AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 482

111TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT 111–230

TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2011

JULY 23, 2010.—Ordered to be printed

Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2009

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3644]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 3644) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amounts of new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 2011

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	$67,888,173,000
Amount of 2010 appropriations	67,898,457,000
Amount of 2011 budget estimate	68,836,693,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2010 appropriations	−10,284,000
2011 budget estimate	−948,520,000

57–576 PDF

CONTENTS

	Page
Program, Project, and Activity	3
Reprogramming Guidelines	3
Congressional Budget Justifications	3
Title I: Department of Transportation:	
Office of the Secretary	6
Federal Aviation Administration	27
Federal Highway Administration	47
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	62
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	73
Federal Railroad Administration	81
Federal Transit Administration	89
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	102
Maritime Administration	104
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	109
Research and Innovative Technology Administration	113
Bureau of Transportation Statistics	115
Office of Inspector General	116
Surface Transportation Board	118
General Provisions—Department of Transportation	119
Title II: Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
Executive Direction	122
Administration, Operations, and Management	124
Personnel Compensation and Benefits	125
Public and Indian Housing	132
Community Planning and Development	145
Housing Programs	163
Federal Housing Administration	170
Government National Mortgage Association	173
Policy Development and Research	174
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	175
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control	177
Management and Administration	178
Administrative Provisions	182
Title III: Independent Agencies:	
Access Board	185
Federal Maritime Commission	186
National Railroad Passenger Corporation: Office of the Inspector General	187
National Transportation Safety Board	189
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	190
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	192
Title IV: General Provisions—This Act	195
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	197
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	198
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate	199
Budgetary Impact of Bill	207
Disclosure of Congressionally Directed Spending Items	207
Comparative Statement of Budget Authority	240

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2011, 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 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

Budget justifications 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 expects that all agencies funded under this act will heed this directive. 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 vital budget information that the Committee needs is not lost. Therefore, the Committee directs that justifications submitted with the fiscal year 2011 budget request by agencies funded under this act 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 2011 to the fiscal year 2010 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 2011 budget request.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Extension of Transportation Programs and the Solvency of the Highway Trust Fund.—For the second year in a row, the Committee notes that it is in the position of recommending funding levels for the highway, transit, and highway and motor carrier safety programs without any certainty that the necessary contract authority will be available for the whole of fiscal year 2011.

The administration still has not produced a proposal for the reauthorization of Federal surface transportation programs, but Congress has begun the work of developing legislation to reauthorize these important programs. Unfortunately, proposals and draft legislation do not produce the kind of stability that is required to keep these programs working. The use of short term extensions has only served to exacerbate the insecurity felt by State and local governments that rely on Federal transportation programs for investing in their communities.

In the meantime, the Committee again must fulfill its responsibility to recommend appropriate funding levels for offices and programs at the Department of Transportation. In order to put forward realistic funding recommendations, the Committee is assuming that the transportation programs will be extended through fiscal year 2011 at the levels authorized under the current extension law. This assumption is especially relevant for those programs that relay on contract authority provided in the authorization acts, including the Federal-aid highway program, the formula and bus transit programs, the programs of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and most funding for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

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 General Counsel; 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 Public Affairs, the Executive Secretariat, Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response, and Chief Information Officer. 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, 2010	$102,686,000
Budget estimate, 2011	124,623,000
Committee recommendation	113,961,000

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 as well as those of the assistant secretaries, and the general counsel.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of $113,961,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, including $60,000 for reception and representation expenses. The recommendation is $10,662,000 less than the budget request and $11,275,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The accompanying bill stipulates that none of the funding provided may be used for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

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 2010 enacted level and the budget estimate:

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 request	
Immediate Office of the Secretary	$2,631,000	$2,667,000	$2,667,000
Office of the Deputy Secretary	986,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Office of the General Counsel	20,359,000	19,711,000	20,211,000
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	11,100,000	13,568,000	16,568,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	10,559,000	20,022,000	11,216,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	2,504,000	2,530,000	2,200,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	25,520,000	25,695,000	25,695,000
Office of Public Affairs	2,055,000	2,240,000	1,800,000
Executive Secretariat	1,658,000	1,683,000	1,683,000
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	1,499,000	1,513,000	1,513,000
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	10,600,000	10,999,000	10,999,000
Office of the Chief Information Officer	13,215,000	22,995,000	18,409,000
Total, Salaries and Expenses	102,686,000	124,623,000	113,961,000

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 $2,667,000 for fiscal year 2011 for the Immediate Office of the Secretary. The recommendation is the same as the budget request and $36,000 greater than the fiscal year 2010 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 $1,000,000 for the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary, which is identical to the budget request and $14,000 greater than the fiscal year 2010 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 $20,211,000 for expenses of the Office of the General Counsel for fiscal year 2011. The recommended funding level is $500,000 more than the budget request and $148,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Efforts To Protect the Rights of Airline Passengers.—The Committee commends the Department for its efforts to protect the rights of airline passengers. The work of the Office of the General Counsel has resulted in significant enforcement actions as well as new rules that address a wide variety of consumer concerns, including tarmac delays, baggage fees, and bumped flights. In order to build on this record, the Committee recommendation includes an additional $500,000 for the Office of the General Counsel. The Committee continues to encourage the office to use its resources for activities that will most effectively increase the protection for air travel consumers.

ADA Rulemaking.—For the past 4 years, the Department has failed to issue final regulations to clarify compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] for commuter and intercity rail systems. In early 2006, the Department published a notice of proposed rulemaking [NPRM] to determine if ADA compliance requires commuter and intercity rail systems to provide level boarding between rail cars and station platforms. This NPRM represented a significant proposal by the Department because setting

a standard for level boarding would require extensive investments by rail systems. It would affect systems regulated by both the Federal Railroad Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. The Department has never followed its NPRM with a final rule.

The Committee acknowledges the proposed rule involves a number of complex issues, but without greater certainty on this matter, Amtrak and other rail systems will not be able to move forward on ADA compliance. Last year, the Committee put forth its expectation that all rail systems fully comply with the requirements of ADA and urged the Department to make progress on this issue. This year again, the Committee urges the Department to reach a resolution on level boarding so that it can publish a final regulation without further delay.

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 2011, the Committee recommends $16,568,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Policy. The recommended funding level is $3,000,000 more than the budget request and $6,468,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Programmatic Increases.—The administration has requested $2,304,000 for programmatic increases to the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation Policy. This funding increase includes $804,000 for six additional FTE to support the ongoing workload requirements of the office, including oversight and implementation of the TIGER program. The programmatic increase also includes $1,500,000 to staff the Transportation Counsel at the U.S. Embassy in Kabul and the Transportation Attaché for the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

In addition to requesting programmatic increases for the Policy office, the administration has requested $20,000,000 to establish a new Office of Livability within the Office of the Secretary. This funding total for the livability office includes $12,000,000 to provide grants and technical assistance to help State and local governments plan and execute transportation investments, $4,000,000 to develop benchmarks and performance measures to study the impact of transportation investments on livability, and $4,000,000 to cover the administrative costs of establishing a new office. The administration has requested 10 new positions for the new office.

The Committee appreciates the Department's efforts coordinate with the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of

Housing and Urban Development, as well as the Department's work to ensure that its programs support livability and do not contradict the needs of communities trying to achieve more livable results. The administration's partnership on sustainability goes against the natural tendencies of the Federal Government to segment its work into a series of separate programs, even though State and local governments do not have the luxury of thinking about housing, transportation and the environment without understanding the interaction among all of the issues.

The Committee also recognizes that the Policy office has offered strong guidance for the Department's work on sustainability. Because of this success, the Committee is not convinced that establishing a new livability office would be a responsible use of Federal funds. A distinct office for livability would require replicating all of the administration functions of the other OST offices, and it would also segregate the policy guidance related to sustainability from all the other guidance provided by the Policy office.

Although the Committee denies the Department's request for a new livability office, the Committee recommendation includes resources above the requested funding levels to support the Policy office in addressing its current workload and developing the sustainability initiative. Specifically, the Committee recommendation includes increases of $804,000 and six FTE to support the ongoing workload requirements of the office, $1,500,000 to staff the U.S. Embassies in Kabul and Baghdad, and $3,000,000 and five FTE to further the Department's livability initiative and develop the benchmarks and performance measures necessary to study the impact of transportation investments on sustainability.

Barriers List.—While generally impressed with the Department's work to support community livability, the Committee is sorely disappointed with the Department's unresponsiveness to the Committee's request for a list of Federal barriers to local sustainability efforts. The Committee asked the Department for a comprehensive list of provisions in Federal regulations and legislation that stand in the way of local communities who need to make coordinated decisions on housing and transportation. In short, the Committee asked to see the extent to which Federal programs were part of the problem for local communities rather than providing a solution.

Well over a year ago, Committee staff first requested this barriers list during a briefing with staff from the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. Committee staff were assured that the Departments had already been developing the list and would be able to provide it within a reasonable period of time. Since a final barriers list had not been forthcoming, the report accompanying the Committee's 2010 appropriations act reiterated the request. Finally, this past March, the Secretary faced direct questions about the list and testified that a final barriers list would be produced shortly. While the administration has forwarded working drafts of the barriers list, the Committee found such drafts to be incomplete, disorganized and entirely inadequate. Furthermore, at no point in time has the Department been able to explain the cause of its delays.

The Committee believes that identifying barriers in Federal regulations and legislation should lie at the heart of the administra-

tion's efforts to improve community livability. The list of barriers in Federal law should provide Congress with a valuable tool as it considers legislation to reauthorize the Federal surface transportation programs. The list of barriers in Federal regulation will give Congress a benchmark against which to independently track the administration's progress on sustainability. Finally, the production of this list in and of itself would provide proof that the administration has thoroughly investigated the issue.

Unfortunately, the administration's track record does little to illustrate that the administration shares the Committee's interest in the matter. The administration has expended significant resources in developing new initiatives and requesting additional funds for promoting sustainability, and yet has not completed the simple task of communicating how well Federal programs support local initiatives.

The Committee now repeats its direction to the Department to work with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to produce a comprehensive list of provisions in Federal regulation and law that act as a barrier to local efforts to coordinate housing and transportation investment. This list must include a brief description of the barrier, specific citations in the Code of Federal Regulations and public law, and an explanation of how the particular provision acts as a barrier to coordination between housing and transportation at the local level. The Committee underlines the importance of having each item in the list relate to specific citations in Federal regulations and public law so that the list can act as a working document for the Committee as well as the administration. The Committee understands that the administration may want to include other kinds of barriers on the list—such as the lack of available data—but the Committee believes that these items are extraneous to the Committees' request and therefore expects the administration to keep these barriers separate from the rest of the list. The Committee also instructs the Department to transmit a comprehensive list to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than May 15, 2011.

Transportation Improvements in Appalachia.—The Committee understands that the Department is cooperating with appropriate Federal, regional, State and local entities to help diversify and strengthen the Appalachian regional economy. The Committee urges the Department to devote due attention to increasing the availability of technical and financial assistance, as well as transportation and land use planning capacity, to support economic diversification. The Committee encourages the Department to include consideration of transportation improvements that will help diversify the regional economy by supporting a growing tourism industry. The Committee requests a preliminary report 90 days after the date of enactment and a detailed report 1 year after the date of enactment on efforts by the Department to promote economic diversification in Appalachia.

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 $11,216,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs. The recommended level is $8,806,000 less than the budget request and $657,000 over the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee recommendation includes several funding increases requested by the Department, including $184,000 for an additional two FTE to improve oversight of the Department's growing portfolio of programs and activities, $183,000 for an additional two FTE to strengthen the budget office charged with managing the OST accounts, and $151,000 for contractual support for the Office of the CFO for OST to fulfill the requirements of the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act.

Acquisition Workforce Development.—The Committee recommendation does not include $7,623,000 requested by the Department to increase the Department's acquisition workforce capacity and capabilities. Under the Department's proposal, OST would transfer these funds to other accounts throughout the Department for the purpose of developing its acquisition workforce. The Committee agrees with the importance of investing in the Department's acquisition workforce, but has chosen to make those investments directly in the accounts that need the resources.

In addition, the Committee directs the Government Accountability Office [GAO] to analyze the Department's acquisition workforce and report its findings to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than December 31, 2011. The GAO's evaluation should include an assessment of the acquisition workforce of each agency within the Department of Transportation, including the Office of the Secretary; an evaluation of OST's current role in supporting and overseeing the acquisition workforce throughout the Department; and a presentation of the best practices that Federal departments have used to maintain their acquisition workforces, including a discussion of how those best practices could be used at the Department of Transportation.

Program Evaluation.—The Committee recommendation also does not include $1,000,000 requested by the Department to establish a new office for program evaluation. The Committee notes that several agencies currently provide objective analysis of the Depart-

ment's programs and activities, including the Office of the Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office. The Committee therefore is not convinced that a new source of program evaluations would justify the expense of a new office within OST.

Travel Expenses.—The Committee is concerned about the Department's spending on travel expenses. The Committee therefore directs the Inspector General to assess spending on travel across the Department, and to report its findings to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations by March 30, 2011. The Inspector General's assessment should distinguish among travel used for oversight, conferences, industry outreach, and other purposes.

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 $2,200,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs. The recommended level is $330,000 less than the budget request and $304,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 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 $25,695,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration. The recommended funding level is equal to the budget request and $175,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 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 mate-

rials. 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 $1,800,000 for the Office of Public Affairs, which is $440,000 less than the budget request and $255,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 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 $1,683,000 for the Executive Secretariat. The recommendation is identical to the budget request and $25,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

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 $1,513,000, an amount equal to the budget request and $14,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE, SECURITY, AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response ensures the development, coordination and execution of plans and procedures for the Department of Transportation to balance transportation security requirements with the safety, mobility and economic needs of the Nation. The office keeps the Secretary and his advisors apprised of current developments and long-range trends in international issues, including terrorism, aviation, trade, transportation markets, and trade agreements. The office also advises the Department's leaders on policy issues related to intelligence, threat information sharing, national security strategies and national preparedness and response planning.

To ensure the Department is able to respond in disasters, the office prepares for and coordinates the Department's participation in national and regional exercises and training for emergency personnel. The office also administers the Department's Continuity of Government and Continuity of Operations programs and initiatives. Additionally, the office provides direct emergency response and recovery support through the National Response Framework and operates the Department's Crisis Management Center. The center 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 $10,999,000 for the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response. The recommendation is equal to the request and $399,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $18,409,000, which is $4,586,000 less than the budget request and $5,194,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The budget request includes $9,172,000 for programmatic increases for the OCIO. These increases include significant boosts to the office's workforce, including an additional position to create a chief information security officer, an additional position for a chief information officer for OST, an additional 13 positions for an application services group to plan the Department's investments in collaborative information technology, and an additional 10 positions for another group to plan for the Department's investments in all kinds of information technology.

The Committee applauds the Department for recognizing its need to invest more strategically in information technology. Even so, the requested increases to the OCIO staff are significant. The office currently has a total of 25 positions, and under the Department's budget request, this staffing level would double over the course of fiscal year 2011. Furthermore, the Committee recommendation provides the OCIO with additional staff increases for its Cyber Security Initiative.

The Committee therefore takes a more moderate approach to bolstering the OCIO workforce, with the belief that a slower hiring schedule will encourage the office to be deliberate in its hiring practices. The Committee recommendation includes $4,586,000 in its recommended funding level for programmatic increases for the OCIO. Under the recommended funding level, the Committee is providing an additional position for a chief information security officer, an additional position for a chief information officer for OST,

and an additional 11 positions for a single group to build strategy for the Departments investments in all kinds of information technology, including the information technology that promotes collaboration and networked activities.

TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 2010	$600,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	.....
Committee recommendation	800,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides grants and credit assistance to State and local governments, transit agencies or a collaboration of such entities for capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure that will have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area or a region. Eligible projects include highways and bridges, public transportation, freight and passenger rail, and port infrastructure. The Department awards grants on a competitive basis; however, the Department must ensure an equitable geographic distribution of funds and an appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural communities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes $800,000,000 for grants and credit assistance for investment in significant transportation projects, which is $200,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The administration requested no funds for this program. This program offers an important source of funding for projects that are difficult to fund through the Department's formula grant programs. The Committee urges the Department to give priority consideration to applications for projects that would complete a larger, multi-phase effort, or that involve collaborations among more than one State.

Protections for Rural Areas.—The Committee continues to believe that our Federal infrastructure programs must benefit communities across the country. For this reason, the Committee continues to require the Secretary to award grants and credit assistance in a manner that ensures an equitable geographic distribution of funds and an appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural communities. The Committee also set aside funding for projects located in rural areas, and included specific provisions to match grant requirements with the needs of rural areas. In addition, the Committee has lowered the minimum size of a grant awarded to a rural area and increased the Federal share of the total project cost.

Infrastructure Fund.—The administration requested $4,000,000,000 to begin a program called the National Infrastructure Innovation and Finance Fund, or the Infrastructure Fund. This new program would award grants to transportation projects across a wide variety of modes, and base the grant awards on a set of merit-based criteria. This proposal resembles the request for $5,000,000,000 for a National Infrastructure Bank the administration submitted for fiscal year 2010.

The Committee shares the administration's desire to invest in essential transportation infrastructure, support a national system that includes all modes of transportation, and allow meritorious projects to compete based on the benefits they provide to the Nation, a region, or the local community. Although the Committee has not seen many details about how the Infrastructure Fund would operate, information that has been offered to the Committee still creates significant concerns about the administration's proposal.

The most significant concern is the unprecedented amount of discretion that the administration requests as a part of the Infrastructure Fund. Under the proposal, the administration would have the authority to fund specific transportation projects whether or not the project's sponsors submitted an application to the Department. The Committee believes that such expansive discretion in allocating Federal dollars could make the Infrastructure Fund vulnerable to abuse. In contrast, the Committee continues to include language that requires a national competition for funds, and has added provisions designed to strengthen the transparency and accountability of this competition.

It is also unclear the extent to which a new agency running the Infrastructure Fund would duplicate the resources and expertise at each of the modal administrations, or at other Departments if the administration proposed to expand the program beyond the scope of the Department of Transportation. As a result of these concerns, the Committee recommendation includes funding for the grant program funded under this heading rather than the Infrastructure Fund proposed by the administration.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CAPITAL

Appropriations, 2010	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	21,000,000
Committee recommendation	21,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Financial Management Capital program is a new multi-year business transformation initiative to streamline and standardize the financial systems and business processes across the Department of Transportation. The initiative includes upgrading and enhancing the commercial software used for DOT's financial systems, improving the cost and performance data provided to managers, implementing a budget line of business, and instituting new accounting standards and mandates.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is recommending $21,000,000 to support the Secretary's Financial Management Capital initiative, which is equal to the budget request and $16,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

OIG Evaluation.—The Committee appreciates the importance of revamping the Department's financial management capital, but is not convinced that the Department has shown evidence of the program's success to date. For this reason, the Committee directs the OIG to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the Department's investments in financial man-

agement capital by May 30, 2011. This report should provide an evaluation of the Department's investment plans and its progress to date in effectively carrying out its plans. The report should also include an assessment of the extent to which the investments being made today will offer the Department the flexibility to use its new financial management tools to address a variety of future needs, many of which the Department may not be able to anticipate at this time.

Funding from OST and the Modal Administrations.—The Committee continues to be interested in balancing the needs of OST and each of the modal administrations. For this reason, the Committee reminds the Secretary of language that continues to be included in the bill that limits OST's ability to approve new assessments or reimbursable agreements pertaining to funds appropriated to the modal administrations for new activities, unless a reprogramming of funds is requested and approved by the Committee. In addition, the Committee continues to direct OST to provide detailed justifications for this program in its fiscal year 2012 budget request, including the amount requested for OST and the amounts included in each of the individual budget requests from the modal administrations.

Period of Availability.—The Committee has included language to limit the availability of funding for this program to a period of four fiscal years. The Committee does not believe that providing an unlimited period of time would encourage the Department to manage its funds responsibly or complete its work in a timely manner.

CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE

Appropriations, 2010	.....
Budget estimate, 2011	$30,000,000
Committee recommendation	30,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Cyber Security Initiative is a new effort to close performance gaps in the Department's cyber security. The initiative includes support for essential program enhancements, infrastructure improvements and contractual resources to enhance the security of the Department's computer network and reduce the risk of security breaches.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000 to support the Secretary's Cyber Security Initiative, a funding level equal to the budget request. The fiscal year 2010 appropriations act included no funding for this activity.

OIG Evaluation.—The Committee commends the administration for its efforts to improve the security of its computer network. The administration has proposed a bold plan of action that is designed to help the Department anticipate potential compromises to its systems and prevent the loss of information, instead of constantly reacting to situations after they develop.

The Committee is concerned, however, that the Cyber Security Initiative represents a significant investment of resources in a highly technical field. For this reason, the Committee directs the

OIG to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the Cyber Security Initiative by May 15, 2011. This report should provide an evaluation of the Department's plan to improve cyber security, identify areas of risk in the initiative and the Department's plans to mitigate this risk, and assess the Department's plans to staff the initiative.

Period of Availability.—The Committee included language to limit the availability of funding for the initiative to a period of 4 fiscal years. The Committee does not believe that providing an unlimited period of time for the initiative would encourage the Department to manage its funds responsibly or complete its work in a timely manner. In addition, the Department has indicated that four years will be sufficient for the Department to complete its work on the initiative.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2010	$9,667,000
Budget estimate, 2011	9,767,000
Committee recommendation	9,767,000

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 discrimination in federally operated and federally assisted transportation programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a funding level of $9,767,000 for the Office of Civil Rights for fiscal year 2011. The recommendation is identical to the budget request and is $100,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2010	$18,168,000
Budget estimate, 2011	9,819,000
Committee recommendation	9,819,000

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 $9,819,000 for transportation planning, research, and development, which is equal to the budget request and $8,349,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee has not included language giving the Department the authority to use funds provided under this heading for the development, coordination, and analysis of data collection procedures and national performance measures. This language was included for the first time in the fiscal year 2010 bill, but the Committee notes that the Department has the underlying authority to use its funding for these purposes without any additional language being included in an appropriations act. The Committee therefore urges the Department to exercise its existing authority and to use its funding to ensure that transportation policies and investments are supported by sound data analysis.

With the funding made available for transportation planning, research and development, funds are to be made available to the following: $750,000 for the PSRC Sustainable Transportation and Growth Modeling Demonstration Project in King County, Washington; $750,000 for the International Mobility and Trade Corridor Project in Whatcom County, Washington; $500,000 for the Aviation Futures Alliance Employment, Export and Industry Growth Analysis in Washington; and $700,000 for the I–81 Corridor Coalition, PA.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Limitation, 2010	$147,596,000
Budget estimate, 2011 [1]	.....
Committee recommendation	147,596,000

[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 negotiated 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 $147,596,000 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, but the Committee continues to insist 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 specifies 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 notes that the "transparency paper" included in the justifications for fiscal year 2011 provides essential information on total budgetary resources for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and the Office of the Chief Information Officer, including the balance of resources provided through the Working Capital Fund and direct appropriations. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to update this "transparency paper" and include it in the budget justifications for fiscal year 2012.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

	Appropriations	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Appropriations, 2010	$923,000	$18,367,000
Budget estimate, 2011	913,000	18,367,000
Committee recommendation	913,000	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 $329,000 to cover the subsidy costs for guaranteed loans and $584,000 for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program. The recommendation is equal to the budget estimate and $10,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 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 2010 enacted level.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

Appropriations, 2010	$3,074,000
Budget estimate, 2011	3,395,000
Committee recommendation	3,395,000

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 $3,395,000 for grants and contractual support provided under this program for fiscal year 2011. The recommendation is the same as the budget request and $321,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

	Appropriations	Mandatory [1]	Total
Appropriations, 2010	$150,000,000	$50,000,000	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	132,000,000	50,000,000	182,000,000
Committee recommendation	146,000,000	50,000,000	196,000,000

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides funding for the Essential Air Service [EAS] program, which was created 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. In addition, the act stipulated that the first $50,000,000 of these so-called "overflight fees" 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. No such shortfall has occurred, however, since fiscal year 2005.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the appropriation of $146,000,000 for the EAS program. This appropriation would be in addition to $50,000,000 of overflight fees collected by the Federal Aviation Administration, resulting in a total program level for EAS of $196,000,000. The recommendation is $14,000,000 more than the budget request, and $4,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Protecting Air Service for Small Communities.—The Airline Deregulation Act passed in 1978 gave airlines the freedom to choose what service they would provide to communities across the country. After deregulation, small communities would be the most vulnerable to losing the air service that provided essential mobility and connected them to the larger aviation network. As a result, Congress created the Essential Air Service to guarantee that small communities who were served by the airlines before deregulation would continue to be connected by air service.

The administration has proposed to remove this guarantee from the EAS program, and limit funding to those communities that received an EAS subsidy in fiscal year 2010. On average, six new communities join the EAS program each year, and the administra-

tion's proposal would deny those communities the opportunity to participate in EAS and maintain their air service. At the present time, there are 53 communities in 26 different States being served by one airline and most at risk of needing EAS assistance in order to maintain their air service.

The Committee believes in the importance of maintaining air service for small communities, and therefore its recommendation includes sufficient funding to protect the air service of those that currently participate in the EAS program, as well as those communities that may become eligible during the course of fiscal year 2011. The Committee has not included language that would limit EAS eligibility to those communities that participated in the program in fiscal year 2010. Furthermore, to protect the air service of small communities, Committee continues to include language that prohibits the Department from requiring local matching funds as a condition of receiving EAS subsidies.

The Committee understands that the administration's proposals to deny EAS participation to new communities in fiscal year 2011 and to require a local match from participating communities reflect an effort to limit the cost of the EAS program. Although the Committee does not agree with these specific proposals, the Committee does share the administration's concerns over the growing cost of supporting the EAS program. Over the fiscal year 2005–2010 period, the cost of the EAS program has almost tripled in size. The Committee believes that any proposals to change the program should be thoroughly reviewed and compared to a variety of alternatives. For that reason, the Committee directs the Department to evaluate proposals for amending the EAS program that contain costs while protecting access for small communities to the air transportation system, and to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations 1 year following the date of enactment.

Transfer Authority.—The EAS program continues to undergo a period of great uncertainty that makes it extremely difficult to predict what the true program costs will be during fiscal year 2011. For this reason, the Committee continues to include bill language that directs the Secretary to transfer to the EAS program such sums as may be necessary to continue service to all eligible EAS points in fiscal year 2011. These funds may come from other funds directly administered by, or appropriated to, the Office of the Secretary.

The following table reflects the points currently receiving service and the annual rates as of June 1, 2010, in the continental United States and Hawaii.

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER

[Data is based on June 1, 2010 rates and CY 2009 passengers]

State	EAS/communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S, M, or L)	Avg. Daily Enplnmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/09)	Subsidy Rates at June 1, 2010	Subsidy per Passenger	YE 12/31/09 Pax Total
AL	Muscle Shoals	60	20.8	$1,782,928	$137.03	13,011
AR	El Dorado/Camden	107		$2,096,517	N/A	
AR	Harrison	86		$1,695,929	N/A	
AR	Hot Springs	51		$1,419,102	N/A	
AR	Jonesboro	82		$836,241	N/A	

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER—Continued

[Data is based on June 1, 2010 rates and CY 2009 passengers]

State	EAS/communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S, M, or L)	Avg. Daily Enplnmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/09)	Subsidy Rates at June 1, 2010	Subsidy per Passenger	YE 12/31/09 Pax Total
AZ	Kingman	121	.....	$1,275,771	N/A	.....
AZ	Page	282	15.5	$1,995,273	$205.78	9,696
AZ	Prescott	102	11.3	$1,622,719	$228.52	7,101
AZ	Show Low	154	11.3	$1,407,255	$198.60	7,086
CA	Crescent City	314	36.7	$1,136,896	$49.48	22,979
CA	Merced	60	3.2	$1,541,365	$757.80	2,034
CA	Visalia	47	7.6	$1,494,319	$315.39	4,738
CA	El Centro	101	18.4	$662,551	$57.56	11,511
CO	Alamosa	164	19.9	$1,853,475	$148.91	12,447
CO	Cortez	255	24.3	$1,297,562	$85.46	15,184
CO	Pueblo	36	12.1	$1,299,821	$171.62	7,574
GA	Athens	72	12.4	$1,051,386	$135.21	7,776
GA	Macon	82	4.3	$1,386,306	$509.48	2,721
IA	Fort Dodge	91	17.0	$1,112,607	$104.37	10,660
IA	Mason City	131	33.5	$1,112,607	$53.10	20,953
IA	Burlington	74	6.4	$2,171,241	$538.24	4,034
IL	Marion/Herrin	123	7.6	$2,053,783	$430.74	4,768
IL	Quincy	111	5.5	$1,946,270	$565.28	3,443
IL	Decatur	126	2.1	$3,082,403	$2,391.31	1,289
KS	Dodge City	150	10.4	$1,842,749	$282.98	6,512
KS	Garden City	202	28.4	$1,884,303	$106.10	17,759
KS	Great Bend	114	1.8	$1,257,617	$1,117.88	1,125
KS	Hays	175	23.8	$1,954,327	$131.40	14,873
KS	Liberal/Guymon	138	11.2	$1,958,570	$280.24	6,989
KS	Salina	97	7.8	$1,489,435	$303.10	4,914
KY	Owensboro	105	.....	$1,068,773	N/A	.....
KY	Paducah	146	58.9	$569,923	$15.45	36,889
MD	Hagerstown	78	.....	$1,203,167	N/A	.....
ME	Augusta/Waterville	56	11.3	$2,086,251	$295.67	7,056
ME	Bar Harbor	51	31.3	$2,086,251	$106.58	19,574
ME	Rockland	64	19.1	$1,522,770	$127.68	11,926
ME	Presque Isle/Houlton	127	42.8	$2,812,853	$105.09	26,766
MI	Escanaba	112	22.0	$1,435,118	$104.16	13,778
MI	Iron Mountain/Kingsford	105	17.5	$1,435,118	$131.12	10,945
MI	Ironwood/Ashland	213	3.6	$1,492,865	$653.90	2,283
MI	Manistee	110	8.7	$1,799,395	$330.10	5,451
MI	Hancock/Houghton	219	46.1	$1,404,714	$48.67	28,861
MI	Muskegon	42	48.8	$660,720	$21.62	30,563
MI	Alpena	174	23.8	$1,532,660	$102.67	14,928
MI	Sault Ste. Marie	278	41.3	$237,825	$9.21	25,830
MN	Thief River Falls	305	8.7	$1,230,322	$226.33	5,436
MN	Chisholm/Hibbing	70	28.3	$2,938,878	$165.66	17,740
MN	International Falls	298	49.4	$1,309,886	$42.40	30,895
MO	Kirksville	137	3.0	$806,169	$429.50	1,877
MO	Columbia/Jefferson City	116	79.1	$2,186,590	$44.16	49,510
MO	Joplin	70	12.3	$997,680	$129.96	7,677
MO	Fort Leonard Wood	85	17.4	$1,292,906	$118.56	10,905
MO	Cape Girardeau	127	2.8	$1,573,818	$883.67	1,781
MS	Greenville	124	19.2	$1,355,693	$112.97	12,000
MS	Tupelo	94	39.5	$1,419,593	$57.35	24,752
MS	Meridian	84	57.3	$678,936	$18.93	35,868
MS	Laurel/Hattiesburg	85	39.6	$1,398,798	$56.40	24,800
MT	Glasgow	285	.....	$928,433	N/A	.....
MT	Glendive	197	.....	$1,056,152	N/A	.....
MT	Havre	230	.....	$1,036,616	N/A	.....
MT	Lewistown	103	3.3	$1,036,616	$494.80	2,095
MT	Miles City	145	2.9	$1,056,152	$586.43	1,801
MT	Sidney	272	8.7	$2,159,591	$397.28	5,436
MT	Wolf Point	293	.....	$928,433	N/A	.....
MT	West Yellowstone	89	13.5	$427,757	$50.65	8,445
ND	Dickinson	319	28.4	$2,274,177	$127.71	17,808

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER—Continued

[Data is based on June 1, 2010 rates and CY 2009 passengers]

State	EAS/communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S, M, or L)	Avg. Daily Enplnmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/09)	Subsidy Rates at June 1, 2010	Subsidy per Passenger	YE 12/31/09 Pax Total
ND	Devils Lake	402	11.2	$1,459,493	$208.17	7,011
ND	Jamestown	97	11.3	$1,963,220	$277.06	7,086
NE	Kearney	181	30.9	$1,978,386	$102.40	19,320
NE	North Platte	255	23.7	$1,860,229	$125.51	14,821
NE	Scottsbluff	192	26.8	$1,535,085	$91.44	16,788
NE	Grand Island	138	.....	$2,271,640	N/A	.....
NE	Alliance	233	4.3	$977,609	$361.54	2,704
NE	Chadron	105	6.1	$977,609	$254.12	3,847
NE	McCook	256	5.5	$1,796,795	$521.41	3,446
NH	Lebanon/White River Jct.	75	19.4	$2,245,669	$185.26	12,122
NM	Clovis	102	6.6	$1,517,277	$369.08	4,111
NM	Silver City/Hurley/Deming	134	5.8	$1,442,174	$395.44	3,647
NM	Carlsbad	149	9.8	$1,046,284	$170.71	6,129
NM	Alamogordo/Holloman AFB	89	1.3	$1,169,337	$1,398.73	836
NV	Ely	234	.6	$1,864,717	$5,223.30	357
NY	Plattsburgh	82	18.1	$1,379,257	$121.75	11,329
NY	Jamestown	76	12.0	$1,350,803	$179.68	7,518
NY	Massena	138	10.2	$1,297,613	$202.69	6,402
NY	Ogdensburg	105	6.3	$1,353,916	$341.04	3,970
NY	Watertown	54	7.7	$1,228,334	$254.68	4,823
OR	Pendleton	185	12.0	$1,608,394	$214.08	7,513
PA	Bradford	77	8.0	$1,350,803	$269.41	5,014
PA	DuBois	112	15.7	$2,020,095	$205.09	9,850
PA	Franklin/Oil City	85	5.7	$1,226,773	$342.39	3,583
PA	Lancaster	28	.....	$1,372,474	N/A	.....
PA	Altoona	112	20.5	$1,674,147	$130.67	12,812
PA	Johnstown	84	24.9	$1,674,147	$107.23	15,612
PR	Mayaguez	105	13.4	$980,980	$117.23	8,368
PR	Ponce	77	13.9	$740,416	$85.35	8,675
SD	Huron	121	6.9	$1,781,159	$411.26	4,331
SD	Watertown	207	17.0	$1,338,321	$125.90	10,630
TN	Jackson	86	.....	$1,225,628	N/A	.....
TX	Victoria	93	17.7	$1,593,922	$144.17	11,056
UT	Moab	256	6.0	$1,798,370	$478.80	3,756
UT	Vernal	150	12.1	$1,421,478	$187.73	7,572
UT	Cedar City	179	14.9	$1,477,125	$158.75	9,305
VA	Staunton	113	26.7	$1,911,466	$114.28	16,726
VT	Rutland	69	13.9	$797,141	$91.73	8,690
WI	Eau Claire	92	35.8	$1,732,372	$77.31	22,408
WV	Beckley	168	7.7	$2,092,844	$436.46	4,795
WV	Clarksburg	96	20.8	$1,058,325	$81.09	13,052
WV	Morgantown	75	32.7	$1,058,325	$51.78	20,439
WV	Parkersburg/Marietta	110	16.1	$2,190,281	$216.77	10,104
WV	Greenbrier/White Sulpher Springs	166	11.5	$2,330,725	$323.94	7,195
WY	Laramie	145	24.2	$1,215,603	$80.40	15,119
WY	Worland	161	8.6	$1,735,814	$321.98	5,391
NY	Saranac Lake/Lake Placid	132	15.1	$1,366,538	$144.41	9,463

NOTE: No passengers means that the community suffered a service hiatus during CY 2009.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Section 101 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 102 prohibits the use of funds for an EAS local participation program.

