds from the Federal Highway Administration.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $65,500,000 for research and university research centers. The Committee recommendation is $4,500,000 more than the budget request, and $4,500,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The Committee recommends funds for the following:

—Missouri Transportation Institute, Rolla Missouri, for research on alternative sources of energy to power transit vehicles (Requested by Senator Bond), $2,000,000;

—WVU Exhaust Emission Testing Initiative, West Virginia (Requested by Senator Byrd), $1,000,000;

—Prototype Vehicle Domestic Manufacturer to build a prototype streetcar, Oregon (Requested by Senator Wyden), $750,000; and

—Staten Island Transit Enhancements Plan—Phase II, New York (Requested by Senators Clinton and Schumer), $300,000.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 2007	$1,566,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	1,399,818,000
Committee recommendation	1,566,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Capital Investment Grants account includes funding for two programs authorized under section 5309 of title 49 of the United States Code: the New Starts program and the Small Starts program. Under New Starts, the FTA provides grants to fund the building of new fixed guideway systems or extensions to existing fixed guideway systems. Eligible services include light rail, rapid rail (heavy rail), commuter rail, and busway/high occupancy vehicle [HOV] facilities. In addition, significant corridor-based bus capital projects which either use an exclusive lane or which involve a substantial investment in a defined corridor (such as bus rapid transit) may also be eligible. Under Small Starts, the FTA provides grants for projects requesting less than $75,000,000 and with a total cost of less than $250,000,000.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee action recommends a level of $1,566,000,000. The recommended level is $166,182,000 more than the budget request and equal to the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The Committee recommends the following allocations of capital investment grant funds in fiscal year 2007:

Project name	Funding category	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Jacksonville Rapid Transit System Phase 1, Florida	Exempt	$9,870,000	Martinez/Nelson, Bill
CORRIDORone Regional Rail Project, PA	Exempt	11,200,000	Specter/Casey
South County Commuter Rail Wickford Junction Station, RI	Exempt	18,965,043	Reed
West Corridor Light Rail Project, CO	Final Design	70,000,000	Allard/Salazar/President
Hartford-New Britain Busway, CT	Final Design	5,000,000	Dodd/Lieberman
MARC Commuter Rail Improvements and Rolling Stock, MD	Final Design	13,000,000	Cardin/Mikulski
Northstar Corridor Rail Project, MN	Final Design	65,000,000	Coleman/Klobuchar
Second Avenue Subway, NY	Final Design	125,000,000	Clinton/Schumer/President
Dulles Corridor Rail Project, VA	Final Design	20,000,000	Webb/Warner
Norfolk Light Rail Project, VA	Final Design	35,000,000	Webb/Warner
Seattle University Link Extension (Light Rail Extension), WA	Final Design	30,000,000	Murray/President
Central Phoenix/East Valley Light Rail, AZ	Full Funding Grant Agreement	90,000,000	President
Metro Gold Line Eastside Light Rail Extension, CA	Full Funding Grant Agreement	70,000,000	Boxer/President
Southeast Corridor Multi-Modal Project (T–REX), CO	Full Funding Grant Agreement	70,000,000	Allard/Salazar/President
CTA Ravenswood Brown Line, IL	Full Funding Grant Agreement	36,500,000	Durbin/President
Largo Metrorail Extension, MD	Full Funding Grant Agreement	35,000,000	Warner/Webb/President
Hudson-Bergen Light Rail MOS2, NJ	Full Funding Grant Agreement	55,192,995	Lautenberg/Menendez/President
Long Island Rail Road East Side Access, NY	Full Funding Grant Agreement	200,000,000	Clinton/Schumer/President
South Corridor I 205/Portland Mall Light Rail Project, OR	Full Funding Grant Agreement	80,000,000	Smith, G./Wyden/President
North Shore LRT Connector, PA	Full Funding Grant Agreement	33,516,444	President
Dallas Area Rapid Transit Northwest/Southeast Light Rail MOS, TX	Full Funding Grant Agreement	86,250,000	Hutchison/Cornyn/President
Weber County to Salt Lake City Commuter Rail, UT	Full Funding Grant Agreement	80,000,000	Bennett/Hatch/President
Central Link Initial Segment, WA	Full Funding Grant Agreement	70,000,000	Murray/President
Central Corridor Light Rail Transit, MN	Preliminary Engineering	35,000,000	Coleman/Klobuchar
North Corridor BRT, Houston and Southeast Corridor BRT, TX	Preliminary Engineering	15,000,000	Hutchison
Mid-Jordan Light Rail Extension, UT	Preliminary Engineering	20,000,000	Bennett/Hatch
Dulles Corridor Rail Project, VA	Preliminary Engineering	21,200,000	Warner/Webb
San Francisco Muni Third Street Light Rail, CA	Preliminary Enginnering	10,000,000	Feinstein
South Sacramento Corridor Phase 2 Light Rail Extension, CA	Preliminary Enginnering	3,000,000	Feinstein/Boxer
Metrorail Orange Line Expansion, Miami-Dade County, FL	Preliminary Enginnering	500,000	Nelson, Bill/Martinez
Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project, Hawaii	Preliminary Enginnering	20,000,000	Inouye/Akaka
CTA Circle Line, Illinois	Preliminary Enginnering	5,000,000	Durbin

Project name	Funding category	Committee recommendation	Requested by
METRA Connects, Illinois	Preliminary Enginnering	1,300,000	Durbin
ARC/The Tunnel—NJ Trans-Hudson Midtown Corridor, NJ	Preliminary Enginnering	20,000,000	Lautenberg/Menendez
VRE Rolling Stock, VA	Preliminary Enginnering	5,000,000	Webb
Troost Corridor BRT, MO	Small Starts	6,260,000	Bond
Perris Valley Line Metrolink Extension, CA	Small Starts	3,000,000	Feinstein
Telegraph Avenue-International Boulevard-East 14th Street Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Improvements, CA	Small Starts	3,000,000	Feinstein
Planning and Design, Bus Rapid Transit—State Avenue Corridor, Wyandotte County, KS	Small Starts	1,500,000	Brownback
Commuter Rail Phase II, Bernalillo to Santa Fe, NMDOT, New Mexico	Small Starts	1,500,000	Bingaman/Domenici
Pawtucket/Central Falls Commuter Rail Station, RI	Small Starts	2,500,000	Reed
Galveston Rail Trolley Extension to Seawall Boulevard, TX	Small Starts	2,000,000	Hutchison
Provo Orem Bus Rapid Transit, Utah	Small Starts	6,000,000	Bennett/Hatch
Route 1 Bus Rapid Transit, Potomac Yard-Crystal City, Alexandria and Arlington, VA	Small Starts	1,000,000	Warner/Webb
King County/Pacific Highway South BRT, WA	Small Starts	14,250,000	Murray/President
Denali Commission, AK	Statutory set-aside	5,000,000	
Alaska and Hawaii Ferry Capital Projects	Statutory set-aside	15,000,000	

Seattle Light Rail Initial Segment and Extensions.—Consistent with the existing full funding grant agreement, the bill includes $70,000,000 for the initial segment of the Seattle Link light rail system. The bill also includes $30,000,000 for the University Link extension that will shortly be entering a full funding grant agreement. It has always been the goal of regional transportation planners and the locally elected leadership that the initial segment of this light rail system should directly connect Seattle city center with SeaTac International Airport. However, due to rapid changes in security and infrastructure planning at the airport after the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Full Funding Grant Agreement [FFGA] for the initial segment could not include a direct connection into the airport. In order to rectify this situation and help provide for a seamless transit link directly to the airport, the bill includes a general provision (section 164) intended to allow any Federal funds that may not be necessary due to budget "under runs" in the performance of the initial segment project to be used to assist in the construction of the airport link. This provision will, in effect, allow Sound Transit to benefit from its careful management of the initial segment project, allowing the agency to capture the Federal portion of any cost savings and use those savings to close a critically important gap in transit service in the region. Requested by Senator Murray.

Limited Extensions of Discretionary Funds.—There have been occasions when the Committee has extended the availability of capital investment funds. These extensions are granted on a case by case basis and, in nearly all instances, are due to circumstances that were unforeseen by the project's sponsor. The availability of these particular funds is intended for one additional year, absent further congressional direction. The Committee directs the FTA not to reallocate funds provided in fiscal years 2004 and 2005 for the following new starts projects:

Alabama—Birmingham Transit Corridor

Connecticut—Stamford, Connecticut, Urban Transitway and Intermodal Transportation Center Improvements

Delaware—Wilmington, Delaware, Train Station Improvements

District of Columbia/Virginia—Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project

Louisiana—Canal Streetcar Project

Minnesota—Northstar Corridor Rail Project

Pennsylvania—Harrisburg Corridor Rail MOS

Pennsylvania—Schuylkill Valley Metro

Texas—North Central Light Rail Extension; and

Wisconsin—Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee Rail Extension Project.

The Committee directs FTA not to reallocate funds provided in fiscal year 2003 or previous acts for the following new starts projects:

Connecticut—Bridgeport Connecticut, Intermodal Transportation Center Project

District of Columbia/Virginia—Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project

Delaware—Wilmington, Delaware, Train Station Improvements

Delaware—Wilmington, Delaware, Downtown Transit Corridor Project; and

Wisconsin—Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee Rail Extension Project.

Appropriations for Full Funding Grant Agreements.—The Committee reiterates direction initially agreed to in the fiscal year 2002 conference report that FTA should not sign any FFGAs that have a maximum Federal share of higher than 60 percent.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

Section 160 exempts limitations previously made available on obligations for programs of the FTA under 49 U.S.C. 5338.

Section 161 allows funds under this act, Federal Transit Administration, Capital investment grants not obligated by September 30, 2008 to be made available for other projects under 40 U.S.C. 5309.

Section 162 allows funds appropriated before October 1, 2005, that remain available for expenditure to be transferred.

Section 163 allows unobligated funds for new projects under Federal Transit Authority to be used during this fiscal year to satisfy expenses incurred for such projects.

Section 164 amends the Central Link Initial Segment Project, as previously stated in the report.

Section 165 makes funds provided in previous appropriations acts for a fixed guideway light rail project in Albuquerque, New Mexico available for buses and bus facilities.

Section 166 makes funds provided in a previous appropriations act for Commuter Rail, Albuquerque to Santa Fe, New Mexico available for buses, equipment and facilities.

Section 167 makes funds previously provided for the Las Vegas Resort Corridor Fixed Guideway Project and other new start projects available for bus and bus facilities under the control of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada.

Section 168 repeals a provision in a prior appropriations act related to subway tunneling in Los Angeles, California. Requested by Senator Feinstein.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation [SLSDC] is a wholly owned Government corporation established by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Act of May 13, 1954 (33 U.S.C. 981). The SLSDC is a vital transportation corridor for the international movement of bulk commodities such as steel, iron, grain, and coal, serving the North American region that makes up one-quarter of the United States population and nearly one-half of the Canadian population. The SLSDC is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and development of the United States portion of the Saint Lawrence Seaway between Montreal and Lake Erie.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2007	$16,223,160
Budget estimate, 2008	17,392,000
Committee recommendation	17,392,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund [HMTF] was established by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–662). Since 1987, the HMTF has supported the operations and maintenance of commercial harbor projects maintained by the Federal Government. Appropriations from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and revenues from non-Federal sources finance the operation and maintenance of the Seaway for which the SLSDC is responsible.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes $17,392,000 for the Operations and Maintenance of the Saint Lawrence Seaway. This amount is $371,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level and the same as the budget request. The recommended level is sufficient to allow the Seaway to continue its operational and maintenance programs for the U.S. portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway in order to sustain its high level of system availability. This amount also includes funding for concrete replacement at the U.S. locks and dredging in the U.S. portion of the Seaway as requested.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Maritime Administration [MARAD] is responsible for programs authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 App. U.S.C. 1101 et seq.). MARAD is also responsible for programs that strengthen the U.S. maritime industry in support of the Nation's security and economic needs. MARAD prioritizes DOD's use of ports and intermodal facilities during DOD mobilizations to guarantee the smooth flow of military cargo through commercial ports. MARAD manages the Maritime Security Program, the Voluntary Intermodal Sealift Agreement Program and the Ready Reserve Force, which assure DOD access to commercial and strategic sealift and associated intermodal capacity. MARAD also continues to address the disposal of obsolete ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet which are deemed a potential environmental risk. Further, MARAD administers education and training programs through the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and six State maritime schools that assist in providing skilled merchant marine officers who are capable of serving defense and commercial transportation needs. The Committee continues to fund MARAD in its support of the United States as a maritime Nation.

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2007	$154,440,000
Budget estimate, 2008	154,440,000
Committee recommendation	156,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Maritime Security Program provides resources to maintain a U.S. flag merchant fleet crewed by U.S. citizens to serve both the commercial and national security needs of the United States. The

program provides direct payments to U.S. flag ship operators engaged in U.S. foreign trade. Participating operators are required to keep the vessels in active commercial service and are required to provide intermodal sealift support to the Department of Defense in times of war or national emergency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $156,000,000 for the Maritime Security Program. This amount is $1,560,000 more than both the fiscal year 2007 and the budget request. This level is consistent with the program's authorized level.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

Appropriations, 2007	$111,522,274
Budget estimate, 2008	115,276,000
Committee recommendation	122,890,545

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Operations and Training appropriation primarily funds the salaries and expenses for MARAD headquarters and regional staff in the administration and direction for all MARAD programs. The account includes funding for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, six State maritime schools, port and intermodal development, cargo preference, international trade relations, deep-water port licensing, and administrative support costs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $122,890,000 for Operations and Training at the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 2008. This amount is $11,368,271 more than the fiscal year 2007 level and $7,614,545 more than the budget request. Funding for the subaccounts within the "operations and training" account are provided as follows:

	Request	Recommendation
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy:		
Salary & Benefits	$24,720,000	$24,720,000
Midshipmen Program	6,977,000	6,977,000
Instructional Program	5,689,000	5,689,000
Program, Direction and Admin	2,915,000	2,915,000
Maintenance, Repair and Operations	7,307,000	7,307,000
Capital Improvements	13,850,000	13,850,000
Subtotal, USMMA	61,458,000	61,458,000
State Maritime Schools:		
Direct Schoolship Payments	1,881,000	1,881,000
Student Incentive Payments		800,000
Schoolship Maintenance & Repair	8,119,000	10,500,000
Subtotal, State Maritime Schools	10,000,000	13,181,000
MARAD Operations:		
Ports & MTS Improvement	3,111,000	7,111,000
Capital Construction Fund Management	606,000	606,000
International Activities	848,000	848,000
Deepwater Port Licensing	1,068,000	1,327,545
Cargo Preference Management	3,787,000	3,787,000

	Request	Recommendation
Mobile Source Emissions	737,000	737,000
MSP Administration	688,000	688,000
VISA/Vessel Transfer	2,143,000	2,143,000
Mariner Training & Education Management	825,000	900,000
Strategic Ports/National Security Planning	1,221,000	1,320,000
War Risk Insurance	889,000	889,000
Organizational Excellence	1,438,000	1,438,000
Administrative Support	26,457,000	26,457,000
Subtotal, MARAD Operations	43,818,000	48,251,545
Total MARAD Operations and Training	115,276,000	122,890,545

The Committee is dismayed by the actions of the Maritime Administration in moving forward with a reorganization of the agency without appropriate notification to the Committee. The Committee appropriates funding based on the information contained in the President's budget request. Therefore the Committee requires notification if funding is going to be allocated in a manner that differs from the information that has been provided as part of an agency's budget request. The Committee reminds the agency of this requirement, and expects that the agency will meet this requirement should there be any deviations from the President's 2008 budget request in the coming year.

U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.—The U.S. Merchant Marine Academy developed a Master plan to address and correct deficiencies at Academy facilities. The $13,850,000 provided is slightly more than the amount called for in the Master Plan. As part of the 2009 budget submission, the Committee directs MARAD to include detailed information on the construction planned with the funding provided.

State Maritime Academies.—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $13,818,000 for the State Maritime Academies. The amount provided represents an increase of $3,818,000 over the budget request. The Committee supports efforts to offer incentives for students to attend the Maritime Academies, and has therefore rejected the President's proposal to eliminate the Student Incentive Payment scholarship. The amount provided is sufficient to maintain the same number of enrollees in the program. The Committee has also included an increase in Schoolship Maintenance and Repair funding. The Committee believes that it is critical that the ships used at the academies are in the best possible condition in order to appropriately educate the mariners attending the State schools.

MARAD Operations.—The Committee has made adjustments to several MARAD programs in order to support important initiatives of the agency. The Committee has increased Deepwater Port licensing activities by $259,545. The agency is responsible for issuing licenses for the operation of offshore oil and natural gas receiving facilities. The Committee supports the agency's efforts to encourage the utilization of U.S. crews onboard liquefied natural gas vessels. The Committee has also increased funding for Mariner Training and Education Management by $75,000 and Strategic Ports/National Security Planning by $99,000.

Marine Transportation System.—The Maritime Administration is the single source for all Marine Transportation System [MTS] information. The information advocate is a comprehensive database of information to assist in reducing intermodal congestion and to increase transportation efficiency. The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 for the Maritime Administration to advance their existing Information Framework, expand their mission of information advocacy for all MTS information and assure critical marine information is captured, managed, protected and available to all authorized agencies. Requested by Senator Cochran.

SHIP DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2007	$20,790,000
Budget estimate, 2008	20,000,000
Committee recommendation	18,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Ship Disposal account provides resources to dispose of obsolete merchant-type vessels of 150,000 gross tons or more in the National Defense Reserve Fleet [NDRF] which the Maritime Administration is required by law to dispose of by the end of 2006. Currently there is a backlog of more than 115 ships awaiting disposal. Many of these vessels are some 50 years old or more and pose a significant environmental threat due to the presence of hazardous substances such as asbestos and solid and liquid polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs].

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $18,000,000 for ship disposal. This amount is $2,790,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 level and $2,000,000 less than the budget request. The Committee has decreased funding in the program due to a large amount of carryover funding, which can help support the program's activities in 2008.

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL SHIPYARDS

Appropriations, 2007	.....
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	$20,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

As authorized by section 3506 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, the Assistance to Small Shipyards program provides assistance in the form of grants, loans and loan guarantees to small shipyards for capital improvements.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is recommending an appropriation of $20,000,000 for assistance to small shipyards and maritime communities. No funding was requested for this program in the President's budget. This program was authorized in 2006, but funding has never been provided to the program. The Committee believes that this program is important to maritime communities and shipyards and will

improve the ability of domestic shipyards to compete for domestic and international commercial ship construction.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2007	$4,085,000
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	13,408,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Program, established pursuant to title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, provides for a full faith and credit guarantee by the U.S. Government of debt obligations issued by (1) U.S. or foreign shipowners for the purpose of financing or refinancing either U.S. flag vessels or eligible export vessels constructed, reconstructed or reconditioned in U.S. shipyards and (2) U.S. shipyards for the purpose of financing advanced shipbuilding technology and modern shipbuilding technology (Technology) of a privately owned general shipyard facility located in the United States. The Program is administered by the Secretary of Transportation acting by and through the Maritime Administrator. Under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, appropriations to cover the estimated costs of a project must be obtained prior to the issuance of any approvals for title XI financing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $13,408,000 for the Maritime Guaranteed Loan Title XI program. Of the amount provided, $3,408,000 is for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the program. The Committee notes that $5,000,000 was included in fiscal year 2006 for Maritime Guaranteed Loan Title XI program. In combining the funding provided in both years, an appropriated level of $15,000,000 will provide for a total loan volume of over $250,000,000. The Committee expects that MARAD will move forward expeditiously in approving loan guarantees that are critical to our Nation's shipbuilding industry.

The Committee has also included language that requires the Department of Transportation's Inspector General [IG] to certify to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that MARAD is in compliance with the recommendations contained in the IG's audit reports on the title XI program.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2007	−$2,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	−4,614,545

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Ship Construction account, which hasn't been funded since 1981, provided construction cost subsidies for vessels built to operate in U.S. foreign trade. This program was designed to offset the higher cost of constructing ships in the U.S. versus overseas.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has recommended a rescission of all unobligated balances under this heading.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Section 170 authorizes the Maritime Administration to furnish utilities and services and make repairs to any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under the control of MARAD. Rental payments received pursuant to this provision shall be credited to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Section 171 prohibits obligations incurred during the current year from construction funds in excess of the appropriations and limitations contained in this act or in any prior appropriation act.

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

The Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration [PHMSA] was established in the Department of Transportation on November 30, 2004, pursuant to the Norman Y. Mineta Research and Special Programs Improvement Act (Public Law 108–246). The PHMSA is responsible for the Department's pipeline safety program as well as oversight of hazardous materials transportation safety operations. The administration also is dedicated to safety, including the elimination of transportation-related deaths and injuries associated with hazardous materials and pipeline transportation, and by promoting transportation solutions that enhance communities and protect the environment.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$18,031,209
Budget estimate, 2008	18,130,000
Committee recommendation	18,130,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account funds program support costs for the PHMSA, including policy development, civil rights, management, administration and agency-wide expenses.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $18,130,000 for this account, of which $639,000 is transferred from the Pipeline Safety Fund. This funding is the same as the budget request and $98,791 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee expects PHMSA to use these funds as reflected in its budget justification.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFTEY

Appropriations, 2007	$26,722,887
Budget estimate, 2008	27,003,000
Committee recommendation	27,003,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The PHMSA oversees the safety of more than 800,000 daily shipments of hazardous materials in the United States. PHMSA uses risk management principles and security threat assessments to

fully assess and reduce the risks inherent in hazardous materials transportation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $27,003,000 for hazardous materials safety, of which $1,761,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009. These funds are the same as the budget request and $280,113 more than the fiscal year 2007 funding level.

Hazmat Intermodal Portal.—Within the funds provided, the Committee has included $1,100,000 for the Hazmat Intermodal Portal, as requested. An additional $400,000 is provided for this activity under the Office of Pipeline Safety. The Committee supports the Department's effort to consolidate hazmat data among the various DOT modes that are responsible for regulating the transportation of hazardous materials. This tool should allow the Department to more effectively monitor the shipment of hazardous materials.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2007	$74,915,297
Budget estimate, 2008	74,580,000
Committee recommendation	82,404,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Pipeline Safety [OPS] is designed to promote the safe, reliable, and reliable sound transportation of natural gas and hazardous liquids by pipelines.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $82,404,000 for the Office of Pipeline Safety. This amount is $7,488,703 more than the fiscal year 2007 level and $7,824,000 more than the budget request. Of the funding provided, $18,810,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and $63,594,000 shall be from the Pipeline Safety Fund. Funding adjustments have been made to the following activities within the budget: inspector and enforcement staffing, research and development programs, and Oil Pollution Act implementation activities.

Inspection and Enforcement Staffing.—The Pipeline Inspection, Protection, Enforcement, and Safety Act of 2006 was signed into law in December 2006. This law called for an increased inspection and enforcement workforce for the Office of Pipeline Safety. The Committee believes that these personnel are essential to preventing pipeline accidents and ensuring the integrity of the Nation's pipeline system. The Committee has therefore included $33,003,000 to accommodate a total level of 111 inspection and enforcement FTEs as authorized, this represents 12 FTE more than the FTE level requested in the budget.

Research and Development.—The Committee has rejected the proposed reduction to the research and development program with-

in the Office of Pipeline Safety, and has funded the program at $10,000,000. This amount is $907,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level and $6,250,000 more than the budget request. The Committee has provided funding for the following activities within the research and development program:

	Amount
Mapping and Information Systems	$1,265,000
Enhanced Operations, Control and Monitoring	2,000,000
Damage Prevention and Leak Detection	4,600,000
Improved Materials Performance	2,135,000

In-line inspection devices that are able to detect defects in underground pipelines, known as "smart pigs", have proven valuable in identifying potentially dangerous flaws in the Nation's pipelines. However, in a September 2006 report evaluating threats to hazardous liquid pipelines, the Department of Transportation Inspector General stated the need for PHMSA to continue research and development activities to address limitations to the current smart pig technology. The Committee also believes that PHMSA should focus attention on developing technologies that can address the challenges with inspecting natural gas transmission and gathering pipelines, such as the fact that many too small to accommodate current pigging technologies. As such, the Committee has provided $4,600,000 for research and development related to damage prevention and leak detection technologies to advance research in these areas.

Oil Pollution Act Activities.—The Committee has recommended increased levels requested in the fiscal year 2008 budget by $338,000. The Committee expects this funding to be used to continue activities related to field exercises to prepare and strengthen operator readiness to respond to oil spills from pipelines, and assess and remediate any conditions which may have led to spills.

Grants to States.—The Committee has included the recommended funding of $22,967,000 for the Office of Pipeline Safety's grants programs. This amount includes an increase of $1,000,000 to the State Pipeline Safety grants, which supports the increased inspection responsibilities of State pipeline agencies, such as new natural gas integrity management requirements. The funding recommended includes $1,043,000 for State one-call grants and $1,515,000 is for the new State damage prevention grant program. These two grant programs are both aimed at preventing damage to underground pipelines. The Committee has also included funding for the new technology grant program at $500,000, as requested.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

Appropriations, 2007	$14,157,000
Budget estimate, 2008	28,318,000
Committee recommendation	28,318,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Hazardness Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act of 1990 [HMTUSA] requires PHMSA to (1) develop and implement a

reimbursable emergency preparedness grant program; (2) monitor public sector emergency response training and planning and provide technical assistance to States, political subdivisions and Indian tribes; and (3) develop and update periodically a mandatory training curriculum for emergency responders.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $28,506,000 for this activity, of which $188,000 shall be for activities related to emergency response training curriculum development and updates, as authorized by section 117(A)(i)(3)(B) of HMTUSA. The Committee includes an obligation limitation of $28,318,000 for the emergency preparedness grant program.