Section 103 authorizes the Secretary of Transportation or his designee to engage in activities with States and State legislatures to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities.

Section 104 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."

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 2011 amounts to $16,500,000,000, including both new budget authority and a limitation on the obligation of contract authority. This funding level is $32,000,000 more than the budget request and $902,269,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations for fiscal year 2011:

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 estimate	
Operations	$9,350,028,000	$9,793,000,000	$9,818,000,000
Facilities and equipment	2,936,203,000	2,970,000,000	2,970,000,000
Research, engineering, and development	190,500,000	190,000,000	198,750,000

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 estimate	
Grants-in-aid for airports (obligation limitation)	3,515,000,000	3,515,000,000	3,515,000,000
Rescission of grants-in-aid for airports contract authority	−394,000,000		
Total	15,596,731,000	16,468,000,000	16,501,750,000

OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2010	$9,350,028,000
Budget estimate, 2011	9,793,000,000
Committee recommendation	9,818,000,000

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, research, 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 $9,818,000,000 for FAA operations. This funding level is $25,000,000 more than the budget request, and $467,972,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee recommendation derives $4,000,000,000 of the appropriation from the airport and airway trust fund. 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 2010 enacted level:

FAA OPERATIONS

	Fiscal year		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 estimate	
Air Transport Organization	$7,299,299,000	$7,630,628,000	$7,660,628,000
Aviation Safety	1,234,065,000	1,293,986,000	1,308,986,000
Commercial Space Transportation	15,237,000	15,747,000	15,747,000
Financial Services	113,681,000	114,784,000	114,784,000
Human Resources	100,428,000	103,297,000	103,297,000
Region and Center Operations	341,977,000	366,354,000	366,354,000
Staff Offices	196,063,000	212,255,000	212,255,000
Information Services	49,278,000	55,949,000	55,949,000
Undistributed Decrease	.....	.....	−20,000,000
Total	9,350,028,000	9,793,000,000	9,818,000,000

FAA Administrative Expenses.—The Committee recommendation for FAA Operations includes a decrease of $20,000,000 across all service units and offices. The Committee remains concerned over the FAA's management of its appropriations, including the use of taxpayer dollars to pay for travel expenses and employee bonuses. The Committee expects the FAA to use its Federal resources judiciously, and does not believe that providing retention bonuses to the same employee for repeated years in a row represents a responsible use of those taxpayer dollars. A retention bonus should offer a short-term enticement to stay at the FAA for employees possessing critical and hard-to-replace skills, thereby giving the agency extra time to find a suitable replacement. When given every year to a broad spectrum of employees, however, a retention bonus acts as a loophole in the Federal administrative process, allowing the FAA to give a permanent pay raise to certain employees without being held accountable to the regular administrative requirements. The Committee is concerned about the FAA's failure to manage this authority responsibly, and has included bill language directing the Department's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration to be the approving official for any request for a retention bonus by the FAA during fiscal year 2011.

AIR TRAFFIC ORGANIZATION

Controller Placement.—The Committee includes bill language directing the FAA to develop an objective test or series of assessments to help the agency place developmental controllers at their first facility. The FAA currently does not have a data-based method for determining the relative strengths and weaknesses of air traffic controllers leaving the FAA academy and assigning them to specific facilities based on those attributes.

At the present time, the FAA administers a test when a candidate first applies to the FAA. Based on the results of this test, the FAA assigns each candidate to one of three categories: not qualified, qualified, and well qualified. This test has been shown to predict the likelihood that a candidate will succeed at the FAA Academy, but it has not been proven to predict the candidate's performance as an air traffic controller. Furthermore, due to the large number of people applying to the FAA in comparison to the number of available positions, the FAA currently accepts only a fraction of

the "well qualified" candidates. The test therefore reveals no differences among the candidates entering the academy. Another examination is conducted at the end of the academy program, but results of this test are given only as pass or fail, and the overwhelming majority of candidates pass the exam. As a result of these limitations, neither test offers the FAA a way to differentiate among its new air traffic controllers.

The Committee understands that, whenever possible, the FAA's placement committee will consider the background of academy graduates when placing them at various air traffic control facilities. The Committee, however, believes that the FAA must develop an objective method that can be applied to each controller and provide reliable results.

The FAA has offered several reasons why it does not place newly hired air traffic controllers based on specific tests of their abilities. In response to the Inspector General's report issued in April on air traffic controller placement, the agency wrote, "FAA is not a military organization that shifts and moves staff at will, rather it is managing a highly skilled, unionized civilian workforce, whose viewpoints must be factored into decisionmaking." Even while implying that the FAA is not in a position to impose its own conditions on the placement of new hires, the agency also wrote, "Ultimately, the FAA will select and hire about 500 of the very best, most qualified candidates from this list, thus screening out 95 percent of the original applicants." The Committee is unable to reconcile these two claims, and notes that most private sector firms find they have greater influence in hiring and placing job applicants when they are able to select from a large number of interested applicants. It reasons the same should be true for the FAA.

The FAA has said that it is working to develop a test and restructure the training at its academy in order to better place its newly hired controllers. The Committee, however, notes that this work has been ongoing for no less than 8 years. While the Committee values thorough and well-researched work, it is not yet convinced that the FAA places a high priority on these efforts. The Committee has therefore included bill language to provide clear direction to the FAA. This bill language includes requirements that the FAA submit for approval an initial work plan no more than 60 days after enactment of the bill, and an assessment of progress made halfway through the time scheduled under the work plan.

En Route Automation Modernization—Program Support.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $20,000,000 for continued support of the En Route Automation Modernization [ERAM] program in fiscal year 2011. The FAA established the ERAM program to replace the computer network for air traffic control facilities that manage high-altitude traffic. Modernizing this network is critical to the effective management of air traffic, and the program is essential to moving the FAA into the next generation of air traffic control.

As discussed later in this report under the Facilities and Equipment account, the ERAM program has experienced several delays over the past year, and the Committee is concerned that the program will not be able to meet current expectations. Such delays not only increase the cost of developing software under the ERAM pro-

gram, but also increase the FAA's operating costs. Until the FAA is able rely on ERAM software for managing all of its high altitude traffic, the agency will continue to pay for the use and maintenance of its legacy software.

Paying for the continual maintenance of the legacy software is a cost that the FAA will have to incur for as long as it takes to develop the new ERAM software. The Committee is disappointed that the FAA could not develop ERAM on its original schedule, and questions whether the FAA had a full understanding of ERAM's complexity at the start of the project. In comparison, the cost of training and then retraining air traffic controllers on the new ERAM software represents simple inefficiency. Pulling controllers out of their regular schedule puts a scheduling burden on field managers and the workforce, and the FAA must pay controllers for their time spent in training in addition to the time spent on their regular duties. As the lag time grows between the controllers' first training and the actual implementation of ERAM, the Committee notes that it is put in the position of covering an entirely avoidable cost. The Committee therefore urges the FAA to establish a realistic budget and schedule for the ERAM program.

Performance Based Navigation.—The Committee recommendation includes an increase of $5,000,000 for activities related to the development of area navigation [RNAV] and required navigation performance [RNP] procedures.

For years, the FAA appeared to develop new procedures in a vacuum. There was no evidence that the FAA prioritized its work based on identifying and giving priority to those procedures would result in reduced flight times or energy consumption, or that the agency considered whether its air traffic controllers would be able utilize the new procedures. This past fall, the RTCA Task Force on NextGen Midterm Implementation recommended that the FAA focus its procedures for performance based navigation on metroplex areas, complex areas where more precise procedures and attention to the airspace design could eliminate inefficiency. The Committee looks forward to seeing the FAA's plan for implementing this recommendation in a timely manner.

Acquisition Workforce.—On November 19, 2009, an outage occurred in the FAA's new telecommunications infrastructure [FTI], which provides for voice, data, and video communications for more than 4,000 FAA facilities. This outage delayed thousands of travelers and grounded hundreds of flights across the Nation. The FAA leases its new telecommunications network from a private sector company, and the outage occurred when an engineer from that company incorrectly configured a router in the network. The outage lasted as long as it did when the company's automated alert system did not work as intended and engineers initially pursued the wrong problem.

While responsibility for the outage itself may rest outside the Federal Government, the FAA is still responsible for managing our national airspace with or without the use of private sector contractors. The Inspector General reported this past June:

"FAA's oversight of the FTI contractor could have been more effective. FAA was unaware that Harris officials had configured the network in error and made other procedural errors. In 2008, we rec-

ommended that FAA develop improved controls over the contractor's FTI equipment configuration and take steps to prevent unscheduled outages and restore them on time to improve service reliability. While FAA agreed to take action, we found it still has problems ensuring FTI services are restored within contractual requirements."

The FAA's ability to oversee its contractors becomes an even larger issue as the agency develops its next generation of air traffic management. NextGen requires the FAA to oversee a portfolio of technical programs, each one dependent on the other. If the FAA fails to oversee one of those programs as it should, the repercussions may be felt throughout the agency's NextGen efforts. For this reason, the Committee recommendation includes an increase of $5,000,000 for activities that will improve the FAA's acquisition workforce, including hiring additional FAA employees and training for the current acquisition workforce.

FAA Public Hearing.—The Committee is concerned that the Federal Aviation Administration has not made a commitment to hold a public hearing in Maine during its consideration of the Air National Guard's environmental impact statement proposing modifications to the Condor 1 and Condor 2 military operating areas. The Committee understands that the Air National Guard, as the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act process, has sought to meet the minimum legal requirements for public participation and comment under the NEPA process, including holding four informational forums and a public hearing at the University of Maine. However, the Committee notes that the authorization of low altitude military training in the proposed airspace would impact areas that significantly contribute to the local economy and areas that are culturally and environmentally sensitive. In particular, the proposed low altitude training airspace covers four ski resorts, potential sites identified for wind energy development, 47,700 acres of a federally recognized Indian tribe reservation, and 144 miles of the Appalachian trail. Furthermore, the Committee notes that the FAA is the only Federal agency that can modify special airspace and that the Federal Aviation Administration may adopt the Air National Guard's EIS in whole, or in part, once the Final EIS has been issued. Therefore, the Committee directs the FAA to hold a public hearing with representatives from the relevant Federal agencies in western Maine. In addition, the Committee directs the FAA to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to the issuance of a record of decision regarding the modification of the Condor 1 and Condor 2 military operations areas that includes a summary of the public hearing and a list of the comments, questions, and responses presented at the hearing.

AVIATION SAFETY

Use of Safety Data.—Two years ago, after an FAA whistleblower exposed the inappropriate relationship between an airline and the FAA field office charged with overseeing it, the FAA promised to make better use of its data to supervise the work of its field offices. FAA started requiring its field offices to regularly report Air Trans-

portation Oversight System [ATOS] data to FAA headquarters so that headquarters staff would be able to see how many inspections were past their deadlines. Concerned about whether the data reported to headquarters would result in improved oversight, the Committee noted in its report accompanying its appropriations bill for fiscal year 2009 that "this requirement will not result in any improvements unless managers at FAA headquarters actually analyze this data and manage the inspector workforce accordingly." The Committee also directed the Office of the Inspector General to verify that the appropriate data is being reported to FAA headquarters and used to oversee field office operations.

The Office of the Inspector General has since reported to the Committee that the data provided to FAA headquarters is incomplete and offers no trend analysis. While aware of the FAA's efforts to improve its safety data under the Aviation Safety Information Analysis and Sharing [ASIAS] system, the Committee is disappointed that the FAA's promise to use ATOS data to oversee its field offices instead appears to be a paperwork exercise.

The Committee is particularly disappointed that many inspection delays are attributed to a lack of resources. The FAA has explained that not all of the inspections included in the ATOS system need to be—or even should be—conducted at the suggested times. According to the FAA, its safety regime is based on assessments of risk rather than a rigid schedule of inspection dates, and its safety inspectors are instructed to apply FAA resources where the data implies a greater risk. Given this level of discretion, the FAA's claim that a lack of resources prohibits further inspection appears to be an unwillingness to accept responsibility for purposeful decisions in how to apply available resources. The Committee also notes that for several years in a row it has provided additional resources for safety inspections above the FAA's budget request.

The Committee urges the FAA to revisit its use of ATOS and ASIAS data for overseeing field offices. The Committee also directs the Inspector General to conduct a full evaluation of the FAA's efforts in this regard and submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than 18 months after the bill's enactment.

Inspector Workforce.—The FAA requested additional funding to increase the safety inspector workforce by 32 full-time positions. The Committee appreciates the FAA's proposal to strengthen the staffing levels for aviation safety, and fully funds the requested full-time positions. In addition, the Committee recommendation includes an additional $15,000,000 to increase the safety inspector workforce by another 150 full-time positions. With these additional resources, the Committee directs the FAA to increase the flight standards staff by 110 full-time positions, and to increase the aircraft certification staff by 40 full-time positions.

The Committee also includes bill language to repeat its direction to the FAA that the next inspector workforce plan shall include a benchmark for the amount of time that aviation inspectors spend in the field directly observing industry operations. In recent years, the FAA has started to use a risk-based oversight regime in order to make the best use of its limited resources. This new approach to safety oversight requires the agency—and its safety inspectors—

to monitor many details of industry operations, and to analyze all of the data collected in order to identify areas of risk. Questions have been raised about the role of safety inspectors, and whether they are spending too much time at their desks inputting and analyzing data, and not enough time in the field observing the facts with their own eyes. The Committee believes it is necessary to establish a benchmark on inspector workloads so that the Committee, the FAA, or any other stakeholder in aviation safety will be able to independently evaluate this issue.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2010	$2,936,203,000
Budget estimate, 2011	2,970,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,970,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Facilities and Equipment 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 $2,970,000,000 for the Facilities and Equipment account of the Federal Aviation Administration. The Committee recommendation is equal to than the budget estimate and $33,797,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The bill provides that $4,000,000,000 shall be available for obligation until September 30, 2013, and $492,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2011.

Budget Activities Format.—The Committee directs that the fiscal year 2011 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

	Fiscal year 2010 enacted	Fiscal year 2011 estimate	Committee recommendation
Activity 1: Engineering, Development, Test and Evaluation:			
Advanced Technology Development and Prototyping	$42,800,000	$25,500,000	$25,500,000
NAS Improvement of System Support Laboratory	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
William J. Hughes Technical Center Facilities	12,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
William J. Hughes Technical Center Infrastructure Sustainment	5,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
Next Generation Network Enabled Weather (NNEW)	20,000,000	28,250,000	23,250,000
Data Communications in support of Next Generation Air Transportation System	46,700,000	153,300,000	153,300,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

	Fiscal year 2010 enacted	Fiscal year 2011 estimate	Committee recommendation
Next Generation Transportation System Demonstration and Infrastructure Development	33,773,730	27,000,000	22,000,000
Next Generation Transportation System—System Development	66,100,000	95,000,000	76,000,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Trajectory Based Operations	63,500,000	58,600,000	46,600,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Reduce Weather Impact	35,600,000	43,202,000	34,202,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Arrivals/Departures at High Density Airports	51,800,000	57,000,000	46,000,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Collaborative ATM	44,640,770	75,500,000	60,500,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Flexible Terminals and Airports	64,300,000	80,700,000	64,700,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Safety, Security and Environment	8,200,000	8,000,000	7,000,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Systems Networked Facilities	24,000,000	35,000,000	28,000,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Integrated Airport	827,900	.....	.....
Total, Activity 1	520,742,400	708,552,000	608,552,000
Activity 2: Procurement and Modernization of Air Traffic Control Facilities and Equipment:			
En Route Programs:			
En Route Automation Modernization (ERAM)	171,750,000	132,300,000	132,300,000
En Route Automation Modernization (ERAM)—program support	.....	.....	50,000,000
En Route Communications Gateway (ECG)	3,600,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Next Generation Weather Radar (NEXRAD)	6,900,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
Air Traffic Control Command Center (ATCSCC)—Relocation	10,300,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
ARTCC Building Improvements/Plant Improvements	50,000,000	36,892,000	36,892,000
Air Traffic Management (ATM)	31,400,000	16,500,000	16,500,000
Air/Ground Communications Infrastructure	8,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000
Air Traffic Control En Route Radar Facilities Improvements	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
ATC Beacon Interrogator (ATCBI)—Replacement	4,700,000	.....	.....
Voice Switch and Control System (VSCS)	16,700,000	15,600,000	15,600,000
Oceanic Automation System	7,700,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Corrider Integrated Weather System (CIWS)	2,300,000	.....	.....
Next Generation Very High Frequency Air/Ground Communications System (NEXCOM)	64,200,000	49,850,000	49,850,000
System-Wide Information Management (SWIM)	56,548,000	92,000,000	92,000,000
ADS–B NAS Wide Implementation	201,350,000	176,100,000	188,100,000
Windshear Detection Services	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Weather and Radar Processor (WARP)	17,600,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
Collaborative Air Traffic Management Technologies	18,100,000	35,900,000	35,900,000
En Route Modernization (ERAM)—Post Release 3	.....	−5,000,000	5,000,000
Terminal Programs:			
Airport Surface Detection Equipment—Model X (ASDE–X)	25,302,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR)—Provide	9,900,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS) (TAMR Phase 1)	28,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
Terminal Automation Modernization/Replacement Program (TAMR Phase 3)	18,000,000	20,000,000	30,000,000
Terminal Automation Program	9,600,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities—Replace	179,000,000	114,600,000	116,350,000
ATCT/Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) Facilities—Improve	38,900,000	45,600,000	45,600,000
Terminal Voice Switch Replacement (TVSR)	10,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
NAS Facilities OSHA and Environmental Standards Compliance	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Airport Surveillance Radar (ASR–9) Service Life Extension Program (SLEP)	3,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Terminal Digital Radar (ASR–11) Technology Refresh	12,863,000	4,100,000	4,100,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

	Fiscal year 2010 enacted	Fiscal year 2011 estimate	Committee recommendation
Precision Runway Monitors (PRM)	.....	950,000	950,000
Runway Status Lights (RWSL)	117,300,000	55,000,000	60,000,000
National Airspace System Voice Switch (NVS)	26,600,000	30,200,000	30,200,000
Next Generation Voice Recorder Replacement Program	11,900,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
Integrated Display System (IDS)	7,000,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
Airport Surveillance Radar (ASR–8)—Service Life Extension Program (SLEP)	.....	2,600,000	2,600,000
Integrated Terminal Weather System (ITWS)	1,900,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Terminal Automation Modernization /Replacement Program (TAMR Phase 2)	.....	3,100,000	3,100,000
Remote Maintenance Monitoring (RMM)	1,000,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
Mode S Service Life Extension Program (SLEP)	.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
Flight Service Programs:			
Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS)	5,500,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
Flight Service Station (FSS) Modernization	20,100,000	21,400,000	21,400,000
Weather Camera Program	3,800,000	3,200,000	4,200,000
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	12,575,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS) for GPS	91,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000
Runway Visual Range (RVR)	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Approach Lighting System Improvement Program (ALSIP)	10,337,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Distance Measuring Equipment (DME)	6,000,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Visual Navaids—Establish/Expand	3,700,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Instrument Flight Procedures Automation (IFPA)	7,900,000	600,000	600,000
Navigation and Landing Aids—Service Life Extension Program (SLEP)	9,000,000	6,000,000	11,000,000
VASI Replacement—Replace with Precision Approach Indicator	4,500,000	4,000,000	6,250,000
Global Positioning System (GPS) Civil Requirements	43,400,000	58,500,000	58,500,000
Runway Safety Areas—Navigational Mitigation	.....	20,000,000	20,000,000
Other ATC Facilities Programs:			
Fuel Storage Tank Replacement and Monitoring	6,200,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
Unstaffed Infrastructure Sustainment	18,200,000	14,100,000	14,100,000
Aircraft Related Equipment Program	10,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Airport Cable Loop Systems—Sustained Support	6,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Alaskan NAS Interfacility Communications System (ANICS)	9,000,000	12,100,000	12,100,000
Facilities Decommissioning	5,000,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
Electrical Power System—Sustain/Support	87,750,100	95,000,000	105,000,000
Aircraft Fleet Modernation (AVS)	5,969,000	.....	.....
Total, Activity 2	1,581,244,100	1,377,892,000	1,474,892,000
Activity 3: Procurement and Modernization of Non-Air Traffic Control Facilities and Equipment:			
Support Programs:			
Hazardous Materials Management	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Aviation Safety Analysis System (ASAS)	10,500,000	14,600,000	14,600,000
Logistics Support System and Facilities (LSSF)	9,300,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
National Air Space Recovery Communications (RCOM)	10,230,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Facility Security Risk Management	18,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
Information Security	12,276,000	15,200,000	15,200,000
System Approach for Safety Oversight (SASO)	20,000,000	23,400,000	23,400,000
Aviation Safety Knowledge Management Environment (ASKME)	8,100,000	14,800,000	14,800,000
Data Center Optimization	.....	1,956,000	1,956,000
Training, Equipment and Facilities:			
Aeronautical Center Infrastructure Modernization	13,810,500	15,000,000	15,000,000
Distance Learning	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
National Airspace System (NAS) Training—Simulator	8,200,000	.....	.....
Total, Activity 3	131,916,500	150,456,000	150,456,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

	Fiscal year 2010 enacted	Fiscal year 2011 estimate	Committee recommendation
Activity 4: Facilities and Equipment Mission Support:			
System Support and Support Services:			
System Engineering and Development Support	31,700,000	32,300,000	32,300,000
Program Support Leases	37,500,000	38,600,000	38,600,000
Logistics Support Services (LSS)	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center Leases	16,200,000	16,600,000	16,600,000
Transition Engineering Support	14,300,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Frequency and Spectrum Engineering	3,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
Technical Support Services Contract (TSSC)	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
Resource Tracking Program (RTP)	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Center for Advanced Aviation System Development (CAASD)	82,000,000	80,700,000	83,700,000
Aeronautical Information Management Program	10,000,000	18,300,000	18,300,000
Total, Activity 4	232,300,000	241,100,000	244,100,000
Activity 5: Personnel Compensation, Benefits, and Travel:			
Personnel and Related Expenses	470,000,000	492,000,000	492,000,000
Total, All Activities	2,936,203,000	2,970,000,000	2,970,000,000

ACTIVITY 1: ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Next Generation Network Enabled Weather.—The Committee recommendation includes $23,250,000 for the Next Generation Network Enabled Weather program. This funding level is $5,000,000 less than the budget request and $3,250,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee is disappointed in the FAA's continued trouble with coordinating work across different parts of the agency. This challenge with coordination is part of what prevents the FAA from defining requirements for the Next Generation Network Enabled Weather program and beginning an acquisition process for it.

Next Generation Air Transportation System Solution Sets.—The FAA has grouped together engineering, development, testing and evaluation activities that support different aspects of the next generation air transportation system. In the budget request for fiscal year 2011, the FAA requests funding for nine of these "solution sets", with one dedicated to each of the following topics: system development; trajectory-based operations; reduced weather impact; arrivals and departures at high density airports; collaborative air traffic management; flexible terminals and airports; safety, security and environment; and systems networked facilities.

The activities funded by these "solution sets" are designed to determine how new approaches to air transportation can be translated into actual technologies, programs, and practices at the FAA. The Committee recognizes that the results of this work will be, by their nature, less predictable than most other projects funded in the Facilities and Equipment account. The FAA may at times determine that some of the ideas tested with this funding may not offer enough benefits to justify further investment. The value of these activities lies in producing better information on which the FAA will base its investment decisions.

The Committee, however, is concerned about whether the FAA will be able to make decisions at the pace it had anticipated. The

NextGen enterprise architecture lays out a series of decision points, or target dates for making certain decisions, and the FAA is already experiencing difficulties in meeting these decision points. In 2009, the FAA failed to meet 6 of the 13 decision points the agency had identified as a high priority. For the current year to date, the FAA is on track to meet only one-half of the 12 decision points identified as high priority. FAA expects to miss four of these high priority decision points, and it considers the remaining two to be at risk.

The FAA failed to meet several of its decision points because the FAA only considers the business case of individual programs. The agency has not developed a system for considering whether or not to invest in a portfolio of related programs. In order to build NextGen, however, the FAA will need to invest in sets of integrated systems that do not always produce benefits on their own. Until it develops a system for considering a portfolio of programs, the FAA will continue to miss decision points for important programs.

Because the Committee is not convinced that the FAA is making sufficient progress in these "solution sets", the Committee recommendation redirects funding from these activities to other programs within the Facilities and Equipment account. The Committee recommendation includes a total of $385,002,000 for the solution sets. This funding level is $95,000,000 less than the budget request and $7,740,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee also directs the FAA to submit a spend plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than 60 days after enactment, and include in the spend plan a description of each project funded out of each of the "solution sets"; the funding allocated to each project for fiscal year 2011, and the total cost of each project; and milestones and decision dates for each project with an explanation for how those milestones and decision dates align with the NextGen enterprise architecture.

ACTIVITY 2: PROCUREMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES

En Route Programs

En Route Automation Modernization—Program Support.—Under the En Route Automation Modernization [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 the 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 FAA established an aggressive schedule for the ERAM program, and for most of the program's life, the agency was able to keep it on time and on budget. Last year, however, the program experienced several delays when program managers began to implement ERAM at two key sites, Salt Lake City and Seattle. The Committee also began to hear two different stories about the condition of the ERAM program. The FAA maintained that the program was developing well, but the air traffic controllers who worked at the facilities and tested the software described significant problems with the software.

To date, the delays in the ERAM schedule have not been large enough to cause the program to exceed its baseline budget or schedule, but the Committee remains concerned that the program will not be able to meet current expectations. In the meantime, delays in the ERAM program require the FAA to continue supporting its legacy system longer than the agency had planned, adding costs to the agency's budget. The Committee recognizes the importance of the ERAM program, and the central role it plays in the FAA's efforts to modernize its air traffic control system. For this reason, the Committee recommendation includes an additional $50,000,000 for continued support of the ERAM program.

ADS–B NAS-wide Implementation.—Under the Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast program, or ADS–B, the FAA is developing satellite-based technology that will allow aircraft to broadcast their precise location, identification, and flight plan information to ground facilities as well as to other aircraft. Because ADS–B offers more accurate and more complete data than radar technology, an air transportation system based on ADS–B will be able to operate more efficiently and accommodate more aircraft than the current system.

Although the Committee is pleased to see that the ADS–B program continues to progress and meet its milestones, the Committee is still not convinced that the FAA leadership is doing enough to achieve all of the benefits possible under ADS–B. The FAA has contented itself with developing an ADS–B baseline that will merely replicate the capabilities of its current radar system, and the agency continues to request only those funds that are necessary to accomplish this first baseline program. The Committee, however, does not believe that such a conservative approach will accomplish all of the agency's goals for the next generation air transportation system.

The RTCA's NextGen Mid-Term Implementation Task Force, published this past September, identified guiding principles for its work. Those principles included the following:

"It's about implementation . . . Our ability to successfully implement beneficial operational capabilities will translate into users' TRUST in NextGen Implementation Plan [NGIP]." [Emphasis is in the original.]

"It's about transition . . . We've learned we're a lot better at planning than EXECUTING. Planning is relatively straightforward and does not require commitment. The transition to NextGen will be tough." [Emphasis is in the original.]

These two statements reflect the same priorities that form the basis of the Committee's concern over FAA's management of its next generation programs. The Committee urges the FAA to focus on achieving new capabilities over the life of its next generation programs, instead of planning on what capabilities will develop after a program is declared to be over.

In recent years, in the absence of proposals from the FAA itself, the Committee has provided additional resources for the ADS–B program for pilot programs designed to test new capabilities using ADS–B technology. Under the first pilot program, the FAA created safety and operating requirements to expedite the development of

ADS–B "In" capabilities, which allow aircraft to transmit data directly to one another. Under the second pilot program, the FAA is testing the use of ADS–B technology in achieving three nautical mile separation standards.

Because of the progress that the ADS–B program has made under these two pilot programs, and because the FAA has not requested any additional funds to build on these pilot programs, the Committee again recommends additional resources above the amounts requested by the FAA. The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 more than the budget request, and directs the FAA to use these resources to further expedite the development of ADS–B "In" capabilities.

Terminal Programs

Terminal Automation Modernization/Replacement Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000 for the replacement of outdated automation equipment at air traffic control towers and at terminal facilities. This funding level is $10,000,000 more than the budget request and $12,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Automation systems process data and display the information for air traffic controllers. The older equipment is limited in its capacity, and it is not immediately compatible with modern air traffic control technology such as ADS–B. The Committee recommendation includes additional funding in order to expedite the replacement of outdated automation technology and support the FAA's transition to the next generation of air traffic technology.

Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities.—The Committee recommendation includes $116,100,000 for new and replacement air traffic control towers, and projects that consolidate air traffic control towers with terminal radar approach control facilities. This funding level is $1,500,000 more than the budget request, and $62,900,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Of the total funding level included in the Committee recommendation, the Committee directs the FAA to allocate $1,500,000 to the Lihue Airport in Hawaii and $250,000 to the Greenwood-Leflore Airport control tower in Mississippi.

Runway Status Lights.—The Committee recommendation includes $60,000,000 for the procurement and installation of runway status lights. This funding level is $5,000,000 more than the budget request and $57,300,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Runway status lights are an important part of the FAA's effort to fulfill a recommendation by the National Transportation Safety Board to improve runway safety by giving "immediate warnings of probable collisions or incursions directly to flight crews in the cockpit." The Committee directs that $1,000,000 of the funding provided for fiscal year 2011 be used to implement runway status lights at Honolulu International Airport, Hawaii.

Flight Service Programs

Weather Cameras.—In places where terrain or rapidly changing weather patterns lead to incomplete data on weather conditions, weather cameras offer a cost effective way to give pilots better information about the situation they will confront along their

planned route. Inexpensive, commercially available cameras provide up-to-date images every 10 minutes, and those images allow pilots to make informed decisions about whether it is safe to fly at that time. The Committee recommendation provides $4,200,000 for the weather camera program in fiscal year 2011. This funding level is $1,000,000 more than the budget request, and $400,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee directs the FAA to use $1,000,000 for the procurement and installation of weather cameras in the State of Hawaii.

LANDING AND NAVIGATIONAL AIDS PROGRAM

Runway Visual Range.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the Runway Visual Range program. This funding level is equal to the budget request and the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Runway visual range equipment provides air traffic controllers and pilots with important information on visibility. The Committee directs the FAA to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report detailing the agency's plans for procuring and installing runway visual range equipment.

Distance Measuring Equipment.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,100,000 for distance measuring equipment. This funding level is equal to the budget request and $1,900,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Distance measuring equipment is an important part of the instrument landing system that helps guide an aircraft during its final approach to landing. The FAA has certified only one supplier of distance measuring equipment, and the Committee is concerned that delays in certification may eliminate the benefits that competition can provide for equipment procurements. The Committee urges the FAA to consider additional suppliers of distance measuring equipment in accordance with all functional, stability and reliability requirements.

Navigation and Landing Aids—Service Life Extension Program [SLEP].—The Committee notes that Runway End Identifier Lights [REILs] improve airport safety by clearly indicating to pilots the approach end of the runway. The Committee recommendation includes $11,000,000 for navigation and landing aids. This funding level is an increase of $5,000,000 more than the budget request, and $2,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee directs the FAA to use these additional funds for the procurement and installation of additional REIL systems.

VASI Replacement—Replace With Precision Approach Path Indicator.—The FAA began to deploy Visual Approach Slope Indicator [VASI] systems in the 1960s to provide visual descent guidance to pilots as they approached an airport runway. Since that time, the international standard for these lighting systems has grown more sophisticated, and the FAA must now replace its VASI systems with Precision Approach Path Indicator [PAPI] systems to comply with the new standards.

The Committee supports bringing FAA equipment into compliance with international standards, and recommends $6,250,000 for the replacement of VASI lighting systems with PAPI lighting systems. This funding level is $2,250,000 more than the budget request and $1,750,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee directs the FAA to use the additional funding to procure additional PAPI systems.

OTHER ATC FACILITIES PROGRAMS

Electrical Power System.—The Committee recommendation includes $105,000,000 for investment in the electrical power system that sustains the FAA's air traffic control system. This funding level is $10,000,000 more than the budget request and $17,249,900 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee recognizes the poor condition of the power system infrastructure for FAA facilities, and provides additional resources to improve reliability.

ACTIVITY 3: PROCUREMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF NON-AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Support Programs

Facility Security Risk Management.—FAA air traffic control facilities are a vital part of the Nation's transportation network, and the air traffic controllers who work in these facilities protect the safety of our pilots, air crew, and passengers every day. The Committee understands that improvements are necessary at the Seattle terminal radar approach facility to continue protecting the safety and security of this facility and the people who work there. The Committee directs the FAA to take all measures recommended for securing its air traffic control facilities, including the Seattle terminal radar approach facility.

ACTIVITY 4: FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MISSION SUPPORT

Center for Advanced Aviation System Development.—The Committee recommendation includes $83,700,000 for the Center for Advanced Aviation System Development. This funding level is $3,000,000 more than the budget request and $700,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2010	$190,500,000
Budget estimate, 2011	190,000,000
Committee recommendation	198,750,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Research, Engineering and Development 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 $198,750,000 for the FAA's research, engineering, and development activities. The recommended level of funding is $8,750,000 more than the budget request and $8,250,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

A table showing the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, the fiscal year 2011 budget estimate, and the Committee recommendation follows:

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 estimate	
Improve Aviation Safety:			
Fire Research and Safety	7,799,000	7,231,000	7,231,000
Propulsion and Fuel Systems	3,105,000	2,332,000	2,332,000
Advanced Structural/Structural Safety	4,935,000	2,566,000	4,316,000
Atmospheric Hazards—Aircraft Icing/Digital System Safety	4,482,000	6,635,000	6,635,000
Continued Airworthiness	10,944,000	10,801,000	10,801,000
Aircraft Catasprohic Failure Prevention Research	1,545,000	1,165,000	1,165,000
Flightdeck/Maintenance/System Integration Human Factors	7,128,000	7,174,000	7,174,000
System Safety Management	12,698,000	11,907,000	12,907,000
Air Traffic Control/Technical Operations Human Factors	10,302,000	10,475,000	10,475,000
Aeromedical Research	10,378,000	11,217,000	10,217,000
Weather Program	16,789,000	16,505,000	16,505,000
Unmanned Aircraft Systems Research	3,467,000	3,694,000	3,694,000
NextGen Alternative Fuels for General Aviation	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Improve Efficiency:			
Joint Planning and Development Office	14,407,000	14,292,000	14,292,000
NextGen: Wake Turbulence	10,631,000	10,685,000	10,685,000
NextGen: Air Ground Integration Human Factors	5,688,000	10,614,000	10,614,000
NextGen: Self-Separation Human Factors	8,247,000	9,971,000	9,971,000
NextGen: Weather Technology in the Cockpit	9,570,000	9,312,000	9,312,000
Reduce Environmental Impact:			
Environment and Energy	15,522,000	15,374,000	15,374,000
NextGen Environmental Research—Aircraft Technologies, Fuels and Metrics	26,509,000	20,600,000	27,600,000
Mission Support:			
System Planning and Resource Management	1,766,000	1,733,000	1,733,000
William J. Hughes Technical Ceneter Laboratory Facility	4,588,000	3,717,000	3,717,000
Total	190,500,000	190,000,000	198,750,000

ADVANCED STRUCTURAL/STRUCTURAL SAFETY

Advance Materials in Transport Aircraft Structures.—The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for research and development of composite materials in transport aircraft structures at the Advance Materials in Transport Aircraft Structures Center in Seattle, Washington.

Advanced Materials Research.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the National Institute for Aviation Research at Wichita State University in Wichita, Kansas, to enhance ongoing aviation safety research in the areas of metallic and non-metallic structures, crashworthiness and aging aircraft effects. The advanced material applications, composite repair, health monitoring, and other research that will be conducted by the National Institute for Aviation Research will be crucial to maintaining the safety of aging aircraft still in service. The funding will be used to purchase

new equipment, hire technical personnel and conduct research in advanced materials.

Nondestructive Inspection Training for Composite Airframe Structures.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for research that will lead to a systematic approach to providing for the safe use of composite and other advanced materials. This will directly support the composite safety and certification initiatives to develop related policy, guidance and training. The funding will be used for technical personnel, facilities, and equipment or the National Institute of Aviation Research to provide comprehensive education and training for composite airframe maintenance and airworthiness.

UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS RESEARCH

FAA Centers of Excellence.—The Committee is aware of the numerous issues facing FAA as technology develops to aid the integration of unmanned aerial vehicles into the national air space. The need for this integration is even more urgent given the recent Deepwater Horizon issue and the vital role that unmanned aerial systems [UAS] can play in times of national emergency. The Committee directs the FAA to establish an FAA Unmanned Aerial System Center of Excellence [COE] to address a host of issues surrounding integration of UAS systems into the National Airspace System during times of emergency and utilize these lessons learned to provide essential data to the Center as it works toward non-emergency integration. The Committee further directs that the new COE shall: provide recommendations for a safe, non-exclusionary airspace designation for cooperative manned and unmanned flight operations; conduct research to support UAS interagency requirements to include emergency response, maritime contingencies, and bio-fuel clean fuel technologies; conduct flight testing of UAS and related navigation procedures and equipment; encourage leveraging and coordination of such research and development activities with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense; provide recommendations on certification, flight standards, and air traffic requirements; and facilitate UAS technology transfer to other civilian and defense agencies, initially focusing upon emergency management. The Administrator shall take into consideration geographical and climate diversity, access to unencumbered and sufficiently large military operations areas [MOAs], relevant research capability, and participating consortia from the public and private sectors, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations.

SAFETY SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Alaska Aviation Safety Project.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the Alaska Aviation Safety Project [AASP] for research involving simulation training, in-cockpit navigational aids, two-way wireless data tethers, and other flight safety enhancements. Over the last decade, there were a total of 107 fatal aviation accidents in the State of Alaska, and those accidents claimed 236 lives. The AASP conducts research with the goal of reducing the frequency of such accidents.

NEXTGEN ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH—AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGIES, FUELS AND METRICS

Continuous Lower Energy Emissions and Noise Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $27,600,000 for NextGen environmental research—aircraft technologies, fuels and metrics. This funding level is $7,000,000 more than the budget request and $1,091,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee recommendation includes this funding increase to support the FAA's Continuous Lower Energy Emissions and Noise [CLEEN] program, which focuses on reducing aircraft noise, improving air quality, cutting greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption, and developing alternative aviation jet fuels.

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, 2010	$3,000,000,000	$3,515,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	3,550,000,000	3,515,000,000
Committee recommendation	3,550,000,000	3,515,000,000

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 $3,515,000,000 for grants-in-aid to airports for fiscal year 2011, which is equal to the budget estimate and the fiscal year 2010 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 $3,550,000,000 for grants-in-aid to airports. The recommended level is equal to the budget estimate and $550,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 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 2011 obligation limitation. The Committee further directs that the specific funding allocated in the table below shall not diminish or prejudice the application of a specific airport or geographic region to receive other AIP discretionary grants or multi-year letters of intent.

AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

State	Airport name	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
AL	Tuscaloosa Regional Airport	For taxiway extension and runway environmental assessment.	$500,000
AL	Huntsville-Madison County Airport	For apron expansion	500,000
AL	Lanett Municipal Airport, Lanett	For runway construction	1,500,000
GA	Middle Georgia Regional Airport, Macon	For runway extension	1,400,000
IL	Quincy Airport	For airfield improvements	600,000
KS	Metropolitan Topeka Airport Authority	For hangar restoration	400,000
ME	Augusta Regional Airport	For runway reconstruction and safety improvements.	1,000,000
MO	Lawrence Smith Memorial Airport	For runway expansion and hangar construction.	2,000,000
MO	Macon-Fowler Memorial Airport	For the design, grading and construction of extending and widening of the runway.	1,600,000
MO	Warsaw Municipal Airport	For the design, grading and construction of extending and widening the runway.	1,500,000
MS	Gulfport-Biloxi Regional Airport	For taxiway and runway construction	2,000,000
MS	Tunica Airport	For terminal expansion	1,500,000
MS	Jackson Municipal Airport Authority	For runway improvements	2,000,000
ND	Devils Lake Regional	For runway improvements	1,000,000
ND	Grand Forks International	For terminal replacement	2,500,000
NV	Reno-Tahoe International Airport	For improvements to the Reno Stead Airport Emergency Operations Center.	500,000
SD	Rapid City Regional Airport	For terminal expansion	500,000
TN	Memphis International Airport	For seismic taxiway retrofits	1,000,000
UT	Provo Municipal Airport	For aircraft parking and staging ramp	2,000,000
WI	New Richmond Regional Airport	For land acquisition for runway approaches and hangar area development.	1,000,000
WI	Wittman Regional Airport	For the reconstruction of a terminal ramp and taxiway.	800,000
WV	West Virginia Statewide Airport Activities	For various improvements to airports in WV.	1,000,000

Administrative Expenses.—The Committee recommends $99,708,000 to cover administrative expenses. This funding level is $500,000 less than the budget request, and $6,286,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee recommendation does not include $500,000 requested to produce a video that follows an air passenger throughout their travels. According to the budget request, this video would be compared with subsequent videos covering the same travel 10 and 20 years later. These videos are meant to highlight the impact of various airport and air traffic improvements. While this request is small in comparison to the total funding requested to cover administrative expenses, the Committee

does not believe that such videos represent a responsible use of taxpayer dollars.

Airport Cooperative Research.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for the airport cooperative research program. This funding level is equal to the budget estimate and the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Airport Technology.—The Committee recommends $27,217,000 for airport technology research. This funding level is the same as the budget request, and $4,745,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 level.

Small Community Air Service Development Program [SCASDP].—The Committee recommends $6,000,000 for the Small Community Air Service Development Program. This funding level is equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The administration requested no funds for this program for fiscal year 2011.

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 600 in fiscal year 2009.

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 prohibits funds limited in this act for the Airport Improvement Program to be provided to an airport that refuses a request from the Secretary of Transportation to use public space at the airport for the purpose of conducting outreach on air passenger rights.

Section 115 prohibits the FAA from paying Sunday premium pay except in those cases where the individual actually worked on a Sunday.

Section 116 prohibits the FAA from using funds provided in the bill to purchase store gift cards or gift certificates through a Government-issued credit card.

Section 117 allows all airports experiencing the required level of boardings through charter and scheduled air service to be eligible for funds under 49 U.S.C. 47114(c).

Section 118 requires approval from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration of the Department of Transportation for retention bonuses for any FAA employee.

Section 119 limits to 20 percent the cost-share required under the contract tower cost-share program.

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 $42,626,869,000 would be provided for the activities of the Federal Highway Administration in fiscal year 2011. The recommendation is $413,225,000 more than the budget request. The recommendation is also $161,960,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

	Fiscal year		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 estimate	
Federal-aid highway program obligation limitation	$41,107,000,000	$41,362,775,000	$41,776,000,000
Planning capacity grants		[1] [200,000,000]	200,000,000
Additional investments in highway infrastructure	650,000,000		
Surface transportation priorities/investments	292,829,000		175,269,000
Emergency relief and equity bonus exempt contract authority	739,000,000	739,000,000	739,000,000
Rescission of unused contract authority		−263,131,000	−263,131,000
Total	42,788,829,000	41,838,644,000	42,627,138,000

[1] The administration requested this funding as part of the obligation limitation for the Federal-aid highways program.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 2010	$413,533,000
Budget estimate, 2011	420,843,000
Committee recommendation	417,843,000

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 $417,843,000 for administrative expenses of the agency. This limitation is $3,000,000 less than the budget request and $4,310,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee is concerned that the travel expenses included in the budget request do not represent a responsible use of taxpayer dollars.

In addition, $3,300,000 in contract authority above this limitation is made available for the administrative expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission in accordance with section 104 of title 23, United States Code.

Reimbursements for the OIG.—For the past several years, the Committee has directed that contract authority originally provided for FHWA's administrative expenses be transferred to the OIG for the cost of audits and investigations of highway programs. The Committee also directed that additional amounts of contract authority be used to reimburse the OIG for the cost of auditing FHWA's financial statements. In order to simplify the relationship between the OIG and the agencies that it audits, the Committee recommendation provides all funding for OIG activities directly to the OIG itself. Therefore, the Committee has not included any language directing that contract authority be transferred or reimbursed to the OIG. This change has no impact on the Committee recommendation for FHWA's limitation on administrative expenses, and it has no impact on the level of resources available to the agency for those expenses.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Limitation, 2010	$41,107,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	41,362,775,000
Committee recommendation	41,776,000,000

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 2011 Federal-aid highways obligations to $41,776,000,000 which is $413,225,000 more than the budget request, and $669,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level for the Federal-aid highway program.

Within the overall limitation on fiscal year 2011 Federal-aid highway obligations, the Committee recommends limiting fiscal year 2011 obligations on transportation research to $429,800,000. The recommendation for transportation research is equal to the budget request. This specific limitation controls spending for the transportation research and technology programs of the FHWA, and it includes the intelligent transportation systems; surface transportation research; technology deployment, training and education; university transportation research; and the Bureau of Transportation Statistics.

In addition, the bill includes a provision 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.

Discretionary Planning Grants.—Under its budget request, the administration would provide grants to metropolitan planning organizations and other planning agencies through set-asides from the obligation limitation and the contract authority from apportioned programs of the Federal-aid highways program. Planning agencies would use these grants to improve their capacity to fulfill requirements under current law, as well as conduct more comprehensive planning that coordinates housing and transportation development. The Committee recommendation includes funding for similar grants, but the Committee has chosen not to fund the grants under the Federal-aid obligation limitation or by setting aside contract authority from any of the apportioned highway programs.

Research.—Under the current extension of the surface transportation programs, the Department was given additional flexibility in distributing funds among highway research projects. That extension, however, was passed several months ago, and the Department still has not been able to communicate its plan for funding highway-related research. The Committee believes that the Department should move forward with its research program, and not delay the productive use of funding provided for research. The Committee directs the Department to continue to support and fund ongoing research programs and projects authorized in title V of public law 109–59 during fiscal years 2010 and 2011. The Committee believes that the Department should continue funding high priority areas of research: infrastructure, including pavement and bridges; planning and environment; operations; highway safety; policy, including work to sustain the Highway Trust Fund; and exploratory advanced research and the Turner Fairbanks Highway Research Center.

Bridge Oversight.—Three years ago, the Interstate 35W bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota, suddenly collapsed during an evening rush hour. Thirteen people died and 145 were injured as a result. The collapse of this bridge called attention to the deteriorating condition of our Nation's bridges and transportation infrastructure. There are almost 6,000 bridges across the country, and although it is unlikely that another bridge will collapse, the consequences of such an event would again be catastrophic. Furthermore, our economy relies on the condition of its transportation infrastructure to allow travelers and freight to move easily and efficiently.

After the collapse of the Minneapolis bridge, FHWA promised improvements to its oversight of bridge maintenance. The agency began a number of initiatives, including the implementation of a more data-driven, risk-based method of overseeing bridge safety. This kind of approach would enable FHWA to focus its limited resources on areas with the greatest need.

Last year, the Office of the Inspector General [OIG] issued a report evaluating FHWA's implementation of its new data-driven, risk-based oversight. The OIG found significant holes in the new oversight regime. When the FHWA conducted its compliance reviews and assessments, the OIG found that the division offices made limited use of the agency's data and conducted their work inconsistently from office to office. The OIG attributed these shortcomings to the fact that managers at FHWA headquarters provided

no minimum requirements for the division offices to follow. The OIG also found that headquarters staff themselves did not routinely use data in order to focus agency resources on the highest risk areas. Finally, the OIG reported that FHWA did not take an active approach in helping States improve the quality of data collected on bridges, a shortcoming that could undermine any effort to base agency efforts on high risk areas identified through data analysis.

The OIG's report included five recommendations for FHWA, and the agency concurred with each one. In its appropriations act for fiscal year 2010, the Committee directed the OIG to provide an update on its report, detailing the progress that FHWA has made in meeting these five recommendations. Since the OIG had also acknowledged that FHWA's efforts are limited in part by a lack of resources, the Committee also provided an additional $5,000,000 that FHWA has dedicated to hiring additional staff to work on bridge oversight, improving its bridge data systems, and other investments to strengthen its oversight.

Based on information from the OIG, the Committee understands that FHWA has acted on all five recommendations from the 2009 report. The OIG, however, has closed only one of the recommendations to date.

Although FHWA is making progress in improving its oversight of bridge maintenance, the Committee believes this progress is being made too slowly. The Committee also believes that the continued vigilance of the OIG plays a large role in ensuring that FHWA follows through on its promises. Therefore, the Committee directs the OIG to provide a second evaluation of FHWA's progress in fulfilling each of the recommendations given in its report on the national bridge inspection program (Report Number MH–2009–013) and to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with its findings no later than September 1, 2010.

Off-system Bridges.—The Committee would like to see off-system bridge funding continue to be available through the reauthorization legislation. This 15 percent set aside for bridges not on the Federal-aid system has been in place since 1978, when it became apparent that many of these bridges were in poor condition. Over the last 30 years, the set aside has been of substantial help to county governments in their efforts to upgrade these facilities. In fiscal year 2009, about $777,000,000 of the $5,200,000,000 Federal bridge program was spent on off-system bridges.

There are approximately 285,000 off-system bridges in the United States out of a total of 601,000 bridges. While there are many off-system bridges in urban areas, most tend to be in rural communities. In rural America, 258,000 of the 456,000 bridges are not on the Federal-aid system. These are the bridges that serve the agriculture, tourism, mining and logging industries. These are the bridges that carry thousands of school buses each day and are used by fire trucks and other emergency vehicles serving rural regions. A closed or weight posted bridge can severely impact the economy of a rural community and affect the lives of residents. School buses that must detour miles around an unsafe bridge and vehicles that are denied the most direct access to a community's agricultural

processing plant hurt local economies, even more so in the current economic crisis.

The data shows that the off-system bridge program works. According to a recent Government Accountability Office report on the Highway Bridge Program, "Improvements were most notable in bridges owned by local agencies and on rural routes, which may be attributable, in part, to the Federal bridge program requirement—under HBP and some of its predecessor programs—that States spend a minimum amount of their apportionment on non-Federal-aid highway bridges."

The following table shows the obligation limitation provided to each State under the Committee's recommended funding level:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM OBLIGATION LIMITATION

[Fiscal year 2010, President's request and Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2011]

	Fiscal year 2010	Fiscal year budget request 2011	Committee recommendation
Formula Programs			
ALABAMA	$700,263,298	$731,470,773	$742,293,679
ALASKA	374,648,510	436,146,704	442,308,151
ARIZONA	685,222,909	699,585,886	709,705,884
ARKANSAS	453,845,016	487,553,400	495,221,539
CALIFORNIA	3,265,770,641	3,470,900,317	3,527,281,778
COLORADO	486,997,867	515,813,585	524,227,763
CONNECTICUT	452,146,366	476,112,299	483,578,967
DELAWARE	146,782,056	159,757,289	162,382,996
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	142,780,817	155,028,036	157,769,235
FLORIDA	1,750,374,521	1,806,778,416	1,832,141,474
GEORGIA	1,191,375,843	1,233,578,793	1,251,293,143
HAWAII	151,807,771	163,984,941	166,822,613
IDAHO	260,710,493	273,913,700	277,987,383
ILLINOIS	1,259,810,240	1,366,673,004	1,388,229,100
INDIANA	881,939,042	909,541,511	922,583,849
IOWA	431,370,074	465,211,767	473,006,558
KANSAS	349,048,525	366,554,923	372,871,382
KENTUCKY	606,749,707	638,708,991	648,404,329
LOUISIANA	610,954,241	654,382,549	665,039,769
MAINE	163,487,162	179,944,523	183,074,342
MARYLAND	551,738,594	579,032,864	588,589,419
MASSACHUSETTS	563,004,948	588,635,469	598,853,748
MICHIGAN	973,677,766	1,013,833,988	1,029,765,348
MINNESOTA	569,889,691	606,905,755	616,437,637
MISSISSIPPI	426,993,733	456,751,431	464,163,519
MISSOURI	828,034,266	885,402,474	899,180,105
MONTANA	340,739,848	368,896,938	374,340,749
NEBRASKA	264,020,165	279,572,154	284,263,023
NEVADA	309,442,654	349,453,057	355,004,342
NEW HAMPSHIRE	153,269,513	159,375,526	161,965,172
NEW JERSEY	911,521,100	954,687,762	969,624,461
NEW MEXICO	328,942,512	344,577,405	349,977,648
NEW YORK	1,539,792,696	1,621,877,515	1,648,719,769
NORTH CAROLINA	966,890,578	998,520,623	1,013,473,147
NORTH DAKOTA	224,734,268	240,188,302	244,152,356
OHIO	1,210,026,325	1,263,233,467	1,282,685,660
OKLAHOMA	564,993,672	611,587,548	621,515,167
OREGON	430,631,284	473,990,958	482,006,037
PENNSYLVANIA	1,519,688,351	1,584,239,442	1,609,646,649
RHODE ISLAND	189,490,250	209,489,255	213,256,910
SOUTH CAROLINA	575,816,228	601,610,576	610,552,008
SOUTH DAKOTA	244,086,301	265,286,145	269,527,970
TENNESSEE	753,570,608	793,862,097	805,845,954
TEXAS	2,941,295,499	3,015,504,101	3,058,805,725

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM OBLIGATION LIMITATION—Continued

[Fiscal year 2010, President's request and Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2011]

	Fiscal year 2010	Fiscal year budget request 2011	Committee recommendation
UTAH	287,996,246	310,259,370	315,232,174
VERMONT	168,301,436	193,638,263	197,030,662
VIRGINIA	913,371,961	958,331,651	972,863,187
WASHINGTON	599,570,763	640,945,314	651,926,022
WEST VIRGINIA	384,525,148	412,008,624	417,944,057
WISCONSIN	678,842,204	709,688,123	719,963,635
WYOMING	225,964,097	234,908,821	238,751,267
SUBTOTAL	35,006,947,804	36,917,936,425	37,492,287,461
Non-formula programs	6,100,052,196	4,444,838,575	4,283,712,539
TOTAL	41,107,000,000	41,362,775,000	41,776,000,000

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, made Federal-aid highways funds available in various categories of spending. These categories were continued by the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment [HIRE] Act, which extends surface transportation programs and Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority through December 31, 2010.

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 current Interstate; other rural principal arterials; urban freeways and connecting urban principal arterials; 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
Augusta North Connections—Exit 113, ME	$4,000,000
Columbia River Crossing, OR	750,000
Columbia River Crossing, WA	2,000,000
East Belgrade I–90 Interchange, MT	750,000
Exit 120 Reconstruction, NV	1,500,000
I–10 Grand Prairie Highway (La Hwy 98) Interchange and Frontage Road, LA	400,000
I–10 Pecue Lane Interchange, Baton Rouge, LA	750,000
I–15 Helena Custer Avenue Interchange and Montana Rail Link Overpass Structures, MT	1,000,000
I–280 Mission Bay Off-Ramp and Improvements, CA	1,500,000
I–29/I–229 Bridges and Interstate Mainline Reconstruction from Near Tea Exit to North of 69th Street and East to Louise Avenue, SD	750,000
I–5 North Stockton Widening and HOV Lane Project, CA	1,000,000
I–5 Ridgefield Interchange Replacement Project, City of Ridgefield, WA	1,000,000
I–5 West Coast Green Highway, WA	1,000,000
I–75/Everglades Project Development and Environment Study, FL	1,000,000
I–84, West of Wendell to Juniper Rest Area Pavement Rehabilitation, ID	1,000,000
I–84/184, Caldwell to Glenns Ferry, Pavement Rehabilitation, ID	750,000
I–85 Widening in Davidson and Rowan Counties, NC	1,000,000
I–95 Pawtucket River Bridge Replacement, RI	3,000,000
I–95/SR1 Interchange Project, DE	1,000,000
I–95/US Hwy. 301 Interchange Improvement Project, SC	500,000
Interchange at State Hwy. 89 and I–40 in Lonoke, AR	1,000,000
Interstate 280 Interchange Improvements, Harrison, NJ	1,500,000
Interstate 430/630—Interchange Modification, AR	3,000,000
Interstate 69/Great River Bridge: Highway 65–MS Highway 1, AR	1,000,000
Interstate 74 Corridor Project, Bettendorf, IA	3,000,000
Interstate 81 Improvements in Washington County, MD	500,000
Interstate-95/Fairfax County Parkway Interchange at Newington Road, VA	1,000,000
Kapolei Interchange Complex Phase 2, HI	1,500,000
Starr Road Interchange, NV	2,000,000
US 84, El Camino East/West Corridor, AL	1,000,000

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 name	Committee recommendation
BIA 25, Spirit Lake Nation, ND	$1,000,000
Boulder City Bypass Improvement, NV	1,000,000
BRAC-related improvements in Anne Arundel County, MD	2,200,000
BRAC-related improvements in Montgomery County, MD	2,200,000
BRAC-related improvements in Prince George's County, MD	2,200,000
BRAC-related improvements, Harford County, MD	2,200,000
Columbia Pike Realignment, Arlington, VA	400,000
Elwha Valley Road Improvements, WA	1,300,000
Federal Lands Improvement Project, HI	4,000,000
FH–24, Banks to Lowman, ID	1,500,000
Ghost Hawk Road Improvements (BIA Route 7 to SD Hwy 18), SD	150,000
I–15 Corridors of the Future, NV	800,000
Improvements and 4 R Work to SD 73 in Jackson County, SD	1,000,000
NM 4 Jemez Pueblo Bypass, NM	1,000,000
Onville Road Upgrades, VA	400,000
Pikes Peak-America's Mountain, Colorado Springs, CO	500,000
Pyramid Highway Corridor, Sparks, NV	2,000,000
SR 160 from I–15 to Pahrump, NV	1,000,000
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe-Community Streets Project, Old Bear Soldier, SD	750,000
US 50—CO 194 Road Construction, Bent County, CO	1,400,000
US 15 at Monocacy Boulevard in Frederick County, MD	500,000
US–20 Sisters Downtown Improvements, Salem, OR	1,500,000

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.

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: $2,000,000 for Keller Ferry Replacement Project, Lincoln and Ferry Counties, Washington; $2,000,000 for Port Lions City Dock and Ferry Terminal Replacement, Alaska; 1,000,000 for Port Townsend Passenger Only Ferry, Washington; and $2,000,000 for Washington State Ferries System Investments, Washington.

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 name	Committee recommendation
Alice's Road/105th Street Interchange and Connecting Roads, Waukee, IA	$900,000
Bellingham Waterfront Transportation Improvements, Bellingham, WA	700,000
Brookstown Redevelopment Project, Winston-Salem, NC	1,000,000

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY AND SYSTEM PRESERVATION PROGRAM—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Centennial Trail Expansion, Snohomish County, WA	375,000
Center Point Greenway and Pedestrian Walkway Project, AL	500,000
Cregg Lane/Wyoming Street Connector, MT	1,825,000
Cushman Trail Project, Pierce County, WA	525,000
Denver Bike Sharing, Denver, CO	500,000
Downtown Streetscape Improvements, City of Pine Bluff, AR	1,100,000
East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana Downtown Greenway, LA	250,000
Environmental Improvement and Cost Savings Pavement Study, SC	350,000
Essex County Riverfront Park, Newark, NJ	1,000,000
Fountain Avenue Rehabilitation and Veteran's Bridge Connectivity, Springfield, OH	350,000
Highway 212 Expansion—Carver County, MN	400,000
I–49 North, LA	1,000,000
I–55 Business Loop to Memorial Hospital, City of Lincoln, IL	2,000,000
John N. Hardee Expressway, SC	1,000,000
Loop 82 Railroad Overpass, San Marcos, TX	1,500,000
Medford Safe Sidewalks, Medford, OR	300,000
Midtown Revitalization Transportation Infrastructure, Rochester, NY	2,000,000
Piedmont Triad Research Park Transportation Improvements, NC	500,000
Qwuloolt Access Trail Project, Marysville, WA	500,000
Reconstruction of the Hudson River Waterfront Walkway, Hoboken, NJ	1,000,000
Rivers Edge Roadway Infrastructure and Streetscape Initiative, MI	1,300,000
Saddle Road Improvement Project, HI	2,000,000
Shoulder Widening and Paving of SC Highway 22, SC	1,000,000
Southern Nevada Beltway Interchanges, NV	1,000,000
State Road 133 from Albany to Valdosta, GA	1,000,000
SW 27th Street—Strander Connection Project, Renton, WA	1,000,000
Tacoma Downtown Streetscape Improvements, Tacoma, WA	500,000
US Highway 97 & J Street Project, Madres, OR	750,000
West Ninth Avenue Extension and Overpass Construction, Belton, TX	750,000

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 distributed among the 13 eligible States based on the latest available cost-to-complete estimate prepared by the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Delta Region Transportation Development Program.—This program encourages multistate transportation planning and supports the development of transportation infrastructure in the eight

States that comprise the region of the Mississippi Delta: Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.