The recommended level for emergency preparedness grants support training of first responders and planning for communities to allow them to appropriately respond to hazardous materials incidents. This amount also supports the development and publication of the Emergency Response Guidebook, as well as, training and curriculum development for public sector emergency response and preparedness teams.

RESEARCH AND INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2007	$7,736,103
Budget estimate, 2008	12,000,000
Committee recommendation	12,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Research and Innovative Technology Administration [RITA] was established in the Department of Transportation, effective November 24, 2004, pursuant to the Norman Y. Mineta Research and Special Programs Improvement Act (Public Law 108–246). The mission of RITA is to focus the Department's multi-modal and intermodal research efforts, while coordinating the multifaceted research agenda of the Department.

RITA includes the University Transportation Centers, the Volpe National Transportation Center and the Bureau of Transportation Statistics [BTS], which is funded by an allocation from the Federal Highway Administration's Federal-aid highway account.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,000,000 for Research and Innovative Technologies Administration for fiscal year 2008. The amount provided is $4,263,897 more then the fiscal year 2007 level and equal to the budget request. The Committee has included funding to support the maintenance and operation of the Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System [NDGPS] system as requested. Funding for NDGPS will also support a systems analysis and assessment of current and potential future NDGPS requirements for transportation and other applications.

The Committee recommends funds to be distributed to the following program activities in the following amounts:

	Amount
Salaries and Administrative Expenses	$5,964,000
Hydrogen Fuels Safety Research and Development	500,000
RD&T Coordination	536,000
Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System [NDGPS]	5,000,000

RITA has the mission of coordinating, facilitating and reviewing research development and technology activities at the Department of Transportation [DOT]. RITA has an important role to play in advancing transportation technologies that improve the mobility, safety and efficiency of the Nation's transportation system. By coordinating research among various DOT modes, RITA should be able to reduce duplicative research and advance innovative technologies that support the goals of the Department. In August 2006, the Government Accountability Office [GAO] released a report requested by the Committee that identified some opportunities for RITA to improve its coordination and oversight of DOT research programs. The Committee continues to believe that RITA must strengthen its role in coordinating research activities among the various DOT modes. The Committee looks forward to GAO's follow-up on its audit, which should assess RITA's response to its recommendations, including how RITA is working with DOT operating administrations to develop and implement strategies, performance goals, and performance measures that ensure coordinated research that will advance the Department's goals.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Limitation on obligations, 2007	$27,561,537
Budget estimate, 2008	27,000,000
Committee recommendation	27,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Bureau of Transportation Statistics [BTS] is funded by an allocation from the limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways. The Bureau compiles, analyzes, and makes accessible information on the Nation's transportation systems; collects information on intermodal transportation and other areas as needed; and enhances the quality and effectiveness of the statistical programs of the Department of Transportation through research, the development of guidelines, and the promotion of improvements in data acquisition and use.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Under the appropriation of the Federal Highway Administration, the bill provides $27,000,000 for BTS.

The Committee limits BTS staff to 122 FTEs in fiscal year 2008 in order to curtail the significant growth in staffing that occurred previously within this agency.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$64,043,000
Budget estimate, 2008	66,400,000
Committee recommendation	66,400,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation provides $66,400,000 for activities of the Office of Inspector General, which is $357,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level and the same as the budget request.

In addition, the OIG will receive $6,874,000 from other agencies in this bill for audit and investigation activities within that agency, as noted below:

	Amount
Federal Highway Administration	$4,024,000
Federal Transit Administration	2,000,000
Federal Aviation Administration	750,000
National Transportation Safety Board	100,000

Funding is sufficient to finance 410 full-time equivalent [FTE] staff in fiscal year 2008, for a decrease of 10 FTEs from the fiscal year 2007 level.

Audit Reports.—The Committee requests the Inspector General to continue to forward copies of all audit reports to the Committee immediately after they are issued, and to continue to make the Committee aware immediately of any review that recommends cancellation or modifications to any major acquisition project or grant, or which recommends significant budgetary savings. The OIG is also directed to withhold from public distribution for a period of 15 days any final audit or investigative report which was requested by the House or Senate Committees on Appropriations.

The Committee has included a provision in section 407 that requires all departments and agencies in this act to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on all sole source contracts, including the contractor, the amount of the contract, and the rationale for a sole-source procurement as opposed to a market-based procurement. The Committee directs the IG to assess any conflicts of interest with regard to these contracts and DOT.

Unfair Business Practices.—The bill maintains language which authorizes the OIG to investigate allegations of fraud and unfair or

deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by air carriers and ticket agents.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriation	Crediting offsetting collections
Appropriations, 2007	$26,313,000	$25,063,000
Budget estimate, 2008	23,085,000	21,835,000
Committee recommendation	25,000,000	23,750,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Surface Transportation Board [STB] was created on January 1, 1996, by the Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act of 1995 [ICCTA] (Public Law 104–88). The Board is a three-member, bipartisan, decisionally independent adjudicatory body organizationally housed within DOT and is responsible for the regulation of the rail and pipeline industries and certain non-licensing regulation of motor carriers and water carriers.

STB's rail oversight activities encompass rate reasonableness, car service and interchange, mergers, line acquisitions, line constructions, and abandonments. STB's jurisdiction also includes certain oversight of the intercity bus industry and pipeline carriers, rate regulation involving noncontiguous domestic water transportation, household goods carriers, and collectively determined motor carrier rates.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $25,000,000. This funding level is $1,915,000 more than the budget request and $1,313,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. Included in the recommendation is $1,250,000 in fees, which will offset the appropriated funding. At this funding level, the Board will be able to accommodate 150 full-time equivalent staff.

User Fees.—Current statutory authority, under 31 U.S.C. 9701, grants the Board the authority to collect user fees. Language is included in the bill allowing fees to be credited to the appropriation on a dollar-for-dollar basis as the fees are received and credited. The Committee continues this language to simplify the tracking of the collections and provide the Board with more flexibility in spending its appropriated funds.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Section 180 allows funds for maintenance and operation of aircraft; motor vehicles; liability insurance; uniforms; or allowances, as authorized by law.

Section 181 limits appropriations for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 not to exceed the rate for an Executive Level IV.

Section 182 prohibits funds in this act for salaries and expenses of more than 110 political and presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation.

Section 183 prohibits funds for the implementation of section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

Section 184 prohibits recipients of funds made available in this act to release personal information, including a Social Security number, medical or disability information, and photographs from a driver's license or motor vehicle record without express consent of the person to whom such information pertains; and prohibits the Secretary of Transportation from withholding funds provided in this act for any grantee if a State is in noncompliance with this provision.

Section 185 allows funds received by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and the Federal Railroad Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training may be credited to each agency's respective accounts.

Section 186 authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to allow issuers of any preferred stock to redeem or repurchase preferred stock sold to the Department of Transportation.

Section 187 prohibits funds in this act to make a grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations at least 3 full business days before any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, or full funding grant agreement totaling $1,000,000 or more is announced by the Department or its modal administration.

Section 188 allows rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees and other funds received by the Department of Transportation from travel management center, charge card programs, subleasing of building space and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department of Transportation.

Section 189 requires amounts from improper payments to a third party contractor that are lawfully recovered by the Department of Transportation be available to cover expenses incurred in recovery of such payments.

Section 190 establishes requirements for reprogramming actions by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Section 191 eliminates certain solid waste processing entities from the jurisdiction of the Surface Transportation Board.

Section 192 prohibits the Surface Transportation Board from charging filing fees for rate complaints that are greater than the fees authorized for district court civil suits.

Section 193 requires an investigation by the Department of Transportation Inspector General on rail service disruptions.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2007	$34,989,245,000
Budget estimate, 2008	33,675,018,000
Committee recommendation	36,167,029,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] was established by the Housing and Urban Development Act (Public Law 89–174), effective November 9, 1965. This Department is the principal Federal agency responsible for programs concerned with the Nation's housing needs, fair housing opportunities, and improving and developing the Nation's communities.

In carrying out the mission of serving the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and of the people who live and work in them, HUD administers mortgage and loan insurance programs that help families become homeowners and facilitate the construction of rental housing; rental and homeownership subsidy programs for low-income families who otherwise could not afford decent housing; programs to combat discrimination in housing and affirmatively further fair housing opportunity; programs aimed at ensuring an adequate supply of mortgage credit; and programs that aid neighborhood rehabilitation, community development, and the preservation of our urban centers from blight and decay.

HUD administers programs to protect the homebuyer in the marketplace and fosters programs and research that stimulate and guide the housing industry to provide not only housing, but better communities and living environments.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends for fiscal year 2008 an appropriation of $36,167,029,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is $1,177,784,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level and $2,492,011,000 more then the budget request.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $3,820,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 3,930,000
Committee recommendation	3,930,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The responsibilities of the Department are administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary, who is responsible for the administration of all programs, functions and authorities of the Department. The Deputy Secretary assists the Secretary in the discharge of the duties and responsibilities, and serves as Acting Secretary in the absence of the Secretary. In addition to the Office of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary, activities include four offices of highly specialized staff with Department-wide responsibility for the following functions: participation of small and disadvantaged businesses in the contracting activities of the Department; Public Affairs; Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations; and Administrative Judicial proceedings.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,930,000 for the Office of the Secretary. This level is the same as the budget request and $110,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $1,340,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 1,490,000
Committee recommendation	1,490,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Hearings and Appeals is an independent adjudicatory office within the Office of the Secretary whose administrative judges conduct hearings and make determinations for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] in accordance with existing statues and departmental policies, regulations, and procedures. The Office of Hearings and Appeals is headed by a Director appointed by the Secretary who supervises the administrative judges, administrative law judges of the Office of Administrative Law Judges, and support staff.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,490,000 for the Office of Hearings and Appeals. This level is the same as the budget request and $150,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $670,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 510,000
Committee recommendation	510,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization is responsible for the implementation and execution of the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] activities on behalf of small businesses, minority businesses, businesses owned and controlled by disadvantaged persons, and firms, in accordance with sections 8 and 15 of the Small Business Act [SBA], as amended. The Office has functional direction and oversight of Department of Housing and Urban Development personnel to the extent that the functions and duties of such personnel relate to sections 8 and 15 of the SBA. For the functions and responsibilities required by Public Law 95–507, the Director shall be responsible only to, and report directly to, the Secretary or Deputy Secretary.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $510,000 for the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization. This level is the same as the budget request and $160,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $39,710,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 43,750,000
Committee recommendation	43,750,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of the Chief Financial Officer [OCFO] provides leadership in instituting financial integrity, fiscal responsibility and accountability. The CFO reports directly to and advises the Secretary of the Department on all aspects of financial management, accounting and budgetary matters; ensures that the Department establishes and meets financial management goals and objectives; that the Department is in compliance with financial management legislation and directives; analyzes budgetary implications of policy and legislative proposals and provides technical oversight with respect to all budget activities throughout the Department.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $43,750,000 for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer. This level is the same as the budget request and $4,040,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $82,900,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 86,820,000
Committee recommendation	86,820,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The General Counsel, as the chief legal officer and legal voice of the Department, is the legal adviser to the Secretary and other principal staff of the Department. It is the responsibility of the General Counsel to provide legal opinions, advice and services with respect to all programs and activities, and to provide counsel and assistance in the development of the Department's programs and policies. Through the Departmental Enforcement Center [DEC], the General Counsel focuses on and resolves the Department's most difficult housing cases by taking aggressive action against those that are in serious non-compliance with regulatory and business agreement requirements.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $86,820,000 for the Office of the General Counsel. This level is the same as the budget request and $3,920,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $12,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 13,500,000
Committee recommendation	13,500,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of the Chief Procurement Officer [OCPO]'s mission is to provide high-quality acquisition support services to all HUD program offices by purchasing necessary operational and mission-related goods and services; provide advice, guidance and technical assistance to all departmental offices on matters concerning procurement; assist program offices in defining and specifying their procurement needs; develop and maintain all procurement guidance including regulations, policies, and procedures; and assist in the development of sound acquisition strategies

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $13,500,000 for the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer. This level is the same as the budget request and $1,500,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

CENTER FOR FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $1,480,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 1,860,000
Committee recommendation	1,860,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

HUD's Center for Faith-based and Community Initiatives conducts outreach, recommends changes to HUD polices and programs that present barriers to grassroots organizations, and initiates special projects, such as grant writing training.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,860,000 for the Center for Faith-Based Initiatives. This level is the same as the budget request and $380,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $2,330,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 2,670,000
Committee recommendation	2,670,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations is the principal advisor to the Secretary, Deputy Secretary and senior staff with respect to legislative affairs, congressional relations, and policy matters affecting Federal, State, and local governments, and public and private interest groups.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,670,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations. This level is the same as the budget request and $340,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $2,140,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 2,630,000
Committee recommendation	2,630,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

HUD's Office of Public Affairs [OPA] educates the American public on the Department's mission to increase homeownership, sup-

port community development and increase access to affordable housing free from discrimination. By pursuing media outreach, OPA works to ensure homeowners, renters, and those living in subsidized housing hear directly from key officials about the Department's latest initiatives and goals. Using communications tools such as press releases, press conferences, the Internet, media interviews and community outreach, OPA provides Americans with information about housing policies and programs that are important to them.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,630,000 for the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs. This level is the same as the budget request and $490,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF DEPARTMENTAL EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $3,070,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 3,440,000
Committee recommendation	3,440,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The mission of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity is to ensure the enforcement of Federal laws relating to the elimination of all forms of discrimination in the Department's employment practices. The mission of the Office is carried out through the functions of three Divisions, the Affirmative Employment Division, the Alternative Dispute Resolution Division, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Division.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,440,000 for the Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity. This level is the same as the budget request and $370,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $1,430,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 1,480,000
Committee recommendation	1,480,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Administration is responsible for the development and implementation of policies, standards, procedures,

systems and materials related to the resource and administrative management of the Department.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,480,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration. This level is the same as the budget request and $50,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $238,410,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 252,010,000
Committee recommendation	252,010,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Administration provides general support services to all offices and divisions throughout HUD. These services include: management analysis, human resource management, employee training, performance analysis; providing general building and office services, maintaining correspondence and scheduling for the Secretary; as well as carrying out special activities directly assigned by the Secretary of HUD.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $252,010,000 for the Office of Administration. This level is the same as the budget request and $13,600,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS AND COORDINATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $11,990,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 12,520,000
Committee recommendation	12,520,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Departmental Operations and Coordination [ODOC] perform a broad range of cross-program functions that assist the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary with HUD's continuing management improvement initiatives. Key responsibilities include leading the development and monitoring of the Department's Management and Strategic Plans; overseeing HUD's planning and accountability processes to ensure that the Department achieves its goals and quality improvement objectives; managing the Department's Compliance and Monitoring Program; managing the Department's Internet, Intranet, and other public access technology; managing HUD's oversight and monitoring of labor standards for HUD-funded construction projects; and coordinating Executive Management and Field Office Management Meetings for the Deputy Secretary.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,520,000 for the Office of Departmental Operations and Coordination. This level is the same as the budget request and $530,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF FIELD POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $52,020,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 47,730,000
Committee recommendation	47,730,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Field Policy and Management serves as the principal advisor of providing oversight and communicate Secretarial priorities and policies to the field office staff and clients. The Regional and Field Office Directors act as the operational managers in each of the field offices. The Regional and Field Office Directors direct and coordinate cross program delivery of the Department's programs in the field. Activities in the field includes conducting marketing and outreach activities, upholding customer service standards, providing cross program coordination, and serving as point of contact with the media, website management, general public and elected officials.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $47,730,000 for the Office of Field Policy and Management. This level is the same as the budget request and $4,290,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 level.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $1,450,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 1,620,000
Committee recommendation	1,620,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing [PIH] is responsible for the management, direction and oversight of promoting affordable housing opportunities for low-income families as they transition to self-sufficiency and homeownership. The key tasks in achieving the mission include the review and oversight of policy and procedures as well as implementing special projects. In efforts to review and oversee policy and procedure implementation, the Office coordinates PIH work with offices within

the Department, OMB, Congress, and other Federal, State, and local agencies and officials. This office also administers and coordinates operations of PIH offices while providing technical assistance and guidance for policy and procedures.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,620,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing. This level is the same as the budget request and $170,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $176,060,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 188,340,000
Committee recommendation	188,340,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Public and Indian Housing oversees the administration of HUD's Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher, Section 8 Rental Assistance and Native American Programs. PIH is responsible for administering and managing programs authorized and funded by Congress under the basic provisions of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $188,340,000 for the Office of Public and Indian Housing. This level is the same as the budget request and $12,280,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007 [1]	$15,920,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008 [1]	16,000,000,000
Committee recommendation [1]	16,598,694,000

[1] Include an advance appropriation of roughly $4,200,000,000.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for the section 8 tenant-based (voucher) program. Section 8 tenant-based housing assistance is one of the principle appropriations for Federal housing assistance and provides rental housing assistance to over 2 million families. Further, it funds incremental vouchers to assist non-elderly disabled families, to provide vouchers for tenants that live in projects where the owner of the project has decided to leave the section 8 program, or for replacement of units lost from the assisted housing inventory (tenant protection vouchers), etc. Under these programs, eligible low-income families pay 30 percent of their adjusted income for rent, and the Federal Government is responsible for the remain-

der of the rent, up to the fair market rent or some other payment standard. This account also provides funding for the Contract Administrator program, Family Self-Sufficiency [FSS] and the Family Unification program. Under FSS, families receive job training and employment that should lead to a decrease in their dependency on welfare programs and move towards economic self-sufficiency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $16,598,694,000 for fiscal year 2008; including $4,200,000,000 as an advance appropriation to be made available on October 1, 2008. This amount is $605,694,000 more than the budget request and $671,694,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

The Committee recommends $14,936,000,000 for the renewal costs for section 8 contracts which is $491,694,000 more than the budget request and $493,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee notes that the budget request provides only $8,306,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level for all the renewal costs associated with almost 2 million vouchers. The administration budget would force Public Housing Authorities [PHAs] to cover all inflationary costs associated with rent increases as well as absorb the cost of tenant protection vouchers that were added to their authorized lease levels. The vast majority of PHAs do not have sufficient resources to meet this unfunded responsibility and the result would be the possible displacement of vulnerable low-income residents. Adequate funding has been provided for inflationary costs, incremental vouchers to assist non-elderly disabled families, vouchers for tenants that live in projects where the owner of the project has decided to opt-out of the section 8 project-based program, or for the replacement of other units lost from the assisted housing inventory. This appropriation will ensure that PHAs have sufficient funding to renew approximately 2 million existing contracts and prevent the displacement of any current tenants.

The Committee continues the section 8 renewal formula established in fiscal year 2007. This formula is based on data derived through the voucher management system [VMS] on the most recently completed 12 consecutive month period that reflects the actual costs off all vouchers under lease. This formula provides an efficient method to capture actual costs incurred by PHAs including variations in the rental markets. The Committee continues to exempt specific categories of public housing authorities from the new 12-month formula; namely (1) agencies impacted by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita that can demonstrate use of such funds within 12 months; (2) agencies that are under receivership within 24 months of enactment of this act and can demonstrate use of such funds within 12 months; and (3) agencies that spent more than the total of their allocated funds for 2006 and 2007.

The Committee provides a set-aside of $100,000,000 to adjust PHA's allocations to include (1) PHAs that were unfairly disadvantaged from excessive costs due to portability; and (2) PHAs that increased their utilization rate using available reserves.

Tenant Protection Vouchers.—The Committee recommends $150,000,000 for tenant protection assistance. This is the same as the budget request and $700,000 more than the fiscal year 2007

level. The Committee rejects the administrative efforts to limit tenant protection vouchers only to units under lease at the time of conversion. Rather, the Committee has included statutory language requiring the Secretary to provide replacement vouchers for all units that cease to be available as assisted housing due to demolition, disposition, or conversion, subject to the available of funds. This statutory change will prevent the loss of critical housing assistance in communities around the Nation.

Family Self-Sufficiency Coordinators.—The Committee recommends $50,000,000 for family self-sufficiency coordinators. This is $2,500,000 more than the budget request and $2,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. These funds are designed to promote self-sufficiency by developing local strategies to coordinate public and private resources that help voucher participants and public housing tenants obtain employment to achieve economic independence.

Family Unification Program.—The Committee recommends $30,000,000 for the Family Unification program. The administration did not request funding for this program. This program provides vouchers for families for whom the lack of adequate housing is a primary factor in the separation, or the threat of imminent separation, of children from their families. This program also provides vouchers to youths 18 to 21 years old who left foster care at age 16 or older and lack adequate housing.

Veterans Affairs Supported Housing Program.—The Committee recommends $75,000,000 for the Veterans Affairs Supported Housing program. The administration did not request funding for this program. According to a recent HUD report submitted to Congress, homeless veterans make up approximately 18.7 percent of all homeless adults who accessed an emergency shelter or transitional housing. This program provides section 8 vouchers for homeless veterans. This program is a supported jointly by the HUD and the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA]. The VA provides ongoing treatment services to veterans that are homeless, mentally ill and suffer from substance abuse disorders. The VA screens homeless veterans for program eligibility and provides case management services to the enrollees. HUD provides the rental assistance subsidy through PHAs utilizing the section 8 voucher program. The Secretary of HUD, in consultation with the Secretary of VA, may waive certain HUD requirements necessary for the effective delivery and administration of such voucher assistance. The Committee notes that funding should be sufficient to provide assistance for over 7,500 homeless veterans.

Administrative Fees.—The Committee recommends $1,351,000,000 for administrative fees for PHAs. This is equal to the budget request and $69,900,000 more than the comparable funding level for fiscal year 2007. These funds are to be allocated on a formula tied to units under lease. These funds pay for the administrative functions for the section 8 voucher program.

Working Capital Transfer.—The Committee includes language allowing up to $6,494,000 to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund. This is the same as the budget request and $594,000 more than fiscal year 2007 level. The Working Capital Fund is needed for HUD to complete an effective IT system to track HUD funding.

Semiannual Reports.—The Committee requests the Secretary to continue to submit the semi-annual on the effectiveness of the budget-based approach to vouchers as first mandated in Senate Report 109–109.

Report on Certain Special Purpose Vouchers.—Within 120 days after enactment of this act, the Secretary shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations a report stating the total amount of budget authority and number of vouchers provided each year from 2001 through fiscal year 2007 to public housing agencies for the first time renewal of each category of tenant protection vouchers, including HOPE VI vouchers and relocation vouchers necessitated by mandatory and voluntary conversions, demolitions, and disposition of public housing developments.

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Appropriations, 2007	−$1,650,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	−1,300,000,000
Committee recommendation	−1,100,000,000

The Housing Certificate Fund until fiscal year 2005 provided funding for both the project-based and tenant-based components of the section 8 program. Project-based rental assistance and tenant-based rental assistance are now separately funded accounts. The Housing Certificate Fund retains balances from previous years' appropriations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a rescission of $1,100,000,000 for fiscal year 2008. This amount is $200,000,000 less than the budget request and $550,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 level. The administration has been unable to provide the Committee information indicating that a rescission of a full $1,300,000,000 is achievable in fiscal year 2008 without doing harm to other HUD programs. If the HUD Secretary is unable to recapture unused section 8 balances of this volume, a rescission of the size requested by the President could result in funds being rescinded from critical programs such as Homeless Assistance, HOME, HOPE VI, Section 202 Housing for the Elderly and Section 811 Housing for Persons with Disabilities. Reducing balances from these accounts will cause great harm to some of the most vulnerable low-income populations in the Nation.

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$5,976,417,000
Budget estimate, 2008	5,813,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,813,000,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Section 8 project-based rental assistance provides a rental subsidy to a private landlord that is tied to a specific housing unit as opposed to a voucher which allows a recipient to seek a unit, sub-

ject primarily to certain rent caps. Amounts in this account include funding for the renewal of expiring 8 project-based contracts, including section 8, moderate rehabilitation, and single room occupancy [SRO] housing. This account also provides funds for contract administrators.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $5,813,000,000 for the annual renewal of project-based contracts, of which up to $286,230,000 is for the cost of contract administrators and up to $3,960,000 may be transferred to the Working Capital Fund. This funding is equal to the budget request and $163,417,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 level.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$2,438,964,000
Budget estimate, 2008	2,024,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,500,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for modernization and capital needs of public housing authorities (except Indian housing authorities), including management improvements, resident relocation and homeownership activities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,500,000,000 for the Public Housing Capital Fund, which is $476,000,000 more than the budget request and $61,036,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

Of the amount made available under this section, $40,000,000 is for supportive services for residents of public housing and up to $8,820,000 is made available to pay the costs of administrative and judicial receiverships. The Committee includes language allowing up to $16,847,000 to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund. The Committee recommends $14,890,000, equal to the budget request, for technical assistance activities.

The Committee provides an adequate increase in funding for capital needs in order to maintain the public housing portfolio which is necessary to preserve affordable, safe and sanitary housing for low-income residents. The Committee directs HUD to perform a new Capital Needs Assessment [CNA] for the entire public housing portfolio including the projected annual cost to adequately maintain that portfolio and submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by June 30, 2008. It has been several years since the last CNA was performed and the Committee believes that this information must be updated.