Within the funding available to the Delta Region Transportation Development Program, funds are to be made available to the following projects and activities:

DELTA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Project name	Committee recommendation
Highway 82 Improvements, MS	$2,000,000
Interchange of Business 67 and Oakgrove, MO	2,000,000
Interstate-55 Interchange, MO	1,000,000
Lake Harbour Drive Extension, MS	1,000,000
US–412 Bypass Center Turn Lane, MO	1,000,000
Washington Street Bridge, Vicksburg, MS	1,500,000

Railway-Highway Crossing Hazard Elimination in High-speed Rail Corridors.—This program provides grants for safety improvements at grade crossings between railways and highways on designated high-speed rail corridors.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2010	$41,846,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	42,102,000,000
Committee recommendation	42,515,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal-aid highways program is funded through contract authority paid out of the Highway Trust Fund. Most forms of budget authority provide the authority to enter into obligations and then to liquate those obligations. Put another way, it allows a Federal agency to commit to spending money on specified activities and then to actually spend that money. In contrast, contract authority provides only the authority to enter into obligations, but not the authority to liquidate those obligations. The authority to liquidate obligations—to actually spend the money committed with the contract authority—must be provided separately. The authority to liquidate obligations under the Federal-aid highways program is provided under this heading. This liquidating authority allows FHWA to follow through on commitments already allowed under current law; it does not provide the authority to enter into new commitments for Federal spending.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $42,515,000,000. The recommended level is $413,000,000 more than the budget request and $669,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. This level of liquidating authority is necessary to pay outstanding obligations from various highway accounts pursuant to this and prior appropriations acts.

PLANNING CAPACITY GRANTS

Appropriations, 2010	.....
Budget estimate, 2011 [1]	$200,000,000
Committee recommendation	200,000,000

[1] The administration requested this funding as part of the obligation limitation of the Federal-aid highways program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Funding provided under this heading would be available for grants to metropolitan planning organizations; State, local, and tribal governments; and public agencies such as transit authorities that conduct surface transportation planning. The grants would be awarded on a competitive basis in order to improve the capacity of those organizations to conduct their transportation planning.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the appropriation of $200,000,000 for planning capacity grants. This funding level is equal to the budget request; however, the administration requested that the budgetary resources for this program be provided as obligation authority and contract authority set aside from the Federal-aid highways program. The fiscal year 2010 appropriations act included no funding for this activity.

The grants awarded under this program will help planning organizations improve their capacity to conduct transportation planning, and to integrate their transportation plans with local housing and economic development. Activities funded under this program may include software and computer upgrades to support better modeling, data collection, and training. In awarding funds provided under this heading, the Committee expects the Department to place a high priority on those applicants that demonstrate a history of working with public and nonprofit agencies that conduct housing and community planning, as well as a willingness to share the resources provided in a planning capacity grant with other planning organizations.

The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000 set aside for grants that will improve planning for rural areas. The Committee also directs the Department to award grants to ensure an equitable geographic distribution of funds and appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural communities. The Committee includes these protections for rural areas in order to make sure that this program offers an opportunity for all kinds of communities to develop transportation plans that suit their own needs.

The Committee also set aside $12,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading for grants that lead to greater public involvement in transportation planning. The administration requested such grants as part of the budget request for the Office of the Secretary.

Finally, the Committee has included language that allows the Secretary to retain up to 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading to fund the award and oversight of planning capacity grants. The language directs this funding to be split equally between the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. The Committee values the expertise and the ex-

perience these two agencies have gained in implementing the planning programs and requirements under the highway and transit authorization laws. The Committee expects them to continue working together in a collaborative manner on the implementation of this program.

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 provides requirements for any waiver of Buy American requirements.

Section 123 continues a provision prohibiting tolling in Texas, with exceptions.

Section 124 appropriates funds for the projects, programs, and activities specified as follows:

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS

Project name	Committee recommendation
Assembly Square Station, MA	$860,000
Burlington Waterfront North Improvements, VT	500,000
7th Street Gateway Enhancement Project, NJ	500,000
9th Street Safety Improvements Project, Pierce County, WA	700,000
A1A/State Road 200, FL	750,000
Access Road for Hospital in St. Bernard Parish, LA	2,500,000
Airport Road Repair and Resurface and Construction of Western Entrance to Bryan Field, Starksville, MS	800,000
Ann Arbor—Detroit Regional Rail Project, MI	2,000,000
Appalachian Development Highway System Corridor H, WV	2,000,000
Ash Avenue Extension, Macon County, IL	400,000
Autumn Street Parkway, San Jose, CA	800,000
Bench Boulevard Improvements, Billings, MT	1,000,000
Bench Boulevard, Helena, MT	750,000
Bloomfield Six Points Intersection Streetscape, Bloomfield, NJ	500,000
Brady/Harrison Sustainability Corridor, Davenport, IA	600,000
Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus Streetscape and Infrastructure Improvements, NY	1,000,000
Carson City Freeway Phase II, NV	500,000
Center at Horseheads Access Project, Chemung County, NY	750,000
Central Business District Streetscape, City of Milan, MO	800,000
City of Detroit Dequindre Cut Greenway, Phase II, MI	1,000,000
City of Harlingen North Rail Relocation, TX	1,000,000
City of Monroe Fourth Street Underpass Project, Monroe, LA	800,000
Congress Street Bridge, Bridgeport, CT	1,200,000
ConnectVermont, VT	1,000,000
Crosby Street Reconstruction Project, Hornell, NY	500,000
Defense Facility Access Road, West Point, MS	750,000
Denali Commission Transportation Program, AK	800,000
Denali Commission, AK only for the Anaktuvuk Pass Bridge Replacement, Scammon Bay Community Streets, Alakanuk Community Streets and King Salmon & Naknek School Bus Road, AK	1,000,000
Division Street Corridor Improvements, Spokane, WA	1,000,000
Downtown Farmingdale Revitalization Master Plan, NY	100,000
Downtown Infrastructure Project, Somersworth, NH	300,000
Downtown Streetscape, City of Custer, SD	400,000
Downtown Streetscape, Yankton, SD	300,000
East Brandon By-Pass, Brandon, MS	2,500,000
East Metropolitan Corridor, Brandon, MS	2,500,000
East Mississippi Intermodal Rail Corridor, MS	1,000,000
Embarcadero Goods Movement Project, Oakland, CA	2,000,000
Fairbanks Rail Line Relocation, AK	1,000,000

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Faulkner Lake Road Improvements, AR	500,000
Fort Campbell KY–911 Road Widening Project from US–41A to Oak Grove, Christian County, KY	3,000,000
Fort Knox Access Road, Hardin County, KY	1,600,000
Fortification Street Improvements, Jackson, MS	2,500,000
Freight Rail Modernization: Improving the Freight Rail and Transfer Facility at the Hunts Point Terminal Produce Market, South Bronx, NY	500,000
Grace Avenue Safety Improvements, City of Battle Ground, WA	1,000,000
Grand Technology Gateway—Phase 1, West Des Moines, IA	500,000
Greensboro Downtown Greenway, Greensboro, NC	300,000
Hattiesburg Longleaf Trace Rails to Trails, Hattiesburg, MS	500,000
Hendersonville Area Infrastructure Improvements, Hendersonville, NC	250,000
High Street/Route 89 Reconstruction, Caribou, ME	1,000,000
Highway 112 Improvement, AR	500,000
Highway 14 Project, Owatonna to Dodge Center, MN	250,000
Highway 226: Highway 67 to Highway 49, Little Rock, AR	1,000,000
Highway 47 Bridge Replacement, MO	2,000,000
Highway 6, Batesville, MS	500,000
Highway 7 Sidewalk Infill, City of Blue Springs, MO	800,000
Highway 93 and Kalispell Bypass, MT	600,000
Highway 965 Project, Phase 2, North Liberty, IA	500,000
Highway 98 Access Improvements, Lamar County, MS	1,750,000
Holly Springs Road, DeSoto County, MS	2,000,000
Horsehoe Bend Parkway Extension, MO	2,000,000
I–15 Corridor: Devore Interchange Improvements, San Bernardino, CA	1,500,000
I–15 MP 8, Bicycle/Pedestrian Passageway, City of St. George, UT	500,000
I–40 Realignment Ingress/Egress Project, Oklahoma City, OK	750,000
I–49 between I–40 and US Hwy. 71 South, Little Rock, AR	2,500,000
Icicle Station—Phase II, City of Leavenworth, WA	900,000
Illinois Pedestrian and Bicycling Road and Trail Improvements and Enhancements, IL	2,500,000
Indian River Inlet Bridge, Dover, DE	800,000
Intallation of the Sterling Highway/Birch Street Traffic Signal Light, Soldatna, AK	400,000
Interchange CSAH7/TH23, Lyon County, MN	1,000,000
Interstate 44 and Range Line Road Interchange, MO	1,000,000
Interstate 44 Crossroads Interchange Study, City of Joplin, MO	250,000
Interstate 64 and 22nd St. Interchange Reconfiguration, MO	1,500,000
Iowa Highway 14–57 Complete Streets Corridor Improvements, Parkersburg, IA	750,000
Jordan Valley Gateway Plaza Streetscape, City of Springfield, MO	600,000
Khrushchev in Iowa Trail, Guthrie County, IA	400,000
LA 1 Project Phase II Design—Golden Meadow, Leeville, LA	500,000
Lafayette Interchange, MO	1,500,000
Lake St. Clair Shoreline Trail, Harrison Township, MI	1,000,000
Lewis and Clark Legacy Trail, ND	600,000
Lone Elm Road Improvements, City of Olathe, KS	600,000
Lower Hill Infrastructure Project, PA	600,000
Lower Main Street Infrastructure Project, Claremont, NH	500,000
Maritime Fire and Safety Administration, WA	500,000
Martin Road Expansion from Zierdt Road West to Laracy Drive, AL	10,000,000
MD 404 Improvements in Caroline, Talbot and Queen Anne's Counties, MD	600,000
Memorial Boulevard Improvements, Picayune, MS	1,450,000
MLK Blvd Grade Separation Safety Improvements, Yakima, WA	1,300,000
MO–740—East Columbia Transportation Extension, MO	1,500,000
Monongalia Health Systems, Morgantown, WV	1,000,000
Monte Vista Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad Grade Separation Project, CA	700,000
Rail and Infrastructure Improvements in Northern Maine, ME	3,000,000
Naugatuck River Greenway/Waterbury Segment, CT	750,000
NC 12, Dare County, NC	750,000
Nevada Pacific Parkway Extension, Fernley, NV	500,000
New Bedford Fast Track Freight Bridges, MA	1,000,000
New York Ave. from 32nd to 48th St, Union City, NJ	500,000
New York State Route 12, Chenango County, NY	450,000
Newport Cliff Walk Restoration, RI	1,000,000
North 5th Street Arterial, NV	2,000,000
North Manhattan Avenue Widening, Manhattan, KS	600,000

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Northern Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation, Boston, MA	1,000,000
Northern Nevada Traffic Management, NV	500,000
Northside Drive Corridor, Clinton, MS	2,500,000
Ogdensburg-Prescott International Bridge Rehabilitation Project, NY	750,000
Paducah Waterfront Development Project, KY	1,000,000
Port of Anchorage Intermodal Expansion Project, AK	1,000,000
Port of Pasco Rail Infrastructure Construction, WA	1,400,000
Quincy Center Redevelopment, Quincy, MA	400,000
Rail Infrastructure Investments, Port of Grays Harbor, WA	2,000,000
Rail Infrastructure Investments, Port of Moses Lake, WA	2,000,000
Raleigh Street Extension, Martinsburg, WV	1,000,000
Reconstruction of Hunter Street Bridge, County of Gloucester, NJ	1,000,000
Red Mountain Transportation Improvements, Benton County, WA	1,000,000
Regional Planning Commission, St. Tammany Parish LA 21 Widening, New Orleans, LA	1,300,000
Rehabilitation of the Ashford Avenue Bridge, Westchester County, NY	750,000
Rickenbacker Pickaway East-West Connector, OH	500,000
Riverside Freeway (State Route 91) Congestion Relief Project, Orange County, CA	1,000,000
Route 1/Route 123 Interchange Improvements, VA	400,000
Route 160 Bridge over I–44, MO	1,000,000
Route 54 Corridor, MO	1,000,000
Sellwood Bridge Replacement Project, OR	500,000
Shelby Intermodal Hub, Shelby, MT	2,000,000
South Dakota Highway 100 Right-of-Way and Construction, Sioux Falls, SD	1,200,000
Southeast Connector, Des Moines, IA	2,000,000
Southpark Bridge Replacement Project, King County, WA	3,000,000
Southridge Transportation Improvements, City of Kennewick, WA	500,000
Sparks Rail Yard Relocation Study, City of Sparks, NV	200,000
SR 6247 Section 000 Valley View Business Park Access Road, Lackawanna County, PA	750,000
SR24, Love Creek to SR1, Dover, DE	500,000
SR–522 Corridor Improvements, City of Kenmore, WA	600,000
St. John's Heritage Parkway Interchanges, FL	1,500,000
Stamford Pedestrian Safety Improvements, CT	500,000
Stamford Street Underpass Reconstruction, Stamford, CT	1,000,000
State Route 19 from State Route 492 to Philadelphia, MS	1,750,000
State Route 794 Realignment, Springfield, OH	750,000
Stonewall Jackson State Park, WV	500,000
Sunport Boulevard Extension, Bernalillo County, NM	1,700,000
TH 5/Oak Avenue Pedestrian Underpass, City of Waconia, MN	400,000
TH 610 from CSAH 81 to I–94, MN	250,000
Town of Bristol Road and Drainage Improvements, RI	350,000
Transportation Infrastructure to Serve the Kansas Logistics Park, Newton, KS	500,000
Trunk Highway 13 & County State Aid Highway 5 Interchange, MN	250,000
US 113 Improvements in Worcester County, MD	600,000
US 12 Safety Improvements, Walla Walla County, WA	1,000,000
US 2 and Sultan Basin Road Safety Improvements, Sultan, WA	1,000,000
US 287 Business Route, Fort Worth, TX	3,500,000
US Route 322 Corridor Safety Improvements, PA	500,000
US Route 422/Sanatoga Interchange, PA	700,000
Umatilla Depot Rail Switches Replacement Project, Umatilla County, OR	400,000
Urban Collector Road Project, Jackson County, MS	2,000,000
US 52 Interchange & Overpass, Relocate Goodhue County 24 at Cannon Falls, MN	400,000
US 93 Corridor, MT	1,000,000
US Highway 30, Whiteside County, IL	500,000
US Highway 63/Future Interstate 555 Interchange Improvements, Little Rock, AR	2,000,000
Vancouver Waterfront Access Improvement Project, WA	2,000,000
Vermont Downtown Streetscape and Sidewalk Improvements in Johnson, Ludlow, Northfield, Springfield, and Townshend, VT	3,250,000
Village West Access Improvements, KS	300,000
Warrensville/Van Aken Transit Oriented Development, Shaker Heights, OH	500,000
West College Street Improvements, Bozeman, MT	750,000
West Virginia Route 10, Logan County, WV	1,500,000
Wilmington to Newark Commuter Rail Improvement Program, DE	1,300,000

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 responsibilities 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, and research and innovative technology, thereby achieving a safer and more secure transportation environment. Additionally, the 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 $569,948,000, for the FMCSA. The language provides the authority to obligate and liquidate $549,898,000 from the Highway Trust Fund, as well as an appropriation of $20,050,000 from the General Fund. The Committee is assuming an extension of SAFETEA–LU at the currently authorized levels. As such it was necessary to provide budget authority in addition to contract authority made available under an extension to meet the President's request for these safety programs. This level is $20,050,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

FMCSA is responsible for developing, implementing, and enforcing regulations for the motor carrier industry that result in qualified drivers and safe vehicles operating on our Nation's highways. By effectively carrying out its responsibilities, the agency provides the motor carrier industry with appropriate guidance and sufficient oversight to ensure both the efficient movement of goods and people as well as the safety of the driving public.

In fiscal year 2010, the Committee voiced frustration with the FMCSA's continued failure to timely address recommendations by the Department of Transportation's Office of Inspector General [OIG], the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB], and the Government Accountability Office [GAO]. For example, the OIG has more than 22 open recommendations for the FMCSA, 7 of which date back to May 2002 regarding improvements to the testing and licensing of commercial drivers. The Committee recognizes the FMCSA's intention to complete regulatory action on this issue by October 2010 and expects the agency to meet its self-imposed goals. In addition, the NTSB continues to rate the agency's response as "unacceptable" in addressing safety recommendations to: (1) improve the collection and maintenance of data concerning hours of service of motor carrier drivers by requiring the mandatory, universal use of electronic onboard recorders, and (2) prevent motor carriers from operating if they have serious safety violations with mechanical failures or unqualified drivers. The Committee urges the FMCSA to appropriately address these issues in the coming fiscal year that were placed on NTSB's Most Wanted List in 2008 and 2010 respectively.

The FMCSA has begun a multilateral approach to addressing a variety of long-standing and serious safety issues across several core programs and activities ranging from: the use of electronic-onboard records; enforcement of the Americans with Disabilities Act for over-the-road bus companies; revised medical qualification and medical certification standards and procedures; and implementation of a Drug and Alcohol National Database. While the agency is making headway to address these and other issues, virtually all programmatic, regulatory, and enforcement solutions remain a work-in-progress. The FMCSA's leadership must commit to seeing these and other projects to a timely and satisfactory conclusion in order to ensure that the recent downward trend in motor carrier related highway fatalities continue. The Committee believes that FMCSA has the opportunity to generate further reductions in large truck fatalities this year by addressing its many outstanding recommendations, and expects the agency to seize this opportunity.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Limitation, 2010	$239,828,000
Budget estimate, 2011 (limitation)	259,878,000
Committee recommendation [1]	259,878,000

[1] The Committee recommendation includes both obligation limitation and budget authority.

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 United States/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 $239,828,000 for FMCSA's Operations and Programs. The Committee has also provided the authority to liquidate an equal amount of contract authorization. The Committee has also appropriated $20,050,000 from the General Fund. The recommendation is $20,050,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

OPERATING EXPENSES

The Committee recommends $195,669,000 for operating expenses. This level is $12,619,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

Comprehensive Safety Analysis [CSA] 2010.—Over the past 6 years, the FMCSA has been undertaking a comprehensive evaluation and overhaul of its systems and operations. The CSA 2010 initiative is designed to improve the effectiveness of the agency's compliance and enforcement programs. The Committee strongly supports the agency's efforts to improve its programs, and remains focused on ensuring CSA 2010 delivers the promised results. The Committee appreciates that the agency has taken steps to communicate the changes and benefits of CSA 2010 to its partners and stakeholders. Given that FMCSA relies on its partners in the field to assist them in fulfilling its mission, continued communication with and training of its partners will be critical to the initiative's success.

The accompanying chart identifies the major milestones associated with the development and implementation of CSA 2010. The Committee is concerned with the FMCSA's failure to meet critical milestones for implementing this new system. For example, the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking related to the safety fitness determination rating system has been delayed from October 2009 to January 2011. Until the rulemaking is complete, the FMCSA is relying on the current rating system that fails to place a sufficient emphasis on both driver and vehicle qualifications thereby compromising safety on our Nation's highways. This rulemaking will be subject to great scrutiny, which is likely to require a significant amount of time, so continued delays in the rulemaking will delay the potential safety benefits that CSA 210 has to offer. The Committee expects the FMCSA to meet its new target date of January 2011.

In the Committee report accompanying the fiscal year 2010 appropriations bill, the Committee requested a report on the results of the CSA 2010 pilot and updated CSA 2010 spending plan by March 15, 2010. The FMCSA has failed to deliver this report. The inability of the agency to meet congressionally directed reporting deadlines in a timely fashion, without justification for such delays,

complicates the Committee's ability to conduct oversight. The Committee requests that GAO continue to monitor the implementation of CSA 2010, provide an assessment of the pilots that were conducted as part of the initiative, and evaluate FMCSA's ability to meet the milestones and cost estimates included in its spending plan.

CSA MILESTONES, 2009–2012

2009	2010	2011	2012
August: Final report on measurement methodology (Complete). SFD final report (Complete). September: Establish protocols for program evaluation data collection (Complete). Define interventions for BASICs of: (1) Driver Fitness, (2) Controlled Substances/Alcohol, (3) Improper loading/cargo securement, & (4) Crash History (Complete). Develop policy, guidance and aids for interventions, Phase II (Complete). Document intervention selection guidance for Phase II BASICs (Complete). Deliver refined concept of operations for Phase II (Complete). Deliver training for Phase II (Complete). Initiate Phase II of operational model test (Complete). November: Deliver final rulemaking support paper (Completed November 2007).	February: Deliver refined concept of operation for broader implementation (Complete). March: Identify and summarize requirements for broader implementation (Complete). [2] April: Initiate motor carrier data preview of violations by BASIC (Complete). June: Update new Safety Measurement System (SMS) (Complete). Complete operational model test (Complete) ... Improve core program elements from operational model test (Complete). [2] July: Modify Field Operations Training Manual (Incomplete). [2] August: Expand data preview to show SMS assessment (Incomplete).	January: Publish NPRM on safety fitness determination (Incomplete). [1] November: Complete CSA 2010 implementation nationwide; training State-by-State (Incomplete).	July: Complete quantitative analyses for program evaluation (Incomplete).

December: Annual public listening session webcasts/report-out (Complete).	October: Coordinate with FMCSA Reauthorization Working Group (Ongoing). Develop training materials for broader implementation (Incomplete).[2] November/December: Begin implementing CSA 2010 nationwide (Incomplete).[2] Deliver final report of findings from analyses and evaluation. Complete measurement system evaluation (Incomplete).[3] Annual public listening session/report-out (TBD).		

[1] Original completion date scheduled for October 2009.
[2] Indicates earlier completion date than originally scheduled and reported in fiscal year 2010 Committee report.
[3] Original completion date scheduled for November 2008.

Hours of Service.—For more than 30 years, the NTSB has advocated regulations that address driver fatigue. According to the NTSB, driver fatigue remains the primary factor in 30 to 40 percent of large truck crashes involving facilities. The NTSB recommended the use of science-based principles to revise the hours-of-service rule to require at least 8 hours of continuous sleep and the elimination of sleeper berth provisions that allow for the splitting of sleep periods. After regulatory actions on the motor carrier hours-of-service rule were challenged and struck down by the courts, the FMCSA is due to present a new regulatory action to OMB by July 26, 2010, and to complete a final rulemaking by July 26, 2011. It is essential for the FMCSA to conduct a fully open and transparent regulatory process that discloses the agency's operator-fatigue model methodology, considers the health impact on drivers, develops policies based upon sound sleep and fatigue scientific research, and properly considers safety and crash-related data. The FMCSA's prior regulatory action on this long standing safety recommendation is very troubling. The Committee expects the FMCSA to fulfill its highway safety mission, revise the hours of service regulations, and protect the Nation's traveling public consistent within the timelines established in the settlement agreement.

Electronic On-board Recorders.—No hours-of-service rule will serve its purpose unless it is adequately enforced. In 1977, the NTSB issued its first recommendation on the use of on-board recording devices for commercial vehicles to provide an efficient and reliable means of tracking the number of hours a commercial motor vehicle operator drives. The NTSB subsequently issued additional recommendations concerning the use of on-board recorders. In 2008, the NTSB added to its Most Wanted List a recommendation to FMCSA to require electronic on-board data recorders [EOBRs] to maintain accurate carrier records of drivers' hours of service. Despite the FMCSA's recent final rulemaking requiring the limited use of EOBRs to carriers with the most serious safety violations, this recommendation remains "open unacceptable". The Committee supports the FMCSA's commitment to issue a broader EOBR mandate and encourages the FMCSA to expand EOBR usage for interstate commercial vehicles.

High-risk Carriers.—Since fiscal year 2008, the Committee has required quarterly reports on the agency's ability to meet the requirement to conduct compliance reviews on all motor carriers identified as high risk. Since the agency first began reporting its performance on this requirement to the Committee, the agency's ability to comply with this requirement has improved significantly, from completing compliance reviews of 69 percent of high-risk carriers in fiscal year 2008 to 88 percent last year. Likewise, it has reduced the backlog of open reviews from 1,084 carriers in fiscal year 2008 to 296 carriers at the end of the 2009 calendar year. The Committee is pleased with this progress and expects the agency to continue to make strides to fulfill its mandate. The Committee directs the agency to continue to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with a report on its ability to meet its requirements to evaluate high-risk carriers on March 30, 2011 and September 30, 2011.

Reincarnated Carriers.—Unfortunately, unscrupulous motor carriers use the new entrant program to evade enforcement action or an out-of-service order by going out of business and then reincarnating themselves as a new motor carrier. For example, the GAO found that 9 percent of motor coach carriers placed out of service by the FMCSA between 2007 and 2008 applied as new entrants. The GAO believes these carriers reincarnated to avoid paying fines for serious safety violations. Further, the GAO concluded that their analysis underestimates the actual number of reincarnated carriers because the matching mechanisms it used could not detect minor spelling changes or other efforts at deception. According to the report, these companies demonstrated a pattern of violations that continued after the carriers reincarnated. They include: breeches of drug and alcohol testing and driver qualification rules, operating without proper authority, and, in one case, illegally transporting passengers across the United States-Mexico border. One company was cited for 78 safety violations between 2000 and 2008, prior to its reincarnation.

In 2009, the FMCSA began its New Entrant Safety Assurance Program, raising the standard of compliance to pass the new entrant safety audit that is conducted within 18 months of registration. In addition, the agency has taken strong enforcement actions in certain cases involving serious and repeated violations. However, it is clear current prevention mechanisms remain insufficient and, at a minimum, further improvements need to be made to the New Applicant Screening Program. The Committee requests that the GAO evaluate the effectiveness of the new-entry safety audit, conduct a programmatic evaluation of the New Applicant Screening Program, and the Passenger Carrier Vetting Process. Further, the Committee requests the GAO evaluate the degree to which the complexities of the application of State laws on corporate successorship may in certain circumstances affect the FMCSA's ability to deny operating authority and pursue enforcement actions against unsafe reincarnated carriers.

Motorcoach Safety.—The Committee commends the Secretary for taking a comprehensive approach to assessing and addressing motorcoach safety issues. Specifically, the Committee appreciates the development of specific action items for modal administrations to undertake to reverse the increase in the number of motorcoach fatalities over the past 10 years. This trend is inconsistent with all other highway fatality trends in the vehicle and motor carrier sectors, which points to a long-standing weakness in effective passenger safety oversight. Four of the seven priority action items fall under the purview of the FMCSA. The FMCSA is responsible for: (1) a rulemaking to require electronic on-board recording devices on all motorcoaches to better monitor drivers' duty hours and manage fatigue; (2) a rulemaking to prohibit texting and limiting the use of cellular telephones and other devices by motorcoach drivers; (3) enhancing oversight of carriers attempting to evade sanctions and of other unsafe motorcoach companies; and (4) establishing minimum knowledge requirements for passenger transportation authority applicants. Additionally, the agency is taking further actions to address the 67 open motor carrier recommendations made by the NTSB. It is important for the FMSCA to satisfy the internal

goals set forward in the report in a timely fashion that is inclusive of State agencies, safety organizations, and other stakeholders. The Committee requests an annual report on the agency's progress in implementing the action items within the Secretary's Motorcoach Safety Action Plan, due within 180 days of enactment.

ADA Compliance.—For several years, this Committee has pushed the FMCSA to enforce DOT's own Americans with Disability Act [ADA] regulations for over-the-road curbside operators. It took the passage of a law by Congress to compel the agency to accept its responsibility to deny or revoke operating authority based on an operator's inability or unwillingness to meeting DOT's ADA regulations. However, to date the FMCSA has not taken any enforcement actions related to ADA noncompliance. The Committee once again directs the FMCSA to include information in its budget for fiscal year 2012 on enforcement actions the agency has taken, including the number of denials or revocations based on noncompliance with ADA regulations. The Committee expects the information to demonstrate that the FMCSA takes its responsibility to enforce DOT's ADA regulations seriously.

Agricultural Spring/Exemption.—The Committee commends the FMCSA's proposed 2-year limited exemption from the Federal hours-of-service [HOS] regulations as authorized by section 345 of the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 to certain motor carriers engaged in the distribution of anhydrous ammonia during the spring planting season and further limited to a 100 air mile radius.

PROGRAM EXPENSES

The Committee recommends $64,209,000 for FMCSA's program expenses. Funding is provided for the programs as follows:

	2010 enacted	2011 estimate	Committee recommendation
Research and technology	$8,543000	$8,586,000	$8,586,000
Information management	34,618,000	41,943,000	41,943,000
Regulatory development	9,728,000	9,777,000	9,777,000
Outreach and education	2,889,000	2,903,000	2,903,000
CMV operations grants	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2010	$310,070,000	$310,070,000
Budget estimate, 2011	310,070,000	310,070,000
Committee recommendation	310,070,000	310,070,000

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.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $310,070,000 for motor carrier safety grants. The recommended limitation is the same as both the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and the budget request. The Committee recommends a separate limitation on obligations for each grant program funded under this account with the funding allocation identified below. The Committee also provides the FMCSA the authority utilize funds provided for commercial driver's license information system grant program [CDLIS] for the motor carrier safety assistance program and the commercial driver's license and driver improvement program consistent with the fiscal year 2011 budget request.

	Amount
Motor carrier safety assistance program [MCSAP]	$212,070,000
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

Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks [CVISN] Grants Program.—The Committee finds that the FMCSA has failed to maintain appropriate oversight of the CVISN grant program resulting in financial irregularities and the award of grants to States in excess of the agency's statutory authority. This development signifies a lack of adherence to internal grants management protocols, policies and processes, bringing into question the integrity of this, and potentially other, competitive State financial assistance programs. Thus far, the FMCSA is taking the appropriate and necessary steps to address the historical mismanagement of the CVISN program. The Committee directs the FMCSA to provide a report by November 1, 2010, to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations on this issue identifying: the findings of the external and internal audits the CVISN program; results of the sampling of other nonformula grant programs within the agency for similar or related weaknesses; estimates of commitments made in excess of the agency's statutory authority; and actions the agency is taking to remedy all direct and indirect deficiencies. Further, the

Committee directs the Government Accountability Office to conduct an audit of the CVISN program and assess the implementation of FMCSA's new grants management policies, procedures, and financial controls to determine if the agency is executing best management practices by May 1, 2010. The bill rescinds $18,900,000 in unobligated balances from amounts available under this heading in prior appropriations acts.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

The bill rescinds $7,300,000 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 $15,000,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations acts.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMNINSTRATION

Section 135 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.

It is essential for the administration to establish a plan to resume cross-border trucking with Mexico in a way that addresses the safety concerns raised during the Department of Transportation's earlier pilot and end the retaliatory tariffs imposed by the Mexican Government. The tariffs were imposed on more than 90 U.S. products, a burden that undermines the competitiveness of many agricultural products produced in the United States. If the administration is unable to find a path forward with Mexico on this issue, these tariffs will continue to send American jobs to other countries, such as Canada, as growers, processors, and packers are forced to relocate. Such relocation threatens the livelihood of many American workers and further exacerbates the economic recession in communities across the Nation. Continued delays in rectifying this trade issue are unacceptable. The Committee directs the Secretary of Transportation, in coordination with the Ambassador of the United States Trade Representative, no later than October 1, 2010, to establish and report on a proposal to implement a cross-border trucking program that maintains the safety of our roads and highways, enhances the efficient movement of commerce, and eliminates harmful and retaliatory tariffs on agricultural products.

Additionally, the North American Free Trade Agreement requires that the United States and Mexico provide operating authority and reciprocal treatment for bus companies to provide domestic,

intercity bus service and cross-border services. Mexico has refused to grant United States owned bus companies comparable rights in Mexico, thus making it impossible for United States bus companies to compete with Mexican bus companies for cross-border traffic. Congress gave the President or his delegate the statutory authority (49 U.S.C. §13902(c)) to suspend or restrict the U.S. operations of passenger motor carriers owned by companies of a contiguous country which unreasonably restricts the operations of U.S.-owned companies. Since those circumstances exist now, the Committee believes that the President or his delegate should consider utilizing that authority unless Mexico immediately starts to provide reciprocal access and fair treatment to United States owned bus companies. The discrimination against U.S. bus companies cannot continue. The Committee directs the Secretary of Transportation, in coordination with the Ambassador of the United States Trade Representative, to report to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations no later than October 1, 2010 on what actions the Department or other executive agencies are taking to rectify this issue.

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.