HUD is prohibited from using any funds under this account as an emergency reserve under section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, but is provided up to $20,000,000 for emergency capital needs.

The Committee recommends up to $15,345,000, equal to the budget request, to support the ongoing financial and physical assessment activities at the Real Estate Assessment Center [REAC].

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

Appropriations, 2007	$3,864,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	4,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,200,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for the payment of operating subsidies to approximately 3,100 public housing authorities (except Indian housing authorities) with a total of approximately 1.2 million units under management in order to augment rent payments by residents in order to provide sufficient revenues to meet reasonable operating costs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,200,000,000 for the public housing operating fund, which is $200,000,000 more than the budget request and $336,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee has provided additional funds to offset rising utility costs and increased requirements placed on PHAs.

HUD is prohibited from using any funds under this account as an emergency reserve under section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937. The bill includes language from the fiscal year 2004 appropriation bill that prohibits the use of operating funds to pay for the operating expenses for a prior year.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING [HOPE VI]

Appropriations, 2007	$99,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The "Revitalization of severely distressed public housing" [HOPE VI] account makes awards to public housing authorities on a competitive basis to demolish obsolete or failed developments or to revitalize, where appropriate, sites upon which these developments exist. This is a focused effort to eliminate public housing which was, in many cases, poorly located, ill-designed, and not well constructed. Such unsuitable housing has been very expensive to operate, and difficult to manage effectively due to multiple deficiencies.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $100,000,000 for the "HOPE VI" account. This amount is $1,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level and $100,000,000 more than the budget request. In addition, the Committee has rejected the President's request to rescind funds provided under this heading for fiscal year 2007.

The HOPE VI program has replaced distressed public housing located in neighborhoods that have concentrated poverty with new

mixed-income housing. HOPE VI projects have succeeded in improving the communities in which these developments are located, as well as changing the lives of public housing residents. While a great deal of public housing has already been rehabilitated through this program, the Committee believes that the HOPE VI program must continue to play an important role in revitalizing distressed communities.

HUD made modifications to the program in 2002 that addressed some challenges identified with earlier grant awards. The agency has also taken steps to improve its management and oversight of the grant program. These changes have resulted in improved timeliness and accountability in the implementation of HOPE VI grants. These changes, as well as the increased resources leveraged from the private sector, make the case for the program's continuation.

The Committee shares the administration's concern about the large amount of unobligated balances in this account and applauds HUD's efforts to work with older grantees to reduce their unspent balances. These efforts have reduced unexpended balances, from the high of $3,300,000,000 in fiscal year 2003 to the current level of $1,500,000,000. In order to continue the advancement and expenditure of HOPE VI grants, the Committee continues to provide technical assistance funding at the level of $1,980,000 within the account. The Committee directs HUD to utilize this funding to provide grantees with the necessary tools to carry out successful HOPE VI projects. The Committee also makes notes of unobligated technical assistance funding and directs HUD to also use this funding to further reduce unexpended balances.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$623,700,000
Budget estimate, 2008	626,965,000
Committee recommendation	630,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account funds the native American housing block grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 [NAHASDA]. This program provides an allocation of funds on a formula basis to Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities to help them address the housing needs within their communities. Under this block grant, Indian tribes will use performance measures and benchmarks that are consistent with the national goals of the program, but can base these measures on the needs and priorities established in their own Indian housing plan.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $630,000,000 for the Native American Housing Block Grant, of which $1,980,000 is set aside for a credit subsidy to support a loan level not to exceed $17,000,000 for the section 601 Loan Guarantee Loan Program.

This total level is $3,035,000 more than the budget request and $6,300,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

The Committee includes $2,000,000 for technical assistance through the National American Housing Council and $4,250,000 for inspections of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, technical assistance, oversight and management.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

Appropriations, 2007	$8,726,850
Budget estimate, 2008	5,940,000
Committee recommendation	9,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Hawaiian Homelands Homeownership Act of 2000 created the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program to provide grants to State of Hawaiian Home Lands for housing and housing related assistance to develop, maintain, and operate affordable housing for eligible low income Native Hawaiian families.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $9,000,000 for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant, which is $3,060,000 more than the budget request and $273,150 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. Of the amount provided, $300,000 shall be for training and technical assistance activities.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans
Appropriations, 2007	$6,000,000	$251,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	7,450,000	367,000,000
Committee recommendation	7,450,000	367,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides access to private financing for Indian families, Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities who otherwise could not acquire housing financing because of the unique status of Indian trust land. As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account includes the subsidy costs associated with the loan guarantees authorized under this program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,450,000 in program subsidies to support a loan level of $367,000,000. This subsidy level is the same as the budget request and $1,450,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans
Appropriations, 2007	$891,000	$35,714,290
Budget estimate, 2008	1,044,000	41,504,255
Committee recommendation	1,044,000	41,504,255

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides access to private financing for native Hawaiians who otherwise could not acquire housing finance because of the unique status of the Hawaiians Home Lands as trust land. As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account includes the subsidy costs associated with the loan guarantees authorized under this program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,044,000 in program subsidies to support a loan level of $41,504,255, which is the same as the budget request and $5,789,965 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $1,420,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 1,520,000
Committee recommendation	1,520,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development is responsible for setting policy and administering HUD community development programs to assure the effective operation and achievement necessary to improve the economic, physical, and social capital of communities. The staff is responsible for representing policy and programs to clients and interest groups including Congress and coordinating uniform policy implementation to 43 field offices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,520,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development. This level is the same as the budget request and $100,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $87,870,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 93,770,000
Committee recommendation	93,770,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Community Planning and Development assists in developing viable communities by promoting integrated approaches that provide decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expand economic opportunities for low and moderate income persons. The primary means toward this end is the development of partnerships among all levels of government and the private sector, including for-profit and nonprofit organizations. This Office is responsible for the effective administration of Community Development Block Grant programs [CDBG], Home Investment Partnership [HOME], Brownfields Economic Development Initiative [BEDI], Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program [SHOP], Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids [HOPWA] and other HUD community development programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $93,770,000 for the Office of Community Planning and Development. This level is the same as the budget request and $5,900,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS [HOPWA]

Appropriations, 2007	$286,110,000
Budget estimate, 2008	300,100,000
Committee recommendation	300,100,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS [HOPWA] Program is designed to provide States and localities with resources and incentives to devise long-term comprehensive strategies for meeting the housing needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.

Statutorily, 90 percent of appropriated funds are distributed by formula to qualifying States and metropolitan areas on the basis of the number and incidence of AIDS cases reported to Centers for Disease Control and Prevention by March 31 of the year preceding the appropriation year. The remaining 10 percent of funds are distributed through a national competition.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $300,100,000 for this program, which is $13,990,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level and equal to the budget request. The Committee also requires HUD to allocate these funds in a manner that preserves existing HOPWA programs to the extent these programs are determined to be meeting the needs of persons with AIDS.

Since the program's inception in 1992, HOPWA has assisted persons living with HIV/AIDS access and maintain housing and supportive services in order to avoid homelessness and improve access to health care. Research shows that housing is one of the greatest unmet needs of people living with HIV/AIDS, and that housing is critical to improving the health of persons living with the disease. The funding recommended by the Committee, and equal to the budget request, will allow providers to continue to address the unique housing and service needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS.

The Committee supports HUD's efforts to gather data on the performance outcomes of HOPWA funding. The Committee is also pleased by initial data included in the 2008 performance budget, which indicate that HUD exceeded its goal for the percentage of HOPWA facility residents who are maintaining stable housing. The Committee looks forward to more comprehensive data in HOPWA's 2009 performance budget.

OFFICE OF RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2007	$16,830,000
Budget estimate, 2008	.....
Committee recommendation	17,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development was established to ensure that the Department has a comprehensive approach to rural housing and rural economic development issues. The account includes funding for capacity building in rural, underserved areas, and grants for Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State and local economic development agencies, rural nonprofits and rural community development corporations to pursue strategies designed to meet rural housing and economic development needs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $17,000,000 for the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development for fiscal year 2008, which is $170,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The administration did not request funding for this program.

The Committee does not accept the administration's recommendation to eliminate funding for this program. The Committee believes that the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development plays an important role in HUD's community development activities. Twenty-five percent of nonmetropolitan homes are renter-occupied, and the high cost of housing burdens those in rural areas, as it does in urban communities. Furthermore, the Committee notes that the programs of the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development are sufficiently different from the housing programs administered by the Department of Agriculture to warrant separate appropriations. Calculations of population to determine if an area is rural shall be based on the reality of an area, not the aggregation of the total population of a number of rural areas in an application for funds.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$3,771,900,000
Budget estimate, 2008	3,036,570,000
Committee recommendation	4,060,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, the Department is authorized to award block grants to units of general local government and States for the funding of local community development programs. A wide range of physical, economic, and social development activities are eligible with spending priorities determined at the local level, but the law enumerates general objectives which the block grants are designed to fulfill, including adequate housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income. Grant recipients are required to use at least 70 percent of their block grant funds for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons.

Funds are distributed to eligible recipients for community development purposes utilizing the higher of two objective formulas, one of which gives somewhat greater weight to the age of housing stock. Seventy percent of appropriated funds are distributed to entitlement communities and 30 percent are distributed to nonentitlement communities after deducting designated amounts for setasides.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,060,000,000 for the Community Development Fund in fiscal year 2008. This level is $1,023,430,000 more than the budget request and $288,100,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

For the third year in a row, the administration has sought to justify their recommendation to slash funding for the Community Development Block Grant [CDBG] program by proposing legislative "reforms" for the program. For fiscal year 2008, the administration's budget proposes a funding cut of approximately 20 percent from the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee notes that the administrations "reform" legislation, which has yet to be introduced in either the House or the Senate, purports to "reform" the program by cutting assistance to affluent communities. The Committee notes, however that CDBG grantees are required by law to use at least 70 percent of their funding to benefit low and moderate-income persons. And, in reality, according to the HUD's own budget documents, between 95 and 97 percent of CDBG funds benefited low- and moderate-income persons in fiscal year 2006. The Committee applauds the State and local governments for their targeted use of funds to assist persons in greatest need. The Committee believes that such aggressive targeting efforts makes it clear that the administration's proposed "reforms" and reduced funding level would do nothing other than de-fund needed assistance in poor communities. The Committee recognizes that the CDBG program is one of the government's most effective and flexible tools to

provide States and local communities with the resources to address such pressing needs. As such, the Committee rejects the administration's proposed funding cut.

The Committee includes $62,000,000 for grants to Indian tribes for essential economic and community development activities which is $4,580,000 more than the budget request and $2,600,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

The Committee includes language indicating funding made available within this account, not to exceed $1,570,000, may be transferred to the Working Capital Fund. This is equal to the budget request. The Committee includes the administration's proposal for $3,000,000 to be used for technical assistance activities within CDBG.

The Committee also funds the Economic Development Initiative at $248,000,000 and the Neighborhood Initiatives program at $40,000,000.

The Economic Development Initiatives are as follows:

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Acadiana Outreach Center Housing Redevelopment; Lafayette, Louisiana	$400,000	Vitter/Landrieu
Affordable Housing Revolving Loan Fund and Grant Pool, Scott County Housing Council, Davenport, IA. For affordable housing for those making lass than 80 percent of the AMI.	400,000	Harkin/Grassley
Akron-Canton Regional Foodbank, Akron, Ohio. The Akron-Canton Regional Foodbank for building renovations.	550,000	Brown
Appalachia Service Project Home Repair Program, Southern West Virginia, for the repair of low and moderate income housing.	500,000	Byrd
Appalachia Service Project, Chavies, KY to continue free home repair services to Kentucky's low-income families.	200,000	Bunning
Armory District Revitalization Planning, NY, for planning and design efforts within the City's Armory District to aid in the redevelopment of this deteriorating corridor.	200,000	Schumer/Clinton
Asian Counseling and Referral Service, Seattle, WA, Asian Counseling and Referral Service for construction of a new building.	500,000	Murray/Cantwell
Audubon, Arkansas, Development of Little Rock Audubon Center, Little Rock, AR, to complete the second phase of development of the Little Rock Audubon Center.	200,000	Lincoln/Pryor
Audubon Mississippi, Pascagoula River Audubon Center, Moss Point, Mississippi, to construct a nature-based education facility that will contribute to the economic and community recovery on the Mississippi Gulf Coast.	750,000	Cochran
Beautiful Gate Outreach Center; Reaching Out and Saving Lives! Project; Wilmington, Delaware; for construction of a larger facility to be used for HIV testing services and prevention programs in New Castle County.	500,000	Carper/Biden
Bell-Whitley Community Agency, Bell County, KY to complete construction of One Stop Training Center.	200,000	Bunning
Bemidji Regional Airport, Bemidji, Minnesota, for the Bemidji JOBZ infrastructure development project to support light manufacturing facilities.	500,000	Klobuchar
Bernalillo County, NM; Metropolitan Assessment and Treatment Services Transitional Housing Facility; Bernalillo County, NM.	250,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Bold Vision Capital Campaign for The Center for Family Resources: Georgia	500,000	Isakson
Borough of Collingswood, NJ, Collingswood Theatre Project, for comprehensive renovation of the Scottish Rite Theatre which is the focal point of the Borough's revitalization program.	200,000	Menendez/Lautenberg
Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater Washington, Alexandria, VA, for the renovation of the Alexandria, Virginia, Branch Boys and Girls Club.	500,000	Warner/Webb
Boys and Girls Club of Greater Manchester, NH, for renovation and expansion of facility.	300,000	Gregg
Boys and Girls Club of Magic Valley, Twin Falls, Idaho, for construction of a Boys and Girls Club facility in the town of Buhl, Idaho.	250,000	Crapo
Boys and Girls Clubs of Socorro County, Construction of Facility, Socorro, New Mexico, provide services and activities for youth throughout Socorro County, NM.	200,000	Domenici

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Business Support Incubator, UAPB to complete construction of the Business Support Incubator to support job creation in Central Arkansas.	600,000	Lincoln/Pryor
Calvin Coolidge State historic site in Plymouth Notch, Vermont for an expanded visitor's center.	250,000	Sanders
Cameron County, Texas; Los Fresnos Boys and Girls Club; Construction of a new Boys and Girls Club facility in Los Fresnos, Cameron County, Texas.	500,000	Cornyn
Camp Barnabas; Missouri	500,000	Bond
Canyon Lake Revitalization Study, Rapid City, South Dakota	200,000	Thune
Capital District YMCA, Schenectady, New York for construction of new YMCA at the side of a brownfield.	200,000	Clinton/Schumer
Capitol Region RSVP/Volunteer Center of Rhode Island, RSVP Veterans Computer Center, Providence, RI for construction of a computer lab and purchase of equipment to train disabled veterans.	200,000	Reed
Cather Foundation, Red Cloud, NE for the Moon Block Project for historic renovations.	1,000,000	Hagel/Nelson, Ben
Catholic Charities of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, to renovate recently acquired property in Makiki to establish permanent facilities for CCH's Social Services Community Center.	200,000	Inouye
CEDARS Youth Services, Lincoln, NE, CEDARS Children's Crisis Center, for construction of the CEDARS Children's Crisis Shelter.	500,000	Nelson, Ben/Hagel
Champlain Area Agency on Aging, Winooski, Vermont, for renovation Vermont senior centers.	250,000	Sanders
Cherokee Strip Regional Heritage Center, Enid, OK	200,000	Inhofe
Cheyenne River Youth Project [CRYP], Teen Center Expansion, Eagle Butte, SD	200,000	Johnson
Children's Home Society, Expansion of Van Demark House and the Loving School, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.	800,000	Thune/Johnson
Chippewa Cree Tribe, Transportation and Rehabilitation of Malmstrom Air Force Base Housing Units, to transport and rehabilitate housing units from Malmstrom Air Force Base that would otherwise be destroyed to the Rocky Boy's Reservation.	600,000	Tester
City and County of Denver, CO, Homeless Veterans Supportive Housing, for supportive housing units for homeless veterans with special needs.	300,000	Salazar
City and County of San Francisco, CA, San Francisco Supportive and Transitional Housing Program, to develop 3,000 supporting housing units.	800,000	Feinstein
City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Supportive and Transitional Housing Program, San Francisco, CA: to finance the new construction of Mason Street, permanent supportive housing for homeless individuals.	200,000	Boxer
City of Aberdeen, SD, Downtown revitalization	250,000	Johnson
City of Albany, WiFi Service in Albany in Albany, New York, public access to technology project.	200,000	Clinton/Schumer
City of Ardmore, OK for a Community Resources Center for low income, at risk citizens.	200,000	Inhofe
City of Asheville, NC for Reid Center Renovation	200,000	Burr
City of Atchison, Kansas for Atchison Pedestrian Mall Redevelopment, Kansas	500,000	Roberts
City of Bangor, Maine to support ongoing efforts to redevelop the Bangor Waterfront.	350,000	Collins/Snowe
City of Battle Ground, WA, Battle Ground Community Center, for a construction of a community center.	400,000	Murray
City of Beaumont, Downtown Improvement Program, Beaumont, TX, for streetscape improvements.	200,000	Hutchison
City of Belen, NM; Multipurpose Community Center Phase III; Belen, NM, to provide a centralized venue for community events and activities.	750,000	Domenici
City of Bellingham, WA, for the construction of the Bellingham Marine Trades Center.	250,000	Murray/Cantwell
City of Bethlehem; South Bethlehem Workforce Training and Development Center; Bethlehem, PA—redevelopment, renovation and construction of a South Bethlehem Workforce Training and Development Center.	200,000	Specter
City of Billings, Housing First Project, to build houses for homeless families	400,000	Tester
City of Billings, MT, Big Sky Economic Development Authority for historic preservation of the Cobb Field facility.	500,000	Baucus/Tester
City of Boise, Public Works Department, Boise, Idaho, for design and construction of city's geothermal system expansion.	250,000	Crapo
City of Brewer, Maine for a redevelopment project on the site of the former Eastern Fine Paper Mill.	350,000	Collins/Snowe

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
City of Browns Valley, Browns Valley, MN, to aid in recovery efforts of a major flood.	1,000,000	Coleman
City of Buffalo, NY for the construction and renovation of the Buffalo Urban Arts Center.	200,000	Clinton/Schumer
City of Canton, MS, to transform the Historic Canton High School into the Canton Municipal Government Complex.	400,000	Cochran
City of Central Falls, Central Falls Urban Revitalization Project, Central Falls, RI for the remediation of the Old Public Works Building and rehabilitation of city recreational facilities.	300,000	Reed
City of College Park, MD for blight removal along the Route 1 Corridor	700,000	Mikulski
City of Columbus, IN, Golden Castings Foundry Demolition and Site Remediation Project to raze and remediate the site of the former Golden Castings Foundry for the demolition and environmental remediation costs of the Golden Castings Foundry site.	500,000	Bayh
City of Columbus, Indiana, Mill Race Center for Active Adults for construction of the new 30,000-square-foot Mill Race Center for Active Adults (the Mill Race Center) that offers a wide variety of programs for senior citizens.	1,000,000	Bayh
City of Conover, North Carolina, Broyhill Furniture Industrial Site Redevelopment, to demolish unusable manufacturing structures at the abandoned Broyhill furniture manufacturing plant and refur.	1,000,000	Dole
City of Council Bluffs, Sunset Park North Neighborhood Redevelopment, Council Bluffs, IA, to redevelope the Katelman neighborhood.	500,000	Harkin/Grassley
City of Detroit, MI, for infrastructure improvements to continue the revitalization of the Brush Park Historic District neighborhood.	280,000	Levin/Stabenow
City of Eagle Mountain, Utah, Eagle Mountain Pony Express Regional Park for community development and park facility improvements for Eagle Mountain's Pony Express Regional Park.	400,000	Hatch/Bennett
City of Everett, WA, for the expansion of the Everett Senior Activity Center	600,000	Murray
City of Fayetteville, Fayetteville Attainable Housing Partnership, Fayetteville, Arkansas, to support the Fayetteville Attainable Housing Partnership.	1,000,000	Lincoln/Pryor
City of Florence, City of Florence Community Activity Center, SC, to provide for a new activity center.	200,000	Graham, L
City of Gardiner, Maine for waterfront infrastructure	200,000	Collins/Snowe
City of Grand Junction, CO, to create park in LMI neighborhoord and/or eliminate slum and blight.	300,000	Salazar
City of Greenville, Community Recreation Centers, Greenville, SC for renovation of Greenville's recreation outdated recreation centers.	200,000	Graham, L
City of Grenada, Taylor Hall Renovation Project, Grenada, MS, for the renovation of the historic Taylor Hall.	250,000	Cochran
City of Hamilton, Fulton Bridge Industrial Park, Hamilton, AL, Development of Industrial Park.	1,000,000	Shelby
City of Hillsboro, Downtown Streetscape Project, Hillsboro, TX, for streetscape improvements.	200,000	Hutchison
City of Humboldt, Iowa for Brownfields clean-up at Frit Industries site	1,000,000	Grassley
City of Kansas City, MO, to provide equipment to produce emerging plant-based economic development options for rural communities.	1,000,000	Bond
City of Kearney, Kearney, NE, Peterson Senior Activity Center, for construction of the Peterson Senior Activity Center.	1,000,000	Nelson, Ben
City of Lake Charles, Lake Charles, LA, America's Wetland Center; to establish a center focused on increasing public awareness of the national importance of sustainable wetlands conservation, preservation, and restoration.	400,000	Landrieu/Vitter
City of Las Vegas, NV, Post Office Museum, Las Vegas, Nevada, to complete renovation and transformation of the historic Post Office in downtown Las Vegas to a musuem on local history.	200,000	Reid
City of Lincoln, NE for Antelope Valley Project Community Revitalization	300,000	Hagel/Nelson, Ben
City of Madison, MS, City of Madison Historic Gateway Project, Madison, MS to support the developments of a new town square and renovation of the Madison Co. Cultural Center.	1,000,000	Lott
City of Marion, Iowa for Central Corridor Redevelopment Project	500,000	Grassley/Harkin
City of Marshall, Memorial Hall Visitor and History Center Renovation, Marshall, TX, for the renovation of a historic building.	200,000	Hutchison
City of Marshalltown, Iowa, for Grant Park Neighborhood Redevelopment Initiative.	200,000	Grassley/Harkin
City of Medford; Santo Community Center—Phase III; Medford, OR; To create a gymnasium and large community classroom in Medford, OR.	400,000	Smith, G./Wyden

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
City of Miami Beach, Florida; Miami Beach City Center Housing; Miami Beach, Florida; to maintain affordable housing for low-income residents of Miami Beach, Florida.	750,000	Martinez
City of Milford, Connecticut, Eisenhower Park Renovation, for the rehabilitation of Eisenhower Park.	520,000	Lieberman
City of Muncie, IN, Unity Center, Muncie, IN for a New community center	500,000	Lugar/Bayh
City of Oakland, Oakland Transit-Oriented Villages, Oakland, CA for the development of new housing.	500,000	Feinstein
City of Orlando, FL, Parramore Neighborhood Revitalization, to redevelop this distressed area of downtown Orlando into a safe and prosperous community with a mixture of residential and supportive accessory opportunities.	1,000,000	Nelson, Bill/Martinez
City of Philadelphia, Green City Strategy, Philadelphia, PA to clean and green 450 parcels—or about 450,000 square feet—of vacant land in Philadelphia using topsoil, grass, trees, and wood fencing.	300,000	Casey
City of Pittsburgh, South Side Works, Pittsburgh; redevelop to enhance mobility.	200,000	Casey
City of Pittsfield, MA, Downtown Building Renovation and Rehabilitation	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry
City of Pocatello, Pocatello, Idaho, for renovation and modernization of the Community Recreational Center.	200,000	Crapo
City of Port Townsend, WA, for the construction of the Northwest Maritime Center.	450,000	Murray/Cantwell
City of Portland, OR, Washington Monroe Community Center, for the design and construction of the community center and supporting elements.	1,000,000	Wyden/Smith, G.
City of Portland; Regional Bridges to Housing Program; Portland, OR and Vancouver, WA; to develop affordable, permanent family-sized housing.	600,000	Wyden/Smith, G.
City of Quincy; Riverfront Infrastructure Improvement; Quincy, Illinois; to connect public facilities and public space in an economically distressed area in Quincy.	250,000	Durbin
City of Reno, NV, Oliver-Montello Affordable Housing Project, to purchase vacant buildings in an effort to revitalize an area of northeast Reno and transition it from commercial to residential.	600,000	Reid
City of Rocky Mount, NC for renovations to the former Booker T. Washington High School.	200,000	Burr
City of Rugby, REAP Zones, Rugby, North Dakota to expand economic development opportunities in two REAP zones.	400,000	Conrad/Dorgan
City of Saginaw, MI, for acquisition and development of the Saginaw riverfront site.	1,000,000	Stabenow/Levin
City of Sarasota, Florida; Robert L. Taylor Community Center, to rebuild the Robert L. Taylor Community Center, in the City of Sarasota's distressed Newtown neighborhood.	250,000	Martinez
City of Scranton; Scranton Housing and Community Space Initiative; Scranton, PA—planning, design and construction of apartments and community space, as part of a downtown revitalization initiative.	200,000	Specter
City of Sparks, NV, Larry D. Johnson Community Center, to complete construction of a multi-purpose community center that will provide low income households and at-risk children with various educational classes.	300,000	Reid
City of Spearfish, SD, Spearfish Industrial Park Infrastructure Construction	250,000	Johnson
City of Suffolk, Virginia, to renovate and restore the Phoenix Bank of Nansemond building for purposes of the Museum.	200,000	Warner/Webb
City of Taunton, MA, to make structural and facility repairs to a low-income senior center.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry
City of Temple, Downtown Redevelopment/Performing Arts Centre, Temple, TX, for downtown redevelopment.	200,000	Hutchison
City of Tonasket, WA, Tonasket Community Center for building renovations	200,000	Murray
City of Waterloo, IA Neighborhood Revitalization Area	500,000	Grassley
City of Waterloo, IA, Chamberlain demolition project	500,000	Grassley
City of Watertown, SD, Uptown Revitalization	200,000	Johnson
City of Wilson, North Carolina, City of Wilson Downtown Redevelopment Project, to clear blighted old tobacco barns and old office buildings that currently exist in Wilson and to construct new homes for owner-occupancy.	500,000	Dole
City Year, Inc. City Year Headquarters Renovation, to assist City Year, Inc. in the renovation of their headquarters to allow them to better serve their low-income students.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Coastal Heritage Society, Savannah Battlefield Historic Paint and Coach Shops, Savannah, GA, for revitilization and repair of the Georgia Central Railway Historic Paint and Coach Shops.	600,000	Chambliss
Coles County Council on Aging; Coles County, Illinois, Coles County Council on Aging Senior Center to construct a new senior center.	250,000	Durbin
Community Chest, Virginia City, NV, Storey County Youth and Community Resource Center, to complete construction on a multi-purpose community resource center.	200,000	Reid
Community Church of Christ, Sean Bell Memorial Field of Dreams, Community Youth Center, 167–04 108th Avenue, Jamaica, NY, for securing a site and/or purchasing a building for the Sean Bell Memorial Field of Dreams, Community Youth Center.	200,000	Schumer/Clinton
CommunityWorks, Inc. for construction, including the finishing of the interior of the ExplorationWorks building.	650,000	Baucus
Cooper University Hospital, Camden, NJ for the Camden Cooper Urban Development Initiative, for neighborhood housing redevelopment.	200,000	Lautenberg
County of Hudson, Jersey City, Redevelopment of Koppers Coke brownfield site, to transform the former Koppers Coke site in Kearny into a two million square foot industrial park that includes warehousing and distribution space.	400,000	Menendez/Lautenberg
County of Umatilla, OR, Umatilla County Fairgrounds Exposition Center to replace the obsolete Umatilla County Exposition Center with an 18,000 square-foot exhibition hall.	500,000	Smith, G./Wyden
Covenant House Alaska for Covenant House Enhancement and Relocation, to construct a new and larger facility.	400,000	Murkowski
Coventry Cares Community Center, Coventry Cares Community Center and Project Friends, Coventry, RI for the construction of an intergenerational complex comprised of human services, adult day care, and a senior center.	500,000	Reed
Crossroads Rhode Island, Crossroads Rhode Island Child Care and Community Center, North Kingstown, RI for the construction of a child care and community center to provide both homeless families and neighborhood residents with affordable child care.	300,000	Reed
Dakota Boys and Girls Ranch, Dakota Boys and Girls Ranch Treatment Facility Renovation, Minot, ND, to upgrade the mechanical heating and water lines, alarm system, and address accessibility concerns.	350,000	Conrad/Dorgan
Daly Mansion Preservation Trust, to preserve and interpret the Daly Mansion, its buildings, grounds and the history it conveys.	400,000	Baucus
Delaware Children's Museum, Inc., for the construction of the Delaware Children's Museum in Wilmington, Delaware, as part of the effort to remove blight and redevelop brownfields along the Christina Riverfront.	400,000	Carper/Biden
Development Workshop, Inc., Upper Valley Industries Plant Facility, Idaho Falls, Idaho, for planning and design of a new facility to provide job services for people with disabilities.	500,000	Craig
Dillon County, I–95 Industrial Park Spec Building, Dillon, South Carolina, to provide for the construction of an industrial park spec building near the City of Dillon on I–95.	200,000	Graham, L
East Baltimore Development, Inc. (EBDI), Baltimore, MD, East Baltimore Development Project, to provide for workforce development, clean and safe programs, and infrastructure improvements.	200,000	Mikulski/Cardin
Easter Seals Hawaii, Easter Seals Hawaii Kapolei Service Center, Hawaii, to construct a multi-program service center to provide therapy and early intervention services to children with physical and developmental disabilities, as well as programs for teens and adults with disabilities.	200,000	Inouye
Easter Seals New Hampshire, Flood Repair and Renovation Project, Manchester, NH for reconstruction and renovation of Easter Seals New Hampshire building.	500,000	Sununu
Edison Wetlands Association, Edison, NJ for the Dismal Swamp Conservation Area Trails Project, for the design and construction of trails for public recreation in the Dismal Swamp Conservation Area.	200,000	Lautenberg
El Centro de la Raza, Seattle, WA, El Centro de la Raza for facility improvements.	300,000	Murray
Empower New Haven, Brownfield's redevelopment initiative, New Haven, CT Redevelopment of a commercial venture and economic catalyst program.	750,000	Lieberman
Erie County; Erie Technology Incubator, Erie, PA for construction of the Erie Technology Incubator, which will promote economic development.	200,000	Specter
Fairfax County, Fairfax, to develop and build 15–30 units of single room occupancy housing for the chronically homeless.	500,000	Warner/Webb

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
FAME Assistance Corporation, Los Angeles, CA, for redevelopment of a blighted neighborhood.	500,000	Feinstein
Fondren Revitilization Project, MS for the revitilization of the Fondren area in Jackson, MS.	750,000	Cochran
Food Bank of Alaska Mat-Su Branch Building purchase, to allow the Food Bank of Alaska to purchase the collaborative anti-hunger facility in the Mat-Su Valley.	400,000	Murkowski
Four Bands Community Fund, Inc., Revolving Loan Fund recapitalization, Eagle Butte, South Dakota.	250,000	Johnson
Gambit Manufacturing and Business Technology Center, Orem, UT	200,000	Hatch
Global Samaritan Resources, Abilene, Texas, to build a 25,000 square foot warehouse facility for receiving, storing and shipping of goods used for humanitarian aid.	200,000	Cornyn
Goodrich-Gannett Neighborhood Center Cleveland, OH; Early Childhood/Family Services Center Campus Completion, to renovate and construct a new childcare/family services center.	500,000	Voinovich
Goodwill Industries of Hawaii, Inc., Kapolei, HI, to construct the Goodwill Ohana Career and Learning Center to provide workforce development and job placement assistance to unemployed and under-employed low-income residents.	200,000	Inouye
Grassroots Crisis Intervention Center, Inc., Columbia, MD, to provide the last stage of construction funding for the only emergency services shelter in Howard County, Maryland.	200,000	Mikulski
Gregory House Programs, Honolulu, HI, to renovate housing for a tempory housing facility that provides housing and support services for individuals suffering from HIV/AIDS.	200,000	Akaka
Harbor Homes Inc., Veterans Center, Buckingham Place, Nashua, NH, to provide transitional housing and support services for homeless veterans.	400,000	Sununu
Hattiesburg Area Development Partnership, Old Hattiesburg High School, Hattiesburg, MS. For the renovation of the old high school.	1,000,000	Lott/Cochran
Hawaii Nature Center, Makiki Valley, Honolulu, Hawaii, Makiki Valley Watershed Education Center Project.	200,000	Inouye
Herriman City, UT, to acquire and restore three histoically significant buildings in the community.	200,000	Bennett
Holbrook Community Foundation in Harpswell, Maine for repair and renovation of Holbrook's Wharf.	200,000	Collins/Snowe
Homeward, Inc.; Equity for Rural Iowa-Revolving Loan Equity Fund; Iowa; Provide equity investment in rural communities.	300,000	Harkin/Grassley
Housing and Neighborhood Development Services, Inc., Orange, NJ for the Berg Hat Factory Commercial Arts Center, to build out a business incubator and community arts complex within a formerly abandoned hat factory in a low income neighborhood.	200,000	Lautenberg/Menendez
Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee, Convent Hill Green Roof, to add a green roof to an affordable housing highrise for low-income seniors.	200,000	Kohl
Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence, RI, for Building renovations.	200,000	Reed
International Peace Garden, International Peace Garden facility renovation, Dunseith, ND to renovate the facilities at this international garden.	450,000	Conrad/Dorgan
Iowa Department of Economic Development, Des Moines, Iowa. To rehabilitate Main Street Communities.	800,000	Harkin
Irvine Urban Outreach Center, Baltimore County, Maryland, for an urban outreach center.	500,000	Cardin
Jackson Medical Mall District Economic and Community Development, MS for housing development.	500,000	Cochran
Jewish Foundation for Group Homes, Inc., Rockville, MD, Jewish Foundation for Group Homes, to acquire and renovate a single-family home into an Alternative Living Unit for three adults with developmental disabilities.	200,000	Mikulski
Keehi Memorial Organization [KMO], Keehi Adult Day Health Center and Child Care Center, Honolulu, Hawaii for an intergenerational health and child care center that will provide services to low and moderate income children and the elderly.	300,000	Inouye
Kenai Peninsula Food Bank, Soldotna, AK to construct an expansion of the existing Kenai Peninsula Food Bank.	200,000	Murkowski

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Kipahulu Community Association, Inc, Hana, Hawaii, Kipahulu Certified Kitchen, the project will enable low income community members to gather as an intergenerational community and create jobs in Native Hawaiian food harvesting and processing.	200,000	Inouye
Lakeview Museum; Lakeview Museum construction; Peoria, Illinois; the museum will promote economic development and tourism in downtown Peoria.	250,000	Durbin
Lamar County Commission, Lamar County Industrial Park, Lamar County, Alabama, Infrastructure Development for Industrial Park.	800,000	Shelby
Las Cruces Families and Youth, Inc., Las Cruces, NM, for construction of a new Transitional Living Program facility to house outpatient counseling for at risk youth and their families.	200,000	Bingaman
Las Cumbres Community Services; Espanola, NM; for construction of new facility for community services.	500,000	Domenici/Bingaman
Longview Housing Authority, Longview, WA, Phoenix House, for construction of low-income housing.	500,000	Murray
Looking for Lincoln Heritage Coalition, for economic development of Illinois historic sites.	500,000	Durbin
Los Pueblos Community Council, Ribera, NM for Restoration and Preservation of Old Ribera School Building for the use of the building as community and cultural center.	400,000	Domenici
Lutheran Settlement House; Low-Income Housing and Multi-Purpose Space; Philadelphia, PA—planning, design, redevelopment and construction of a facility, which will include affordable housing.	200,000	Specter
Maine State Music Theatre in Brunswick, Maine to complete the renovation of rehearsal and office space in the newly acquired facility.	250,000	Collins/Snowe
Marguerite's Place, Nashua, New Hampshire, for the provision of transitional housing and supportive services to homeless women and children who have been victimes of domestic abuse.	300,000	Gregg
Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center, Rock Island, Illinois, for the renovation and expansion of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center.	1,000,000	Obama
McKinley County, New Mexico, Construction of a new regional juvenile crisis complex.	500,000	Bingaman
Mercer County Commission; For repair and renovation of the Memorial Building, Princeton, WV.	1,000,000	Byrd
Mercy Housing Incorporated, Mercy housing project in Holyoke, Massachusetts, to build 50 new homes for low-income senior citizens in Holyoke, Massachusetts.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry
Mid-America-Research and Development Foundation in Jefferson City, MO to provide equipment to produce emerging plant-based economic development options for rural communities.	500,000	Bond
Missoula Food Bank Inc., Statewide Food Bank Transportation System, Missoula, MT to purchase eight new vehicles to rescue more local food.	450,000	Tester
Mobile C.A.R.E. Foundation, Chicago, IL for the acquisition and operation of Asthma Vans.	300,000	Obama
Mohawk Theater Restoration, North Adams, Massachusetts, to assist in the renovation of the Mohawk Theater and in the redevelopment of downtown North Adams.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry
Monmouth County, NJ for the NJ Children's Advocacy Center for the construction of a children's advocacy center for victims of child abuse.	200,000	Lautenberg/Menendez
Montgomery County Government, Silver Spring, MD, Long Branch Pedestrian Safety Linkages and Way-Finding Community Markers, to provide for pedestrian safety in the Long Branch community.	400,000	Mikulski/Cardin
Morningstar Community Development Corporation in Kansas City, MO, to construct a youth family center.	1,000,000	Bond
Morning Star Ranch in Florence, KS, to renovate facilities	850,000	Brownback
Mount Airy USA; Mount Airy Urban Renewal Initiative; Philadelphia, PA—blight removal, development, and construction, as part of an urban renewal initiative.	200,000	Specter
Municipality of Anchorage, Mountain View Revitalization Project, Anchorage, Alaska to restore buildings in the Mountain View area.	1,000,000	Stevens
Murray-Calloway County Economic Development Corporation for the Industrial Park Acquisition and Development Project, to construct an industrial park.	2,000,000	McConnell
Muskegon Heights Housing Commission, Muskegon Heights, MI, for community networking.	200,000	Stabenow/Levin
Nathan Adelson Hospice, Adult Day Care Center, Henderson/Las Vegas, NV	1,000,000	Ensign

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
National Tropical Botanical Garden; Kalaheo, Kaua'i, Hawai'i; to construct a Native Hawaiian community learning center.	200,000	Inouye
Nebraska Innovation Center (Whittier) to renovate and improve the Whittier school for use as the Nebraska Innovation Center.	1,000,000	Nelson, Ben/Hagel
Neighborhood House, Seattle, WA, Highpoint Neighborhood Center, for construction of a community center.	600,000	Murray
Neighbors for Kids, Depoe Bay, OR; to make an addition to their current facility.	200,000	Smith, G./Wyden
New Center Council Inc., Detroit, MI, for infrastructure improvements to enhance the economic viability of the Historic New Center.	1,000,000	Levin/Stabenow
NH Division of Parks and Recreation, Robert Frost Farm, Derry, New Hampshire, for reconstruction.	300,000	Gregg
Norman Economic Development Corp., Norman, OK for the construction of an engineering incubator that will create a new industrial center for Norman, OK.	200,000	Inhofe
Northeast Community Center Association in Spokane, WA, Northeast Community Center, for facility construction.	500,000	Murray
Northern Community Investment Corporation to expand and secure the region's economy and public services by providing high speed, high technology connectivity throughout the region.	1,000,000	Gregg
Northwest Tennessee Port Authority, Tiptonville, Tennessee for the construction of this new facility will promote growth in the region and take advantage of unique transportation opportunities that will tie in the port.	750,000	Alexander
Ocean Community YMCA, Camp Watchaug Redevelopment, Westerly, RI for the renovations to create a state-of-the-art learning center.	200,000	Reed/Whitehouse
OK Native American Cultural and Educational Authority for American Indian Cultural Center and Museum, Oklahoma City, OK.	200,000	Inhofe
Old Town Boys and Girls Club, Albuquerque, NM, for renovation of the existing Old Town Boys and Girls Club accompanied by construction of new areas for the Club.	500,000	Bingaman
Opportunity Village, Las Vegas, NV, Employment and Training Center, to construct a third facility in Las Vegas for employment services for those with intellectual disabilities.	300,000	Reid
Our Children's Homestead, Central Iowa for Housing/Vocational Education Program for Foster Children—Aging Out; Iowa.	300,000	Grassley/Harkin
Our City Reading; Housing Initiative; Reading, PA—rehabilitation of abandoned houses and provide down payment assistance to home buyers.	200,000	Specter
PACE Training and Evaluation Center, Morgantown, WV, for the construction of a new training facility.	1,500,000	Byrd
Patterson Park Community Development Corp., Library Square Revitalization Project, Baltimore, MD, to provide for the revitalization of an under-used area of Baltimore City.	300,000	Mikulski
Pearl City Foundation, Pearl City, Hawaii, Momilani Community Center Adult Day Care and Child Care Facility Construction Project, to construct a new facility of 6,700 square feet for the Elderly Daycare/Day Health and an Early Educational Daycare of the Head Start Program.	200,000	Inouye
Penobscot Theatre Company in Bangor, Maine to renovate the Bangor Opera House.	200,000	Collins/Snowe
Port of Gold Beach, OR, Port of Gold Beach High Dock Rehabilitation, to rebuild the High Dock at the Port of Gold Beach that provides critical infrastructure for water-dependent and water-related commercial and retail activities.	500,000	Smith, G./Wyden
Preble Street in Portland, Maine for the development of Florence House, a comprehensive center for homeless women.	200,000	Collins/Snowe
Providence Connections, Inc.; Providence Family Support Center; Pittsburgh, PA for planning, renovation and redevelopment of the Providence Family Support Center.	200,000	Specter
Provo City Downtown Parking Structure Project, Utah	200,000	Hatch
Rainier Vista Boys and Girls Club, Seattle, WA, Rainier Vista Boys and Girls Club for facility construction.	500,000	Murray
Randolph County YMCA, IN to build a new licensed child care facility for 93 children.	200,000	Lugar
Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 30th Street Industrial Corridor-Milwaukee, Wisconsin for blight elimination and redevelopment of the 30th Street Corridor.	750,000	Kohl
Redevelopment Authority of the City of Racine, WI, for blight removal and reconstruction efforts.	200,000	Kohl

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
RurAL CAP, Inc. for Rural Alaska Community Head Start Facility Upgrades	200,000	Murkowski
Saginaw Depot Preservation Corporation, Saginaw, MI, to restore the historic Potter Street storefronts and add street enhancements.	1,000,000	Levin/Stabenow
Salina City, to build a senior citizens and civic center for the three communities in the area of Salina, UT.	750,000	Bennett
Salvation Army Alaska Division for Anchorage Salvation Army Family Enrichment Center to build a family shelter, a commercial-grade kitchen.	400,000	Murkowski
San Bernardino Boys & Girls Club, Boys & Girls Club Improvements, San Bernardino, CA, for facility expansion.	300,000	Boxer
San Francisco Museum and Historical Society, Redevelopment of the Old Mint facility, San Francisco, CA.	500,000	Boxer/Feinstein
Santa Clara Pueblo, Construction of Regional Adult Day Care Center, Espanola, NM, Regional Adult Day Care Center.	500,000	Domenici
Seattle Nisei Veterans Committee, Seattle, WA, Nisei Veterans Memorial Hall, for construction.	250,000	Murray
Second Harvest Food Bank of East Central Indiana, Inc., for Food Bank Capital Improvements Project.	1,000,000	Lugar
Smithfield City, UT, to construct a new city complex	750,000	Bennett
Souhegan Boys and Girls Club, Milford, NH, for renovations and reconstruction after severe flood damage.	200,000	Gregg
South Dakota State Fair Foundation, Huron, SD, upgrade South Dakota State Fair Open Class Beef Complex and Hippodrome.	250,000	Johnson
Southern Cultural Heritage Foundation, Vicksburg, MS; for the renovation of the Southern Cultural Heritage Center Auditorium.	200,000	Cochran
Southern Nevada Convention Training Trust, Las Vegas, NV, Convention and Trade Training Center, to construct a facility in Las Vegas to provide trade training for the convention industry to students who are unemployed, underemployed, or in transition.	400,000	Reid
Southern West Virginia Multicultural Museum and Community Center, Raleigh County, West Virginia, for the establishment of a multicultural museum and community center in Beckley, WV.	200,000	Byrd
Southside Institutions Neighborhood Alliance, Southside Institutions Neighborhood Alliance Blight Removal, Hartford, CT, for activities associated the acquistion, removal, and redevelopment of blighted properties in Hartford, Connecticut.	200,000	Dodd/Lieberman
Spaulding Fibre Remediation and Demolition, NY to demolish the structures and remediate any environmental problems and develop new infrastructure on the site.	1,500,000	Schumer/Clinton
Springfield Boys and Girls Club; Community Center; Springfield, IL; Planning, development, land acquisition, and construction costs for a new community center in Springfield.	250,000	Durbin
St. Lawrence County Chamber of Commerce Inc., Regional Rural Broadband Expansion, Canton, NY. To expand broadband access to rural areas.	200,000	Clinton/Schumer
St. Louis Area Food Bank, St. Louis County, MO, Foodbank Warehouse Acquisition Project.	500,000	Bond
Stanford Settlement, Inc. Carl R. Hansen Teen Center, Sacramento, CA. Funds will be used to construct a new teen center facility for at-risk youth in the northern area of Sacramento, CA.	200,000	Boxer
Synergy Services, Inc., in Kansas City, MO, to design and construct a homeless youth shelter and campus.	750,000	Bond
Syracuse City, Utah for Syracuse City Utah Municipal Center Expansion Project ..	300,000	Hatch
Tallahatchie County Board of Supervisors, Sumner, MS, Tallahatchie County Courthouse Restoration, for the restoration of the Tallahatchie County Courthouse.	750,000	Cochran
TechTown, Detroit, MI for renovations for historic structures for economic development.	200,000	Stabenow/Levin
The Arc of Hilo, Arc of Hilo Client Support Services Facility Construction, in Hilo, HI, to construct a multi-purpose job training, day program, and community center for people with disabilities.	400,000	Akaka/Inouye
The ARC of Madison County Facilities Expansion, AL	250,000	Shelby
The Children's Center of the Cumberlands, Scott County, Tennessee, expand the Children's Center and allow expanded service and care for abused children.	250,000	Alexander
The Children's Home, Children's Home [CH] Residential Facility Improvement Initiative, Cromwell, Connecticut, for the redesign of residential facilities.	200,000	Dodd/Lieberman

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
The City of Newport News, VA, Jefferson Park Revitalization, VA, for acquisition, demolition, relocation activities and capital improvements of dilapidated housing.	1,000,000	Webb/Warner
The City of Northampton, Massachusetts, Northampton State Hospital Renovation, to assist the City of Northampton in developing more than 200 units of affordable housing.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry
The Civic Center of Moreau, Inc. The Moreau Community Center, Campaign to Establish the New Regional Community Center at Moreau, South Glens Falls, NY, for the construction of the Regional Community Center at Moreau which will provide dramatically improved educational, recreational, and community service facilities as well as substantial economic development.	200,000	Schumer/Clinton
The Greater Boston Food Bank, Boston, Massachusetts, for the development of a new facility to distribute food to Massachusetts families in need.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry
The Ministry of Caring Inc.; Mary Mother of Hope House I—Renovation Project, Wilmington, DE, to renovate the Mary Mother of Hope House which provides housing and support services from homeless women 18 and older.	1,000,000	Biden/Carper
The Westfield Boys and Girls Club, Westfield, Massachusetts, Westfield Boys and Girls Club, for renovation and repair.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry
TLC for Children and Families, Olathe, KS, for an emergency shelter and social services for children and youth in the Kansas City.	750,000	Brownback
To Bridgeton Board of Education, Bridgeton, NJ for the restoration of the historic Bridgeton High School facility which was built during the New Deal by the WPA.	200,000	Lautenberg
To Paterson Board of Education, Paterson, NJ, Hinchliffe facility, for the restoration of the historic Hinchliffe facility.	200,000	Lautenberg
To the Goodwill Rescue Mission, Newark, NJ for the renovation of transitional living facilities.	200,000	Lautenberg
Tom Green County, San Angelo, TX, for the relocation and expansion of the Tom Green County Library, the only public library in the region.	200,000	Hutchison
Town of Bolton, MS, Bolton Municipal Building, for renovation of the Bolton Municipal Building.	200,000	Cochran
Town of Colebrook, Mohawk River Retaining Wall, Colebrook, NH, repair retaining wall and two water mains along the Mohawk River.	400,000	Sununu
Town of Colmar Manor, Colmar Manor Community Center, Colmar Manor, Maryland, to construct a multi-use community facility that combines community organizations and municipal services.	600,000	Cardin
Town of Goodman, MS for the remodeling of a historic building	200,000	Cochran
Town of Manchester, Connecticut, Spruce Street Youth Center, Manchester, Connecticut, for construction activities associated with the conversion of an old firehouse facility into a municipal youth center.	200,000	Dodd/Lieberman
Town of Marietta, MS, for the construction of a multi-purpose facility	200,000	Cochran
Town of Vernon, Amberbelle Mill Historic Restoration Initiative, Vernon, Connecticut, for exterior and interior upgrades to the historic Amberbelle Mill facility.	200,000	Dodd/Lieberman
Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Youth Center, Belcourt, ND to construct a youth center for Native Americans on the reservation.	500,000	Conrad/Dorgan
United Methodist Youthville, Dodge City, Kansas to provide a central kitchen/dining facility for the campus in compliance with federal regulations.	300,000	Roberts
United Way for Southeastern Michigan, Detroit, MI, to construct a training center for non-profit social service providers.	400,000	Stabenow/Levin
United Way of Treasure Valley, Boise, Idaho, for construction of a Community Detox Center.	250,000	Crapo
Urban League of Eastern Massachusetts, Roxbury, Massachusetts, to assist in the expansion of the Urban League of Eastern Massachusetts facility expansion.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry
Urban League of Rhode Island, South Providence Neighborhood Center Building Project, Providence, RI for the construction of a three-story, 9,000 square foot addition to house a community meeting room, senior center, and office space.	500,000	Reed
Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, VT, for affordable housing and community development linked with land conservation and historic preservation.	2,600,000	Leahy
Veterans Benefits Clearinghouse, Roxbury, MA, Veterans Benefits Clearinghouse renovation, to renovate the Veterans Benefits Clearinghouse facility to allow the non-profit organization to expand its programs to assist low-income veterans across Massachusetts.	250,000	Kennedy/Kerry