The 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) carried out by the States and for highway safety research, development, and demonstration programs (section 403 of title 23, United States Code).

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 $903,046,000 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA]. This total funding level includes both budget authority and limitations on the obligation of contract authority. This funding is $25,436,000 more than the President's request and $30,269,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations excluding rescissions:

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 estimate	
Operations and Research	$245,927,000	$250,213,000	$290,149,000
National Driver Register	7,350,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
Highway Traffic Safety Grants	619,500,000	620,697,000	606,197,000
Total	872,777,000	877,610,000	903,046,000

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2010	$245,927,000
Budget estimate, 2011	250,213,000
Committee recommendation	290,149,000

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.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has provided $290,149,000 for Operations and Research. This level is $44,222,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and $39,936,000 more than the budget request. Of the total amount recommended for Operations and Research, $172,773,000 is derived from the General Fund and $117,376,000 is derived from the Highway Trust Fund.

Sudden Unintended Acceleration.—Incidents of sudden unintended acceleration [SUA] in vehicles during the past several years have exposed shortcomings with current vehicle safety standards. More worrisome, these incidents have prompted questions about NHTSA's ability to detect, inspect, and enforce safety standards for the 246 million vehicles on America's roads. Multiple Congressional hearings on this issue over the past year have established that: (1) there are no Federal standards for the electronics and computers that now control modern vehicles; (2) some automakers limit consumer access to event data recorders; (3) NHTSA lacks sufficient expertise in vehicle electronics and software; (4) NHTSA's cap on civil penalties fails to act as an effective deterrent for companies with multi-billion dollar revenues; (5) NHTSA needs to make its safety database more accessible and consumer-friendly; and (6) consumers need straight-forward information about how to report potential vehicle defects to NHTSA. These are largely issues within NHTSA's means to address, and the Committee expects the Department's and agency's leadership to make significant progress on all six during the coming year. The Committee supports the budget request for additional personnel resources to support vehicle safety programs, research, and investigations.

The Committee approved a reprogramming of NHTSA funds in the fiscal year 2010 supplemental appropriations act to fund critical research into the potential causes of SUA, focusing on possible vulnerabilities in the Toyota electronic throttle control system. Additionally, NHTSA contracted with the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] to assess the safety and reliability of vehicle electronic control systems across the industry. The NAS will consider other possible causes of SUA events, such as human error, mechanical failure, and mechanical interference with accelerator mechanisms. The Academy expects to complete its research by late sum-

mer, 2011. The Committee requests NHTSA provide a report on the NAS research and its findings to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee 15 days after NAS delivers its findings to the Department.

The Committee provides an additional $4,350,000 in fiscal year 2011 to support additional SUA related research such as: a human factors study that will evaluate driver usability versus pedal designs, and assess if a vehicles pedal design and placement affect susceptibility to pedal misapplication leading to unintended acceleration incidents; further research into electronic throttle control systems in additional Toyota models based on fiscal year 2010 testing; and the evaluation of electronic data recorder testing.

Alcohol-related Fatalities.—Alcohol-impaired driving fatalities continue to be a leading cause of highway fatalities. Although the number of alcohol-impaired driving fatalities has dropped recently, they continue to represent 32 percent of all highway fatalities. Alcohol ignition interlock systems hold great promise for reducing alcohol-related fatalities. However, ignition interlock systems are an intrusive technology, which limits their use.

In 2008, NHTSA partnered with leading automobile manufacturers in the Automotive Coalition for Traffic Safety [ACTS] to develop alcohol detection technologies that could be installed in vehicles to prevent drunk driving. These technologies need to be non-intrusive in order to achieve greater acceptance by the general public. The development of advanced alcohol detection technologies is one of the key components of the Campaign to Eliminate Drunk Driving, which has brought together Mothers Against Drunk Driving, major auto manufacturers, law enforcement, and other stakeholders with the goal of eliminating drunk driving. To date, NHTSA and ACTS have developed preliminary device specifications, completed a rigorous technical review of candidate technologies, and initiated proof-of-concept research to investigate those technologies that hold the most promise. The Committee recommends $2,250,000 to support this collaboration in fiscal year 2011. This funding level is $1,250,000 more than the budget request and $1,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Alternative Fuels Research.—The recommended funding level includes $4,500,000 for research into the safety of vehicles that use alternative fuels. This funding is equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and $3,500,000 more than the budget request. Funds will be used to continue research on the safety of emerging battery technologies, particularly lithium ion batteries used in hybridized fuel cells and plug-in electric vehicles. The funding provided for alternative fuels research shall be used to continue the development of pack and vehicles level test procedures for charging, discharging, damage tolerance, fire impingement, as well as the development of full-scale vehicle crash test procedures. Research will be used to select suitable performance criteria and quantify potential failures. This continuing research is an important step in ensuring that vehicles powered by alternative sources of energy do not compromise safety. The Committee directs NHTSA to provide specific information on the research and findings as part of its budget request for fiscal year 2012.

Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standard [CAFE].—The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 [EISA] requires NHTSA to regulate fuel efficiency for medium- and heavy-duty trucks. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has a legal duty to regulate all motor vehicles, including medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, as a result of the Supreme Court's ruling on the *Massachusetts* v. *EPA* case in April 2007. Both agencies have been directed by the President to align their research, performance requirements, and regulatory framework to develop a coordinated national program. This program must achieve the purposes of both EISA and the Clean Air Act, while also including California's State environmental standards. This will allow automobile manufacturers to produce vehicles that adhere to a single standard to minimize costs associated with meeting competing compulsory requirements. These actions support the twin goals of improving the nation's energy security and air quality.

The Committee recently approved reprogramming funds from the fiscal year 2010 Supplemental Appropriations Act to accelerate NHTSA's research and rulemaking and is providing an additional $500,000 above the budget request in fiscal year 2011. This will provide vehicle manufacturers the certainty of established targets to plan for future investments for model years 2017 and beyond. The Committee instructs NHTSA, in coordination with EPA, to provide a long-range research and regulatory plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 180 days of enactment describing the: (1) specific research projects that each agency is undertaking, their purpose, and intended goals; (2) cost estimates associated with each research and regulatory activity; and (3) major milestones and estimated completion dates for each activity. The plan should include current and future expenditures from fiscal year 2010 until all final actions are concluded for the regulation of medium and heavy duty trucks for model years 2017–2022.

Motorcoach Safety.—The Committee commends the Secretary for taking a comprehensive approach to assessing and addressing motorcoach safety issues. Specifically, the Committee appreciates the development of specific action items for modal administrations to rectify the increase in the number of motorcoach fatalities over the past 10 years. This trend is inconsistent with all other highway fatality trends in vehicle and motor carrier sectors, which points to a long-standing weakness in passenger safety oversight. The Secretary's Motorcoach Safety Action Plan requires NHTSA to develop performance requirements for stability control systems and to expand its research on crash-avoidance technologies. The Committee provides NHTSA $500,000 to implement the agency's heavy vehicle research responsibilities and to take additional actions to address NTSB recommendations on occupant protection systems, emergency egress, and flammability standards.

National Automotive Sampling System [NASS].—The Committee provides $25,000,000 to fully fund modernization of the NASS data collection system that provides crash data on a nationally representative sample of police-reported motor vehicle crashes and related injuries. Funds are available for obligation through September 30, 2014. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety has

stated that NASS provides a "vital means of understanding injury mechanisms and identifying ways to improve crashworthiness and restraint system performance". The Committee believes it is important for NHTSA to expand the scope of its data collection relative to the NASS/Crashworthiness Data System [CDS]. Expanding the NASS data collection from its current 24 data collection sites assures a larger and more representative sample of crashes and increases the precision in which the agency can determine and validate areas of specific interest to rulemaking, the Office of Defects Investigation, and Behavioral Safety Research along with assisting researchers around the world in making informed decision on vehicle design and safety policy.

NHTSA must also undertake a comprehensive review of the data elements to be collected from each crash, solicit input from interested parties—including suppliers, automakers, safety advocates, the medical community and research organizations—and assess the need for more data from the pre-crash, crash, and post-crash phases. The agency should consider including the following factors as part of an enhanced data collection initiative: vehicle velocities; vehicle acceleration/deceleration; departure from the roadway; presence of crash avoidance or driver assistance systems in the vehicle(s); and road surface and condition. Funding will allow NHTSA to modernize the NASS system to improve data quality, timeliness, and accessibility in responding to the rapidly changing vehicle and highway safety environment.

The Committee directs the FMCSA to report on the NASS modernization efforts and related expenditures in the President's annual budget submission to Congress. Additionally, within 1 year of the date of enactment of this act, the NHTSA shall provide the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations a report on the results of the data element review and recommendations for revision.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2010	$4,000,000	$4,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	4,170,000	4,170,000
Committee recommendation	4,170,000	4,170,000

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 $4,170,000 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 $170,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $4,170,000 for the National Driver Register, which is equal to the budget request and $170,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER MODERNIZATION

Appropriations, 2010	$3,350,000
Budget estimate, 2011	2,530,000
Committee recommendation	2,530,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Driver Register helps States determine whether a driver has had a license suspended or revoked for a serious offense in any of the other States. No other database provides this service, and the States increasingly rely on the database year after year. However, the increased use of the database has exceeded the system's capacity. Consequently, the database has recently experienced service disruptions. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is modernizing the National Driver Register as it continues to operate the existing legacy system.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,530,000 for the modernization of the National Driver Register. The funds provided will finalize the modernization effort in the 2011 fiscal year.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2010	$619,500,000	$619,500,000
Budget estimate, 2011	620,697,000	620,697,000
Committee recommendation	606,197,000	606,197,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

SAFETEA–LU reauthorized three State grant programs: highway safety programs, occupant protection incentive grants, and alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures incentive grants; and au-

thorized 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 grant 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 established 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- 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.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of $606,197,000 for the highway traffic safety grant programs funded under this heading. The recommendation limitation is $14,500,000 less than the budget estimate and $13,303,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee has also provided the authority to liquidate an equal amount of contract authorization.

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)	$235,000,000
Occupant Protection Incentive Grants (section 405)	25,000,000
Safety Belt Performance Grants (section 406)	60,000,000
Distracted Driver Incentive Grants	50,000,000
State Traffic Safety Information System Improvement Grants (section 408)	34,500,000
Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grants (section 410)	139,000,000
Motorcyclist Safety Grants (section 2010)	7,000,000
Child Safety and Child Booster Seat Safety Incentive Grants (section 2011)	7,000,000
High Visibility Enforcement Program (section 2009)	29,000,000
Administrative Expenses	19,697,000

Distracted Driver.—In 2008, distracted drivers killed 5,870 people and injured 515,000 people nationwide. Distracted driving encompasses a wide range of behavior—not just cell phone use—that takes the driver's attention from his or her primary driving responsibilities. There is no definitive data as to how many distracted driving deaths and injuries are caused by cell phone use and texting, but as overall cell phone use and text messaging increased year-to-year, the proportion of vehicle fatalities associated with driver distraction has risen—from 12 percent in 2004 to 16 percent in 2008. Further, in a 2009 poll, 67 percent of drivers self-reported using a cell phone while driving, and 21 percent self-reported that they send and receive text messages while driving.

The Committee commends the Secretary's strong leadership on this significant safety issue across all modes of transportation and supports establishing a voluntary incentive grant program to States to encourage the enactment and enforcement of laws to prevent distracted driving. The Committee recommends $50,000,000 to fund this program in fiscal year 2011. Funds are available for expenditure through September 31, 2012, and no State shall receive greater than $3,000,000 in any fiscal year. The NHTSA shall provide the specific criteria and guidance States must meet to receive incentive and enforcement grants to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations 30 days prior to any regulatory action or notice of the availability of funds. Further, section 188 of this act shall apply for the award of grants under this section.

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 exempts obligation authority made available in previous Public Laws for multiple years from limitations on obligations for the current year.

Section 142 rescinds $1,829,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under the heading "Operations and Research" in prior appropriations acts.

Section 143 rescinds $78,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under the heading "National Driver Register" in prior appropriations acts.

Section 144 rescinds $79,843,000 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 admin-

istering 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, 2010	$172,270,000
Budget estimate, 2011 [1]	203,348,000
Committee recommendation	205,098,000

[1] The amount shown above represents the total level of funding requested for FRA's safety programs and operations. The budget request separated these costs into two new accounts.

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 $205,098,000 for Safety and Operations for fiscal year 2011, which is $1,750,000 more than the funding included for these activities in the budget request and $32,828,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Of this total, the bill specifies that $8,380,000 shall remain available through fiscal year 2012. These funds cover travel costs related to safety inspections as well as the cost of the close call system, a key element of the FRA's risk reduction program. Providing these funds for 2 years will give the FRA greater flexibility in managing these mission-critical activities from 1 year to the next. The bill also specifies that $21,279,000 shall remain available until expended. This funding covers the cost of the Automated Track Inspection Program, Railroad Safety Information System, Southeastern Transportation Study, research and development activities, contract support, and Alaska Railroad liabilities.

Acquisition Workforce.—The Office of the Secretary requested additional funds for fiscal year 2011 that the office would distribute throughout the Department for developing its acquisition workforce. The Committee applauds OST for placing a priority on improving the capacity of the Department's acquisition workforce, but has denied this request in order to provide resources directly to the modal administrations. The Committee recommendation therefore includes $250,000 for an additional three positions at FRA. These positions will help FRA conduct significant acquisitions as part of the agency's implementation of the new grant program for intercity and high speed rail. FRA announced grants for the $8,000,000,000 provided through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and must now oversee the implementation of those projects. FRA plans to hire project management oversight contractors, but the ultimate responsibility for overseeing those contractors and ensuring the responsible use of taxpayer dollars rests with the FRA workforce.

Next Generation Corridor Equipment Pool Committee.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for the Next Genera-

tion Corridor Equipment Pool Committee. Investments being made in intercity and high speed rail have the potential to support a domestic industry for manufacturing rail equipment. The equipment pool committee is a mechanism by which projects and corridors being developed across the country can coordinate on rail equipment standards and orders so that a domestic industry will be able to respond.

Operation Lifesaver.—The Committee notes that the funding provided for FRA Safety and Operations includes $2,000,000 for Operation Lifesaver, as authorized under section 206 of the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008. The funding will support grants to Operation Lifesaver to carry out a public information and education program to end collisions, deaths and injuries at places where roadways cross train tracks, and on railroad rights-of-way. The funding will also support a pilot program in which Operation Lifesaver conducts targeted and sustained outreach in communities with the greatest risk.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2010	$37,613,000
Budget estimate, 2011	40,000,000
Committee recommendation	40,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Railroad Research and Development program provides science and technology support for FRA's rail safety rulemaking and enforcement efforts. It also supports technological advances in conventional and high-speed railroads, as well as evaluations of the role of railroads in the Nation's transportation system.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $40,000,000 for railroad research and development, which is equal to the budget request and $2,387,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Proton exchange membrane fuel cells have proven to be a highly reliable, efficient and clean form of electrical generation and the Committee believes these devices are uniquely suited and have great potential for serving to provide remote generation and backup power solutions in transportation control applications. The Committee directs FRA to test and evaluate the use of fuel cell technology to support off-grid and backup power production units for implementation of positive train control and other technology initiatives to improve the safety and performance of freight and passenger rail movements.

Within the amount provided, the Committee recommendation includes funding for the following projects and activities: $1,000,000 for San Diego Positive Train Control, California; $1,000,000 for Metrolink Positive Train Control, California; $500,000 for PEERS Rail-Grade Crossing Safety, Illinois; and $400,000 for the RR Whistle Free Zone Project, Goodview and Minnesota City, Minnesota.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING PROGRAM

The Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing [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 2011.

RAILROAD SAFETY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010	$50,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	.....
Committee recommendation	150,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Railroad Safety Technology Program is a newly authorized program under the Rail Safety Improvement Act (Public Law 110–432). The program authorizes the Department to provide grants to passenger and freight rail carriers, railroad suppliers, and State and local governments for projects that have a public benefit of improved railroad safety and efficiency. Such projects may include the deployment of train control technologies, train control component technologies, processor-based technologies, electronically controlled pneumatic brakes, rail integrity inspection systems, rail integrity warning systems, switch position indicators and monitors, remote control power switch technologies, track integrity circuit technologies, and other new technologies to improve the safety of railroad systems. Priority must be given to projects that make technologies interoperable between railroad systems; accelerate the deployment of train control technology on high risk corridors, such as those that have high volumes of hazardous materials shipments, or over which commuter or passenger trains operate; or benefit both passenger and freight safety and efficiency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the appropriation of $150,000,000 for the Railroad Safety Technology Program for fiscal year 2011 which is $100,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The administration requested no funding for this program.

Base Year for Positive Train Control.—The Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 [RSIA] mandates the installation of positive train control by December 31, 2015, on main lines used to transport toxic-by-inhalation [TIH] hazardous materials or passengers. The mandate is very specific. Three criteria must be met for a portion of railroad track to be in compliance with the mandate: (1) the track must be a main line; (2) the track must be used for the transportation of TIH substances or passengers; and (3) the track must be equipped with positive train control by December 31, 2015.

To implement this mandate, FRA published regulations that require the installation of positive train control on main lines where TIH or passengers were transported in 2008. Tying the require-

ment to routes used 2 years ago has brought additional controversy and dispute to this issue. FRA argued in its final rule that using 2008 as a base year was the only way to ensure the full deployment of positive train control as Congress intended, but the Committee notes that the legislative language of RSIA ties the mandate only to the year 2015 and not to any other year.

FRA regulations give railroads a limited opportunity to exempt routes used to transport TIH or passengers in 2008, but not 2015, from the mandate. The regulations, however, place potentially significant hurdles in the way of receiving an exemption. The Committee therefore urges FRA to seriously examine each application, and to consider granting an exemption to any railroad acting in good faith to implement the mandate. The Committee also directs FRA to reconsider its use of 2008 as a base year and provide the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations a full justification for its use by March 30, 2011.

CAPITAL ASSISTANCE FOR HIGH SPEED RAIL CORRIDORS AND INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE

Appropriations, 2010	$2,500,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	1,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The funding provided under this heading is available for several programs authorized under the Passenger Rail and Investment and Improvement Act for investing in passenger rail infrastructure: grants for intercity passenger rail, grants for high-speed passenger rail, and grants to reduce congestion or facilitate ridership growth along passenger rail corridors.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for grants to support intercity rail service and high speed rail corridors. The recommended funding level is equal to the budget request. It is also $1,500,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

National Rail Plan.—Under the fiscal year 2010 appropriations act, FRA must submit its national rail plan by September 15 of this year. FRA has worked hard to include input from government and industry stakeholders across the country, and the Committee looks forward to seeing the complete plan submitted on time. The Committee understands that FRA will treat the national rail plan as a living document, refining its plan and making adjustments as necessary. Yet the Committee believes that certain elements must be included in the national plan from the very beginning: an estimate of the cost to complete the system of high speed rail envisioned in the plan, and a complete map of that system. For this reason, the Committee has included language in the bill that requires these elements to be included in the national rail plan. If FRA is unable to accommodate this requirement by the September 15, 2010 deadline, then the Committee directs FRA to incorporate these elements into the national rail plan and resubmit the plan by June 1, 2011.

OIG Report.—FRA published its strategic plan for high speed rail in April of last year. In that plan, FRA mentioned the need to consider changes to its safety regulations in order to accommodate the development of high speed rail. Overseas, most high speed rail systems operate on dedicated track, separated from freight railroads. In the United States, however, passenger and freight rail service often share tracks, and the freight equipment used in the United States is often heavier than the equipment used overseas. This mixed operating environment poses a safety challenge that the FRA will need to address in order to continue protecting the safety of the entire rail transportation system. According to the strategic plan, "The systems approach required to ensure safety of new HSR corridors will necessitate consideration of additional changes in several regulations, including equipment, system safety, and collision and derailment prevention."

FRA published a preliminary draft of its national rail plan in October of last year, but this plan did not provide any additional details on FRA's plans to consider changes to its safety regulations. The Committee believes that, even as FRA awards grants for the development of high speed rail, the agency's primary mission must be to protect safety. The Committee expects the final national rail plan will offer a more detailed discussion about safety standards for high speed rail. In addition, the Committee directs the Inspector General to assess the FRA's progress in developing safety standards for high speed rail, and to report his findings to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than December 31, 2011.

Grant Agreements.—After the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act included $8,000,000,000 for intercity and high speed rail, the FRA conducted extensive outreach to States, freight railroads and other stakeholders as it developed interim guidance for the program. The agency received significant input from a wide range of stakeholders, and took this input into account before publishing guidance on the program's eligibility requirements, procedures for applying for grant, and the criteria on which applications would be evaluated. The Committee commends FRA for these efforts.

Many States and freight railroads negotiated agreements with each other based on this interim guidance, and those agreements formed the basis for their applications for intercity and high speed rail funding.

Almost a year after FRA issued the interim guidance, however, the agency developed a new set of guidance for grant agreements between FRA and States receiving a grant award. This new guidance included specific expectations for freight railroads working with a State on an intercity or high speed rail project funded under the program. Whereas FRA's interim guidance was informed by extensive outreach, this new guidance was made public before any notice or opportunity for comment. The Committee understands that States had requested additional details on the program's implementation, but the manner in which FRA introduced new information created a sense of uncertainty for the program that was unnecessary and counterproductive.

The success of the intercity and high speed rail program will rest to large extent on the ability of States, freight railroads, and pas-

senger rail operators to agree on how passenger and freight rail service will share the same infrastructure over the life of these projects.

FRA has committed itself to respecting the terms of the applications that were awarded with grant funding. The Committee believes this approach is appropriate and allows future applicants under the program to put forth their best applications with the confidence that they will be held to the same standards before and after a grant is awarded. The Committee therefore urges the FRA to move expeditiously to finalize grant agreements for projects that have been announced under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and continue to give States and freight railroads the appropriate flexibility for negotiating performance standards and expectations.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK)

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

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2010	$563,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	563,000,000
Committee recommendation	563,000,000

The Committee provides $563,000,000 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 equal to the President's request and the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Fleet Plan.—This past February, Amtrak submitted its fleet plan, describing the railroad's strategy for replacing its outdated rolling stock over the next 30 years. For fiscal year 2012, the Committee directs Amtrak to provide a unified request that includes funding related to its fleet plan and incorporates fleet acquisition into its prioritized list of capital projects. The Committee also amended language from last year that requires Amtrak to submit its budget, business plan, and 5-year financial plan to require Amtrak to include annual information consistent with the comprehensive fleet plan.

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2010	$1,001,625,000
Budget estimate, 2011	1,052,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,400,000,000

The Committee recommends $1,400,000,000 for capital and debt service grants for Amtrak. Of this amount, not more than $305,000,000 shall be available for debt service payments. The amount provided is $348,000,000 more than the budget request and $398,375,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

ADA Compliance.—The Committee continues to believe that compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] is essential to ensuring that all people have equal access to transportation services. Last year, Amtrak announced that it will not be able to meet the legislative deadline for compliance with ADA. The railroad presented a plan for coming into compliance over a 5-year period, and has requested additional funds to implement this plan for fiscal year 2010 and again this year.

Since presenting this plan, however, it has become clear that the current obstacle to achieving ADA compliance throughout Amtrak's system has not been the availability of funds. Amtrak expects that by the end of the current fiscal year, it will be able to spend less than one-half of the $144,000,000 provided in the fiscal year 2010 appropriations act for ADA compliance. In addition, just 3 months after submitting a budget request that included $280,700,000 for ADA improvements, Amtrak's president and CEO testified before the Committee that it would have to lower this budget request by $50,000,000. There is reason to believe that Amtrak may be able to spend even less than the revised request.

Amtrak has faced challenges in defining what work is necessary to comply with ADA and in forming work agreements with its partners at each station. The Committee finds this news discouraging, noting that last year Amtrak claimed it was going to tackle easier jobs first and give itself time to develop work plans for the more complicated jobs.

Amtrak's capital grants are available until expended, and the Committee expects that Amtrak will continue setting aside any remaining funds from the $144,000,000 provided for fiscal year 2010 for ADA-related projects until those projects have been completed. For fiscal year 2011, the Committee recommendation includes $230,000,000 for ADA compliance. The Committee recognizes that at times Amtrak faces true emergencies that require immediate spending to repair or replace its infrastructure. The Committee also appreciates the value that Amtrak places on preserving the safety of its system. However, the Committee expects Amtrak to set aside the funding included in the Committee recommendation for ADA-related work, and to continue giving ADA compliance priority for the use of these funds.

Fleet Acquisition.—The Committee notes that Amtrak's fleet plan identified several options for financing the replacement of its rolling stock, including direct appropriations, Federal credit assistance, and credit assistance through a private lender. The Committee understands that Amtrak has started a conversation with the Department of Transportation about using the FRA's Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program [RRIF]. The RIFF program provides an opportunity to soften the impact of Federal contributions to the fleet plan, and to spread the cost of this assistance over the life of the equipment. Using the RRIF program also provides the Department with an opportunity to oversee Amtrak's im-

plementation of its fleet plan. The Committee therefore urges Amtrak and the Department to continue this conversation.

In comparison to the RRIF program, the private market will demand a significantly higher interest rate. Furthermore, a portion of those interest earnings will represent profits to a private corporation. Given that Amtrak relies on Federal subsidies, and is therefore beholden to the Federal taxpayer for the responsible use of its funds, the Committee does not believe that Amtrak should consider borrowing from the private market until every opportunity to apply for credit assistance from the Department of Transportation has been exhausted.

Finally, the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations should be notified when the Amtrak Board decides to pursue a formal RRIF loan application with the Department of Transportation or a private sector loan application.

Amtrak Service in Rural Areas.—The Committee recognizes the importance of passenger train service to communities, especially rural areas, across the United States. The Committee also notes that natural disasters and environmental changes can present engineering challenges to the continuation of this rail service. Consequently, the Committee encourages Amtrak to give priority consideration to projects that will ensure the continued operation of normal passenger rail service along any route that serves rural areas, including the current route of the Empire Builder Line.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 151 allows DOT to purchase promotional items of nominal value for use in certain outreach activities.

Section 152 permanently 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 153 allows the Secretary to receive and use cash or spare parts to repair and replace damaged track inspection cars.

Section 154 requires the Federal Railroad Administrator to submit an annual report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on Amtrak on-time performance.

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 most recent authorization for transit programs was contained in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA–LU], which expired on September 30, 2009. The authority for these programs has been continued by the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment [HIRE] Act, which extends surface transportation programs and Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority through December 31, 2010. The Committee's recommendations assume they will be further extended under their current structure until the enactment of a full reauthorization package.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations compared to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and the administration's request:

Program	Fiscal year		Committee recommendation
	2010 enacted	2011 estimate	
Administrative expenses	$98,911,000	$113,559,000	$111,981,000
Formula and bus grants (trust fund)	8,343,171,000	8,271,700,000	8,360,565,000
Livable communities (trust fund)		306,905,000	[1]
Research and university research centers	65,670,000	33,913,000	69,750,000
Capital investment grants	2,000,000,000	1,822,112,000	2,000,000,000
Rail transit safety oversight program		24,139,000	
Grants for energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reductions	75,000,000	52,743, 000	100,000,000
Technical assistance and workforce development		24,463,000	
Grants to WMATA	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
Total	10,732,752,000	10,799,534,000	10,792,296,000

[1] The Committee recommendation provides funding for this initiative within Formula and Bus grants.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010	$98,911,000
Budget estimate, 2011	113,559,000
Committee recommendation	111,981,000

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 $111,981,000 for the agency's salaries and administrative expenses. The recommended level of funding is $1,578,000 below the budget request and $13,070,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The bill limits travel expenses to $2,000,000, which has been increased above the fiscal year 2010 level to support 40 new FTE. The Committee recognizes this amount is significantly below the level requested in the administration's budget, and encourages FTA to curb lower priority travel and make greater use of video teleconferencing.

Strengthening FTA's Workforce.—In 2008, FTA commissioned a consultant to review its workforce management practices and staffing levels. The consultant concluded that FTA requires additional staff to support its growing workload and improve its ability to per-

form project oversight, contract administration, and technical assistance. The consultant also determined FTA needs to take steps to better manage and support its existing workforce, including improving employees' skills. The Committee recommendation provides 20 additional FTE to ensure FTA has adequate staffing to perform its mission, consistent with the budget request. The Committee directs FTA to brief the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations 30 days after enactment detailing its plans for allocating these resources to those areas of greatest priority. Since effective workforce management practices are central to realizing the full potential of its workforce—including wisely allocating the additional positions included in this bill—the report should also describe the steps FTA is taking to optimize its existing workforce, shore up needed skill areas, and prepare for future requirements.

Office of Safety.—In recent years, rail transit accidents in San Francisco, Boston, Los Angeles and Washington, DC, have exposed vulnerabilities and gaps in the safety practices of some of the Nation's largest systems. While rail transit remains far safer than traveling by auto, these incidents highlight the need for a greater Federal role in developing standards and promoting safety, just as it currently does for commuter rail systems. They also make apparent the need for stronger Federal support and oversight of the 27 State Safety Oversight agencies, many of which rely on the transit agencies they oversee for funding. In anticipation that comprehensive authority to address this problem will be enacted in coming months, the Committee recommendation includes 20 FTE and $5,000,000 to launch the FTA Office of Safety. These funds will become available upon enactment of safety oversight legislation, and would allow FTA to develop safety-related performance standards, new safety regulations, and provide technical assistance to local transit agencies. These funds would also allow FTA to oversee and support the development of State Safety Oversight agencies.

Rail Station Accessibility.—The American with Disabilities Act provided an extended time period for a number of large transit systems to reach compliance with the act in regard to certain rail stations. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report by June 30, 2011, detailing theses systems' progress in achieving compliance with the act. The report should contain a list of stations that have reached full compliance with the act and a list not yet in compliance. For each station not in compliance, details should be provided regarding the status of work already accomplished towards reaching compliance and a timeline for future actions to complete the remaining work.

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.

Full Funding Grant Agreements [FFGAs].—SAFETEA–LU, as amended and extended, 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 2013; (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 provide a monthly new start project update at the beginning of each month 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. It should also highlight and explain any potential cost and schedule changes affecting projects. 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)

	Obligation limitation (trust fund)
Appropriations, 2010	$8,343,171,000
Budget estimate, 2011	8,271,700,000
Committee recommendation	8,360,565,000

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 other-than-urbanized areas; new freedom grants; growing States and high-density States grants; bus and bus facility grants; rail modernization grants; alternative transportation in parks and public lands; and

the national transit database. Set-asides from formula funds are directed to a grant program for intercity bus operators to finance Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility costs. The account also provides funding for the administration's Sustainable Communities Initiative through job access and reverse commute grants and the alternatives analysis and planning programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends limiting obligations in the transit formula and bus grants account in fiscal year 2011 to $8,360,565,000. The recommendation is consistent with the authorized level, and is $17,394,000 more than the obligation limitation enacted for fiscal year 2010.

The Committee recommends $9,200,000,000 in authority to liquidate contract authorizations. This amount is sufficient to cover outstanding obligations from this account.