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Waipahu Jack Hall Memorial Housing Corporation, Oahu, HI, to renovate, repair, and maintain the Kunia Village Housing Complex and to bring it in compliance with Honolulu City and County housing codes.	300,000	Inouye
Washington County Free Library, New Washington County Free Library Branch in Boonsboro, MD, to facilitate design and construction of new library branch.	200,000	Mikulski
Western Elmore County Recreation District, Mountain Home Community Center Complex, Mountain Home, Idaho, for planning, design, and construction of an energy efficient, multi-use community center.	500,000	Craig
Where to Turn, Hands and Hearts, Staten Island, NY for the construction of a 9/11 living memorial.	600,000	Clinton/Schumer
Wichita, KS for the 21st Street Industrial Corridor Revitalization Plan and Pre-Engineering Designs.	300,000	Roberts
Wilmington Housing Authority, Wilmington, DE, Sprinkler Retrofit of High Rise Building, to retrofit the Crestview Apartments with a fire suppression sprinkler system.	1,000,000	Biden/Carper
Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership, Center for Excellence, Milwaukee, WI, to complete renovation of the Center of Excellence for the assessment, preparation and placement of job-ready candidates for careers in skilled trades and industries.	250,000	Kohl
World Impact, St. Louis, MO, in St. Louis, to renovate the former YMCA North Building.	750,000	Bond
YMCA of Spokane, WA, YMCA/YWCA of Spokane, for facility construction	500,000	Murray/Cantwell
YMCA of Tacoma-Pierce County, Tacoma, WA, YMCA of Tacoma-Pierce County for facility construction.	250,000	Murray
YWCA of Greater Los Angeles, Union Pacific Child Development and Family Center, Los Angeles, CA: for the construction of the new Union Pacific Child Development and Family Center.	200,000	Boxer

The neighborhood initiatives are as follows:

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Bering Straits Native Corporation, Nome, Alaska, funds will be used for the construction and expansion of the site pad for the quarry.	$750,000	Stevens
Center for Planning Excellence; Baton Rouge, LA to continue to coordinate urban and rural planning efforts in South Louisiana.	2,000,000	Landrieu
Central Wyoming College Foundation; Intertribal Education and Community Center; Riverton, Wyoming; to complete construction of and purchase equipment for the Intertribal Education and Community Center.	600,000	Enzi
City of Forsyth, Georgia to renovate and repair the buildings on the former Tift College campus so that it will be ready to house the hundreds of employees of the State Department of Corrections.	500,000	Isakson
City of Green Bay, Wisconsin, Neighborhood Block Redevelopment, to purchase, demolish and refurbish blighted properties to eliminate overcrowding, reduce crime and stablize a struggling neighborhood.	1,500,000	Kohl
City of Rochester, NY, Rochester Lead Hazard Prevention Program, to enhance lead hazard assessments, inspections, remediation training and outreach to expedite lead hazard remediation in public housing.	200,000	Clinton/Schumer
Emergency Demolition of the Former Swift Plant (KD Station) in Sioux City, Iowa.	1,000,000	Grassley/Harkin
Hiawatha Village Low Income Housing Development Project, Seattle, WA	750,000	Murray
homeWORD, Missoula, MT to develop rental housing that is affordable to working families in Missoula, MT.	1,000,000	Baucus/Tester
John C. Stennis Institute for Capacity Development Initiative, MS	1,000,000	Cochran
Kitsap County Resources Community Services Center Construction, Bremerton, WA .	200,000	Murray/Cantwell
Miami Dade Collect, FL, Cuban American Historical Museum at the Miami Dade College Freedom Tower, Florida.	500,000	Martinez
NeighborhoodsNOW, Community Foundation of Wyandotte County, Kansas City, KS.	2,000,000	Brownback
Passage Point Transitional Housing Construction, King County, WA	500,000	Murray
Poplar Bluff Historic Depot Restoration; Missouri	250,000	Bond
Robinson Film Center Building; Shreveport, Louisiana	400,000	Vitter
Salishan HOPE VI Redevelopment Project, Tacoma, WA	1,500,000	Murray

Project description	Committee recommendation	Requested by
Starr Commonwealth of Ohio, Van Wert and Columbus, Ohio, Starr Commonwealth facilities renovations for positive environments where children flourish.	700,000	Brown
Washington State Housing Finance Commission, Seattle, Washington, for capacity building.	1,000,000	Murray

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program costs	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Appropriations, 2007	$3,715,000	$137,500,000
Budget estimate, 2008		
Committee recommendation	6,000,000	275,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, authorizes the Secretary to issue Federal loan guarantees of private market loans used by entitlement and non-entitlement communities to cover the costs of acquiring real property, rehabilitation of publicly owned real property, housing rehabilitation, and other economic development activities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,000,000 for the program costs associated with the section 108 loan guarantee program. This amount is $2,287,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The administration recommended no funding for this program.

Of the funding provided, $6,000,000 is for credit subsidy costs to guarantee $275,000,000 in section 108 loan commitments in fiscal year 2008.

The Committee recognizes that for every $1 of section 108 funding, $3 is leveraged in private investment. This additional private investment will benefit revitalization efforts across the country. The Committee encourages the Secretary to streamline the section 108 loan guarantee process to ensure that communities in need have access to this effective financing tool more promptly.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2007	$9,900,000
Budget estimate, 2008	
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 108(q) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, authorizes the Brownfields Redevelopment program. This program provides competitive economic development grants in conjunction with section 108 loan guarantees for qualified brownfields projects. Grants are made in accordance with section 108(q) selection criteria. The program supports the cleanup and economic redevelopment of contaminated sites.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000 for the Brownfields Redevelopment program which is $100,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The administration recommended no funding for this program.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$1,757,250,000
Budget estimate, 2008	1,966,640,000
Committee recommendation	1,970,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title II of the National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, authorizes the HOME Investment Partnerships Program. This program provides assistance to States and units of local government for the purpose of expanding the supply and affordability of housing to low- and very low-income people. Eligible activities include tenant-based rental assistance, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable rental and ownership housing and, also, construction of housing. To participate in the HOME program, State and local governments must develop a comprehensive housing affordability strategy. There is a 25 percent matching requirement for participating jurisdictions which can be reduced or eliminated if they are experiencing fiscal distress.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,970,000,000 for the Home Investment Partnership Program. This amount is $3,360,000 more than the budget request and $212,750,000 more than the comparable level for fiscal year 2007. The Committee does not provide funding for the American Dream Downpayment Fund as such downpayment assistance is already an eligible purpose for funding made available through the HOME program.

Technical Assistance.—The Committee includes $15,000,000 for technical assistance. This amount is $5,100,000 more than the budget request and $5,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. Of this amount, $10,000,000 is for qualified nonprofit intermediaries to provide technical assistance to Community Housing and Development Organizations [CHDOs]. The remaining $5,000,000 is for intermediaries to provide technical assistance to HOME participating jurisdictions.

Housing Counseling.—The Committee provides $150,000,000 for housing counseling activities within the HOME account. This amount is $108,420,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

The Committee is concerned about the impact of the rapidly expanded use of subprime and other mortgage products that have placed millions of Americans in jeopardy of losing their home. According to the Mortgages Bankers Association, new foreclosure starts rose to another record level in the first quarter of 2007. Falling property values in some States are contributing to this spike. The Committee encourages the Secretary to use every available re-

source within the Department to address this housing worsening crisis.

In order to help address this issue, the Committee has increased funding for housing counseling by more than 350 percent for fiscal year 2008. Within the amount provided, $100,000,000 shall be exclusively targeted on individuals and families who are currently in foreclosure or are facing the immediate prospect of losing their homes through foreclosure. Such funding may also be targeted on individuals and families who may need to modify or refinance their loan to prevent the possibility of foreclosure. Such activities may include community-based outreach efforts to contact borrowers.

The Committee directs the Secretary to issue a Notice of Funding Availability for these funds within 60 days of enactment of this act. Eligible entities should include national and regional intermediaries including qualified fair housing enforcement organizations with experience providing delinquency, default and foreclosure counseling and prevention. Eligible entities should be able to provide immediate assistance, especially in areas where the Secretary determines the greatest needs exist.

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP

Appropriations, 2007	$49,390,000
Budget estimate, 2008	69,700,000
Committee recommendation	70,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program [SHOP] funds assist low-income homebuyers willing to contribute "sweat equity" toward the construction of their houses. The funds will increase nonprofit organization's ability to leverage funds from other sources and produce at least 2,000 new homeownership units. In 2006, SHOP became a separate account. SHOP was previously funded as a set-aside within the Community Development Fund. This account also includes funding for the National Community Development Initiative for grantees to develop the capacity of nonprofit community development entities to undertake community development and affordable housing projects.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $70,000,000 for the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Program, which is $300,000 more than the budget request and $20,610,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee has included $26,500,000 for the Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Extension Act of 1996.

The Committee recommends $33,500,000 for capacity building as authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993. The Committee notes that funding provided under this section requires a statutory 3 to 1 match to further leverage resources to assist more communities. In fiscal year 2006, the Local Initiative Support Coalition and the Enterprise Community Partners leveraged over $8 for every one Federal dollar provided by this program. The Committee includes statutory language allowing up to

$5,000,000 under this program to be used for capacity building activities in rural areas.

The Committee provides additional funding for programs to further enhance capacity building activities to maximize Federal investment for housing and community development activities. The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for Housing Assistance Council (Domenici/Leahy/Inouye); $2,000,000 for the National American Indian Housing Council (Johnson/Domenici); $2,000,000 for the Housing Partnership Network (Reid/Mikulski); and $3,000,000 for the Raza Development Fund of La Raza (Dodd/Martinez/Lieberman/Obama/Landrieu/Kerry/Bingaman/Casey/Menendez/Brown/Clinton/Boxer/Durbin).

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$1,441,600,000
Budget estimate, 2008	1,585,990,000
Committee recommendation	1,585,990,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Homeless Assistance Grants Program provides funding to break the cycle of homelessness and to move homeless persons and families to permanent housing. This is done by providing rental assistance, emergency shelter, transitional and permanent housing, and supportive services to homeless persons and families. The emergency grant is a formula funded grant program, while the supportive housing, section 8 moderate rehabilitation single-room occupancy program and the shelter plus care programs are competitive grants. Homeless assistance grants provide Federal support to one of the Nation's most vulnerable populations. These grants assist localities in addressing the housing and service needs of a wide variety of homeless populations while developing coordinated Continuum of Care [CoC] systems that ensure the support necessary to help those who are homeless to attain housing and move toward self-sufficiency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,585,990,000 for Homeless Assistance Grants for fiscal year 2008. This amount is equal to the budget request and $144,390 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. Of the amount provided $8,000,000 is for technical assistance and data analysis and $2,475,000 is for the Department's working capital fund. Sufficient funding has also been included to fully fund Shelter Plus Care renewals on an annual basis. The Committee has continued bill language that: (1) requires not less than 30 percent of the funds appropriated, excluding renewal costs, shall be for permanent housing for both individuals and families; (2) requires the renewal of all expiring Shelter Plus Care contracts on an annual basis if the contract meets certain requirements; (3) requires a 25 percent match for social services; and (4) requires all homeless funding recipients to coordinate and integrate their programs with other mainstream and targeted social programs.

The Committee has not included the transfer of funds to the Department of Labor [DOL] for the Prisoner Re-Entry Initiative as requested in the budget. The budget documentation provided little detail on how this money would be used to address the housing needs of returning prisoners. Moreover, the Committee believes that DOL is not the appropriate agency to address housing issues.

Rapid Re-Housing Demonstration Program.—The Committee has provided $25,000,000 for the Secretary to conduct a demonstration program on the effectiveness of rapid re-housing programs in reducing the number of homeless families. Every year, there are over 600,000 families that experience homelessness in the United States. Since there are few alternatives available to these families, many of whom are victims of domestic violence, they often end up in emergency shelters. They now spend more time in shelters than may be necessary. These extended shelter stays can be harmful for families and especially for children according to HUD's own Annual Homeless Assessment Report [AHAR]. Recent research has also indicated that the traditional approaches to serving homeless families may not be effectively addressing the needs of these families, and may be more costly. Therefore, HUD must evaluate new methods aimed at reducing family homelessness.

Rapid re-housing is one approach that is showing promise in effectively reducing family homelessness. This approach minimizes the amount of time that families are homeless by quickly moving them out of shelters and into safe and stable housing. Rapid re-housing programs provide families with housing placement services, short-term housing assistance, and follow up case management. Research on the effectiveness of this approach, though promising, is limited. The Committee believes that further evaluation of rapid re-housing programs will better inform policies related to homeless families.

The Committee directs HUD to select a limited number of sites to receive funding for this demonstration program as a part of the Homeless Assistance Grants competition. In order to have a successful demonstration, HUD should consider the following factors in selecting sites: proven experience in rapid re-housing, performance of the Continuum of Care, and geographic diversity. Selected sites should have programs that minimize the amount of time that families are homeless, provide families with housing placement services, short-term housing assistance, including up to 12 months of rental assistance, and provide case management services to ensure that families are stably housed and connected to mainstream services. In addition, the Secretary may consider the ability of projects to leverage support from other sources.

The Committee has also included language that allows the Secretary to use up to $3,000,000 to conduct an evaluation of the demonstration program. It is critical to gather information and data on the effects of this approach in reducing family homelessness, which should help HUD develop a long-term strategy to end family homelessness.

Goal to End Chronic Homelessness.—The administration has stated a goal to end chronic homelessness by 2012 and in fact has targeted resources within the Homeless Assistance program to support projects that serve the chronically homeless. The Committee

continues to support this effort, which has enabled homeless providers to better serve this vulnerable population, with research-based and results-driven strategies. It is important that the Committee understand the progress that HUD and communities across the country are making toward meeting this important goal. Currently, the Committee has no point of comparison that demonstrates a reduction in the number of chronic homeless persons. Therefore, as part of the Department's 2009 performance budget, HUD is directed to include verifiable and updatable data that demonstrates how the funding provided through the Homeless Assistance Grants program is effectively reducing the number of chronically homeless in order to meet the administration's goal of ending chronic homelessness.

Permanent Supportive Housing.—The Committee continues language that requires 30 percent of funds be set aside for permanent supportive housing for individuals and families. This will support Federal, State and local efforts to increase the supply of permanent housing until the estimated need of 150,000 units is met. The Committee continues to believe that permanent supportive housing is critical to reducing homelessness for both individuals and families.

Annual Homeless Assessment Report [AHAR].—In February 2007, HUD released the first Annual Homeless Assessment Report. This report stemmed from congressional directives begun in 2001 that charged the Department with collecting homeless data through the implementation of a new Homeless Management Information System [HMIS]. The AHAR report included HMIS data, information provided by Continuums of Care, and a count of sheltered and unsheltered persons from one night in January 2005. This report provided a better understanding of the Nation's homeless—who they are, where they are located, and the services they are accessing. The Committee applauds these efforts to collect and analyze data on the Nation's homeless. This is an important tool to evaluate fiscal and policy decisions related to homelessness in the United States.

The report did, however, highlight some flaws in the HMIS data. This underscored the need for HUD to continue to use some of the technical assistance funding provided to ensure the participation in HMIS by all grantees, and to make improvements to the data. The Committee requests that HUD submit the AHAR report by March 21, 2008. The Committee further hopes that HUD's efforts to increase participation in the HMIS effort will lead to improved information about and understanding of the Nation's homeless.

Renewal Costs.—The Committee reiterates the directive included in the conference report for the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (House Report 108–792) regarding out-year costs of renewing HUD's permanent housing programs. The Department should continue to include 5-year projects, on an annual basis, for the cost of renewing the permanent housing component of the Supportive Housing program and the Shelter Plus Care program in its fiscal year 2009 budget justifications.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HOUSING, FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $3,260,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 3,420,000
Committee recommendation	3,420,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner, provides program policy and guidance, as well as providing oversight for all of housing's programs and regulatory functions. The office staff coordinates inquires and concerns from partners in the housing industry, Congress, and from the American public regarding housing programs. The staff also leads and coordinates operational issues and procedures to assure that housing, HUD and other Government-wide policies and regulations are consistently followed throughout all of housing's offices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,420,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner. This level is the same as the budget request and $160,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF HOUSING

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $326,550,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 351,560,000
Committee recommendation	351,560,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Housing implements housing's programmatic, regulatory, financial, and operational responsibilities under the leadership of six deputy assistant secretaries and the field staff for activities related to FHA multifamily and single family homeownership programs, housing counseling grant program, and assisted housing programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $351,560,000 for the Office of Housing. This level is the same as the budget request and $25,010,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$734,580,000
Budget estimate, 2008	575,000,000
Committee recommendation	735,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for housing for the elderly under section 202. Under this program, the Department provides capital grants to eligible entities for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of housing for seniors and provides project-based rental assistance [PRAC] to support operational costs for such units.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $735,000,000 for the section 202 program. This level is $160,000,000 more than the budget request and $420,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee recommends $60,000,000 for service coordinators and for the continuation of existing congregate service grants; up to $24,750,000 for the conversion of projects to assisted living housing or for substantial rehabilitation for emergency capital repairs; $20,000,000 for grants to nonprofits for architectural and engineering work, site control and planning activities. The Committee includes language allowing up to $1,400,000 to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

The Committee has not provided the $25,000,000 sought in the budget for a Leverage Financing Demonstration program. The Committee notes that HUD has provided very little supporting documentation as to the need for this program. Moreover, the initiative has little or no support from the practitioners working within the section 202 program. Moreover, it appears that the program would seek to demonstrate activities that could already be funded under the regular section 202 program.

The Committee is again dismayed by the administration's efforts to slash funding targeted on the housing needs of low-income elderly citizens. According to a recent survey by the American Association of Retired Persons [AARP], there are at least 10 seniors waiting for every available section 202 unit that becomes available. This estimate does not consider properties that have closed their waiting list or seniors that have been discouraged to apply for the program because of the low turnover and long waiting lists that are common for this program. The 2005 Affordable Housing Needs Report from HUD states that, between 2003 and 2005, the number and percentage of elderly renters with very low incomes and worst case housing needs by 9.6 percent to 3.58 million. The number of worst case seniors has increase by 1.5 percent to 1.291 million.

The Committee notes that, while improvements have been made over the last year, much more needs to be done by HUD to expedite the process of approving project applications under the 202 program. The Committee is hopeful that HUD will continue to make progress in this area. The Committee also expects HUD to use a portion of this appropriation for necessary emergency repairs to preserve this essential housing stock.

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$236,610,000
Budget estimate, 2008	125,000,000
Committee recommendation	237,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for housing for the persons with disabilities under section 811. Under this program, the Department provides capital grants to eligible entities for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of housing for persons with disabilities. Up to 25 percent of the funding may be made available for tenant-based assistance under section 8 and provides project-based rental assistance [PRAC] to support operational costs for such units.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $237,000,000 for the section 811 program. This level is $112,000,000 more than the budget request and $390,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. HUD is directed to ensure all tenant-based assistance made available under this account shall remain available for persons with disabilities upon turnover. The Committee has provided $74,745,000 for incremental section 8 vouchers under this program. In addition, section 811 funds may be used for inspections by HUD's Real Estate Assessment Center [REAC] and for related inspection activities. HUD is directed to submit a budget to the Committees on Appropriations before funding REAC inspections. The Committee includes language indicating funding made available within this account, not to exceed $600,000, may be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

This is the fourth consecutive year that the President's budget proposed deep cuts to the capital advance/project-based side of the 811 program. Both the House and Senate have consistently rejected these cuts which would undermine a program already burdened with significant renewal costs.

According to Priced Out in 2006, a recent study of income and rental costs for people with the most significant and long term disabilities, people receiving Federal Supplemental Security Income [SSI] benefits had incomes equal to only 18.2 percent of median income in 2006. Over 4 million non-elderly adults receive SSI and it can be conservatively estimated that more than 1 million of these persons need permanent supportive housing. The current section 811 program produces fewer than 1,000 new units per year.

The Committee recommends no new funding for the section 811 mainstream program for fiscal year 2008. The Committee, once again, urges HUD to issue programmatic guidance for the section 811 tenant-based program. Such guidance should include criteria for targeting of assistance consistent with 811 supportive housing eligibility criteria and retention of a meaningful role for nonprofit organizations. As in the case of the section 202 program, the Committee has not provided funding for a Leveraged Financing Demonstration program, since the program apparently lacks both jus-

tification and support within the section 811 practitioner community.

OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Appropriations, 2007	$26,136,000
Budget estimate, 2008	27,600,000
Committee recommendation	27,600,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides amendment funding for housing assisted under a variety of HUD housing programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $27,600,000 for HUD-assisted, State-aided, non-insured rental housing projects.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 authorized HUD to establish a revolving fund for the collection of rents in excess of the established basic rents for section 236 projects. Subject to appropriations, HUD is authorized to transfer excess rent collection received after 1978 to the Flexible Subsidy Fund.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that the account continue to serve as the repository for the excess rental charges appropriated from the Rental Housing Assistance Fund; these funds will continue to offset flexible subsidy outlays and other discretionary expenditures to support affordable housing projects. The language is designed to allow surplus funds in excess of allowable rent levels to be returned to project owners only for purposes of the rehabilitation and renovation of projects.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

Appropriations, 2007	$13,000,000
Budget request, 2008	16,000,000
Committee recommendation	16,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, as amended by the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000, authorizes the Secretary to establish Federal manufactured home construction and safety standards for the construction, design, and performance of manufactured homes. All manufactured homes are required to meet the Federal standards, and fees are charged to producers to cover the costs of administering the act.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $16,000,000 to support the manufactured housing standards programs to be derived from fees collected and deposited in the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund account. The amount recommended is the same as the budget request and $3,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2006 enacted level.

The Committee thanks the Department for submitting line-item expenses for the manufactured housing program in its proposed fiscal year 2007 budget request, and encourages the HUD to continue doing so in its future budgets. In addition, the Committee encourages HUD to continue to prioritize its expenditures for this program in accordance with the appropriate sections of the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses including contract administrators
Appropriations, 2007	$50,000,000	$185,000,000,000	$413,424,000
Budget estimate, 2008	50,000,000	185,000,000,000	428,850,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000	185,000,000,000	[1] 77,400,000

[1] Administrative expenses for MMI are funded within the Office of Housing.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses including contract administrators	Program costs
Appropriations, 2007	$50,000,000	$45,000,000,000	$307,812,341	$8,712,000
Budget estimate, 2008	50,000,000	35,000,000,000	307,197,000	8,600,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000	45,000,000,000	[1] 78,111,000	8,600,000

[1] Administrative expenses for GSR are funded within the Office of Housing.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal Housing Administration [FHA] fund covers the mortgage and loan insurance activity of HUD mortgage/loan insurance programs which are grouped into the mutual mortgage insurance [MMI] fund, cooperative management housing insurance [CMHI] fund, general insurance fund [GI] fund, and the special risk insurance [SRI] fund. For presentation and accounting control purposes, these are divided into two sets of accounts based on shared characteristics. The unsubsidized insurance programs of the mutual mortgage insurance fund and the cooperative management housing insurance fund constitute one set; and the general risk insurance and special risk insurance funds, which are partially composed of subsidized programs, make up the other.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has included the following amounts for the "Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program" account: a limitation on guaranteed loans of $185,000,000,000, a limitation on direct loans of

$50,000,000 and $77,400,000 for administrative contract expenses of which up to $25,550,000 may be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

The Committee provides $5,000,000 for HUD to make HUD-owned or HUD-held housing available through a right of first refusal to units of local government. This language requires this housing to be maintained for low-income residents' use pursuant to requirements established by HUD.

For the GI/SRI account, the Committee recommends $45,000,000,000 as a limitation on guaranteed loans and a limitation on direct loans of $50,000,000. The Committee provides $78,111,000 for administrative contract expenses of which up to $15,692,000 may be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

The Committee does not provide for transfers of funds from FHA to the HUD "Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account". The Committee has eliminated all salaries and expenses transfers and replaced this funding mechanism with direct appropriations to specific salaries and expenses accounts within each HUD mission area. This new format will provide for a more transparent process and a more effective way to allocate staffing to match programmatic needs.

In addition, the Committee directs HUD to continue direct loan programs in 2008 for multifamily bridge loans and single family purchase money mortgages to finance the sale of certain properties owned by the Department. Temporary financing shall be provided for the acquisition and rehabilitation of multifamily projects by purchasers who have obtained commitments for permanent financing from another lender. Purchase money mortgages will enable governmental and nonprofit intermediaries to acquire properties for resale to owner-occupants in areas undergoing revitalization.

On March 15, 2007, the Committee held a hearing on the solvency of the FHA as well as the administration's reform proposal for FHA single-family housing. The hearing took place at the same time as many subprime lenders were exhibiting considerable financial stress, with the third largest such lender in the Nation declaring bankruptcy.

The crises in the subprime lending market has its roots in certain lenders engaging in aggressive, and sometimes fraudulent, marketing techniques while lowering credit standards—sometimes requiring little or no proof of income or creditworthiness on the part of borrowers. The Committee is concerned of the impact that the vast expansion of these mortgage products will now have on low and moderate-income working Americans for years to come.

Since its inception in 1934, the FHA has played a critical role in meeting the demands of borrowers that the private market would not serve—creating housing products that have insured over 34 million homes. In the wake of this new crisis, the Committee believes that the FHA must reestablish itself as America's mortgage lender. The agency should do this, not by imitating the marketing and underwriting practices of some subprime lenders, but by working to ensure that families are able to purchase and stay in their homes with affordable loans that they fully understand.

Unfortunately, this new challenge comes at a time when the FHA finances are in a particularly precarious state. FHA's market

share has diminished significantly and the solvency of its insurance funds have worsened as a result. FHA is no longer an innovator and major player in the housing market. While a number of FHA's challenges can be attributed to factors outside its control, some of its wounds have been self-inflicted as identified in recent reports and testimony by the GAO and HUD OIG. If FHA did a better job of managing risk, its financial condition might improve.

The signs of a troubled FHA have been identified in a number of ways since 2002—FHA has experienced a sharp decline in single-family loan volume with total guarantees dropping 60 percent from $147,000,000,000 in 2003 to only $58,000,000,000 in 2005. This is primarily due to (1) the perception among lenders that FHA's services are inefficient and overly cumbersome, (2) its flat pricing structure, and (3) its limited range of loan products compared to conventional mortgage companies. In addition, default rates and the amounts of insurance claims have increased even as participation in the program has declined. Some of these problems are attributed to "adverse selection" where FHA has taken on more risky borrowers, such as seller-financed down-payment loans. The FHA Commissioner's Report from September 2006 found that, while endorsements dropped by 17 percent between fiscal year 2005 and fiscal year 2006, the default rate (90 days in arrears) increased from 6.36 percent to 6.63 percent. Further, loss mitigation activity (forbearance agreements, loan modifications, and partial claims) had increased by 44 percent between 2005 and 2006.

In 2007, as in 2006, the administration and Congress have proposed a number of reforms to FHA to address the health and solvency of its insurance funds. While some aspects remain controversial, there seems to be widespread support and recognition that some FHA reforms are necessary. Such reforms will certainly be necessary if FHA is going to be able to once again position itself to grow its market share and meet its mission of allowing low-income families the opportunity to share in the American Dream.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $8,210,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 9,530,000
Committee recommendation	9,530,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Government National Mortgage Association [GNMA] supports the Mortgage Backed Securities [MBS] program, which is the guarantee of timely payment of principal and interest to investors on the mortgage backed securities pools of FHA/VA/RD/PIH guaranteed loans. The mission of GNMA is to expand affordable housing in America by linking domestic and global capital markets to the Nation's housing markets.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $9,530,000 for the Office of Government National Mortgage Association. This level is the same as the budget request and $1,320,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007:	
Limitation on guaranteed loans	$200,000,000,000
Administrative expenses	10,593,000
Budget estimate, 2008:	
Limitation on guaranteed loans	100,000,000,000
Administrative expenses	11,000,000
Committee recommendation:	
Limitation on guaranteed loans	200,000,000,000
Administrative expenses	9,530,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Government National Mortgage Association [GNMA], through the mortgage-backed securities program, guarantees privately issued securities backed by pools of mortgages. GNMA is a wholly owned corporate instrumentality of the United States within the Department. Its powers are prescribed generally by title III of the National Housing Act, as amended. GNMA is authorized by section 306(g) of the act to guarantee the timely payment of principal and interest on securities that are based on and backed by a trust, or pool, composed of mortgages that are guaranteed and insured by the Federal Housing Administration, the Rural Housing Service, or the Department of Veterans Affairs. GNMA's guarantee of mortgage-backed securities is backed by the full faith and credit of the United States.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on new commitments on mortgage-backed securities of $200,000,000,000. This level is $100,000,000,000 more than the budget request and same as the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee has included $9,530,000 for administrative expenses.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $1,520,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 1,570,000
Committee recommendation	1,570,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary establishes the vision and mission for the policy development and research components to carry out routine work activities and assignments, and monitors the established goals of the organization in support of HUD's mission and policy agenda. Coordinates the development of HUD's Strategic Plan, substantially participates in the Annual Performance Plan and Performance and Accountability Report processes and co-chairs the HUD Energy Action Task Force with the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,570,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research. This level is the same as the budget request and $50,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $19,360,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 19,310,000
Committee recommendation	19,310,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Policy Development and Research establishes the Department's annual research agenda to support the research and evaluation of housing and other departmental initiatives to improve HUD effectiveness and operational efficiencies. Research proposals are determined through consultations with senior staff from each HUD program office, the Office of Management and Budget, Congress as well as discussion with key HUD stakeholders (National Housing Conference, National Association of Home Builders, Department of Transportation, Department of Education, Department of Health and Human Services, Federal Emergency Management Agency, etc.) Addresses all inquiries regarding key housing economic information such as the American Housing Survey, Fair Market Rents, Median Family Income Limits, annual housing goals and oversight of the Government Sponsored Enterprises [GSEs], Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act and mortgage market analyses.

Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Statistics.—The Committee is concerned that of the population statistics that the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] uses to determine allocations for the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program do not accurately reflect the populations of rapidly growing States. Statistics used by HUD are typically 1 year behind the population estimates of the State demographer, which results in the loss of additional tax credits for affordable housing projects. The Committee urges the HUD to work with State demographer offices to determine a more accurate and up-to-date population count.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $19,310,000 for the Office of Policy Development and Research. This level is the same as the budget request and $50,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 level.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriations, 2007	$50,087,000
Budget estimate, 2008	65,040,000
Committee recommendation	59,040,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended, directs the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to undertake programs of research, evaluation, and reports relating to the Department's mission and programs. These functions are carried out internally and through grants and contracts with industry, nonprofit research organizations, educational institutions, and through agreements with State and local governments and other Federal agencies. The research programs seek ways to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and equity of HUD programs and to identify methods to achieve cost reductions. Additionally, this appropriation is used to support HUD evaluation and monitoring activities and to conduct housing surveys. Funding is also provided for university programs to further community development related activities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $59,040,000 for research, technology and community development activities in fiscal year 2008. This level is $6,000,000 less than the budget request and $8,953,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. Of this funding, $5,000,000 is for the Partnership for Advancing Technologies in Housing [PATH] program. The Committee recommends $20,600,000 to carry-out university programs to further community development related activities as authorized under section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

The Committee recommends that activities for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing Initiative [PATH] shall be administered by the Office of Policy Development and Research.

In addition, because in the past HUD has used this office's broad authority to administer new and unauthorized programs, the Office of Policy Development and Research is denied demonstration authority except where approval is provided by Congress in response to a reprogramming request.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $1,250,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 1,490,000
Committee recommendation	1,490,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary is responsible for fair housing and civil rights policy, enforcement of the fair housing and equal opportunity laws within HUD's jurisdiction, and the management of the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,490,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. This level is the same as the budget request and $240,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $63,330,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 69,390,000
Committee recommendation	69,390,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity is responsible for developing policies, guidance and for providing technical support for enforcement of the Fair Housing Act and the civil rights statues, including title VI of the Civil Rights Act, section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Acts, the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, section 109 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, and the Age discrimination Act of 1975, as well as Executive orders. FHEO serves as the central point for the formulation, clearance and dissemination of FHEP policies, intra-departmental clearances, and public information.

FHEO receives, investigates, conciliate and recommends the issuance of charges of discrimination and determinations of noncompliance for complaints filed under title VIII and other civil rights authorities and conduct civil rights compliance review and compliance reviews under section 3.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $69,390,000 for the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. This level is the same as the budget request and $6,060,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2007	$45,540,000
Budget estimate, 2008	45,000,000
Committee recommendation	52,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The fair housing activities appropriation includes funding for both the Fair Housing Assistance Program [FHAP] and the Fair Housing Initiatives Program [FHIP].

The Fair Housing Assistance Program helps State and local agencies to implement title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended, which prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of housing and in the provision of brokerage services. The major objective of the program is to assure prompt and effective processing of title VIII complaints with appropriate remedies for complaints by State and local fair housing agencies.

The Fair Housing Initiatives Program is authorized by section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, and by section 905 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992. This initiative is designed to alleviate housing discrimination by increasing support to public and private organizations for the purpose of eliminating or preventing discrimination in housing, and to enhance fair housing opportunities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation provides $52,000,000 of which $27,000,000 is for the fair housing assistance program [FHAP] and $25,000,000 is for the fair housing initiatives program [FHIP]. The total is $7,000,000 more than the budget request and $6,460,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

The Committee emphasizes that State and local agencies under FHAP should have the primary responsibility for identifying and addressing discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of housing and in the provision of brokerage services. It is critical that consistent fair housing policies be identified and implemented to insure continuity and fairness, and that States and localities continue to increase their understanding, expertise, and implementation of the law.

The practice of housing discrimination and predatory lending continues to be a serious concern for the Committee. Fair housing organizations provide vital services in protecting tenants by conducting testing and research activities to uncover fair lending violations. The Committee recommends a $5,000,000 increase over the fiscal year 2007 level to the Fair Housing Initiatives Program [FHIP] to better address this problem. This funding boost will further enhance funding to fair housing organizations and other nonprofit groups that fight discrimination and encourage integration through education, enforcement and capacity building activities. In 2006, some 27,000 housing discrimination complaints were filed. Yet HUD has acknowledged there is much more to be done since only 1 percent of housing discrimination cases are reported each year. The Committee expects HUD to continue to direct enforcement money and education money to fair housing organizations

from HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity in order to adequately address housing discrimination, from education and outreach to community members, to investigative work, and intervention.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	[1] $5,780,000
Budget estimate, 2008	[1] 6,140,000
Committee recommendation	6,140,000

[1] As provided within the unified Management and Administration Salaries and Expenses account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control has primary responsibility for the lead-based paint and healthy homes activities of the Department and is directly responsible for the administration of the Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction program authorized by title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992; the Office also addresses multiple housing-related hazards affecting the health of residents, particularly children. The Office develops lead-based paint regulations, guidelines, and policies applicable to HUD programs, and enforces the Lead Disclosure Rule issued under title X. For both lead-based paint and healthy homes issues, the Office designs and administers programs for grants, training, research, education and information dissemination, and serves as the Department's central information source for the Secretary, the Congress, HUD staff, HUD grantees, State and local governments and the public.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,140,000 for the Office of the Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control. This level is the same as the budget request and $360,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

Appropriations, 2007	$150,480,000
Budget estimate, 2008	116,000,000
Committee recommendation	151,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 established the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act under which HUD is authorized to make grants to States, localities and native American tribes to conduct lead-based paint hazard reduction and abatement activities in private low-income housing. This has become a significant health hazard, especially for children. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], some 434,000 children have elevated blood levels, down from 1.7 million in the late 1980's. Despite this improvement, lead poisoning remains a serious childhood environmental condition,

with some 2.2 percent of all children aged 1 to 5 years having elevated blood lead levels. This percentage is much higher for low-income children living in older housing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $151,000,000 for lead-based paint hazard reduction and abatement activities for fiscal year 2008. This amount is $35,000,000 more than the budget request and $520,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. Of this amount, HUD may use up to $8,800,000 for the Healthy Homes Initiative under which HUD conducts a number of activities designed to identify and address housing-related illnesses.

The Committee recommends $48,000,000 for the lead hazard reduction demonstration program which was established in fiscal year 2003 to focus on major urban areas where children are disproportionately at risk for lead poisoning.

As previously discussed, there remains significant lead risks in privately owned housing, particularly in unsubsidized low-income units. For that reason, approximately 1 million children under the age of 6 in the United States suffer from lead poisoning. While lead poisoning crosses all socioeconomic, geographic, and racial boundaries, the burden of this disease falls disproportionately on low-income and minority families. In the United States, children from poor families are eight times more likely to be poisoned than those from higher income families. Nevertheless, the risks associated with lead-based paint hazards can be addressed fully over the next decade.

The Committee also encourages HUD to work with grantees on its lead-based paint abatement hazards programs so that information is disclosed to the public on lead hazard abatements, risk assessment data and blood lead levels through publications and internet sites such as Lead-SafeHomes.info.

Big Buy Program.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 to continue funding the Big Buy Program at the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD]. Further, the Committee directs that these funds be managed by the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control. In 2001, HUD launched the Big Buy program to use the Department's purchasing power to contract for lead inspections of pre-1978 Federally subsidized properties that HUD determined posed the greatest likelihood of containing potentially hazardous levels of lead-based paint. The Big Buy program was initially funded with $56,000,000 and over 3,900 eligible properties registered to take part. The Committee is concerned that at this time fewer than half of these properties have been scheduled for testing services, and less than that have actually been tested and had the inspection report delivered. The Committee understands that HUD does not have the necessary funds to complete testing these properties. HUD informed the Committee that there are still approximately 1,500 properties that still need to be inspected. The Committee provides these funds to continue the Big Buy Program inspections and recognizes that these funds are not sufficient to complete the testing that is necessary. The Committee urges HUD to provide sufficient funding in future year budget requests.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Direct Appropriation	FHA funds	GNMA funds	Development Loan Guarantee funds	Natuve American Block Grant funds	Indian Housing Loan Guarantee funds	Native Hawaiian Loan funds	Total
Appropriations, 2007	580,821	556,776	10,593	743	149	248	35	1,149,365
Budget estimate, 2008	654,092	556,776	10,700	.....	149	248	35	1,222,000
Committee recommendation	1,222,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,222,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The "Salaries and expenses" account finances all salaries and related expenses associated with administering the programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. These include the following activities:

Housing and Mortgage Credit Programs.—This activity includes staff salaries and related expenses associated with administering housing programs, the implementation of consumer protection activities in the areas of interstate land sales, mobile home construction and safety, and real estate settlement procedures.

Community Planning and Development Programs.—Funds in this activity are for staff salaries and expenses necessary to administer community planning and development programs.

Equal Opportunity and Research Programs.—This activity includes salaries and related expenses associated with implementing equal opportunity programs in housing and employment as required by law and Executive orders and the administration of research programs and demonstrations.

Departmental Management, Legal, and Audit Services.—This activity includes a variety of general functions required for the Department's overall administration and management. These include the Office of the Secretary, Office of General Counsel, Office of Chief Financial Officer, as well as administrative support in such areas as accounting, personnel management, contracting and procurement, and office services.

Field Direction and Administration.—This activity includes salaries and expenses for the regional administrators, area office managers, and their staff who are responsible for the direction, supervision, and performance of the Department's field offices, as well as administrative support in areas such as accounting, personnel management, contracting and procurement, and office services.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends several separate appropriations which together total $1,222,000,000 for salaries and expenses. This level is the same as the budget request and $72,636,524 more than the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee has eliminated all salaries and expenses transfers and replaced this funding mechanism with direct appropriations to specific salaries and expenses ac-

counts within each HUD mission area. This new format will provide for a more transparent process and a more effective way to allocate staffing to match programmatic needs.

The Committee remains concerned about HUD's ability to administer its programs and place staff where most needed. Therefore, the Committee directs HUD to report quarterly to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on all hiring within the Department, including justifications for any significant increase in FTEs for any particular office or activity.

In addition, the Department is prohibited from employing more than 77 schedule C and 20 noncareer senior executive service employees. The Committee understands that the Department is staffed largely by personnel who are close to retirement and at the top of the civil service pay schedule. The Committee encourages HUD to implement hiring practices that result in the hiring of young professionals who can gain experience and advancement.

The Committee directs the Department to issue quarterly reports on HUD travel to the Senate Committee on Appropriations. These reports shall include a list of all HUD-related trips, the names of all staff on each trip, and all costs, including the individual costs of lodging, food, transportation and any other costs.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	FHA funds by transfer	Total
Appropriations, 2007	$81,852,503	$23,760,000	105,612,503
Budget estimate, 2008	88,240,000	23,760,000	112,000,000
Committee recommendation	112,000,000	.....	112,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation will finance all salaries and related expenses associated with the operation of the Office of the Inspector General [OIG].

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends $112,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General [OIG]. This amount is the same as the budget request and $6,387,497 above the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee does not provide for transfers of FHA funds to OIG. The Committee has eliminated all salaries and expenses transfers and replaced this funding mechanism with direct appropriations to specific salaries and expenses accounts within each HUD mission area. This new format will provide for a more transparent process and a more effective way to allocate staffing to match programmatic needs.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriations, 2007	$195,356,000
Budget estimate, 2008	220,000,000
Committee recommendation	175,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Working Capital Fund, authorized by the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, finances information technology and office automation initiatives on a centralized basis.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $175,000,000 for the Working Capital Fund for fiscal year 2008. These funds are $45,000,000 less than the budget request and $20,356,000 less than the fiscal year 2007 level. This fund is needed to enhance efficient use of appropriated funds and improve budget projections and needs for submission of the Committees on Appropriations.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2007	$60,000,000
Budget estimate, 2008	66,000,000
Committee recommendation	66,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation funds the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight [OFHEO], which was established in 1992 to regulate the financial safety and soundness of the two housing Government sponsored enterprises [GSE's], the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation. The Office was authorized in the Federal Housing Enterprise Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, which also instituted a three-part capital standard for the GSE's, and gave the regulator enhanced authority to enforce those standards.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $66,000,000 for the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, which is the same as the budget request and $6,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends administrative provisions. A brief description follows.

SEC. 201. This section promotes the refinancing of certain housing bonds.

SEC. 202. This section clarifies a limitation on use of funds under the Fair Housing Act.

SEC. 203. This section clarifies the allocation of HOPWA funding for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 204. This section requires HUD to award funds on a competitive basis unless otherwise provided.

SEC. 205. This section allows funds to be used to reimburse GSEs and other Federal entities for various administrative expenses.

SEC. 206. This section limits HUD spending to amounts set out in the budget justification.

SEC. 207. This section clarifies expenditure authority for entities subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

SEC. 208. This section requires HUD to submit certain additional information as part of its annual budget justifications.

SEC. 209. This section requires quarterly reports on all uncommitted, unobligated and excess funds associated with HUD programs.

SEC. 210. This section makes a number of corrections to the award of HOPWA funding.

SEC. 211. This section requires HUD to submit annual reports on the number and cost of HUD-assisted units. The Committee is concerned that HUD's property disposition program is not adequately committed to preserving the affordability of formerly subsidized units, and directs HUD to establish and submit to the Committee workable criteria for ensuring the maintenance of project-based section 8 wherever possible. The Committee also expects HUD to improve its consultation and coordination with units of local government and residents. HUD is reminded that it should use its discretionary preservation authority for the purpose of preserving affordability.

SEC. 212. This section requires HUD to submit its fiscal year 2008 budget justifications according to congressional requirements.

SEC. 213. This section requires vouchers for non-elderly disabled families to be renewed, to the extent practicable, to non-elderly disabled families.

SEC. 214. This section exempts Los Angeles County, Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi from the requirement of having a PHA resident on the board of directors for fiscal year 2006. Instead, the public housing agencies in these States are required to establish advisory boards that include public housing tenants and section 8 recipients.

SEC. 215. This section allows HUD to authorize the transfer of existing project-based subsidies and liabilities from obsolete housing to housing that better meets the needs of the assisted tenants.

SEC. 216. This section provides allocation requirements for Native Alaskans under the Native American Indian Housing Block Grant program.

SEC. 217. This section requires vouchers for family unification to be renewed, to the extent practicable, for the family unification.

SEC. 218. This section exempts GNMA from certain requirements of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 219. This section reforms certain section 8 rent calculations as to athletic scholarships.

SEC. 220. This section requires HUD to maintain section 8 assistance on HUD-held or owned multifamily housing.

SEC. 221. This section increases FHA multifamily housing loan limits.

SEC. 222. This section extends the HOPE VI program until September 30, 2008.

SEC. 223. This section allows public housing authorities with less than 500 units the option to be exempt from management requirements in the operating fund rule.

SEC. 224. This section prevents HUD from imposing certain restrictions on the use of capital funds by public housing authorities.

SEC. 225. This section requires HUD to report quarterly to the Appropriations Committees on the status of all section 8 project-based housing units, including all units preserved or lost as section 8 project-based housing.

SEC. 226. This section requires HUD to report quarterly to the appropriations committees on the use of all sole source contracting by HUD.

SEC. 227. This section allows existing energy performance contracts between public housing authorities and third parties to be extended.

SEC. 228. This section includes Alaska Pubic Housing Agency as a Moving-to-Work Agency.

SEC. 229. This section provides technical corrections to economic development initiatives included in previous appropriations acts.

SEC. 230. This section expands the availability of Home Equity Conversion Mortgage without limit during 2008.

SEC. 231. This section clarifies that the Housing Authority of Baltimore City has and will continue to carry the Moving-to-Work program designation.

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$5,915,000
Budget estimate, 2008	6,150,000
Committee recommendation	6,150,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board) was established by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The Access Board is responsible for developing guidelines under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Architectural Barriers Act, and the Telecommunications Act. These guidelines ensure that buildings and facilities, transportation vehicles, and telecommunications equipment covered by these laws are readily accessible to and usable by people with disabilities. The Board is also responsible for developing standards under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act for accessible electronic and information technology used by Federal agencies. The Access Board also enforces the Architectural Barriers Act. In addition, the Board provides training and technical assistance on the guidelines and standards it develops to Government agencies, public and private organizations, individuals and businesses on the removal of accessibility barriers.

In 2002, the Access Board was given additional responsibilities under the Help America Vote Act. The Board serves on the Board of Advisors and the Technical Guidelines Development Committee, which helps Election Assistance Commission develop voluntary guidelines and guidance for voting systems, including accessibility for people with disabilities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $6,150,000 for the operations of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, the funding level requested by the administration and $235,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 level.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$20,428,000
Budget estimate, 2008	22,322,000
Committee recommendation	22,322,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal Maritime Commission [FMC] is an independent regulatory agency which administers the Shipping Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–237) as amended by the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–258); section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (41 Stat. 998); the Foreign Shipping Practices Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–418); and Public Law 89–777.

FMC regulates the international waterborne commerce of the United States. In addition, the FMC has responsibility for licensing and bonding ocean transportation intermediaries and assuring that vessel owners or operators establish financial responsibility to pay judgments for death or injury to passengers, or nonperformance of a cruise, on voyages from U.S. ports. Major program areas for 2006 are: carrying out investigations of foreign trade practices under the Foreign Shipping Practices Act; maintaining equitable trading conditions in U.S. ocean commerce; ensuring compliance with applicable shipping statutes; pursuing an active enforcement program designed to identify and prosecute violators of the shipping statutes; and reviewing ocean carrier operational and pricing agreements to guard against excessively anticompetitive effects.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee includes $22,322,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 2008. This amount is the same as the budget request and $1,894,000 above the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$79,338,000
Budget estimate, 2008	83,000,000
Committee recommendation	84,500,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Initially established along with the Department of Transportation [DOT], the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB] commenced operations on April 1, 1967, as an independent Federal agency. The board is charged by Congress with investigating every civil aviation accident in the United States as well as significant accidents in the other modes of transportation—railroad, highway, marine and pipeline—and issuing safety recommendations aimed at preventing future accidents. Although it has always operated independently, NTSB relied on DOT for funding and administrative support until the Independent Safety Board Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–633) severed all ties between the two organizations starting in 1975.

In addition to its investigatory duties, NTSB is responsible for maintaining the Government's database of civil aviation accidents and also conducts special studies of transportation safety issues of national significance. Furthermore, in accordance with the provisions of international treaties, NTSB supplies investigators to serve as U.S. Accredited Representatives for aviation accidents overseas

involving U.S-registered aircraft, or involving aircraft or major components of U.S. manufacture. NTSB also serves as the "court of appeals" for any airman, mechanic or mariner whenever certificate action is taken by the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] or the U.S. Coast Guard Commandant, or when civil penalties are assessed by FAA.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $84,500,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board, which is $1,500,000 more than the budget request and $5,162,000 more than the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The Committee has included $1,500,000 more than the budget request to allow the agency to hire an additional 11 investigative staff. Since fiscal year 2005, staffing at NTSB has been reduced from 418 positions to 396. As a result, the NTSB is lacking engineers, investigators, technicians and specialists in the areas of highways, pipelines, rail, research and engineering and aviation. The Committee instructs the agency to use additional funding provided to hire personnel in the most critical areas in order to enable the agency to continue to perform its investigative duties with the critical expertise needed.

NTSB Academy.—In 2001, the National Transportation Safety Board entered into an illegal multi-year lease for its new training facility without sufficient funding to cover the cost of the lease. Consequently, the NTSB reported an Anti-deficiency Act violation to the President and Congress on December 19, 2003.

The annual operating costs of the training center continue to be a drain on the NTSB's resources and divert needed funds away from the Board's central missions of accident investigations and the issuance of safety recommendations. In the National Transportation Safety Board Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–443), Congress sought to address this problem by mandating that NTSB prepare a utilization plan on how the Board would make the academy's operations self-sufficient. The act further charges the Board to implement the plan with the goal of making the academy's operations self-sufficient within 2 years of the date of enactment of the act—or no later than December 21, 2008.

The Committee has included bill language that gives the NTSB the authority to continue to make lease payments on the NTSB academy facility. However, this authority is limited to fiscal year 2008 only. The NTSB sent its final utilization plan to Congress in June, and as part of that plan, it expects to award a contract in the fall to an entity that will serve as a partner in running the academy. The Committee will be closely monitoring the implementation of this plan, as well as the Board's financial data that will indicate if the NTSB is successfully reducing the financial burden of the academy.