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
Clean Fuels Program	$51,500,000
Over-the-Road Bus Accessibility Program	8,800,000
Urban Area Formula Grants	4,552,047,525
Bus and Bus Facilities	984,000,000
Fixed Guideway Modernization	1,666,500,000
Elderly and Persons with Disabilities	133,500,000
Nonurbanized Area Formula	538,317,475
New Freedom	92,500,000
National Transit Database	3,500,000
Alternative Transportation in Parks and Park Lands	26,900,000
Sustainable Communities:	
Job Access and Reverse Commute	164,500,000
Planning Programs	113,500,000
Alternatives Analysis	25,000,000

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:

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ESTIMATED FISCAL YEAR 2011 APPORTIONMENTS FOR FORMULA GRANTS PROGRAMS BY STATE

State name	Urbanized areas (5307 and 5340) [1]	Fixed guideway modernization	Nonurbanized areas (5311 and 5340)	Formula JARC [1]	Special need for elderly and disabled	New freedom	Section 5303 and 5304 metropolitan and State planning	State total
Alabama	$20,449,814		$13,274,210	$2,879,183	$2,316,728	$1,580,716	$891,783	$41,585,069
Alaska	24,120,264	$17,837,551	6,050,695	249,841	298,338	133,248	471,245	49,243,971
American Samoa			226,697	98,957	65,166	8,925		412,663
Arizona	66,088,575	3,659,655	9,450,248	3,186,231	2,421,844	1,613,609	2,240,005	88,787,432
Arkansas	10,036,216		10,121,961	1,693,090	1,485,312	924,977	471,245	24,890,127
California	741,065,743	227,275,153	22,662,823	23,568,713	14,201,975	11,695,489	17,551,730	1,058,282,824
Colorado	69,317,018	8,297,242	8,338,909	2,011,620	1,680,950	1,243,083	1,705,644	92,714,897
Connecticut	75,931,794	47,944,586	2,700,412	1,355,986	1,633,799	1,127,343	1,308,644	132,095,938
Delaware	11,852,043		1,261,953	317,794	467,748	231,164	471,245	14,679,811
District of Columbia	84,464,994	109,782,829		456,583	401,674	223,556	471,245	195,800,881
Florida	217,298,733	26,206,936	13,577,954	9,985,182	9,054,548	6,505,029	7,386,177	290,207,519
Georgia	86,145,949	37,799,351	17,133,382	4,486,708	3,388,163	2,513,664	2,884,442	154,578,443
Guam			612,752	99,091	173,448	26,039		929,215
Hawaii	31,413,591	2,019,925	1,959,137	549,598	652,887	354,739	471,245	37,505,254
Idaho	7,243,901		5,829,061	757,513	622,251	379,945	471,245	15,404,068
Illinois	265,675,179	176,278,632	14,137,853	6,071,763	5,238,179	3,691,937	6,106,858	477,401,997
Indiana	45,042,778	1,129,199	13,580,086	2,770,550	2,750,575	1,862,130	1,731,849	69,068,138
Iowa	17,705,693		10,117,499	1,245,478	1,411,636	757,073	512,130	31,906,778
Kansas	12,902,272		9,383,779	1,116,939	1,263,995	688,090	589,707	26,085,194
Kentucky	23,481,923		12,841,709	2,220,284	2,134,698	1,282,835	741,644	42,894,155
Louisiana	36,085,428	3,439,776	10,244,144	3,478,175	2,125,248	1,598,377	1,167,016	58,301,638
Maine	3,886,150		5,412,105	608,013	738,482	403,410	471,245	11,633,351
Maryland	116,362,749	38,789,776	4,968,237	2,136,303	2,260,435	1,662,607	2,502,780	168,798,771
Massachusetts	187,849,668	95,436,474	3,497,854	2,800,070	3,005,985	2,108,240	3,287,282	298,086,938
Michigan	83,185,003	821,373	17,206,541	4,791,370	4,355,117	3,146,204	3,699,068	117,440,807
Minnesota	57,341,286	13,579,692	12,713,238	1,702,850	1,990,631	1,119,362	1,569,505	90,194,012
Mississippi	6,485,761		11,525,233	1,754,947	1,489,595	814,978	471,245	22,717,017
Missouri	47,981,872	9,225,733	13,845,128	2,689,137	2,626,238	1,582,543	1,677,361	79,820,580
Montana	3,266,568		7,514,821	549,361	515,089	253,731	471,245	12,669,839
Northern Mariana Islands	805,388		34,899	151,658	66,533	29,856		1,098,717
Nebraska	10,192,647		6,547,626	676,220	833,830	371,742	471,245	19,204,464
Nevada	30,886,718		4,891,404	1,032,473	1,022,392	693,529	843,379	39,451,293
New Hampshire	6,024,865		3,485,840	424,353	625,384	387,861	471,245	11,519,385
New Jersey	322,308,880	113,994,894	3,232,414	3,418,251	3,827,337	2,677,319	5,071,183	454,628,923
New Mexico	12,069,600		8,176,132	1,318,036	922,070	567,213	471,245	23,638,025

New York	708,446,984	461,903,710	17,534,585	11,752,631	9,093,992	6,640,776	9,734,853	1,225,349,366
North Carolina	55,117,401	244,945	22,113,209	4,040,259	3,791,181	2,561,858	1,727,729	89,880,010
North Dakota	4,267,989	.....	3,973,042	350,849	404,204	187,613	471,245	9,740,896
Ohio	101,695,706	20,667,827	19,950,591	5,328,248	5,095,271	3,363,088	3,668,328	160,039,926
Oklahoma	16,310,442	.....	11,315,898	1,957,742	1,753,695	1,008,090	681,577	33,192,632
Oregon	45,840,198	10,834,263	9,759,511	1,767,473	1,624,581	978,972	1,019,351	71,962,963
Pennsylvania	175,904,601	138,096,423	20,235,594	6,048,161	6,017,165	3,790,923	4,619,038	354,984,209
Puerto Rico	46,973,611	2,985,649	1,402,706	7,986,091	2,041,295	2,103,599	1,880,821	65,455,678
Rhode Island	21,105,372	3,116,893	578,180	562,161	633,128	362,907	483,681	26,913,444
South Carolina	18,505,182	.....	11,124,173	2,254,320	2,016,570	1,371,615	860,827	36,306,594
South Dakota	3,108,225	.....	4,917,579	376,535	447,170	196,839	471,245	9,611,129
Tennessee	39,038,496	649,001	14,157,940	3,215,419	2,815,688	1,918,824	1,361,981	63,361,122
Texas	245,046,130	24,572,319	33,827,071	14,959,595	8,422,652	6,746,650	8,264,950	342,212,821
Utah	45,348,133	4,916,078	4,834,130	1,072,135	827,533	547,165	803,061	58,437,943
Vermont	1,780,842	.....	2,621,896	225,002	379,702	141,005	471,245	5,710,335
Virgin Islands	974,031	.....	.....	99,487	163,743	17,993	.....	1,255,254
Virginia	73,884,994	2,314,907	12,412,837	3,074,363	2,970,333	2,032,950	2,568,339	99,444,193
Washington	126,385,198	43,320,527	9,561,020	2,985,692	2,524,195	1,925,130	2,400,761	189,248,524
West Virginia	6,882,584	1,373,967	6,716,609	1,275,133	1,116,184	708,504	471,245	18,675,098
Wisconsin	47,507,512	1,319,714	13,444,063	2,272,745	2,303,921	1,498,861	1,377,851	69,918,081
Wyoming	1,752,094	.....	4,655,105	243,638	322,017	136,075	471,245	7,663,911
Unallocated	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	4,520,844,788	1,649,835,000	511,692,475	164,500,000	132,832,500	92,500,000	112,932,500	7,193,042,263
Oversight	31,202,737	16,665,000	2,325,000	.....	667,500	.....	567,500	51,427,737
Total	4,552,047,525	1,666,500,000	514,017,475	164,500,000	133,500,000	92,500,000	113,500,000	7,244,470,000
Tribal Transit Program	.....	.....	15,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	15,000,000
National RTAP	.....	.....	9,300,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,695,000
Over-the-Road Bus	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,800,000
Grand Total	4,552,047,525	1,666,500,000	538,317,475	164,500,000	133,500,000	92,500,000	113,500,000	7,278,965,000

[1] Allocations for UZAs that are within multiple States are split between the applicable States.

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
1st Congressional District Buses and Bus Facilities, MI	$1,000,000
ACE Boulder Highway System, NV	1,000,000
Ben Franklin Transit Vehicle Replacements, Benton and Franklin Counties, WA	1,000,000
Brookings Area Transit Authority Bus Storage and Transit Operations Facility, SD	1,000,000
Bus and Bus Facilities, Santa Fe, NM	500,000
Bus and Bus Facilities, UT	8,000,000
Bus Maintenance Facility, Sacramento, CA	1,800,000
Bus Purchases, DE	1,000,000
Bus Replacement, Kansas City, MO	1,000,000
Bus Turnouts for Downtown Las Vegas Roads, NV	750,000
Cedar Avenue Bus Rapid Transitway, MN	500,000
City of Janesville Transit Services Center, WI	3,065,000
Clallam Transit Maintenance Facility Improvements, Clallam County, WA	200,000
Coach Bus for Commuter Campus, Campbell County, KY	690,000
Community Transit Vehicle Replacements, Snohomish County, WA	1,000,000
C–TRAN 4th Plain BRT, Clark County, WA	1,500,000
Deerfield Valley Transit Association Facilities, Buses, and Equipment, VT	2,500,000
Dubuque Intermodal Facility, IA	400,000
Everett Transit Vehicle Replacements, Snohomish County, WA	1,000,000
Glassboro/Rowan Local Transit System, NJ	500,000
Grant County Transit Vehicle Replacement and Facilities Construction, Grant County, WA	1,000,000
Harrison County Multimodal Project, MS	2,250,000
Idaho Transit Coalition Bus and Bus Facilities, ID	1,500,000
Illinois Bus and Bus Facilities, IL	4,000,000
Innovation Station, East Lansing, MI	2,500,000
Intercity Transit Vehicle Replacements, Thurston County, WA	1,000,000
JATRAN Fleet Replacement and Bus Shelters, MS	600,000
Jefferson Transit Vehicle Replacements, Jefferson County, WA	400,000
Kitsap County Vehicle Replacements, WA	500,000
Link Transit Vehicle Replacements, Chelan and Douglas Counties, WA	1,000,000
Longview Transit Vehicle Replacements, Clark County, WA	650,000
Maine Statewide Bus Replacement, ME	1,000,000
MARTA Bus, Bus Facilities and Security Improvements, GA	2,000,000
Metro Area Transit—Bus and Bus Facilities, Omaha, NE	1,500,000
Moultrie Intermodal Facility, City of Moultrie, GA	400,000
Naugatuck Transportation Facility, CT	500,000
North Central Regional Transit District Pueblo Buses, NM	800,000
North Dakota Statewide Capital Transit, ND	1,500,000
Oxford-University Transit System Bus Purchase, MS	400,000
Pierce Transit Clean-Fuel Bus Replacements, Pierce County, WA	1,000,000
Reconstruction of the Mayfield Road Rapid Transit Station and Bridge, OH	2,000,000
Replacement Buses at Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky [TANK], Kenton County, KY	1,000,000
Replacement of the Fixed Route Fleet, Springfield, MO	1,000,000
Rural Bus Program for Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, HI	3,500,000
Senior Transportation Program, AL	500,000
Skagit Transit Vehicle Replacements, Skagit County, WA	500,000
South Burlington Transit Center, VT	1,000,000
Southest Missouri Transportation Service Facility, MO	800,000
Spokane Transit paratransit Vehicles, Spokane County, WA	1,000,000
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities Fund, IA	2,500,000
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, MO	4,000,000
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, NM	1,000,000
Statewide Bus Purchases and Facility Improvements, CO	2,500,000
Statler Intermodal Facility, Buffalo, Erie County, NY	3,000,000
Tacoma Intermodal Transit Center, Tacoma, WA	1,000,000
Tennessee Statewide Bus Program, TN	12,000,000
TRANSPO Paratransit Replacement Vehicles, IN	352,000
Twin Transit Vehicle Replacements, Lewis County, WA	500,000

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Washoe County Bus Facilities, NV	500,000
White Earth Tribal Transit Service Bus Garage Facility, MN	500,000
Total	92,157,000

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
Innovation in Transportation Infrastructure Systems Planning, College of Staten Island, Staten Island, NY	$450,000
JTA Commuter Rail Alternative Analysis, Jacksonville, FL	1,200,000
Las Cruces to El Paso Transportation Corridor, NM	1,000,000
Mountain View Corridor Transit, UT	1,000,000
North Main Line Rehabilitation Project, Chicago Transit Authority, IL	500,000
Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement/Preliminary Engineering, Atlanta, GA	1,000,000

RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTERS

	General fund
Appropriations, 2010	$65,670,000
Budget estimate, 2011	33,913,000
Committee recommendation	69,750,000

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 and to help public transportation services meet national transportation needs at the lowest reasonable 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 $69,750,000 for research and university research centers. The Committee recommendation is equal to the authorized level, and $4,080,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Asset Management.—In 2008, the Committee required FTA to assess the condition of the Nation's transit rail infrastructure. In April, 2009, the agency reported that one-third of transit agencies' assets are either in marginal or poor condition, and that significant reinvestment is necessary to address the backlog of capital needs. Given the large gap between the level of investment needed to bring rail transit into better condition and the amount of resources currently available for such investments, it is imperative that every dollar invested in rail capital improvements be put to its best use.

Compounding the resource challenge is the generally weak state of much of the transit sector's ability to manage capital assets strategically. Asset management programs would enable transit agencies to take inventory of their capital assets, assess the condition of those assets, use objective and quantitative analysis to estimate reinvestment needs over the long term, and prioritize their capital investments by using all of the information and analysis that was required under the program.

In 2010, the Committee directed FTA to assume a leadership role in improving asset management in transit agencies. Specifically, the Committee instructed FTA to develop standards for asset management plans with an emphasis on maintaining safety, as well as to provide technical assistance to transit agencies on asset management and conduct a pilot program to identify best practices in the field. FTA is required to report its findings from the pilot to the Committee by June 16, 2011.

FTA made good progress over the past year in establishing conditions to improve asset management and the state of good repair of the transit industry. It expanded its assessment of the condition of transit assets to include the entire industry, concluding that the industry faces a backlog of $80 billion to restore a state of good repair, compared with the estimate of $50 billion made last year for the seven largest rail transit operators. It included acquisition of Asset Management Systems as an eligible expense under sections 5307 and 5309, a decision that should help industry build the information systems that support sound asset management practices. Working with the American Public Transportation Association, FTA received significant interest from the transit sector in improving asset management practices—support it can use to foster the best practices it develops from the pilot and standard-setting efforts.

During fiscal year 2011, FTA will complete the pilot program, and disseminate the innovative and improved asset management methods it learns from this effort. The Committee expects FTA to focus on significantly increasing the number of transit agencies with complete and up-to-date asset inventories. The Committee directs FTA to develop analysis tools which agencies can use to develop estimates of cost-to-achieve-a-state-of-good-repair, as well as better inform local decisions about assets which need particular at-

tention in their capital plans. Particular attention should be dedicated to tools that help the industry identify safety related capital assets as part of a risk-based management program. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue to support these activities and FTA's leadership role on related research, training, and technical assistance. Drawing upon the lessons it learns from these experiences, the Committee directs FTA to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking by September 30, 2011, to implement asset management standards requiring transit agencies that receive FTA funds to develop capital asset inventories and condition assessments.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 2010	$2,000,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	1,822,112,000
Committee recommendation	2,000,000,000

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 recommends a level of $2,000,000,000 for capital investment grants. The recommended level is $177,888,000 more than the budget request. The bill does not include a provision requiring FTA to transfer funds to the DOT Office of Inspector General.

FTA is strongly encouraged to expedite executing a Full Funding Grant Agreement for the Draper project before the completion of the Mid-Jordan project. The rationale is an agreement between UTA and the Draper design/build contractor to begin design/build work on the Draper project when the Mid-Jordan design/build project is completed in 2010. This seamless transition will save $20,000,000 by reducing financing and remobilization cost and will avoid laying off 1,900 workers from the Mid-Jordan project.

While significant progress has been made in recent months, the Committee continues to believe the Columbia River Crossing project will benefit from broad agreement on project details among local stakeholders, and encourages Columbia River Crossing project sponsors and planners in Oregon and Washington to continue to seek consensus among and consider input from local stakeholders.

The Committee recommends the following allocations of capital investment grant funds in fiscal year 2011:

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

Project	Amount
Access to Region's Core [ARC] Tunnel, NJ	$200,000,000
Austin, MetroRapid BRT, TX	24,229,796
Baltimore Red Line, MD	1,500,000
Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project, MN	42,345,000
Chicago Transit Authority—Green Line—South Branches Project, IL	2,200,000
City of Charlotte, Charlotte Area Transit System's Blue Line Extension—Northeast Corridor Project, NC	3,700,000
Columbia River Crossing, WA	40,000,000
Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor, CA	1,250,000
Dallas, Northwest/Southeast LRT MOS, TX	91,249,717
Downtown Connector/Westside Subway Extension, CA	6,500,000
Draper Light Rail, UT	2,100,000
Dulles Corridor Rail Project, VA	96,000,000
Fort Collins, Mason Corridor BRT, CO	5,128,989
Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project, HI	55,000,000
Houston, North Corridor LRT, TX	75,000,000
Houston, Southeast Corridor LRT, TX	75,000,000
King County, West Seattle BRT, WA	21,274,000
New Britain-Hartford Busway, CT	42,345,000
New York City, Nostrand Ave BRT, NY	26,723,039
New York, Long Island Rail Road East Side Access, NY	202,315,000
New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase I, NY	185,548,262
Northstar Phase II Project—Extension of Northstar Commuter Rail to the St. Cloud Area, MN	1,500,000
Oakland, East Bay BRT, CA	15,000,000
Orlando, Central Florida Commuter Rail Transit—Initial Operating Settlement, FL	34,000,000
Perris Valley Line, Riverside, CA	23,490,000
Purple Line, MD	1,500,000
RTD FasTracks East Corridor, Denver, CO	40,000,000
RTD FasTracks Gold Corridor, Denver, CO	40,000,000
RTD FasTracks West Corridor, Denver, CO	37,808,439
Salt Lake City, Mid Jordan LRT, UT	100,000,000
Salt Lake City, Weber County to Salt Lake City Commuter Rail, UT	80,000,000
San Bernardino, E Street Corridor sbX BRT, CA	40,114,830
San Francisco Muni Third St. Light Rail, Central Subway Project, CA	20,000,000
San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT, CA	14,115,000
Seattle, University Link LRT Extension, WA	110,000,000
Tampa Light Rail, Preliminary Engineering, FL	1,000,000
VelociRFTA Bus Rapid Transit, CO	24,163,000
Virgina Railway Express Rolling Stock, VA	1,000,000

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 higher than 60 percent.

GRANTS FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS

Appropriations, 2010	$75,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	52,743,000
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes $100,000,000 for grants to public transit agencies for unique and innovative approaches to reducing energy consumption or greenhouse gas emissions. The Committee supports the administration's efforts to reduce the Nation's dependence on foreign oil, and to encourage investment in clean energy sources to improve air quality and reduce our reliance

on fossil fuels. These funds will enable the FTA to support innovative technologies and other approaches, such as electric drive technologies, lightweight materials, and regenerative braking. The bill requires the FTA to place priority on projects with national applicability, including the potential to be replicated by other transit agencies regionally or nationally.

GRANTS TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2010	$150,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	150,000,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes $150,000,000 for grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority [WMATA] for capital and preventive maintenance expenses. These grants are authorized under section 601 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–432), and are in addition to the funding support local jurisdictions have committed to provide to WMATA. The Committee trusts this strong demonstration of support will encourage Metro's three funding partners to continue to meet their responsibilities toward the system as well.

The bill requires the FTA to provide these grants to WMATA only after receiving and reviewing a request for each specific project to be funded under this heading. The bill also requires the FTA to determine that WMATA has placed the highest priority on funding projects that will improve the safety of its public transit system before approving these grants. The Committee expects FTA to make this determination by taking into account the extent to which WMATA plans to use the funding provided under this heading in order to implement the safety recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board.

The Committee directs the General Accountability Office [GAO] to review WMATA's governance structure and examine other comparable systems to identify best practices. GAO should make recommendations to the Committee on how WMATA should change its governance structure to improve management and oversight by June 1, 2011.

The Committee directs WMATA to provide quarterly reports, beginning October 1, 2010, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations measuring the safety improvements it has made from implementing the recommendations of FTA's March 4, 2010, report, "Audit of the Tri-State Oversight Committee and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority."

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

Section 160 exempts authority previously made available for programs of the FTA under section 5338 of title 49, United States Code, from the obligation limitations in this act.

Section 161 requires that funds appropriated or limited by this act for specific projects not obligated by September 30, 2013, and other recoveries, be directed to projects eligible to use the funds for the purposes for which they were originally provided.

Section 162 allows funds appropriated before October 1, 2010, that remain available for expenditure to be transferred to the most recent appropriation heading.

Section 163 allows unobligated funds for new fixed guideway system projects in any previous appropriations act to be used during this fiscal year to satisfy expenses incurred for such projects.

Section 164 provides flexibility to fund program management oversight of activities authorized by section 5316 of title 49, United States Code.

Section 165 requires unobligated funds or recoveries under section 5309 of title 49, United States Code, that are available for reallocation shall be directed to projects eligible to use the funds for which they were originally intended.

Section 166 allows funds made available for Alaska or Hawaii ferry boats or ferry terminal facilities to be used to construct new vessels and facilities, or to improve existing vessels and facilities, and provides that funding may be used by the city and county of Honolulu to operate a passenger ferry boat service demonstration project.

Section 167 extends the contingent commitment authority for the New Starts program.

Section 168 provides an exemption from the charter bus regulations for the State of Washington.

Section 169 clarifies local share calculations for a New Starts project in Honolulu, Hawaii.

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, 2010	$32,324,000
Budget estimate, 2011	32,150,000
Committee recommendation	32,324,000

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 op-

eration and maintenance of the Seaway for which the SLSDC is responsible.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $32,324,000 for the operations, maintenance, and asset renewal of the Saint Lawrence Seaway. This amount is the same as the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, and $174,000 more than the President's fiscal year 2011 request. The recommended level includes $15,700,000 to continue the agency's Asset Renewal Program [ARP].

The Seaway is entering its 52nd year of operation, which means that its infrastructure components are reaching the end of their design life. ARP is a significant, 10-year, multi-project strategy to address the long-term asset renewal needs of the U.S. portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway, with attention to two locks (Snell and Eisenhower), the U.S. segment of the Seaway International Bridge, maintenance dredging, operational systems, facilities, and equipment.

The Committee expects SLSDC to control costs and implement the ARP in as timely and cost-effective manner as possible. It is crucial for the agency to anticipate changes to project scope and design, and to calculate and report projected estimates in the year of expenditure. In addition, as SLSDC refines its cost estimates for near-term projects and integrates those estimates into budget requests, the Committee expects SLSDC to achieve an increased level of accuracy by comparing projects to data that is as current and relevant as possible. The Committee encourages SLSDC to work with its Canadian counterpart, the Canadian Saint Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation, to track the actual costs of their modernization projects in the Canadian sectors of the Seaway, and to use these projects as a benchmark in determining the reasonableness of cost estimates and bids received for United States projects. The Committee also encourages SLSDC to increase the dependability of its cost estimation process by requesting independent financial reviews of project cost estimates and independent constructability reviews of project designs prior to contract solicitation for large construction projects to better ensure that projects can be successfully bid and built.

The Committee directs SLSDC to submit an annual report regarding the ARP. SLSDC shall, not later than April 30 of each year, submit to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees an annual report summarizing the activities of the ARP during the immediately preceding fiscal year. The report shall include up to date information on the status of the ARP, including but not limited to the following: an update on the status of each project that has received funding; cost overruns and cost savings for each active project; total work years of employees per project to date; delays and the cause of delays; schedule changes; up to date cost projections for each project in the ARP, highlighting changes in estimates; and any other deviations from the ARP. The SLSDC is directed to include in the reports any other relevant information relating to the management, funding, and implementation of the ARP.

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, 2010	$174,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	174,000,000
Committee recommendation	174,000,000

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 $174,000,000 for the Maritime Security Program. This amount is equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and budget request, and is consistent with the program's authorized level.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

Appropriations, 2010	$149,750,000
Budget estimate, 2011	164,353,000
Committee recommendation	172,754,000

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 recommends an appropriation of $172,754,000 for Operations and Training at the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 2011. This amount is $23,004,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and $8,401,000 more than the budget request.

	Fiscal year 2011 request	Committee recommendation
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy [USMMA]: [1]		
Salaries and Benefits	$32,877,000	$33,177,000
Midshipment Program	8,402,000	8,402,000
Midshipmen Reimbursement	6,000,000	6,000,000
Instructional Program	4,184,000	4,184,000
Program, Direction, and Administration	8,545,000	8,445,000
Maintenance, Repair and Operations	9,112,000	9,112,000
Capital Improvements	30,900,000	30,900,000
Subtotal, USMMA	100,020,000	100,220,000
State Maritime Schools:		
SIP	2,000,000	2,400,000
Direct Payments to Schools	2,000,000	2,000,000
Schoolship M&R	11,007,000	11,007,000
Subtotal, State Maritime Academies	15,007,000	15,407,000
MARAD Operations and Programs:		
Salaries and Benefits	29,047,000	29,047,000
Non-Discretionary Operations	11,179,000	11,179,000
Information Technology	6,314,000	9,115,000
Discretionary Operations and Travel	1,786,000	1,786,000
Discretionary Program Expenses	1,000,000	6,000,000
Subtotal, MARAD Operations and Programs	49,326,000	57,127,000
Total, Operations and Training	164,353,000	172,754,000

[1] These amounts may be altered as part of the spending plan.

United States Merchant Marine Academy.—The United States Merchant Marine Academy [USMMA] provides educational programs for men and women to become shipboard officers and leaders in the transportation field. The Committee is committed to ensuring that the Academy's midshipmen receive the highest quality education so that they are prepared for a commission with the U.S. Naval Reserve or other uniformed service upon graduation.

The Committee remains troubled that for many years, officials at the Academy engaged in questionable financial and management practices that potentially compromised the education and quality of life of the Academy's students. Senior leadership at both MARAD and at the Department of Transportation failed to exercise sufficient oversight of Academy operations, and showed little concern for its seriously degrading physical infrastructure. The culmination of these issues has caused significant turmoil throughout all aspects of the Academy's operations and resulted in a crisis of leadership, facilities management, and human resource management.

The Committee is pleased the current Secretary has taken a keen interest in reforming the Academy with the vision of restoring it to a prominent academic institution capable of producing top quality shipboard officers with a dedicated faculty to inspire future leaders in the maritime sector of the transportation industry. In order to be successful in this mission, it is essential that the Secretary provide the Academy with focused, dedicated, and strong leadership committed to the institution and supportive of the Administrator. The new Superintendent must: (1) recognize the Academy's partnership with MARAD in a mutually respectful manner; (2) develop a strategic plan grounded in the needs of both the commercial maritime industry and the United States military; (3) be open, transparent, and forthcoming with Congress; and (4) invest themselves both personally and professionally with improving all facets of the Academy's operations.

Further, it is critical that the Academy establish a more sophisticated and experienced workforce able to manage the major acquisition and construction projects of the Capital Improvement Program [CIP] and routine facilities maintenance projects in a cost-conscious and timely manner. The Committee recognizes the Academy's many infrastructure improvement needs are important to enhancing students' quality of life, as well as ensuring their safety. Therefore, the Committee provides the full $30,900,000 for capital improvements as requested in the budget, an increase of $15,900,000 over the fiscal year 2010 level. Further, the Committee provides $300,000 above the budget request for Academy salaries and benefits to support three additional acquisition and engineering staff to manage the CIP and facility maintenance consistent with the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Panel.

It is clear the internal process and organizational changes that are needed to restore the Academy will take time to be fully implemented. Therefore, the Committee has once again included language requiring that all funding for the Academy be given directly to the Secretary, and that 50 percent of the funding will not be available until MARAD submits a plan detailing how the funding will be spent. The spend plan shall include up-to-date information on the status of the CIP, including but not limited to the following: an update on the status of each project that has received funding; cost overruns and cost savings for each active project; delays and the cause for delays; schedule changes; up-to-date cost projections for each project in the CIP, highlighting changes in estimates; and any other deviations from the CIP. The Secretary is directed to include any other relevant information relating to the management, funding and implementation of the CIP and other significant facility maintenance items. The Committee believes that this process will ensure the Secretary's continued engagement, as well as sustain the newly developed system of funds control and accountability.

The Maritime Administration's request to increase funding to sponsor additional students at the 1-year pre-USMMA prep school program is denied.

Information Technology.—Integrated, real-time data on vessels is critical to both maritime commerce and the safety and security of our ports and waterways. The Committee has provided additional

resources for information technology, so that the agency can continue to improve and enhance data collection and analysis efforts in addition to expeditiously satisfying the data collection, analysis, and publication requirements pursuant to the Cruise Vessel Security and Safety Act of 2010.

Staffing.—The Committee is concerned about the large number of vacancies in MARAD and the agency's inability to fill job announcements with qualified applicants. The absence of qualified staff is impacting major programs and operations that are critical to the agency's core mission, such as the United States Merchant Marine Academy and the title XI loan guarantee program. The Committee directs MARAD to provide a quarterly report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the number of vacancies and the duties associated with each vacant position. Further, 90 days after the enactment of this act, the Committee requests the Secretary to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a plan to assist MARAD in addressing the Office of Personnel Management audit recommendations. This plan should establish policies, procedures, and timelines to set the agency on track to restore its hiring authority and ensure management of its human resources needs.

Environment and Compliance.—The Committee commends MARAD's initiative to support the domestic maritime industry's efforts to comply with emerging international and domestic environmental regulatory requirements. This is a promising collaborative program that coordinates and leverages the efforts of technology developers, ship builders, vessel owners, port authorities, academic researchers, classifications societies, and regulatory agencies to promote the development of a vital and environmentally responsible maritime industry. Funds provided in fiscal year 2010 established the infrastructure to test ballast water technology with consistent standards and procedures and related testing protocols. Funds provided in fiscal year 2011 should continue with the independent testing of ballast water technologies to meet domestic and international regulatory requirements, as well as assist in the testing and certification of air emissions reduction technology with the Environmental Protection Agency.

SHIP DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2010	$15,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

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] that MARAD is required by law to dispose of by the end of 2006. Currently there is a backlog of more than 76 ships awaiting disposal. Many of these vessels are 50 or more years old and have the potential to pose a significant environmental threat due to the presence of hazardous substances such as asbestos and solid and liquid polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs].

SHIP DISPOSAL

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000 for the Maritime Administration's Ship Disposal program. This level of funding is $5,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request. The Committee strongly supports MARAD's efforts to dispose of all obsolete vessels that it has in its fleet. The Committee is pleased that the agency was able to reach a settlement agreement addressing the 57 non-retention ships stored at the Suisun Bay Reserve Fleet allowing for significant progress to dispose of the 28 worst conditioned ships in the fleet. The Committee recognizes the agency takes this mission seriously and is aggressively taking steps to remediate the environmental threat these ships could pose if left unattended.

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL SHIPYARDS

Appropriations, 2010	$15,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	.....
Committee recommendation	25,000,000

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 and training programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is recommending an appropriation of $25,000,000 for assistance to small shipyards. This level of funding is $10,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The President did not request funding for this program in fiscal year 2011.

The Committee began funding this program in fiscal year 2008, which helps small shipyards improve the efficiency of their operations by providing funding for equipment and other facility upgrades, as well as workforce training and apprenticeship programs. Almost 150 qualified applicants submitted requests totaling $143,900,000 in fiscal year 2010, far exceeding available resources. The funding recommended by the Committee will help meet the demand, and improve the competitiveness of our Nation's small shipyards in communities dependent upon maritime transportation.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010	$9,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	3,688,000
Committee recommendation	9,000,000

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 refi-

nancing 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 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 provides an appropriation of $9,000,000 for the Maritime Guaranteed Loan Title XI program. Of the amount provided, $4,000,000 is for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the program. This level of funding is equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and $5,312,000 more than the President's request. The loan guarantee amount of $5,000,000 will provide for a total loan volume of up to $74,000,000. The affordable financing opportunities that these loans allow are critical to ensuring that shipowners can build ships in the United States. The Committee expects that MARAD will move quickly to approve the loan guarantees, which are critical to our domestic shipbuilding industry.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Section 175 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.

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 is dedicated to safety, including the elimination of transportation-related deaths and injuries associated with hazardous materials and pipeline transportation, and to promoting transportation solutions that enhance communities and protect the environment.

OPERATIONAL EXPENSES

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

Appropriations, 2010	$21,132,000
Budget estimate, 2011	22,383,000
Committee recommendation	22,383,000

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 $22,383,000 for this account, of which $639,000 is to be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, and of which $1,000,000 may be transferred to the Office of Pipeline Safety for Information Grants to Communities. This level of funding is equal to the budget request and $1,251,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee directs the PHMSA to provide to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a funding distribution table listing how State and Federal program expenses for the previous fiscal year are divided between the four pipeline segments—natural gas distribution natural gas transmission, liquefied natural gas, and hazardous liquid pipelines.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

Appropriations, 2010	$37,994,000
Budget estimate, 2011	40,434,000
Committee recommendation	50,434,000

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.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $50,434,000 for hazardous materials safety, of which $6,497,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2013. The amount provided is $10,000,000 more than the budget request and $12,440,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee provides an increase for the Office of Hazardous Materials Safety [HMS] to implement the Secretary's action plan to address the Office of the Inspector General's [OIG] investigations into the administration of special permits and approvals for the packaging and transportation of explosives and other hazardous materials. Of the increase, $5,210,000 is for 54 new positions and $4,790,000 is for improvements to the PHMSA's data management and information technology modernization effort. The additional positions will enable the PHMSA to improve its oversight, management, and processing of special permits and approvals, as well as address the projected 43 percent increase in workload resulting from the elimination of special permits and approvals for trade associations. The increase in funds will also allow the PHMSA to streamline, eliminate, or codify certain special permits and approvals into regulations. In order to ensure HMS is moving forward in hiring these additional personnel, the Committee requests quarterly staffing reports.

Over the course of the past year the OIG conducted an investigation into the PHMSA's special permits and approvals program. The OIG found such egregious mismanagement affecting the safe transportation of hazardous materials that it was compelled to issue two

management advisories so that immediate remediation actions could be taken prior to the issuance of its final report. In the first management advisory, the OIG stated that the PHMSA does not: (1) adequately review applicants' safety history; (2) ensure applicants will provide an acceptable level of safety; (3) coordinate with the affected operating administrations; and (4) conduct regular compliance reviews of individuals and companies that have been granted special permits and approvals. For example, of the 99 permits and 56 approvals that the OIG examined, the PHMSA did not consider the applicants' incident and compliance records when granting, renewing, or allowing "party-to" permits. The OIG found this to be the case even when applicants had multiple incidents and enforcement violations in the years prior to receiving their permit. Of particular concern to the OIG was the PHMSA's practice of granting special permits to trade associations—effectively giving a blanket authorization to thousands of member companies without any assessment of their safety histories or need for the permit. Further, the OIG's visits to 27 companies found that more than one-half did not comply with the terms of their special permits. In the second management advisory the OIG found: (1) the PHMSA has no formalized guidance for classifying and approving explosives; (2) the PHMSA did not adhere to regulatory requirements for reclassifying an explosive; (3) the PHMSA lacks a formal process and controls for appropriately resolving internally contested safety decisions; and, (4) over the last 10 years, the PHMSA has not conducted fitness inspections or safety reviews at any of its four approved explosives testing labs.

Clearly, the PHMSA faces significant flaws in virtually every aspect of this program. As a result of these investigations, the PHMSA has developed action, data management, and information technology modernization plans to remediate the fundamental failures the OIG identified. The OIG agrees the agency is making significant progress in addressing many of its recommendations; however, insufficient resources will limit the agency's ability to successfully execute and resolve pending recommendations and manage the program consistent with its statutory obligations. The Committee understands that with every budget resources are limited and priorities have to be made. However, the Department's failure to make safety its first and foremost priority by requesting sufficient resources to implement the aforementioned action plans—especially in light of the seriousness of the OIG findings—is disturbing.

The Committee directs the Department to include a proposal to establish a reasonable user fee with its fiscal year 2012 budget to assist in covering a portion of the cost of expenses incurred to process applications and ensure compliance with the terms of special permits and approvals issued under 49 U.S.C. 5117. In addition, the Committee directs the OIG to continue to monitor the implementation of the Secretary's action plans and report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by April 1, 2011, on the agency's progress in implementing the OIG recommendations and its ability to efficiently and effectively manage the processing of special permits and approvals.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2010	$105,239,000
Budget estimate, 2011	111,111,000
Committee recommendation	111,111,000

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 $111,111,000 for the Office of Pipeline Safety. This amount is $5,872,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request. Of the funding provided, $18,905,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and $92,206,000 shall be from the Pipeline Safety Fund.

The Pipeline Safety Office has the important responsibility of ensuring the safety and integrity of the pipelines that run through every community in our Nation. Following the passage of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002, the Office of Pipeline Safety has taken important steps to improve the integrity of pipelines in order to protect our communities from pipeline incidents. Efforts by Congress and the OPS to push for further advancements in safety technologies, increase civil penalties, and educate communities about the dangers of pipelines, have resulted in a reduction in serious pipeline incidents. However, it is critical that the agency continue to make strides in protecting communities from pipeline failures and incidents.

Technical Assistance Grants.—In fiscal year 2009, the Committee provided funding for the first time for pipeline safety information grants to communities, or technical assistance grants [TAG]. Through this funding, communities are able to obtain technical assistance in the form of engineering or other scientific analysis of pipeline safety issues. The funding will also help promote public participation in official proceedings. The Committee strongly believes that providing communities with resources to obtain expertise and assistance will help them protect their communities from future pipeline incidents.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

Appropriations, 2010	$28,318,000
Budget estimate, 2011	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 $28,318,000 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 supports training and curriculum development for public sector emergency response and preparedness teams.

RESEARCH AND INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2010	$13,007,0000
Budget estimate, 2011	17,200,000
Committee recommendation	16,900,000

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 strengthen and facilitate the Department's multimodal and inter-modal research efforts, leverage and enhance intra-modal research efforts, and coordinate and sharpen 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 $16,900,000 for Research and Innovative Technology Administration for fiscal year 2011. The amount provided is $3,893,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 level.

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

	Amount
Salaries and Administrative Expenses	7,200,000
Alternative Fuels Safety Research and Development	500,000
RD&T Coordination	900,000
Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System [NDGPS]	7,400,000
Position, Navigation, and Timing [PNT]	900,000

Over the past several years, RITA has taken steps to transform itself into a more effective organization by implementing key 2006 and 2009 GAO recommendations, and associated developments in

the agency's Research, Development, and Technology [RD&T] Coordination division. The development of new RD&T tools, such as the Knowledge Management System, is a positive step towards better identifying synergies and facilitating collaborative, cross-cutting research. In addition, the Committee awaits the completion of DOT's RD&T Strategic Plan, and notes the positive potential of a well-managed and structured strategic planning process. Accordingly, the Committee expects RITA to develop suitable metrics to help evaluate the Strategic Plan's implementation.

Alternative Fuels Safety Research and Development.—The Committee recommends $500,000 for Fuels Safety Research and Development. RITA should continue to expand the focus of the program to encompass a variety of promising alternative fuels. The Committee encourages RITA to work with the DOT Alternative Fuels Working Group to accelerate testing and confirmation of new materials and components. Likewise, RITA will continue to respond to direct stakeholder and industry needs in advancing alternative fuels, as well as develop and test alternative safety and inspection technologies. Research in sustainable fuels is an important component of ensuring that the United States remains economically competitive, and RITA is well suited to take the lead in facilitating relevant, cross-cutting and multi-modal alternative fuels research throughout DOT.

Research, Development, and Technology Coordination.—The Committee recommends $900,000 for Research, Development, and Technology [RD&T] Coordination with the expectation that RITA will coordinate, facilitate, and review the Department's R&D portfolio and identify synergies among the programs. Central to realizing the agency's mission, the Committee supports RITA's ongoing efforts to develop its RD&T Coordination capabilities through innovative tools such as the Knowledge Management System [KMS], the development of an RD&T Strategic Plan, and the continued implementation of key GAO recommendations. Notably, the KMS should improve cross-modal collaboration within DOT, while reducing duplicative research efforts. RITA's work over the past year to collaboratively identify research clusters, facilitate dialogue between researchers, and hold annual program reviews to identify cross-cutting research projects, represents positive steps towards better fulfilling its mission. The Committee expects RITA to continue to develop and improve its RD&T coordination capacities.

Likewise, RITA must continue to innovate and take the lead in developing cutting-edge coordinative tools and methods. The funds provided by the Committee are $364,000 over the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, and equal to the President's request. They will allow RITA to further develop the KMS, as well as other systematic approaches to identify research synergies. In doing so, RITA should be mindful to communicate and coordinate with relevant Federal, State, and local stakeholders.

Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System [NDGPS].—The Committee provides $7,400,000 to support operations and maintenance [O&M] and equipment recapitalization of the Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System [NDGPS]. The amount provided is $2,800,000 over the fiscal year 2010 level, and includes $5,400,000 for O&M. The $800,000 increase to O&M over fiscal

year 2010 levels responds to increased Coast Guard cost-estimates for servicing existing NDGPS infrastructure, and will help cover expenses associated with maintaining aging electronic components, and incremental cost growth. RITA has a long-standing track record of maintaining annual NDGPS availability in excess of 98.5 percent, and this year's appropriation will allow the agency to continue to meet this high standard of service.

Consistent with the request, the Committee directs $2,000,000 of the funds provided to RITA be used for NDGPS equipment recapitalization. The Committee recognizes that both RITA and the Coast Guard consider timely NDGPS recapitalization to be essential for preserving the system and maintaining service availability in the most cost-effective manner. The existing in-land NDGPS suffers from aging components, many of which now exceed their serviceable lifespan. Because of the system's age, hardware is obsolete, and replacement parts are increasingly expensive and difficult to obtain. Many in-land receivers are being serviced with parts salvaged during the Coast Guard's 2009 recapitalization of the Maritime DGPS system, or through costly special orders. Moreover, according to estimates provided by RITA, future O&M costs are expected to increase between 15 and 20 percent annually should recapitalization of the existing system be delayed.

Recapitalization in fiscal year 2011 is further supported by the Coast Guard's existing contract structure for replacing NDGPS transmitters. Extending the current contract to upgrade NDGPS transmitters is ultimately more cost effective than upgrading in the future under a new contract agreement. Maintaining continuity of hardware with the Maritime DGPS will benefit RITA and the Coast Guard as the upgraded system becomes operational.

Position, Navigation, and Timing [PNT].—The Committee provides $900,000 to support responsibilities in Position, Navigation and Timing [PNT] leadership that were delegated from OST to RITA. This realignment has made RITA the primary agency responsible for coordinating and developing PNT policy and technology. The Committee's fiscal year 2011 appropriation is $500,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, and will allow RITA to continue to develop the national PNT architecture, participate in PNT and spectrum policy coordination, support the FRP revision, and further identify civil PNT requirements.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Limitation on obligations, 2010	$28,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	30,000,000
Committee recommendation	30,000,000

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 $30,000,000 for BTS. This amount is equal to the President's request, and $2,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level to support the implementation phase of the 2012 Commodity Flow Survey [CFS]. Conducted on a 5-year cycle, the CFS is the largest national survey of multimodal freight movement, and provides comprehensive data on two-thirds of the freight tonnage transported in the United States. The funds provided by the Committee will allow finalization of survey design and data collection methods, and cover associated cost increases.

Over the past year, BTS has made some progress on projects to gauge and improve customer satisfaction. The American Customer Satisfaction Index Web survey was implemented in January, 2010, and customer feedback data is now being distributed to BTS and RITA leadership on a quarterly basis. In addition, BTS has met with stakeholders to identify theme areas for improvement. In fiscal year 2011, the Committee expects BTS to continue to develop performance indicators for user satisfaction, and develop an action plan to tailor products to better suit clients' needs.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010	$75,114,000
Budget estimate, 2011	79,772,000
Committee recommendation	86,406,000

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 $86,406,000 for activities of the Office of the Inspector General, which is $6,634,000 more than the President's budget request and $11,292,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

OIG Workforce.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,010,000 for essential investments in the OIG workforce. This funding increase includes $1,525,000 to increase the OIG workforce by eight FTE in fiscal year 2010, $200,000 to provide additional training for OIG staff, and $285,000 to supplement the in-house ex-

pertise of the OIG with consultant services for highly technical and complex audits.

The Committee relies on the Inspector General and his staff to provide objective analysis of the Department's programs. These programs will continue to grow increasingly complex as the FAA modernizes its air traffic control system, and as Congress considers how to reauthorize the surface transportation programs. In addition, the Office of the Secretary is embarking on two Department-wide initiatives to revamp its financial management capital and better secure its computer networks. Both of these initiatives are significant investments that will involve complex technologies and require substantial resources.

The OIG must have the ability to monitor all of these Department programs and initiatives at the Department, to respond to congressional requests, and to initiate audits as necessary. As the Department's activities grow in complexity, the Committee expects the Inspector General to maintain a workforce with the skills necessary to produce relevant, accurate, thorough, and reliable work.

Transfers and Reimbursements from Other Agencies.—For the past several years, the FAA, FHWA, FTA and NTSB have provided funds to the OIG to cover the cost of audits and investigations of their programs and financial statements. These agencies have either transferred funds directly to the OIG or provided the funding on a reimbursable basis.

This year, the Administration has proposed transferring and reimbursing the OIG a total of $6,634,000. In contrast, the Committee recommendation provides this funding directly to the OIG. For this reason, the Committee recommendation provides $6,634,000 more to the OIG than the Administration's budget request. However, the Committee recommendation has not included this funding in the resources provided for the FAA, FHWA, FTA and NTSB. This decrease in funding levels for those agencies will have no impact on the level of resources available to them for their own programs and activities.

Providing direct appropriations to the OIG will give greater transparency to the OIG budget, provide the funding in a more efficient manner, and simplify the relationship between the OIG and the agencies it oversees. Last year, the Committee disentangled the funding appropriated for the Amtrak and the Amtrak OIG, arguing that the Amtrak OIG cannot rely on the railroad it oversees for the cost of its oversight. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2011 continues this practice, and extends this same policy to DOT and the Department's OIG.

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.

Sole Source Contracts.—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, 2010	$29,066,000	$1,250,000
Budget estimate, 2011	25,988,000	1,250,000
Committee recommendation	29,934,000	1,250,000

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, pipeline carriers, and intercity passenger train service, 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 $29,934,000. This funding level is $3,946,000 more than the President's request, and $868,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Included in the recommendation is $1,250,000 in fees, which will offset the appropriated funding.

Uniform Rail Costing System.—Many of the STB's responsibilities require the board to estimate the variable costs of railroad movements and activities. In fulfilling these responsibilities, the STB employs a highly specialized cost model called the Uniform Rail Costing System [URCS]. STB's predecessor agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, invested 5 years' time and leveraged significant technical assistance from economists to develop URCS during the 1980s.

Today, URCS is outdated. Many stakeholders in the railroad industry, as well as the Departments of Transportation and Agriculture, have asked the STB to review and update its cost model.

The Committee provided the STB with additional resources for fiscal year 2010 to evaluate the adequacy of the URCS, identify a range of options for modernizing the cost model, and report on the resources necessary for each option. On May 27, 2010, the STB submitted its report to the Committee, including discussion of basic, moderate and comprehensive options for URCS modernization. The board recommended investment in the moderate option, which would include extensive updates to the URCS, but not entail a complete overhaul. A complete overhaul could increase costs significantly, but it may not provide enough benefits to justify its price tag.

The Committee recommendation includes $625,000 for extensive updates to the URCS, the amount that STB identified as necessary to complete the moderate option in its report.

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 clarifies the requirement to fund certain programs, projects and activities identified in this report within the accounts of the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, and Federal Transit Administration.

Section 187 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 188 prohibits the use of funds in this act to make a grant or announce the intention to make a grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations at least 3 full business days before making the grant or the announcement.

Section 189 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 190 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 191 establishes requirements for reprogramming actions by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

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

Section 193 allows the Department of Transportation to make use of the Working Capital Fund in providing transit benefits to Federal employees.

Section 194 clarifies funding for certain projects that were included in previous appropriations acts.

Section 195 clarifies funding for certain projects that were included in Public Law 109–59.

Section 196 requires the Department of Transportation to conduct a study related to the Missouri River.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2010	$46,059,233,000
Budget estimate, 2011	45,570,699,000
Committee recommendation	46,591,857,000

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 opportunities; 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 2011 an appropriation of $46,591,857,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is $532,624,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and $1,021,158,000 more than the budget request.

The Committee reiterates that the Department must limit the reprogramming of funds between the programs, projects, and activities within each account without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations. Unless otherwise identified in the bill or report, the most detailed allocation of funds presented in the budget justifications is approved, with any deviation from such approved allocation subject to the normal reprogramming requirements. Except as specifically provided otherwise, it is the intent of the Committee that all carryover funds in the various accounts, including recaptures and de-obligations, are subject to the normal reprogramming requirements outlined above. No change may be made to any program, project, or activity if it is construed to be new policy or a

change in policy, without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations. Finally, the Committee expects to be notified regarding reorganizations of offices, programs or activities prior to the implementation of such reorganizations, as well as be notified, on a monthly basis, of all ongoing litigation, including any negotiations or discussions, planned or ongoing, regarding a consent decree between the Department and any other entity, including the estimated costs of such decrees.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION

Appropriations, 2010	$26,855,000
Budget estimate, 2011	30,265,000
Committee recommendation	30,265,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides all Personnel Compensation and Benefits and Non-Personnel Services funding for the Office of the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, the Office of the Chief Operating Officer, the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, the Office of Public Affairs, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization. Additionally, funding is provided for the executive management in the offices of the Chief Financial Officer, the General Counsel, the Office of Public and Indian Housing, the Office of Community Planning and Development, the Office of Housing, the Office of Policy Development and Research, and the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. These individuals are responsible for developing policy and managing the resources necessary to carry out HUD's mission. The core mission of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is to support community development, increase access to affordable housing free from discrimination and help Americans achieve the dream of homeownership.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $30,265,000 for this account, which is equal to the budget request and $3,410,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Amounts are made available as follows:

	Amount
Immediate Office of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary	7,674,000
Office of Hearings and Appeals	1,706,000
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	719,000
Immediate Office of the Chief Financial Officer	999,000
Immediate Office of the General Counsel	1,503,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations	2,709,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs	4,861,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Affairs	2,163,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community and Planning Development	1,755,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner	3,565,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research	1,117,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	945,000
Office of the Chief Operating Officer	549,000

For many years, HUD was appropriated funding for the salaries and expenses of the entire Department in one account. This pro-

vided little transparency, and made it difficult for Congress to determine if funding was being used to meet the pressing housing needs facing the Department and the country. In fiscal year 2008, the Committee created a new salaries and expenses structure in order to increase transparency of the Department's funding and improve congressional oversight.

Managing its funding under this new structure has been an adjustment for HUD. It requires better management of staff and resources, which depend on educating management and staff about appropriate resource management and instilling fiscal discipline. The Committee continues to believe that the increased transparency and oversight afforded through this structure serves the interest of the Department and the taxpayers.

The Committee notes that the Department is taking steps to address its management shortfalls, and is seeking to improve its operations by achieving efficiencies, as well as focusing on outcomes rather than outputs. In order to assist HUD in this process, the Committee is providing the Department with some additional, limited flexibility to improve the management of its programs. However, the Committee continues to require that any significant changes in program funding be approved by the Committees on Appropriations in order for Congress to track funding and evaluate program needs.

As the Department works to improve its operations, the Committee notes that staffing execution has varied by office. For example, the Office of Housing has greatly improved its ability to hire the additional personnel to meet the demands on the Federal Housing Administration [FHA]. However, other program offices have been slow to hire and, as a result, are expected to lapse significant salaries and expenses funding at the end of fiscal year 2010, which is unacceptable. In light of carryover balances, some of the funding levels for program offices have been reduced. In order to avoid lapsing funding in the future, HUD must remain focused on program execution and management to ensure that taxpayer dollars are effectively and efficiently spent. If lapses continue, the Committee will further reduce office staffing budgets in fiscal year 2012.

Congressional Justifications.—The Committee directs the Department to include more detailed information on its salaries and expenses request in the fiscal year 2012 congressional justification. These budget documents provide the Committee with the necessary information to make decisions about how funding is allocated. Therefore, the justification for the salaries and expenses requests across the Department should include an explanation of any proposed increase or decrease in full-time equivalent [FTE] personnel, as well as the program areas for which any increase or decrease in FTEs is being sought. In addition, the budget documents should include a break out of the Executive Direction account by office. Finally, the Committee expects the documents to include detailed information on nonpersonnel related expenses, including travel, by program office. This should include information on prior travel and travel planned for fiscal year 2012. The Committee also requests the location and purpose of any international travel.

ADMINISTRATION, OPERATIONS, AND MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2010	$537,011,000
Budget estimate, 2011	540,622,635
Committee recommendation	528,845,635

The Administration, Operations, and Management [AOM] account is the backbone of HUD's operations, and consists of several offices that are supposed to work seamlessly to provide the support services required to ensure the Department performs its core mission, and is compliant with all legal, operational, and financial guidelines established by Congress for the benefit of the Nation. The AOM account funds the personnel compensation and benefits costs of the remaining staff in the Office of General Counsel, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, and the Office of Administration, as well as the entire staff in the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer, the Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity, the Office of Field Policy and Management, the Office of Departmental Operations and Coordination, the Office of Sustainability, the Office of Strategic Planning and Management, the Office of Disaster and Emergency Management, and the Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. This account also contains Non-Personnel Services funding for the Department.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $528,845,635 for this account, which is $9,706,000 less than the budget request and $8,165,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. Funds are made available as follows:

	Amount
Office of Chief Human Capital Officer Personnel Compensation and Benefits	$65,120,000
Office of Departmental Operations and Coordination Personnel Compensation and Benefits	9,122,000
Office of Field Policy and Management Personnel Compensation and Benefits	49,090,000
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer Personnel Compensation and Benefits	15,931,635
Office of the Chief Financial Officer Personnel Compensation and Benefits	33,831,000
Office of the General Counsel Personnel Compensation and Benefits	86,482,000
Office of the Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity Personnel Compensation and Benefits	3,296,000
Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Personnel Compensation and Benefits	1,316,000
Office of Sustainability Personnel Compensation and Benefits	2,887,000
Office of Strategic Planning and Management Personnel Compensation and Benefits	4,445,000
Office of the Chief Disaster and Emergency Management Officer	4,875,000
Non-personnel expenses	252,450,000

The Committee recommends funding under this account to cover the necessary administrative staff and nonpersonnel-related expenses of the Department.

The Committee notes that HUD is being provided additional flexibility within its salaries and expenses accounts this year so that it can make the investments necessary to improve staffing expertise and program management. The Committee expects the Department to keep the Committee apprised of the results of these efforts, and will continue to closely monitor the use of these funds.

Travel.—HUD is responsible for the oversight of thousands of grantees across the country receiving Federal funding through its programs. Given this responsibility, adequate travel resources are necessary so that staff can conduct on-site monitoring of its grantees. However, in recognition of the constraints of the Federal budg-

et, the Committee believes that the travel budget of the Department can be reduced while maintaining sufficient resources to ensure continued monitoring of its grantees. Therefore, the Committee has reduced the Department's request for travel-related expenses by 5 percent. The Committee expects the reduction to be absorbed through reductions in conference and other nonoversight related travel.

Workforce Acquisition.—The Committee notes that the President's budget included an additional $2,000,000 to improve the Department's acquisition workforce capacity and capabilities. The Committee has not included this language as a general provision, but has instead provided this funding directly to the Office of the Chief Procurement Officer. The Committee expects that this funding will be used primarily to hire additional acquisition staff.

Building Modernization.—The President's request for nonpersonnel-related expenses includes $11,000,000 to begin design for the modernization of the Department's headquarters building. The Committee supports the Secretary's efforts to increase the energy efficiency of the headquarters building, and improve the workplace environment for HUD employees. While the Department has yet to receive and assess the feasibility study for the building modernization being conducted by the General Services Administration, this modernization effort is expected to require a substantial investment of taxpayer dollars in future years. Given the current fiscal pressures, the Committee cannot commit to a large, multi-year modernization project without an understanding of the full scope and cost of the project. Therefore the Committee does not think it is prudent to provide funding to begin the design phase of this project, and has not included the requested funding in the budget this year.

PERSONNEL COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

Appropriations, 2010	$197,074,000
Budget estimate, 2011	197,282,000
Committee recommendation	195,508,000

This account provides salary and benefits funding to support staff in headquarters and in 46 field offices (funding for the immediate office of Assistant Secretary is provided out of the "Executive Direction Account") in the Office of Public and Indian Housing [PIH]. PIH is charged with ensuring the availability of safe, decent, and affordable housing, creating opportunities for residents' self sufficiency and economic independence, and assuring the fiscal integrity of all public housing agencies. The Office ensures that safe, decent and affordable housing is available to Native American families, creates economic opportunities for tribes and Indian housing residents, assists tribes in the formulation of plans and strategies for community development, and assures fiscal integrity in the operation of the programs. The Office also administers programs authorized in the Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act of 1996 [NAHASDA], which provides housing assistance to Native Americans and Native Hawaiians. PIH also manages the Housing Choice Voucher program, in which tenant-

based vouchers increase affordable housing choices for low-income families. Tenant-based vouchers enable families to lease safe, decent, and affordable privately owned rental housing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $195,508,000 for this account, which is $1,774,000 less than the budget request and $1,566,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee is reducing this amount due to expected lapsing funds in fiscal year 2010 and excessive staff dedicated to Transforming Rental Assistance.

Public and Indian Housing's [PIH] responsibilities include the oversight of public housing agencies across the country that manage public housing and participate in the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program. These programs serve more than 3 million low-income individuals and families across the country. Section 8 also represents the largest single item in HUD's budget. The oversight of these programs is therefore critical to protecting both residents and taxpayers.

The budget request includes resources for a significant number of staff to work on the Transforming Rental Assistance initiative. While the Committee understands that staff time and effort is needed to better understand the needs of public housing and develop a solution to the capital backlog, too much time is being dedicated to this initiative, which is not yet being implemented. Instead, HUD should focus greater attention on the oversight of its core programs. For example, PIH staff resources should be dedicated to improving its ability to analyze and understand the cost trends in the section 8 program. This information is critical to ensuring the appropriate management of section 8 resources by HUD and public housing agencies in order to sustain this affordable housing over the long-term. The Committee directs HUD to increase staff dedicated to oversight of PIH's core programs, including the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program.

Regulatory Barriers.—The Committee is very interested in the soon to be released report on the Moving to Work demonstration, including both the successes and failures of the program. In particular, the Committee is very intrigued about HUD regulation of public housing and the extent to which existing regulations interfere or are barriers to the development and implementation of public housing as affordable assisted housing. To the extent possible, the Committee wants to understand how effective the elimination of certain regulations will be to the effective use of public housing and section 8 resources. The Committee directs HUD to submit a list of regulatory or statutory barriers to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by May 15, 2011.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2010	$98,989,000
Budget estimate, 2011	105,768,000
Committee recommendation	105,281,000

This account provides salary and benefits funding for Community Planning and Development [CPD] staff in headquarters and in 43 field offices, (funding for the immediate office of the Assistant Sec-

retary is provided out of the "Executive Direction account"). CPD's mission is to enable the progress of viable urban, suburban and rural communities by promoting integrated approaches to community and economic development. CPD programs also assist in the expansion of opportunities for low- and moderate-income individuals and families in moving towards homeownership. The Assistant Secretary for CPD administers formula and competitive grant programs as well as guaranteed loan programs that help communities plan and finance their growth and development. These programs also help communities increase their capacity to govern and provide shelter and services for homeless persons and other persons with special needs, including person with HIV/AIDS.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $105,281,000 for the staffing within this office, which is $487,000 less than the budget request and $6,292,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee supports the Department's request for increased staff in this program. The additional staff will be used to increase compliance and monitoring, which is critical given the number of grantees receiving funding through CPD programs. The Committee is also pleased that the budget supports a new staff person who will be dedicated to veterans' housing issues.

HOUSING

Appropriations, 2010	$374,887,000
Budget estimate, 2011	395,917,000
Committee recommendation	395,917,000

This account provides salary and benefits funding to support staff in headquarters and in 52 field locations, (funding for the immediate office of the Assistant Secretary/FHA Housing Commissioner is provided out of the Executive Direction account) in the Office of Housing. The Office of Housing is responsible for implementing programs to assist projects for occupancy by very low-and moderate-income households, to provide capital grants to nonprofit sponsors for the development of housing for the elderly or handicapped, and to conduct several regulatory functions. The Office also administers Federal Housing Administration [FHA] programs that help lenders reduce exposure to the risk of default. These programs underwrite mortgages or loan insurance to finance new construction, rehabilitation or the purchase of existing dwelling units. The Office also provides services to maintain and preserve home ownership, especially for underserved population. This assistance allows lenders to make lower-cost financing available to more borrowers for home and home improvement loans, and apartment, hospital, and nursing home loans. FHA provides a vital link in addressing America's homeownership and affordable housing needs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $395,917,000 for staffing in the Office of Housing, which is equal to the budget request and $21,030,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted

level. The Office of Housing includes the Federal Housing Administration [FHA], which as a result of the housing crisis is currently playing an outsized role in the market. FHA's ability to provide continued access to liquidity has helped provide some stability to the housing market, but its increased role does not come without risk. Sufficient staff with the appropriate expertise is critical to mitigating this risk through strong oversight.

The Committee supports HUD's efforts to bolster FHA staff, and has been pleased with FHA's ability to bring on staff consistent with the staffing plan required by the Committee last year. The Committee remains focused on the Department's effort to fulfill this plan, and expects HUD to continue providing the Committee with regular updates.

The Committee notes that FHA is also playing an important role in financing hospitals and other healthcare facilities. The funding provided will enable HUD to increase staff within the Office of Insured Healthcare Facilities. This staff is important to efficiently managing its programs, while reducing any risk related to increased business.

FHA has recently implemented lean processing in the Office of Insured Healthcare Facilities in order to improve the efficiency of the program. The Committee directs HUD to submit a report within 6 months of the enactment of the act detailing how this is being implemented. This report should include policies put in place that protect the program against losses, as well as the staffing necessary to ensure effective program management.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Appropriations, 2010	$11,095,000
Budget estimate, 2011	10,902,000
Committee recommendation	16,000,000

This account provides all salary and benefits funding to support Government National Mortgage Association [Ginnie Mae] headquarters staff. Ginnie Mae programs help expand the supply of affordable housing in the United States by linking the capital markets to the Nation's housing markets. Ginnie Mae accomplishes this by facilitating the financing of residential mortgage loans insured or guaranteed by the FHA, the Department of Veteran Affairs [VA], and additional entities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $16,000,000, which is $5,098,000 more than the budget request and $4,905,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee provides language to continue allowing funding for personnel compensation and benefits to be derived from the Ginnie Mae guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account.

Since Ginnie Mae securitizes FHA insured mortgages, its business has grown dramatically over the past few years along with FHA's. This increased business, including the potential for fraudulent lenders to enter Government programs, demands greater oversight by Ginnie Mae. This can only be accomplished with a sufficiently sized and capable workforce. Yet while the Department proposes significant increases FHA's staff, the budget inexplicably

would trim Ginnie Mae's workforce. The Committee believes Ginnie Mae needs to be performing more oversight, not less, and has provided resources to nearly double Ginnie Mae's workforce. With these additional funds, the Committee expects Ginnie Mae to move expeditiously to hire staff with the necessary expertise. Since Ginnie Mae has faced challenges in maintaining an adequate workforce in the past, the Committee directs HUD to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with quarterly staffing updates for Ginnie Mae.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2010	$21,138,000
Budget estimate, 2011	23,588,000
Committee recommendation	22,556,421

This account provides salary and benefits funding to support staff in headquarters and in 16 field locations, (funding for the immediate office of Assistant Secretary is provided out of the Executive Direction account) in the Office of Policy Development and Research [PD&R]. PD&R supports the Department's efforts to help create cohesive, economically healthy communities. PD&R is responsible for maintaining current information on housing needs, market conditions, and existing programs, as well as conducting research on priority housing and community development issues. The Office provides reliable and objective data and analysis to help inform policy decisions.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $22,556,421 for this account, which is $1,031,579 less than the budget request and $1,418,421 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee supports the administration's efforts to expand and improve the data and research on which the Department bases its policy decisions. However, the Committee is concerned that the PD&R workforce is growing too quickly. Therefore, the Committee is partially approving the administration's request for additional staff. The Committee has included funding that will allow PD&R to hire additional economists in the field. This will improve HUD's ability to collect and analyze market-level data, as well as assist in underwriting related to FHA business, including healthcare facilities. However, the Committee denies the Department's request for additional funding to support increased staff in headquarters.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Appropriations, 2010	$71,800,000
Budget estimate, 2011	67,964,000
Committee recommendation	70,363,435

This account provides salary and benefits funding to support staff in headquarters and in 42 field locations, (funding for the immediate office of Assistant Secretary is provided out of the Executive Direction account) in the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity [FHEO]. FHEO is responsible for investigating, resolving, and prosecuting complaints of housing discrimination and conducting education and outreach activities to increase awareness of

the requirements of the Fair Housing Act. The Office also develops and interprets fair housing policy, processes complaints, performs compliance reviews and provides oversight and technical assistance to local housing authorities and community development agencies regarding section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $70,363,435, which is 2,399,435 more than the budget request and $1,436,565 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The President's budget proposed to reduce FHEO by nearly $4,000,000. A decrease of this size would reduce the number of enforcement personnel potentially undermining a core responsibility of the office. Therefore, the Committee has provided funding over the President's budget to ensure that enforcement staffing is not reduced. Since the Department expects FHEO to lapse a portion of its fiscal year 2010 budget, the Committee recommendation does not fully restore this account to its fiscal year 2010 level.