Most Wanted Safety Recommendations.—As a result of its investigative work and the studies it conducts, the Board makes recommendations to industry, Federal agencies and the States for actions that they can take to improve transportation safety. Every year, the Board prioritizes some of these recommendations on its "Most Wanted" list. This list encompasses all the recommendations that the agency believes have the most potential to improve safety,

reduce accidents and injuries and save lives. This list is an important tool that the Committee uses to understand critical transportation safety concerns, as well as to evaluate the agencies' responsiveness to critical safety issues. The Committee therefore directs the Board to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations the "Most Wanted" recommendation list when it is updated annually. The Board is further directed to notify the Committees when the status of a recommendation has changed.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2007	$116,820,000
Budget estimate, 2008	119,800,000
Committee recommendation	119,800,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation was created by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (title VI of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, Public Law 95–557, October 31, 1978). Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation now operates under the trade name "NeighborWorks America." NeighborWorks America helps local communities establish efficient and effective partnerships between residents and representatives of the public and private sectors. These partnership-based organizations are independent, tax-exempt, nonprofit entities and are frequently known as Neighborhood Housing Services [NHS] or mutual housing associations.

Collectively, these organizations are known as the NeighborWorks® network. Nationally, 235 NeighborWorks® organizations serve nearly 3,000 urban, suburban and rural communities in 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $119,800,000 for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation [NRC] for fiscal year 2008. This amount is the same as the budget request and $2,980,000 above the fiscal year 2007 level. The Committee continues to support the set-aside of $5,000,000 for the multifamily rental housing initiative, which has been successful in developing innovative approaches to producing mixed-income affordable housing throughout the Nation. The Committee directs NRC to provide a status report on this initiative in its fiscal year 2009 budget justifications.

Homeownership Counseling.—The Committee applauds the important work that NRC is doing in addressing the many challenges facing homeowners today, especially as the number of foreclosures continues to rise. In an effort to create educated borrowers, NRC educated and counseled over 84,000 people and assisted more than 16,500 individuals and families of modest means to achieve homeownership in fiscal year 2006. The success of these efforts in providing housing education and homeownership counseling is demonstrated in the improved loan performance of families assisted by NRC organizations. Using its experience in this area, NRC, with a consortium of nonprofit and industry partners developed national

standards for homeownership educators and counselors. These standards should help improve the quality and consistency of counseling that homeowners receive.

Foreclosure Prevention Efforts.—The NeighborWorks® Center for Foreclosure Solutions is a partnership between nonprofit, financial, mortgage, and insurance sectors that works to preserve homeownership and prevent foreclosures across the country. The Center established a national toll-free hotline, which is operated by the Homeownership Preservation Foundation of Chicago. Through this hotline, which served 25,000 families in 2006, at-risk homeowners are offered over-the-phone counseling or referrals to organizations that can provide in-person counseling for those who need additional assistance. The Committee supports the efforts of NRC to help homeowners avoid foreclosure and sustain the gains that have been made in increasing homeownership and reviving neighborhoods around the country.

Rural Areas.—The Committee also continues to support Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation's efforts in building capacity in rural areas. The Committee urges the Corporation to continue its efforts in addressing the needs of rural communities.

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2007	$1,787,971
Budget estimate, 2008	2,320,000
Committee recommendation	2,300,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness is an independent agency created by the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 to coordinate and direct the multiple efforts of Federal agencies and other designated groups. The Council was authorized to review Federal programs that assist homeless persons and to take necessary actions to reduce duplication. The Council can recommend improvements in programs and activities conducted by Federal, State and local government as well as local volunteer organizations. The Council consists of the heads of 18 Federal agencies such as the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Veterans Affairs, Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Labor, and Transportation; and other entities as deemed appropriate.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,300,000 for the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness [ICH]. This amount is $512,029 more than the fiscal year 2007 level and $20,000 less than the budget request. These funds are for carrying out the functions authorized under section 203 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. Bill language is included that extends the reauthorization for the ICH until October 1, 2008.

The Committee continues to support the mission of ICH and its efforts to end homelessness. The agency has a critical role to play in coordinating the efforts of Federal agencies to address the needs

of the Nation's homeless in a comprehensive nature. In 2002, the administration set a goal to end chronic homelessness in 10 years. If the administration is to be successful in achieving this goal by 2012, it will take the efforts and resources of Federal, State, and local governments. ICH has been successful in engaging States and cities across the Nation in responding to the needs of the homeless, which is evident in the development of over 300 10-year plans to end homelessness across the country. However, it is unclear whether all Federal agencies are fully participating in this effort. Accordingly, the Committee directs the ICH to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the progress in meeting the goal to end chronic homelessness in 10 years. This report should include specifics on how efforts by both local and Federal agencies will enable the achievement of this goal. This report should be submitted by no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Staffing.—The Committee believes that regional coordinators are important to assisting communities in developing and carrying out 10-year plans to end homelessness. Therefore, the Committee has included funding to support two additional regional coordinator positions, as requested. The Committee also believes that additional efforts must be taken to ensure improved efforts on the Federal level. As such, it is the intent of the Committee that the special advisor position requested be used to improve Federal coordination efforts and policy development related to homelessness in the United States.

Travel.—The Committee is concerned by the requested increase in the travel budget for fiscal year 2008. The Committee understands that this increase is associated with the additional regional coordinator positions. However, while the Committee recognizes that the travel budget for the Executive Director has been decreased in the fiscal year 2008 request, the Committee still believes that it is too high. Therefore the travel budget for ICH is limited to $143,642, which is $20,000 less than the requested level. The reduction to the travel budget should be taken out of the allocation for the Executive Director, since the Committee believes that increased time and efforts should be spent coordinating Federal agencies.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS THIS ACT

Section 401 requires pay raises to be absorbed within appropriated levels in this act or previous appropriations acts.

Section 402 prohibits pay and other expenses for non-Federal parties in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this act.

Section 403 prohibits obligations beyond the current fiscal year and prohibits transfers of funds unless expressly so provided herein.

Section 404 limits expenditures for consulting service through procurement contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection.

Section 405 authorizes the reprogramming of funds and specifies the reprogramming procedures for agencies funded by this act.

Section 406 ensures that 50 percent of unobligated balances may remain available for certain purposes.

Section 407 requires departments and agencies under this act to report information regarding all sole source contracts.

Section 408 prohibits the use of funds for employee training unless such training bears directly upon the performance of official duties.

Section 409 continues the provision prohibiting the use of funds for eminent domain unless such taking is employed for public use.

Section 410 prohibits funds in this act to be transferred without express authority.

Section 411 protects employment rights of Federal employees who return to their civilian jobs after assignment with the Armed Forces.

Section 412 prohibits the use of funds for activities not in compliance with the Buy American Act.

Section 413 prohibits funding for any person or entity convicted of violating the Buy American Act.

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."

The Committee is filing an original bill, which is not covered under this rule, but reports this information in the spirit of full disclosure.

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2008:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration:
- Operations
- Facilities and Equipment
- Research, Engineering and Development
- Grants-in-Aid for Airports

Federal Railroad Administration:
- Safety and Operations
- Railroad Research and Development
- Grants to the National Passenger Railroad Corp

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration:
- Administrative Expenses

Research and Innovative Technology Administration:
- Research and Development

Surface Transportation Board

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Rental Assistance:
- Section 8 Contract Renewals and Administrative Expenses
- Section 441 Contracts
- Section 8 Preservation, Protection, and Family Unification
- Contract Administrators
- Public Housing Capital Fund
- Public Housing Operating Fund

Native American Housing Block Grants:
- Native American Housing Block Grants
- Federal Guarantees

Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund
Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund
Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids
Rural Housing and Economics Development

Community Development Fund:
- Community Development Block Grants
- Economic Development Initiatives
- Neighborhood Initiatives

HOME Program:
- HOME Investment Partnership
- Downpayment Assistance Initiative

HOPE VI

Brownfields Redevelopment

Self Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity:
- Capacity Building
- Housing Assistance Council
- Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program
- National Housing Development Corporation
- Homeless Assistance Grants
- Housing for the Elderly
- Housing for Persons with Disabilities

FHA General and Special Risk Program Account:
- Limitation on Guaranteed Loans
- Limitation on Direct Loans
- Credit Subsidy
- Administrative Expenses

GNMA Mortgage Backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account:
- Limitation on Guaranteed Loans
- Administrative Expenses
- Policy Development and Research
- Fair Housing Activities, Fair Housing Program
- Lead Hazards Reduction Program
- Salaries and Expenses

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 12, 2007, the Committee ordered reported an original bill (S. 1789) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with the bill subject to amendment and subject to the budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 29–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	

Ms. Landrieu
Mr. Reed
Mr. Lautenberg
Mr. Nelson
Mr. Cochran
Mr. Stevens
Mr. Specter
Mr. Domenici
Mr. Bond
Mr. McConnell
Mr. Shelby
Mr. Gregg
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Craig
Mrs. Hutchison
Mr. Brownback
Mr. Allard
Mr. Alexander

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 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 8—LOW-INCOME HOUSING

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROGRAM OF ASSISTED HOUSING

* * * * * * *

§ 1437v. Demolition, site revitalization, replacement housing, and tenant-based assistance grants for projects

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(m) Funding

(1) Authorization of appropriations

There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section $574,000,000 for fiscal year [2003] *2008*.

* * * * * * *

(o) Sunset

No assistance may be provided under this section after [September 30, 2007] *September 30, 2008*.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 49—TRANSPORTATION

* * * * * * *

SUBTITLE VII—AVIATION PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

PART A—AIR COMMERCE AND SAFETY

* * * * * * *

SUBPART III—SAFETY

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 443—INSURANCE

* * * * * * *

§ 44302. General authority

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) EXTENSION OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall extend through August 31, [2006,] *2008,* and may extend through December 31, [2006,] *2008,* the termination date of any insurance policy that the Department of Transportation issued to an air carrier under subsection (a) and that is in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection on no less favorable terms to the air carrier than existed on June 19, 2002; except that the Secretary shall amend the insurance policy, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, to add coverage for losses or injuries to aircraft hulls, passengers, and crew at the limits carried by air carriers for such losses and injuries as of such date of enactment and at an additional premium comparable to the premium charged for third-party casualty coverage under such policy.

* * * * * * *

§ 44303. Coverage

(a) * * *

(b) AIR CARRIER LIABILITY FOR THIRD PARTY CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF ACTS OF TERRORISM.—For acts of terrorism committed on or to an air carrier during the period beginning on September 22,

2001, and ending on December 31, [2006,] *2008,* the Secretary may certify that the air carrier was a victim of an act of terrorism and in the Secretary's judgment, based on the Secretary's analysis and conclusions regarding the facts and circumstances of each case, shall not be responsible for losses suffered by third parties (as referred to in section 205.5(b)(1) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations) that exceed $100,000,000, in the aggregate, for all claims by such parties arising out of such act. If the Secretary so certifies, the air carrier shall not be liable for an amount that exceeds $100,000,000, in the aggregate, for all claims by such parties arising out of such act, and the Government shall be responsible for any liability above such amount. No punitive damages may be awarded against an air carrier (or the Government taking responsibility for an air carrier under this subsection) under a cause of action arising out of such act. The Secretary may extend the provisions of this subsection to an aircraft manufacturer (as defined in section 44301) of the aircraft of the air carrier involved.

* * * * * * *

§ 44310. Ending effective date

The authority of the Secretary of Transportation to provide insurance and reinsurance under this chapter is not effective after [March 30, 2008] *December 31, 2008*.

* * * * * * *

McKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 209. TERMINATION.

The Council shall cease to exist, and the requirements of this title shall terminate, on October 1, [2007] *2008*.

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

* * * * * * *

"RENTAL HOUSING INSURANCE

"SEC. 207. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

[“(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

"(3)(A) not to exceed, for such part of the property or projects as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior and land improvements as defined by the Secretary), $38,025 per family unit without bedroom, $42,120 per family

unit with one bedroom, $50,310 per family unit with two bedrooms, $62,010 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $70,200 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, or not to exceed $17,460 per space; except that as to projects to consist of elevator-type structures the Secretary may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitations per family unit to not to exceed $43,875 per family unit without a bedroom, $49,140 per family unit with one bedroom, $60,255 per family unit with two bedrooms, $75,465 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $85,328 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator type structures of sound standards of construction and design; and except that the Secretary may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations contained in this paragraph by not to exceed ⟦140 percent⟧ *170 percent* in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed ⟦140 percent⟧ *170 percent*, or ⟦170 percent in high cost areas⟧ *215 percent in high cost areas*, where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis, but in no case may any such increase exceed 90 percent where the Secretary determines that a mortgage purchased or to be purchased by the Government National Mortgage Association in implementing its special assistance functions under section 305 of this Act (as such section existed immediately before November 30, 1983) is involved.

* * * * * * *

"'COOPERATIVE HOUSING INSURANCE

"'SEC. 213. (a) * * *

"'(b) * * *

⟦"'(1)

"'(2)(A) not to exceed, for such part of the property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior land improvements as defined by the Secretary), $41,207 per family unit without a bedroom, $47,511 per family unit with one bedroom, $57,300 per family unit with two bedrooms, $73,343 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $81,708 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, and not to exceed 98 per centum of the amount which the Secretary estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided,* That as to projects to consist of elevator-type structures the Secretary may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitations per family unit to not to exceed $43,875 per family unit without a bedroom, $49,710 per family unit with one bedroom, $60,446 per family unit with two bedrooms, $78,197 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $85,836 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher cost incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design; (B)(i) the Secretary may, by regulation, increase any of the dollar amount limitations in subparagraph (A) (as such limitations

may have been adjusted in accordance with section 206A of this Act) by not to exceed [140 percent] *170 percent* in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed [140 percent] *170 percent*, or [170 percent in high cost areas] *215 percent in high cost areas*, where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis, but in no case may any such increase exceed 90 percent where the Secretary determines that a mortgage purchased or to be purchased by the Government National Mortgage Association in implementing its special assistance functions under section 305 of this Act (as such section existed immediately before November 30, 1983) is involved; and (ii) in the case of a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) the mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 per centum of the amount which the Secretary estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed; and (iii) upon the sale of a property or project by a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) to a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation or trust within two years after the completion of such property or project the mortgage given to finance such sale shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed the maximum amount computed in accordance with this subparagraph (B)(i)..

* * * * * * *

"'REHABILITATION AND NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION HOUSING INSURANCE

"'SEC. 220. (a) * * *

"'(d) * * *

"'(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

"'(3) * * *

"'(A)(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

"'(B)

"'(ii) * * *

"'(iii)(I) not to exceed, for such part of the property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior land improvements as defined by the Secretary), $38,025 per family unit without a bedroom, $42,120 per family unit with one bedroom, $50,310 per family unit with two bedrooms, $62,010 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $70,200 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, except that as to projects to consist of elevator-type structures the Secretary may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitations per family unit not to exceed $43,875 per family unit without a bedroom, $49,140 per family unit with one bedroom, $60,255 per family unit with two bedrooms, $75,465 per family unit with

three bedrooms, and $85,328 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design; and (II) with respect to rehabilitation projects involving not more than five family units, the Secretary may by regulation increase by 25 per centum any of the dollar amount limitations in subparagraph (B)(iii)(I) (as such limitations may have been adjusted in accordance with section 206A of this Act) which are applicable to units with two, three, or four or more bedrooms; (III) the Secretary may, by regulation, increase the dollar amount limitations contained in subparagraph (B)(iii)(I) (as such limitations may have been adjusted in accordance with section ⟦206A of this Act)) by not to exceed 110 percent in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed 140 percent where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis⟧ *206A of this Act) by not to exceed 170 percent in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed 170 percent, or 215 percent in high cost areas, where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis*, but in no case may any such increase exceed 90 percent where the Secretary determines that a mortgage purchased or to be purchased by the Government National Mortgage Association in implementing its special assistance functions under section 305 of this Act (as such section existed immediately before November 30, 1983) is involved); (IV) That nothing contained in this subparagraph (B)(iii)(I) shall preclude the insurance of mortgages covering existing multifamily dwellings to be rehabilitated or reconstructed for the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section; (V) the Secretary may further increase any of the dollar limitations which would otherwise apply to such projects by not to exceed 20 per centum if such increase is necessary to account for the increased cost of the project due to the installation therein of a solar energy system (as defined in subparagraph (3) of the last paragraph of section 2(a) of this Act) or residential energy conservation measures (as defined in section 210(11)(A) through (G) and (I) of Public Law 95–619) in cases where the Secretary determines that such measures are in addition to those required under the minimum property standards and will be cost-effective over the life of the measure; and

* * * * * * *

"'HOUSING FOR MODERATE INCOME AND DISPLACED FAMILIES

"'SEC. 221. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

"'(d) * * *

"'(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

"'(3) * * *

[" '(i)

" '(ii)(I) not exceed, for such part of the property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior land improvements as defined by the Secretary), $42,048 per family unit without a bedroom, $48,481 per family unit with one bedroom, 58,469 per family unit with two bedrooms, $74,840 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $83,375 per family unit with four or more bedrooms; except that as to projects to consist of elevator-type structures the Secretary may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitations per family unit to not to exceed $44,250 per family unit without a bedroom, $50,724 per family unit with one bedroom, $61,680 per family unit with two bedrooms, $79,793 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $87,588 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design; (II) the Secretary may, by regulation, increase any of the dollar amount limitations in subclause (I) (as such limitations may have been adjusted in accordance with section 206A of this Act) by not to exceed [140 percent] *170 percent* in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed [140 percent] *170 percent*, or [170 percent in high cost areas] *215 percent in high cost areas*, where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis, but in no case may any such increase exceed 90 percent where the Secretary determines that a mortgage purchased or to be purchased by the Government National Mortgage Association in implementing its special assistance functions under section 305 of this Act (as such section existed immediately before November 30, 1983) is involved; and

* * * * * * *

"'(4) * * *

"'

[" '(i)

" '(ii)(I) not exceed, or such part of the property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior land improvements as defined by the Secretary), $37,843 per family unit without a bedroom, $42,954 per family unit with one bedroom, $51,920 per family unit with two bedrooms, $65,169 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $73,846 per family unit with four or more bedrooms; except that as to projects to consist of elevator-type structures the Secretary may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitations per family unit to not to exceed $40,876 per family unit without a bedroom, $46,859 per family unit with one bedroom, $56,979 per

family unit with two bedrooms, $73,710 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $80,913 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design; (II) the Secretary may, by regulation, increase any of the dollar limitations in subclause (I) (as such limitations may have been adjusted in accordance with section 206A of this Act) by not to exceed [140 percent] *170 percent* in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed [140 percent] *170 percent*, or [170 percent in high cost areas] *215 percent in high cost areas*, where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis, but in no case may any such increase exceed 90 percent where the Secretary determines that a mortgage purchased or to be purchased by the Government National Mortgage Association in implementing its special assistance functions under section 305 of this Act (as such section existed immediately before November 30, 1983) is involved;

* * * * * * *

"'HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

"'SEC. 231. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

"'(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage to provide housing for elderly persons shall—

["'(1)

"'(2)(A) not to exceed, for such part of the property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior land improvement as defined by the Secretary), $35,978 per family unit without a bedroom, $40,220 per family unit with one bedroom, $48,029 per family unit with two bedrooms, $57,798 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $67,950 per family unit with four or more bedrooms; except that as to projects to consist of elevator-type structures the Secretary may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitations per family unit to not to exceed $40,876 per family unit without a bedroom, $46,859 per family unit with one bedroom, $56,979 per family unit with two bedrooms, $73,710 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $80,913 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design; (B) the Secretary may, by regulation, increase any of the dollar limitations in subparagraph (A) (as such limitations may have been adjusted in accordance with section 206A of this Act) by not to exceed [140 percent] *170 percent* in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed [140 percent] *170 percent*, or [170 percent in high cost areas] *215 percent in high cost areas*, where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis, but in no case may any such increase exceed 90 percent where

the Secretary determines that a mortgage purchased or to be purchased by the Government National Mortgage Association in implementing its special assistance functions under section 305 of this Act (as such section existed immediately before November 30, 1983) is involved; (C) the Secretary may, by regulation, increase any of the dollar limitations in subparagraph (A) (as such limitations may have been adjusted in accordance with section 206A of this Act) by not to exceed 20 per centum if such increase is necessary to account for the increased cost of the project due to the installation therein of a solar energy system (as defined in subparagraph (3) of the last paragraph of section 2(a) of this Act) or residential energy conservation measures (as defined in section 210(11) (A) through (G) and (I) of Public Law 95–619) in cases where the Secretary determines that such measures are in addition to those required under the minimum property standards and will be cost-effective over the life of the measure;

* * * * * * *

"'MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CONDOMINIUMS

"'SEC. 234. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

"'(e) * * *

[**]**"'(1)

* * * * * * *

"'(3)(A) not to exceed, for such part of the project as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior land improvements as defined by the Secretary), $42,048 per family unit without a bedroom, $48,481 per family unit with one bedroom, $58,469 per family unit with two bedrooms, $74,840 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $83,375 per family unit with four or more bedrooms; except that as to projects to consist of elevator-type structures the Secretary may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitations per family unit to not to exceed $44,250 per family unit without a bedroom, $50,724 per family unit with one bedroom, $61,680 per family unit with two bedrooms, $79,793 per family unit with three bedrooms, and $87,588 per family unit with four or more bedrooms, as the case may be, to compensate for higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design; (B) the Secretary may, by regulation, increase any of the dollar limitations in subparagraph (A) (as such limitations may have been adjusted in accordance with section 206A of this Act) by not to exceed [**]140 percent[**] *170 percent* in any geographical area where the Secretary finds that cost levels so require and by not to exceed [**]140 percent[**] *170 percent*, or [**]170 percent in high cost areas[**] *215 percent in high cost areas*, where the Secretary determines it necessary on a project-by-project basis, but in no case may any such increase exceed 90 percent where the Secretary determines that a mortgage purchased or to be purchased by the Government National Mortgage Association in implementing

its special assistance functions under section 305 of this Act (as such section existed immediately before November 30, 1983) is involved; and

* * * * * * *

UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

* * * * * * *

"SEC. 9. PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL AND OPERATING FUNDS.

"(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

"(e) OPERATING FUND.—

"(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

"(2) FORMULA.—

"(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

"(C) TREATMENT OF SAVINGS.—

"(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

"(iii) TERM OF CONTRACT.—The total term of a contract described in clause (i) shall not exceed 20 years to allow longer payback periods for retrofits, including windows, heating system replacements, wall insulation, site-based generation, advanced energy savings technologies, including renewable energy generation, and other such retrofits.

(iv) EXISTING CONTRACTS.—The term of a contract described in clause (i) that, as of the date of enactment of this clause, is in repayment and has a term of not more than 12 years, may be extended to a term of not more than 20 years to permit additional energy conservation improvements without requiring the reprocurement of energy performance contractors.

* * * * * * *

FOURTH FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1986, PUBLIC LAW 99–190

* * * * * * *

(e) Such amounts as may be necessary for projects or activities provided for in the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1986, at a rate for operations and to the extent and in the manner provided for in the following Act; this subsection shall be effective as if it had been enacted into law as the regular appropriations Act:

An Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

SEC. 321. The Urban Mass Transportation Administration shall enter into a contract with the Southern California Rapid Transit District to conduct a study of the potential methane gas risks relating to the proposed alignment of the Metro Rail project beyond the Minimum Operable Segment, MOS–1. [None of the funds described in section 320 may be made available for any segment of the downtown Los Angeles to San Fernando Valley Metro Rail project unless and until the Southern California Rapid Transit District officially notifies and commits to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration that no part of the Metro Rail project will tunnel into or through any zone designated as a potential risk zone or high potential risk zone in the report of the City of Los Angeles dated June 10, 1985, entitled "Task Force Report on the March 24, 1985 Methane Gas Explosion and Fire in the Fairfax Area".] Funds for this study, in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000, shall be made available from funds previously allocated for the MOS–1 project, commencing within 30 days of enactment.

* * * * * * *

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 the budget resolution for 2008: Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies:				
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Discretionary	51,063	51.063	114,627	[1] 114,621
Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2008	.....	.....	.....	[2] 43,606
2009	.....	.....	.....	31,620
2010	.....	.....	.....	14,643
2011	.....	.....	.....	6,499
2012 and future years	.....	.....	.....	6,952
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2008	NA	27,052	NA	27,870

[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 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	84,552	96,197	95,197	+10,645	−1,000
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,191)		(2,314)	(+123)	(+2,314)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(697)		(737)	(+40)	(+737)
Office of the General Counsel	(15,148)		(18,719)	(+3,571)	(+18,719)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(11,635)		(11,874)	(+239)	(+11,874)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(8,465)		(10,417)	(+1,952)	(+10,417)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,291)		(2,384)	(+93)	(+2,384)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(21,880)		(24,008)	(+2,128)	(+24,008)
Office of Public Affairs	(1,908)		(1,988)	(+80)	(+1,988)
Executive Secretariat	(1,441)		(1,535)	(+94)	(+1,535)
Board of Contract Appeals	(696)			(−696)	
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,264)		(1,335)	(+71)	(+1,335)
Office of Intelligence and Security	(2,041)			(−2,041)	
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(11,801)		(11,587)	(−214)	(+11,587)
Office of emergency transportation	(3,089)			(−3,089)	
Office of Intelligence Security and Emergency Response			(8,299)	(+8,299)	(+8,299)
Undesignated pay raise	(501)			(−501)	
Subtotal	(84,552)	(96,197)	(95,197)	(+10,645)	(−1,000)
Office of Civil Rights	8,527	9,141	9,141	+614	
Rescission of excess compensation for air carriers	−50,000	−22,000	−22,000	+28,000	
Transportation planning, research, and development	14,893	9,115	14,115	−778	+5,000
Working capital fund	(118,014)		(128,094)	(+10,080)	(+128,094)
Minority business resource center program	893	891	891	−2	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)		
Minority business outreach	2,970	2,970	2,970		
New headquarters building	49,500			−49,500	

Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	59,400	.....	60,000	+600	+60,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	170,735	96,314	160,314	−10,421	+64,000
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	8,374,217	.....	8,761,783	+387,566	+8,761,783
Air traffic organization	(6,704,223)	.....	(6,964,813)	(+260,590)	(+6,964,813)
Aviation Safety	(997,718)	.....	(1,092,103)	(+94,385)	(+1,092,103)
Commercial Space Transportation	(11,641)	.....	(12,837)	(+1,196)	(+12,837)
Financial Services	(76,175)	.....	(103,849)	(+27,674)	(+103,849)
Human Resource Management	(85,313)	.....	(91,214)	(+5,901)	(+91,214)
Region and Center Operations	(275,156)	.....	(290,872)	(+15,716)	(+290,872)
Staff Offices	(144,617)	.....	(166,542)	(+21,925)	(+166,542)
Information Services	(35,907)	.....	(39,552)	(+3,645)	(+39,552)
Undistributed pay raise	(43,467)	.....	.....	(−43,467)	.....
Subtotal	(8,374,217)	.....	(8,761,783)	(+387,566)	(+8,761,783)
Safety and Operations	.....	1,879,453	.....	.....	−1,879,453
Air Traffic Organization	.....	9,307,896	.....	.....	−9,307,896
Facilities & equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,516,920	.....	2,516,920	.....	+2,516,920
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	130,234	140,000	148,800	+18,566	+8,800
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,399,000)	(4,300,000)	(4,399,000)	.....	(+99,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,514,500)	(2,750,000)	(3,514,500)	.....	(+764,500)
Small community air service development program	(10,000)	.....	(10,000)	.....	(+10,000)
Airport Cooperative Research Program	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	.....	.....
Airport Technology Research	(17,870)	(18,712)	(18,712)	(+842)	.....
2007 F&E Pop-up contract authority	596,000	.....	.....	−596,000	.....
Rescission of contract authority (BY F&E Pop-up)	−596,000	.....	.....	+596,000	.....
Rescission of contract authority (prior yr Pop-up)	−25,000	.....	−185,500	−160,500	−185,500
Subtotal	(3,489,500)	(2,750,000)	(3,329,000)	(−160,500)	(+579,000)
War risk insurance program extension	−29,000	.....	−164,000	−135,000	−164,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	10,967,371	11,327,349	11,078,003	+110,632	−249,346
Appropriations	(11,588,371)	(11,327,349)	(11,263,503)	(−324,868)	(−63,846)
Rescissions of contract authority	(−621,000)	.....	(−185,500)	(+435,500)	(−185,500)
Limitations on obligations)	(3,514,500)	(2,750,000)	(3,514,500)	.....	(+764,500)
Total budgetary resources	(14,481,871)	(14,077,349)	(14,592,503)	(+110,632)	(+515,154)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses	(360,992)	(384,556)	(377,556)	(+16,564)	(−7,000)
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(36,032,344)	(38,000,000)	(40,965,051)	(+4,932,707)	(+2,965,051)
(Limitation on obligations)	(39,086,465)	(39,585,075)	(40,216,051)	(+1,129,586)	(+630,976)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	.....	.....
(Transfer to NHTSA)	(−121,232)	.....	.....	(+121,232)	.....
Congestion reduction initiative (leg. proposal)	.....	(175,000)	.....	.....	(−175,000)
Pay raise (Sec. 111 of Public Law110–5)	2,794	.....	.....	−2,794	.....
Appalachian development highway system	19,800	.....	20,000	+200	+20,000
Delta Regional Authority	.....	.....	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Rescission of contract authority (Hwy Trust Fund)	−3,471,582	−1,317,000	−2,890,000	+581,582	−1,573,000
Rescission of exempt contract authority (HTF)	.....	−52,000	.....	.....	+52,000
Miscellaneous appropriations (rescission)	.....	−149,000	.....	.....	+149,000
Miscellaneous highway trust funds (rescission)	.....	−260,469	.....	.....	+260,469
2008 rescission of revenue-aligned budget authority	.....	−630,976	.....	.....	+630,976
Administration (rescission of contract authority)	.....	.....	−43,359	−43,359	−43,359
TIFIA (rescission of contract authority)	.....	.....	−187,146	−187,146	−187,146
Total, Federal Highway Administration	−3,448,988	−2,409,445	−3,080,505	+368,483	−671,060
Appropriations	(22,594)	.....	(40,000)	(+17,406)	(+40,000)
Rescissions	.....	(−1,040,445)	.....	.....	(+1,040,445)
Rescissions of contract authority	(−3,471,582)	(−1,369,000)	(−3,120,505)	(+351,077)	(−1,751,505)
Limitations on obligations)	(39,086,465)	(39,585,075)	(40,216,051)	(+1,129,586)	(+630,976)
Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	.....	.....
Transfer out)	(−121,232)	.....	.....	(+121,232)	.....
Total budgetary resources	(36,255,245)	(37,914,630)	(37,874,546)	(+1,619,301)	(−40,084)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor carrier safety operations and programs (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(223,000)	(228,000)	(231,470)	(+8,470)	(+3,470)
(Limitation on obligations)	(223,000)	(228,000)	(231,470)	(+8,470)	(+3,470)

Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(294,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(+6,000)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(294,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(+6,000)	.....
Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	−11,260	−11,260	−11,260
National Motor Carrier Safety Program (HTF): Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	−5,213	−5,213	−5,213
Motor Carrier Safety (HTF): Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	−32,188	−32,188	−32,188
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Admin	.....	.....	−48,661	−48,661	−48,661
(Limitations on obligations)	(517,000)	(528,000)	(531,470)	(+14,470)	(+3,470)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research (general fund)	.....	.....	124,406	+124,406	+124,406
Operations and research (Highway trust fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(107,750)	(229,750)	(107,750)	.....	(−122,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(107,750)	(229,750)	(107,750)	.....	(−122,000)
(Transfer from FHWA)	(121,232)	.....	.....	(−121,232)	.....
Subtotal, Operations and research	(228,982)	(229,750)	(232,156)	(+3,174)	(+2,406)
National Driver Register (Highway trust fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	.....	.....
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(587,750)	(599,250)	(599,250)	(+11,500)	.....
(Limitation on obligations):					
Highway safety programs (Sec. 402)	(220,000)	(225,000)	(225,000)	(+5,000)	.....
Occupant protection incentive grants (Sec. 405)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	.....	.....
Safety belt performance grants (Sec. 406)	(124,500)	(124,500)	(124,500)	.....	.....
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (Sec. 410)	(125,000)	(131,000)	(131,000)	(+6,000)	.....
State traffic safety information system improvement grants (Sec. 408)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	.....	.....
High visibility enforcement	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	.....	.....
Child safety and booster seat grants	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	.....	.....
Motorcyclist safety	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	.....	.....
Grant administration	(17,750)	(18,250)	(18,250)	(+500)	.....
Operations and Research: Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	−12,197	−12,197	−12,197
National Driver Register: Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	−120	−120	−120
National Highway Traffic Safety Grants: Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	−10,529	−10,529	−10,529
Subtotal	(587,750)	(599,250)	(576,404)	(−11,346)	(−22,846)
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin	.....	.....	101,560	+101,560	+101,560
(Limitations on obligations)	(699,500)	(833,000)	(711,000)	(+11,500)	(−122,000)
(by transfer)	(121,232)	.....	.....	(−121,232)	.....
Total budgetary resources	(820,732)	(833,000)	(812,560)	(−8,172)	(−20,440)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and operations	150,271	148,472	151,186	+915	+2,714
Railroad research and development	34,524	32,250	36,250	+1,726	+4,000
Intercity Passenger Rail Grant Program (leg proposal)		100,000			−100,000
Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment (rescission)		−9,000			+9,000
Capital assistance to States—Intercity Passenger Rail Service			100,000	+100,000	+100,000
National Railroad Passenger Corporation					
Operating subsidy grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	490,050		485,000	−5,050	+485,000
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	772,200	500,000	885,000	+112,800	+385,000
Efficiency incentive grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation	31,300	300,000		−31,300	−300,000
Total, National Railroad Passenger Corporation	1,293,550	800,000	1,370,000	+76,450	+570,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,478,345	1,071,722	1,657,436	+179,091	+585,714
Appropriations	(1,478,345)	(1,080,722)	(1,657,436)	(+179,091)	(+576,714)
Rescissions		(−9,000)			(+9,000)
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses, general fund	85,000	89,300	88,795	+3,795	−505
Office of the Administrator	(1,063)		(910)	(−153)	(+910)
Office of Chief Counsel	(4,273)		(4,545)	(+272)	(+4,545)
Office of Civil Rights	(3,272)		(3,235)	(−37)	(+3,235)
Office of Communications and Congressional Affairs	(1,394)		(1,480)	(+86)	(+1,480)
Office of Budget and Policy	(9,259)		(10,858)	(+1,599)	(+10,858)
Office of Planning	(4,718)		(4,458)	(−260)	(+4,458)
Office of Program Management	(8,403)		(8,741)	(+338)	(+8,741)
Office of Demonstration and Innovation	(4,876)		(4,944)	(+68)	(+4,944)
Office of Administration	(7,654)		(6,354)	(−1,300)	(+6,354)
Central Account	(17,668)		(20,719)	(+3,051)	(+20,719)

Regional offices	(22,420)	.....	(22,551)	(+131)	(+22,551)
Subtotal	(85,000)	(89,300)	(88,795)	(+3,795)	(−505)
Formula and Bus Grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(7,262,775)	(7,871,895)	(7,872,893)	(+610,118)	(+998)
Formula and Bus Grants (rescission)	.....	.....	−28,661	−28,661	−28,661
Subtotal	(7,262,775)	(7,871,895)	(7,844,232)	(+581,457)	(−27,663)
Research and University Research Centers	61,000	61,000	65,500	+4,500	+4,500
Trust fund share of expenses (Mass Transit Account, HTF) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,660,000)	(6,855,000)	(6,855,000)	(+2,195,000)	.....
Capital investment grants	1,566,000	1,399,818	1,566,000	.....	+166,182
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,712,000	1,550,118	1,691,634	−20,366	+141,516
(Limitations on obligations)	(7,262,775)	(7,871,895)	(7,872,893)	(+610,118)	(+998)
Total budgetary resources	(8,974,775)	(9,422,013)	(9,564,527)	(+589,752)	(+142,514)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	16,223	17,392	17,392	+1,169	.....
Maritime Administration					
Maritime security program	154,440	154,440	156,000	+1,560	+1,560
Operations and training	111,522	115,276	122,891	+11,369	+7,615
Ship disposal	20,790	20,000	18,000	−2,790	−2,000
Assistance for small shipyards	.....	.....	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Vessel operations revolving fund	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
War risk insurance revolving fund	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses	4,085	.....	3,408	−677	+3,408
Fund admin expenses with takedowns (leg. proposal)	.....	(3,408)	.....	.....	(−3,408)
Guarantee loans subsidy	.....	.....	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
National defense tank vessel program (rescission)	−74,400	.....	.....	+74,400	.....
Alteration of bridges	.....	5,650	.....	.....	−5,650
Ship construction (rescission)	−2,000	.....	−4,615	−2,615	−4,615
Total, Maritime Administration	214,437	295,366	325,684	+111,247	+30,318
Appropriations	(290,837)	(295,366)	(330,299)	(+39,462)	(+34,933)
Rescissions	(−76,400)	.....	(−4,615)	(+71,785)	(−4,615)
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Hazardous materials safety	26,723	27,003	27,003	+280	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Administrative expenses	18,031	17,491	17,491	−540	.....
Pipeline Safety Fund	.....	639	639	+639	.....
Subtotal	(44,754)	(45,133)	(45,133)	(+379)	.....
Pipeline safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	60,065	55,770	63,594	+3,529	+7,824
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	14,850	18,810	18,810	+3,960	.....
Subtotal	(74,915)	(74,580)	(82,404)	(+7,489)	(+7,824)
Emergency preparedness grants:					
Emergency preparedness fund	198	188	188	−10	.....
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund	(14,798)	(28,318)	(28,318)	(+13,520)	.....
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	134,665	148,219	156,043	+21,378	+7,824
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and development	7,736	12,000	12,000	+4,264	.....
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	64,043	66,400	66,400	+2,357	.....
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and expenses	26,313	23,085	25,000	−1,313	+1,915
Offsetting collections	−1,250	−1,250	−1,250	.....	.....
Total, Surface Transportation Board	25,063	21,835	23,750	−1,313	+1,915
Total, title I, Department of Transportation	11,326,832	12,168,952	12,132,732	+805,900	−36,220
Appropriations	(15,545,814)	(14,609,397)	(15,565,520)	(+19,706)	(+956,123)
Rescissions	(−126,400)	(−1,071,445)	(−55,276)	(+71,124)	(+1,016,169)

Rescission of contract authority	(−4,092,582)	(−1,369,000)	(−3,377,512)	(+715,070)	(−2,008,512)
(Limitations on obligations)	(51,080,240)	(51,571,378)	(52,845,914)	(+1,765,674)	(+1,274,536)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(121,232)	.....	.....	(−121,232)	.....
(Transfer out)	(−121,232)	.....	.....	(+121,232)	.....
Total budgetary resources	(63,146,072)	(64,479,330)	(65,717,646)	(+2,571,574)	(+1,238,316)
Transportation discretionary total	11,326,832	12,168,952	12,132,732	+805,900	−36,220
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	3,930	+3,930	+3,930
Executive Operations					
Salaries and expenses:					
Office of Hearings and Appeals	.....	.....	1,490	+1,490	+1,490
Office of Small and Disadvantages Business Utilization	.....	.....	510	+510	+510
Office of Chief Financial Officer	.....	.....	43,750	+43,750	+43,750
Office of General Counsel	.....	.....	86,820	+86,820	+86,820
Office of Chief Procurement Officer	.....	.....	13,500	+13,500	+13,500
Center for Faith-Based Initiatives	.....	.....	1,860	+1,860	+1,860
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations	.....	.....	2,670	+2,670	+2,670
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs	.....	.....	2,630	+2,630	+2,630
Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity	.....	.....	3,440	+3,440	+3,440
Total, Executive Operations	.....	.....	156,670	+156,670	+156,670
Administrative Activities					
Salaries and expenses:					
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	.....	.....	1,480	+1,480	+1,480
Administration salaries and expenses	.....	.....	252,010	+252,010	+252,010
Office of Departmental Operations and Coordination	.....	.....	12,520	+12,520	+12,520
Office of Field Policy and Management	.....	.....	47,730	+47,730	+47,730
Total, Administrative Activities	.....	.....	313,740	+313,740	+313,740

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Public and Indian Housing					
Salaries and expenses:					
Assistant Secretary For Public and Indian Housing	.....	.....	1,620	+1,620	+1,620
Housing salaries and expenses	.....	.....	188,340	+188,340	+188,340
Total, salaries and expenses	.....	.....	189,960	+189,960	+189,960
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Renewals	14,443,200	14,437,506	14,936,200	+493,000	+498,694
Tenant protection vouchers	149,300	150,000	150,000	+700	.....
Family self-sufficiency coordinators	47,500	48,000	50,000	+2,500	+2,000
Administrative fees	1,281,100	1,351,000	1,351,000	+69,900	.....
Incremental family unification vouchers	.....	.....	30,000	+30,000	+30,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing	.....	.....	75,000	+75,000	+75,000
Working capital fund	5,900	6,494	6,494	+594	.....
Subtotal	(15,927,000)	(15,993,000)	(16,598,694)	(+671,694)	(+605,694)
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 109–148)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Advance appropriations	4,193,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	+7,000	.....
Less appropriations from prior year advances	−4,200,000	−4,193,000	−4,193,000	+7,000	.....
Total, Tenant-based rental assistance	15,920,000	16,000,000	16,795,654	+875,654	+795,654
Project-based rental assistance:					
Renewals	5,829,303	5,522,810	5,522,810	−306,493	.....
Contract administrators	145,728	286,230	286,230	+140,502	.....
Working capital fund	1,386	3,960	3,960	+2,574	.....
Total, Project-based rental assistance	5,976,417	5,813,000	5,813,000	−163,417	.....
Public Housing Capital Fund	2,438,964	2,024,000	2,500,000	+61,036	+476,000
Public Housing Operating Fund	3,864,000	4,000,000	4,200,000	+336,000	+200,000

Revitalization of severely distressed public housing	99,000	.....	100,000	+1,000	+100,000
Rescission	.....	−99,000	.....	.....	+99,000
Native American housing block grants	623,700	626,965	630,000	+6,300	+3,035
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	6,000	7,450	7,450	+1,450	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(116,276)	(367,000)	(367,000)	(+250,724)	.....
Native Hawaiian housing block grant	8,727	5,940	9,000	+273	+3,060
Native Hawaiian loan guarantee fund program account	891	1,044	1,044	+153	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(35,714)	(41,504)	(41,504)	(+5,790)	.....
Total, Public and Indian Housing	28,937,699	28,379,399	30,056,148	+1,118,449	+1,676,749
Community Planning and Development					
Salaries and expenses:					
Assistant Secretary for Community and Planning Development	.....	.....	1,520	+1,520	+1,520
Community Planning and Development salaries and expenses	.....	.....	93,770	+93,770	+93,770
Total, Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	95,290	+95,290	+95,290
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	286,110	300,100	300,100	+13,990	.....
Rural housing and economic development	16,830	.....	17,000	+170	+17,000
Community development fund	3,771,900	3,036,570	4,060,000	+288,100	+1,023,430
Section 108 loan guarantees:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(137,500)	.....	(275,000)	(+137,500)	(+275,000)
Credit subsidy	2,970	.....	6,000	+3,030	+6,000
Administrative expenses	743	.....	.....	−743	.....
Brownfields redevelopment	9,900	.....	10,000	+100	+10,000
HOME investment partnerships program	1,757,250	1,966,640	1,970,000	+212,750	+3,360
Homeless assistance grants	1,441,600	1,585,990	1,585,990	+144,390	.....
Self-help homeownership opportunity program	49,390	69,700	70,000	+20,610	+300
Total, Community Planning and Development	7,336,693	6,959,000	8,114,380	+777,687	+1,155,380
Housing Programs					
Salaries and expenses:					
Office of the Assistant Secretary For Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner	.....	.....	3,420	+3,420	+3,420
Housing salaries and expenses	.....	.....	351,560	+351,560	+351,560
Total, Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	354,980	+354,980	+354,980
Housing for the elderly	734,580	575,000	735,000	+420	+160,000
Housing for persons with disabilities	236,610	125,000	237,000	+390	+112,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Housing counseling assistance	.....	50,000	.....	.....	−50,000
Manufactured housing fees trust fund	13,000	16,000	16,000	+3,000	.....
Offsetting collections	−13,000	−13,000	−13,000	.....	.....
Offsetting collections (legislative proposal)	.....	−3,000	−3,000	−3,000	.....
Rental housing assistance	26,136	27,600	27,600	+1,464	.....
Total, Housing Programs	997,326	777,600	1,354,580	+357,254	+576,980
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA—Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	351,450	351,450	.....	−351,450	−351,450
Offsetting receipts	−176,000	.....	.....	+176,000	.....
Administrative contract expenses	61,974	77,400	77,400	+15,426	.....
FHA—General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(45,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(45,000,000)	.....	(+10,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	229,086	229,086	.....	−229,086	−229,086
Offsetting receipts	−476,000	−230,000	−230,000	+246,000	.....
Credit subsidy	8,712	8,600	8,600	−112	.....
Right of first refusal	.....	.....	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Non-overhead administrative expenses	71,181	78,111	78,111	+6,930	.....
Administrative fee increase	.....	−20,000	−20,000	−20,000	.....
Move single-family programs to MMI (leg. proposal)	.....	22,000	.....	.....	−22,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	70,403	516,647	−80,889	−151,292	−597,536
Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)					
Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	9,530	+9,530	+9,530

Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(200,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(200,000,000)	.....	(+100,000,000)
Administrative expenses	10,700	11,000	.....	−10,700	−11,000
Consolidate admin expenses (Sec 312) (leg. proposal)	.....	(43,000)	.....	.....	(−43,000)
Offsetting receipts	−181,000	−163,000	−163,000	+18,000	.....
Move single-family prgms from GSRI (leg. proposal)	.....	−22,000	.....	.....	+22,000
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association	−170,300	−174,000	−153,470	+16,830	+20,530
Policy Development and Research					
Salaries and expenses:					
Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research	.....	.....	1,570	+1,570	+1,570
Policy Development and Research salaries and expenses	.....	.....	19,310	+19,310	+19,310
Total, Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	20,880	+20,880	+20,880
Research and technology	50,087	65,040	59,040	+8,953	−6,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Salaries and expenses:					
Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	.....	.....	1,490	+1,490	+1,490
Fair and Equal Opportunity salaries and expenses	.....	.....	69,390	+69,390	+69,390
Total, Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	70,880	+70,880	+70,880
Fair housing activities	45,540	45,000	52,000	+6,460	+7,000
Office of Lead Hazard Control					
Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	6,140	+6,140	+6,140
Lead hazard reduction	150,480	116,000	151,000	+520	+35,000
Total, Office of Lead Hazard Control	150,480	116,000	157,140	+6,660	+41,140
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses	581,108	654,092	.....	−581,108	−654,092
GSE regulator/HUD oversight (leg. proposal)	.....	−4,000	.....	.....	+4,000
Transfer from:					
Limitation on FHA corporate funds	(562,400)	(556,776)	.....	(−562,400)	(−556,776)
GNMA	(10,700)	(10,700)	.....	(−10,700)	(−10,700)
Community Development Loan Guarantees Program	(750)	.....	.....	(−750)	.....
Native American Housing Block Grants	(150)	(149)	.....	(−150)	(−149)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2007 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2007 appropriation	Budget estimate
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program	(250)	(248)	.....	(−250)	(−248)
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantees	(35)	(35)	.....	(−35)	(−35)
Subtotal	(1,155,393)	(1,218,000)	.....	(−1,155,393)	(−1,218,000)
Working capital fund	195,356	220,000	175,000	−20,356	−45,000
Office of Inspector General	81,853	88,240	112,000	+30,147	+23,760
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(23,760)	(23,760)	.....	(−23,760)	(−23,760)
Subtotal	(105,613)	(112,000)	(112,000)	(+6,387)	.....
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight	60,000	66,000	66,000	+6,000	.....
Offsetting receipts	−60,000	−66,000	−66,000	−6,000	.....
Total, Management and Administration	858,317	958,332	287,000	−571,317	−671,332
Rescissions:					
Housing certificate fund	−1,650,000	−1,300,000	−1,100,000	+550,000	+200,000
Rental housing assistance (rescission)	.....	−27,600	−27,600	−27,600	.....
Brownfields Redevelopment	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Community Development Fund	.....	−356,400	.....	.....	+356,400
Subtotal	−1,650,000	−1,684,000	−1,127,600	+522,400	+556,400
FHA Proposals:					
Remove HECM cap/set nat'l loan limit	.....	−333,000	−512,000	−512,000	−179,000
Increase multifamily loan limit	.....	−14,000	−28,000	−28,000	−14,000
GNMA six basis point premium	.....	−15,000	.....	.....	+15,000
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development	36,626,245	35,597,018	38,744,429	+2,118,184	+3,147,411
Appropriations	(34,989,245)	(33,675,018)	(36,167,029)	(+1,177,784)	(+2,492,011)
Rescissions	(−1,650,000)	(−1,783,000)	(−1,127,600)	(+522,400)	(+655,400)
Advance appropriations	(4,193,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(+7,000)	.....

Emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Offsetting receipts	(−833,000)	(−413,000)	(−413,000)	(+420,000)	.....
Offsetting collections	(−73,000)	(−82,000)	(−82,000)	(−9,000)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(430,289,490)	(320,408,504)	(430,683,504)	(+394,014)	(+110,275,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(598,045)	(591,668)	.....	(−598,045)	(−591,668)
TITLE III—OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board	5,915	6,150	6,150	+235	.....
Federal Maritime Commission	20,428	22,322	22,322	+1,894	.....
National Transportation Safety Board:					
Salaries and expenses	79,338	83,000	84,500	+5,162	+1,500
Rescission of unobligated balances	−1,000	.....	.....	+1,000	.....
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	116,820	119,800	119,800	+2,980	.....
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	1,788	2,320	2,300	+512	−20
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies	223,289	233,592	235,072	+11,783	+1,480
Grand total (net)	48,174,326	47,999,562	51,112,233	+2,937,907	+3,112,671
Appropriations	(50,759,348)	(48,518,007)	(51,967,621)	(+1,208,273)	(+3,449,614)
Emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	(−73,000)	(−82,000)	(−82,000)	(−9,000)	.....
Rescissions	(−1,727,400)	(−2,832,445)	(−1,160,876)	(+566,524)	(+1,671,569)
Rescission of contract authority	(−4,092,582)	(−1,369,000)	(−3,377,512)	(+715,070)	(−2,008,512)
Negative subsidy receipts	(−833,000)	(−413,000)	(−413,000)	(+420,000)	.....
Advance appropriations	(4,193,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(+7,000)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(51,080,240)	(51,571,378)	(52,845,914)	(+1,765,674)	(+1,274,536)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(121,232)	.....	.....	(−121,232)	.....
(Transfer out)	(−121,232)	.....	.....	(+121,232)	.....
Total budgetary resources	(99,995,606)	(100,309,940)	(104,697,147)	(+4,701,541)	(+4,387,207)

○