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

Appropriations, 2010	$7,151,000
Budget estimate, 2011	6,762,000
Committee recommendation	7,151,000

This account provides salary and benefits funding to support the Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control [OHHLHC] headquarters staff. OHHLHC administers and manages 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. The Office also develops lead-based paint regulations, guidelines, and policies applicable to HUD programs, designs lead-based paint and healthy homes training programs, administers lead-hazard control and healthy homes grant programs, and implements the lead and healthy homes research program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,151,000 for this account, which is $389,000 more than the budget request and equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

TRANSFORMING RENTAL ASSISTANCE

Appropriations, 2010	.....
Budget estimate, 2011	$350,000,000
Committee recommendation	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Transforming Rental Assistance [TRA] is intended to fund the preservation of public and HUD-assisted housing, as well as enhance housing choice for residents. Incentives would also be provided through this program to increase administrative efficiency. Participation in the program by public and assisted housing owners would be voluntary and involve the conversion to an improved form

of property-based rental assistance. This form of rental assistance would enable public housing agencies and assisted housing owners to leverage private sector resources in order to recapitalize this housing stock and maintain these units of affordable housing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation does not include $350,000,000 as requested for the administration's TRA initiative in fiscal year 2011.

TRA is an ambitious proposal by the administration intended to preserve public and other HUD-assisted housing. This critical supply of affordable housing has suffered from inadequate funding and neglect, which has resulted in the loss of thousands of units of affordable housing. The loss of these units only exacerbates the affordable housing crisis in the country, where today nearly 5,500,000 Americans pay more than 50 percent of their income for housing. The Committee applauds the administration's commitment to preserving this supply of affordable housing, and also commends the administration's effort to look beyond Federal funding to recapitalize it. The Committee agrees that in order to address the backlog in public housing, which is estimated to be between $20,000,000,000 and $30,000,000,000, it will be necessary to leverage private sector resources. Nevertheless, the issue is too important to begin implementation without an extensive review of all possible options and costs.

Therefore, while the Committee supports the goals of the program, it does not believe that this program is ready for implementation, and cannot justify a substantial Federal investment at this time. Since this initiative represents a radical change from current policy, the administration must consider how changes in the program would affect the operation of this housing and its tenants, as well as how this investment might impact funding for other core programs in the future.

The Committee is also concerned that the administration has not adequately addressed how the involvement of the private market would impact these properties in the short- and long-term. This includes the ability of different properties to leverage adequate private sector resources in different markets to make needed capital improvements, as well as the fate of tenants living in properties that may face foreclosure. The possible risk of the loss of this housing through foreclosure remains a substantial concern that must be fully understood.

The greatest concern of the Committee, however, is the long-term costs of the program. The Committee appreciates the administration's effort to determine the costs of the initiative, but feels that this analysis falls short. Many of the assumptions underlying the cost models lack the necessary specificity to instill confidence in the accuracy of long-term cost estimates put forth by the administration. For example, the cost per unit is not based on the actual needs of properties, but rather a calculation based on the overall capital needs backlog and the number of public and assisted units eligible for the program. Without understanding the needs of projects and the subsidy that the local market would support, it is not known if the increased subsidy would enable public housing au-

thorities to leverage sufficient funding to recapitalize the property. If the estimated cost of addressing the capital needs of eligible housing units are low, the funding requested may serve far fewer than the 300,000 units anticipated to be funded with the budget request.

The long-term cost of the conversion of all of this public and assisted housing, as envisioned by the Department, is difficult to determine without an accurate assessment of the true capital needs of the properties. The administration expects to complete its capital needs assessment this fall, which will be an important tool to help the administration, and Congress, understand the capital needs of the assisted housing portfolio. Moreover, the projects needs assessments will provide the necessary details on where these housing units are located and their true capital needs. This data is essential to understanding the full costs of the initiative.

The Committee expects the Department to improve its cost models and refine its costs estimates for the proposal. Improved data will help to assure the Committee that the investment is sound, and can be sustained over the long-term.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009 [1]	$18,184,200,000
Budget estimate, 2010 [1]	19,550,663,180
Committee recommendation [1]	19,495,663,000

[1] Includes an advance appropriation of $4,000,000,000.

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 approximately 2 million families. The program also funds incremental vouchers to assist nonelderly disabled families and vouchers for tenants who live in projects where the owner of the project has decided to leave the section 8 program. The program also provides for the replacement of units lost from the assisted housing inventory through its tenant protection vouchers. Under these programs, eligible low-income families pay 30 percent of their adjusted income for rent, and the Federal Government is responsible for the remainder 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], Housing and Urban Development Veterans Supportive Housing [HUD–VASH] Program and the Family Unification program. Under FSS, families receive job training and employment that should lead to a decrease in their dependency on government assistance and help them move toward economic self-sufficiency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $19,495,663,000 for fiscal year 2011; including $4,000,000,000 as an advance appropriation to be made available on October 1, 2011. This amount is $55,000,000 less than the budget request and $1,311,463,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee recommends $17,165,000,000 for the renewal costs for section 8 contracts, which is $145,000,000 less than the budget request and $825,800,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. However, the Committee is reducing the amount provided for renewals as a result of more recent estimates of need.

The section 8 rental assistance program is a critical tool that enables over 2 million low-income individuals and families to access safe, stable and affordable housing in the private market. Over the last decade, the supply of affordable housing has diminished and the number of Americans forced to pay more than half of their income for housing has increased.

In recognition of the section 8 program's central role in ensuring housing for vulnerable Americans, the Committee has worked to provide sufficient resources so that no voucher holders are put at risk of losing their housing. At the same time, it is essential that cost estimates of renewal needs are accurate, and public housing agencies [PHAs] manage their programs within their budgets. To ensure poor management doesn't put voucher holders at-risk of losing their housing, the Committee directs HUD to increase its oversight of PHAs, especially those that have had difficulty managing their finances. For example, if public housing agencies expend resources at a rate that will outpace their yearly budget, HUD must take steps to correct overspending before families are put at risk. To do this, HUD must dedicate more time and staff resources to overseeing PHAs. This increased oversight must focus on instilling a culture of fiscal discipline in PHAs. HUD must also be willing to take action against PHAs that are not following program rules and requirements, or operating beyond their budget or voucher caps. For oversight and enforcement to be fair and effective, HUD must have clear policies. Therefore the Committee directs HUD to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with a report within 120 days of the enactment of this act detailing how the Department will monitor PHAs to ensure they manage their programs within budget, what actions they will take to assist PHAs that are leasing over their budget or unit caps, as well as enforcement actions that they will take for PHAs that exceed their caps for more than 2 years. In addition, HUD shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations at the end of 2010 on the number of PHAs that are over-leased.

The Committee also expects HUD to improve its understanding and management of the program. Congress has provided additional resources for HUD to develop a new voucher management system to improve access to data on the section 8 program. However, the Committee will not wait for this system to be developed. The Committee expects HUD to be able to provide real-time information on the program, including leasing data and net restricted assets. Without accurate and current data, oversight is compromised.

Formula Adjustment.—In 2007, the Committee modified the formula for allocating resources among PHAs. This modified formula based allocations primarily on resource utilization during the course of the most recent Federal fiscal year while accounting for inflation. Since that time, the formula has remained fairly constant in order to provide consistency and stability to PHAs managing voucher programs. This year, the Committee is recommending a modification that would change the period of re-benchmarking for the formula allocation from the Federal fiscal year to the calendar year. This would align the period on which funding is based with how PHAs manage their programs.

The Committee used the Federal fiscal year so that the time it takes for HUD to verify PHA data would not delay program allocations as PHAs begin their programs. However, this misalignment created other challenges to managing the program. Now that HUD is receiving more timely data, this delay should be minimized.

The Committee is not including additional language requested by the Administration to authorize the reallocation of reserve funding. The Committee is concerned that this proposed change has the potential to quickly and significantly increase the amount of resources needed for the program. At this point, the Committee does not have the confidence that such changes and their potential costs can be managed by HUD and its IT systems.

HUD-Veterans Affairs Supported Housing [HUD–VASH].—The Committee has included $75,000,000 to support 10,000 additional HUD–VASH vouchers. The President's budget did not include funding for any new HUD–VASH vouchers. In May 2010, the Committee held a hearing with HUD Secretary Donovan and VA Secretary Shinseki to assess the status of the program. Both Secretaries noted the effectiveness of this program in solving veterans' homelessness. It is also clear that these vouchers are critical to supporting the Administration's goal of ending homelessness among the Nation's veterans in 5 years.

The Secretaries also pointed to steps their Departments are taking to improve the program's operation. These improvements helped to increase the rate at which vouchers were issued by 44 percent in the first quarter of fiscal year 2010. As a result of the improvements, the Committee feels confident that additional vouchers can be effectively used in fiscal year 2011. Moreover, the Committee is concerned that halting new vouchers would threaten partnerships among HUD, the VA, housing authorities and nonprofit organizations that are being developed in communities across the country.

While progress is being made in strengthening partnerships around HUD–VASH, challenges remain. It continues to take excess time to get vouchers to veterans and place them in housing. One of the reasons for the delay is the slow hiring of case managers. The Committee recognizes that this delay is due, in part, to the rigorous evaluation of data and capacity that HUD and the VA undertake to determine where to allocate vouchers. While this process is important, the Committee directs HUD to work with the VA to identify ways to streamline the process, so that VA case managers will be on board when PHAs receive their vouchers.

The ultimate success of this program will be demonstrated by veterans remaining housed and off the street. The Committee therefore expects HUD to work with the VA to track the stability of participating veterans, so that if housing stability isn't being achieved program modifications can be made.

The Committee notes that the HUD and the VA have been involved in a demonstration in Washington, DC, which has achieved improved leasing rates. These improvements have resulted from efforts by the DC Public Housing Authority to streamline many of its processes, including screening of clients and inspection of units. The Committee expects HUD to share and encourage these best practices with other PHAs.

Homelessness Demonstrations.—The Committee recommends $85,000,000 for two homelessness demonstrations: one to prevent and end homelessness for homeless and at-risk families, and one to target the chronically homeless.

As part of the demonstration to address the needs of homeless and at-risk families, HUD will competitively award 6,000 vouchers to public housing authorities [PHAs] that partner with entities administering Temporarily Assistance for Needy Families [TANF] and other health and human services funding to deliver housing and services to targeted families. The local partnership should also involve homelessness liaisons funded through the Department of Education's Education for Homeless Children and Youth program to help identify children and families suitable for this program. The Committee supports the goal of demonstrating how mainstream service programs coupled with housing can be more effectively used to improve outcomes for families and children.

The Committee wants to ensure that successful applicants are able to demonstrate a commitment to providing services, and it expects successful applicants to identify specific examples of services and funding that will be provided to support families receiving vouchers. Since there are a limited number of vouchers available for the demonstration, the Committee believes it is important to demonstrate how cooperation among PHAs, TANF administrators, and homelessness liaisons can improve outcomes for families. The Committee expects the lessons learned will result in best practices that can be replicated by PHAs not receiving new vouchers. Therefore, the Committee encourages HUD to consider applicants that can demonstrate how their local partnership will enhance access to mainstream services or housing for families currently being served by PHAs or through TANF.

In addition, the Committee expects homelessness liaisons to assist in identifying children and families that are homeless or at-risk. Since school stability and educational attainment are important to the long-term success of families and children, the Committee expects outcomes for both to be monitored and evaluated as part of the demonstration.

The Committee also notes the importance of improving job training and employment opportunities for at-risk families and encourages HUD to consider how the Department of Labor and local Workforce Investment Boards could enhance this demonstration.

HUD will also competitively award 4,000 vouchers to PHAs that partner with eligible State Medicaid agencies and State behavioral

health entities to provide housing in conjunction with Medicaid case management, substance abuse treatment, and mental health services. Numerous studies have proven the effectiveness of permanent supportive housing to end homelessness for the chronically homeless. The Committee has also observed the HUD–Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing [HUD–VASH] program's success in serving chronically homeless veterans. This demonstration will provide vouchers to be combined with similar services through State Medicaid and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA] to serve this target population. The Committee expects this demonstration to provide best-practices that can be shared with States that will soon expand Medicaid eligibility to enable additional persons with need to qualify.

Family Unification Program.—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 for incremental voucher assistance through the Family Unification Program. This level of funding is the same as the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and $15,000,000 more than the budget request. The Committee has included language that requires the Secretary to make this funding available to entities with sufficient experience and resources available to provide voucher recipients with appropriate supportive services.

The Family Unification Program assists families that have been separated, or are facing separation due to a lack of housing. The program also provides vouchers to youths age 18 to 21 that are aging out of foster care, or those age 16 or older who lack adequate housing. The Committee also hopes that these vouchers will be used to serve victims of domestic violence who lack a safe and stable home environment.

The vouchers the Congress has already funded have helped parents improve their lives and reunited families. In addition, the program is creating an important dialogue between child welfare agencies and housing providers. The Committee continues to encourage HUD to coordinate the release of these vouchers with providers that are part of HUD's Continuum of Care, who can assist housing providers identify the housing needs of families and youth, as well as helping child welfare agencies understand the resources available to assist families, particularly as more resources are devoted to prevention.

Set-asides for Special Circumstances.—The Committee provides a set-aside of $150,000,000 to allow the Secretary to adjust allocations to PHAs under certain prescribed circumstances. The Committee expects this will provide the Secretary with a means of assisting PHAs with unexpectedly high unemployment and loss of income. Qualifying factors include: (1) public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of tenant-based rental assistance resulting from unforeseen circumstances and voucher utilization or the impact from portability under section 8(r) of the act; (2) public housing agencies with vouchers that were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the act; (3) for any increase in the costs associated with deposits to family self-sufficiency program escrow accounts; (4) one-time adjustments for PHAs in receivership that had fungibility plans for 2009; and (5) for public housing agencies that

need allocation adjustments to prevent termination of assistance to families receiving assistance under the disaster voucher program. A PHA should not receive an adjustment to its allocation from the funding provided under this section if the Secretary determines that such PHA, through negligence or intentional actions, would exceed its authorized level.

Administrative Fees and Family Self-sufficiency Coordinators.—The Committee recommends $1,851,000,000 for administrative fees, which is $60,000,000 more than the budget request and $276,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee moved funding for the family self-sufficiency program back under the Administrative Fees heading in order to ensure that this funding is awarded to eligible PHAs in a timely manner. While the Committee supports the goals of adding new PHAs to the program, it is important to maintain adequate resources for PHAs that already operate programs, and expects this prioritization will be reflected in allocations for fiscal year 2011.

Mainstream Vouchers.—Funding is included under this heading to support the renewal of vouchers previously funded under Housing for Persons with Disabilities, but which have long been administered by the Housing Choice Voucher office. The Committee supports the Administration's proposal to transfer the funding under this heading to more accurately reflect how the program is administered. These vouchers are not included as part of the renewal base because the Committee wants to ensure that these vouchers remain dedicated to serving persons with disabilities as intended.

Transformation Initiative.—The Committee has included language allowing the Secretary to transfer up to $100,000,000 from this account to the Transformation Initiative. This is less than the 1 percent the President's budget proposed to transfer from this account. The Committee directs that some of the funding will be dedicated to improving the voucher management system or other investments that will directly benefit the program.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010	$2,500,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	2,044,200,000
Committee recommendation	2,510,000,000

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 $2,510,000,000 for the Public Housing Capital Fund, which is $465,800,000 more than the budget request and $10,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Of the amount made available under this section, $50,000,000 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 recommends up to $15,345,000 to support the ongoing financial and physical assessment activities at the Real Estate Assessment Center [REAC]. This amount is equal to the budget request. The Committee has also set aside $30,000,000 for emergency capital needs including safety and security measures necessary to address crime and drug-related activity, as well as needs resulting from unforeseen or unpreventable emergencies and natural disasters, excluding presidentially declared emergencies and natural disasters. The Committee directs that of this amount, not less than $10,000,000 shall be for safety and security measures.

The Public Housing Capital Fund supports the maintenance of critical affordable housing, which provides more than 1.2 million low-income households with safe and stable housing. Unfortunately, limited resources have affected the ability of public housing authorities to upgrade and preserve these facilities, leading to a backlog in capital needs of between $20,000,000,000 and $30,000,000,000.

The President's budget proposed an ambitious plan—Transforming Rental Assistance—to leverage private sector resources to address the capital needs backlog of public housing. The Committee appreciates that the Secretary is demonstrating a commitment to preserving public housing, but does not feel that this program is ready for implementation. In addition, the Committee is concerned that while this effort would direct funding to help address the needs associated with up to 300,000 units of public and HUD-assisted housing, capital funding for the entire country would be cut. Therefore the Committee has restored this funding in order to ensure that capital needs do not continue to mount.

This fall, HUD is expected to report the findings of the Capital Needs Assessment [CNA]. The Committee expects this report will be more comprehensive than previous CNAs, and will provide a guide for maintaining public housing, as well as how additional investments could achieve energy efficiency or improve the lives of public housing residents. In addition to the CNA, Project Needs Assessments are important to understand the needs of individual projects. Obtaining a better understanding of both the overall needs of the Nation's public housing portfolio and the requirements and locations of specific projects will be critical to determining the cost of Transforming Rental Assistance, or other attempts to address the long-term preservation of public housing.

Early Childhood Education Facilities.—The Committee has included up to $40,000,000 to fund grants for public housing agencies to construct, rehabilitate or acquire facilities to provide quality early childhood education and care to children living in and around public housing. Research has demonstrated that effective early learning can have an enormous impact on a child's future success in school and in society. However, the cost of building adequate facilities that best serve children is high, which poses a particular challenge to serving low-income children. These grants will provide public housing agencies the necessary capital to leverage additional resources and increase their ability to work with State, local, nonprofit and private sector partners to bring quality early childhood

education and childcare opportunities to children living in and around public housing. The funding provided can also be used for facilities that provide other important services to public housing residents, including: job and employment training, adult education, financial literacy education, or other appropriate supportive services.

The Committee is disappointed that HUD has not yet released a notice of funding availability [NOFA] for the resourced provide for early education centers in fiscal year 2010. In order to ensure that this funding is available to public housing agencies, the Committee has included language requiring HUD to publish the NOFA within 90 days of the enactment of this act.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

Appropriations, 2010	$4,775,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	4,829,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,829,000,000

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 $4,829,000,000 for the public housing operating fund, which is equal to the budget request and $54,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee applauds the administration's goal to fully fund the cost of operating public housing. Adequate funding is necessary to ensure quality housing for residents.

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, 2010	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

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 HOPE VI program has been a vital tool used to revitalize low-income neighborhoods and improve the lives of public housing residents. The Committee remains supportive of the goal of the HOPE VI program to replace severely distressed public housing with new housing and stronger communities. The Committee has included funding for the President's proposed Choice Neighborhoods Initiative, which builds on the successes of HOPE VI and expands the program to other HUD-assisted housing. The Committee is therefore not recommending any additional funding for HOPE VI in fiscal year 2010.

CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS

Appropriations, 2010	.....
Budget estimate, 2011	$250,000,000
Committee recommendation	250,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Choice Neighborhoods Initiative will provide competitive grants to transform impoverished neighborhoods into functioning, sustainable mixed-income neighborhoods with co-location of appropriate services, schools, public assets, transportation options, and access to jobs or job training. The goal of the program is to demonstrate that concentrated and coordinated neighborhood investments from multiple sources can transform a distressed neighborhood and improve the quality of life of current and future residents.

Choice Neighborhoods grants will primarily fund the preservation, rehabilitation, and transformation of public and HUD-assisted housing. The program builds on the successes of public housing transformation under HOPE VI with a broader approach to concentrated poverty. Grantees will include public housing authorities, local governments, and nonprofit organizations. For-profit developers may also apply in partnership with another eligible grantee. Grant funds can be used for resident and community services, community development and affordable housing activities in surrounding communities. Grantees will undertake comprehensive local planning with input from residents and the community. A strong emphasis will be placed on local community planning for school and educational improvements, including early childhood initiatives. Up to 10 percent of the appropriation will be used for planning grants to assist local partnerships.

The Department will place a strong emphasis on coordination with other Federal agencies, notably the Departments of Education, Labor, Transportation, and Health and Human Services and the Environmental Protection Agency, to leverage additional resources. Where possible, the program will be coordinated with the Department of Education's Promise Neighborhoods proposal.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $250,000,000 for the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative. This amount is equal to the level requested by the President. The fiscal year 2010 appropria-

tions bill included $200,000,000 for the HOPE VI program, which replaces the most severely distressed public housing with mixed-income, mixed-use neighborhoods. Choice Neighborhoods seeks to build on the HOPE VI program by expanding the types of eligible grantees and allowing funding to be used on HUD-owned or assisted housing, as well as the surrounding community.

The Committee agrees that expanding HUD's ability to direct funds to revitalization efforts that reach beyond public housing will broaden the impact of the Department's community revitalization efforts. However, the Committee notes that the work to replace distressed public housing is not yet complete. Therefore the Committee has included language that stipulates that not less than $135,000,000 of the funding provided shall be awarded to projects where public housing authorities are the lead applicant.

Choice Neighborhoods recognizes that community transformation requires more than replacing housing. The creation of vibrant, sustainable communities also requires greater access to services and increased opportunities for community residents. However, HUD funding cannot support all of these activities, so the Committee supports the emphasis Choice Neighborhoods places on both local and Federal partnerships. The administration has identified partners such as the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services and Transportation. The Committee expects that through better coordination at the Federal level, communities can successfully combine Federal funding to achieve broader improvement.

The Committee notes that in addition to services, it is critical to create or expand economic opportunities in these communities. As HUD works to structure its Notice of Funding Availability and evaluate grantees, it should encourage partnerships with entities that can support small businesses and job creation.

However, while the Committee supports the administration's efforts to push communities to work in partnership with other organizations and different State and local agencies, the Committee also expects HUD to recognize that communities have different local needs and structures. So, in developing the criteria for this initiative, HUD should not be overly prescriptive or unnecessarily limiting in what types of partnerships are required or how they are defined.

Green Buildings and Green Jobs.—As HUD seeks to define the projects that it will fund, the Committee encourages the Department to prioritize investments in green buildings and energy efficient technologies. Furthermore, the Committee encourages the Secretary to consider grantees that have demonstrated experience in creating green, affordable housing and redeveloping distressed neighborhoods. Green and energy efficient investments are not only beneficial to the environment, but they can also result in important energy cost savings for public housing authorities and low-income housing residents.

Moreover, as Choice Neighborhoods grantees undertake construction, the Committee expects HUD to promote grantees that successfully integrate green jobs training into projects with an emphasis on providing training and job opportunities to public housing and community residents.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010	$700,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	580,000,000
Committee recommendation	700,000,000

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 $700,000,000 for the Native American Housing Block Grants, of which $2,000,000 is set aside for a credit subsidy to support a loan level not to exceed $18,000,000 for the section 601 Loan Guarantee Loan Program. The recommended level of funding is equal to the level provided in fiscal year 2010 and $120,000,000 more than the budget request.

As the Nation struggles with high unemployment and economic challenges, the Committee recognizes that these challenges have long plagued Native Americans, which the current crisis has only exacerbated. According to the most recent data, Native Americans are twice as likely as the rest of the Nation to live in poverty. As a result, the housing challenges on tribal lands are daunting. For example, nearly three times as many Native Americans live in overcrowded housing as compared to the rest of the Nation. Given the housing challenges and needs of Native Americans, the Committee was perplexed by the administration's proposal to cut funding for the Indian Housing Block Grant [IHBG] by more than 17 percent in fiscal year 2011. Such a cut would undermine efforts made by Congress through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the fiscal year 2010 Appropriations Act to increase housing investments in Native American communities.

The Committee is also concerned that such a cut would disproportionately affect tribes that receive smaller IHBG grants. According to a report issued by the Government Accountability Office [GAO] in February 2010, many recipients of smaller grants that receive insufficient funding to construct new housing use their IHBG funding for rental assistance. Therefore, any significant cuts could jeopardize rental assistance for Native Americans.

Consultation With Tribes on Housing Needs Assessment.—In fiscal year 2010, Congress required HUD to conduct a housing needs assessment for Native Americans, including how sustainable building practices can be used in Native American communities. The Committee intends for this assessment to take a comprehensive

look at the housing needs and challenges facing Native American tribes. This document should provide a quantifiable assessment of need, but it should also look at barriers and opportunities to address their housing needs. In order to ensure the most usable and informative document, the Committee expects HUD to consult with Native American tribes in conducting this evaluation. In order to ensure a broad array of perspectives, the Committee expects HUD to provide technical assistance that will enable tribes to participate, especially smaller tribes with limited access to data.

Technical Assistance.—The Committee continues to include $3,500,000 for technical assistance through a national organization representing Native American housing interests and $4,250,000 for inspections of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, technical assistance, oversight, and management.

The Committee noted GAO's assessment that limited capacity hinders the ability of many tribes to effectively address their housing needs. The Committee expects HUD to use the technical assistance funding provided to aid tribes with capacity challenges, especially tribes receiving small grant awards. The funding should be used for training, contract expertise, and other services necessary to improve data collection, increase leveraging, and address other needs identified by tribes. The Committee expects that any assistance provided by HUD will reflects the unique needs and culture of Native Americans.

As HUD works to address the needs of tribes, especially smaller tribes, the Committee hopes that HUD will look to identify opportunities to coordinate with other agencies, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Indian Health Service.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

Appropriations, 2010	$13,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	13,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Hawaiian Homelands Homeownership Act of 2000 created the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program to provide grants to the State of Hawaii Department 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 $13,000,000 for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant Program, which is $3,000,000 more than the budget request and equal to the fiscal year 2011 enacted level. Of the amount provided, $300,000 shall be for training and technical assistance activities, including up to $100,000 for related travel for Hawaii-based HUD employees.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Appropriations, 2010	$7,000,000	$919,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	9,000,000	994,000,000
Committee recommendation	9,000,000	994,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides access to private financing for Indian families, Indian tribes, and their tribally designated housing entities that 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 $9,000,000 in program subsidies to support a loan level of $994,000,000. This subsidy amount is equal to the budget request and $2,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Appropriations, 2010	$1,044,000	$41,504,255
Budget estimate, 2011	.....	.....
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 equal to the subsidy and loan levels provided in fiscal year 2010. The budget request did not include any subsidy to support this program.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS [HOPWA]

Appropriations, 2010	$335,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	340,000,000
Committee recommendation	340,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS [HOPWA] Program provides States and localities with resources and incentives to devise long-term comprehensive strategies for meeting the housing and supportive services 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 the 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 $340,000,000 for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program. This level of funding is $5,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request. The Committee has included language requiring HUD to allocate these funds in a manner that preserves existing HOPWA programs to the extent that these programs are determined to be meeting the needs of persons with AIDS.

The HOPWA program has proven effective at helping individuals with HIV/AIDS avoid homelessness and achieve housing stability. Research has demonstrated that providing stable housing to persons with HIV/AIDS can improve their health outcomes. For example, a June 2009 article published in the American Journal of Public Health discussed a comparison of housing outcomes for persons who received respite care after hospitalization with those who were unable to find housing. The research found that the individuals with housing had improved health outcomes and fewer hospitals stays. These data demonstrate, once again, that housing not only improves the health and quality of life of persons living with HIV/AIDS, but is also more cost-effective than frequent hospital stays.

Grantees receiving HOPWA funding have demonstrated similar success in their performance reports. According to information HUD gathered from its grantees, from 2008–2009, 96 percent of households receiving rental assistance achieved housing stability with related support. In the same reporting period, individuals receiving short term or transitional housing support maintained their housing stability, or reduced their risk of homelessness by 69 percent.

While the HOPWA program has demonstrated success, there is still substantial work to do to meet the housing demand of low-income persons with HIV/AIDS. The Committee supports the budget request to increase assistance this fiscal year.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010	$4,450,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	4,380,100,000
Committee recommendation	4,450,000,000

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 set-asides.

The resources provided as part of this program will also fund the Sustainable Communities Initiative as a joint HUD-Department of Transportation [DOT] effort to improve coordination of transportation and housing investments that result in more regional and local sustainable development patterns, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and more transit accessible housing choices for residents. These funds will stimulate more integrated regional planning to guide State, metropolitan, and local decisions, investments, and reforms in land use, transportation, and housing.

Program funding will support the Rural Innovation Fund, which will provide grants to Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State community and/or economic development agencies, and local rural nonprofits through a competitive process to promote innovative and cost-effective approaches to improving housing conditions in rural communities.

Resources made available under this heading will also be awarded to eligible colleges and universities to implement community activities, revitalize neighborhoods, address economic development and housing issues, and promote energy conservation and homeownership counseling and training.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,450,000,000 for the Community Development Fund in fiscal year 2011. This level is $69,900,000 more than the budget request and equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee has provided $3,990,000,000 for Community Development Block Grants. This funding provides States and entitlement communities across the Nation with resources that allow them to undertake a wide range of community development activities, including public infrastructure improvements, housing rehabilitation and construction, job creation and retention, and public services that primarily benefit low and moderate income persons. As States and communities struggle with budget constraints, this funding will allow States and communities to undertake new housing and community development projects, and maintain important services.

The Committee includes $65,000,000 for grants to Indian tribes for essential economic and community development activities which is equal to the budget request and the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Sustainable Communities Initiative.—The Committee has recommended $150,000,000, as requested, to support the President's Sustainable Communities Initiative. The funding provided will support an interagency collaboration among HUD, DOT, and the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]. The resources provided include: $100,000,000 for Regional Integrated Planning grants; $40,000,000 for Community Challenge Planning grants; and $10,000,000 for joint HUD and DOT research and capacity building to support and enhance the creation of sustainable, livable communities. The Committee has included language stipulating that not less than $25,000,000 of Regional Integrated Planning funding shall go to metropolitan areas with fewer than 500,000 persons.

The interagency partnership among HUD, DOT, and EPA is a first step to removing barriers that limit the ability of communities to coordinate the housing, transportation, and water infrastructure resources that support smart community development. The objective of this interagency partnership is to create new opportunities to design and build communities that link the housing, transportation, services, and commercial assets that comprise vibrant, economically diverse communities.

After HUD received funding for the Sustainable Communities Initiative in 2010, it conducted outreach to regions, local communities, and stakeholders as it established the requirements, criteria and performance metrics for both the Regional Integrated Planning Grants and the Community Challenge Planning Grants. The Committee believes that efforts to create sustainable communities must be driven by local decisions, so it supported the administration's effort to seek extensive input as it designed these programs.

As required, HUD submitted a report to Congress in which it provided details for how the programs would be designed, including eligible grantees and activities, selection criteria and performance measures. Within these guidelines, HUD intends to provide flexibility to meet communities where they are. In the report to Congress, HUD lays out performance metrics, which will be adapted to each grant recipient, so that they are appropriate to each community. It will be critical that HUD work with grant recipients to establish specific targets and dates to ensure that funding is well spent and is achieving the desired outcomes.

In fiscal year 2011, the Committee expects HUD to utilize the funding provided for Regional Integrated Planning Grants and Community Challenge Planning Grants consistent with guidelines established for the programs in fiscal year 2010. The Committee notes that in fiscal year 2011, DOT will be receiving funding for transportation planning capacity grants. The Committee appreciates that the administration has assigned specific roles to each agency within the partnership, with DOT as the lead on capacity building. However, the Committee expects HUD to use the funding provided to increase capacity of grantees, since capacity needs extend beyond the transportation community.

Sustainability in Rural Communities.—The Committee continues a set-aside of at least $25,000,000 within the Regional Integrated Planning Grants funding for smaller communities to ensure that planning assistance will be provided to all types of communities. The Committee supports HUD's recognition of the needs of smaller communities, including the additional set-aside it has created in fiscal year 2010 for communities with a population of less than 200,000. The Committee expects HUD to continue to pay special attention to the unique needs of small and rural communities that would also benefit from coordinated transportation and housing planning.

List of Federal Barriers.—In May, Secretary Donovan testified before the Committee with DOT Secretary LaHood on the Partnership for Sustainable Communities. At that hearing, and again in the report delivered to Congress on how it will use its 2010 funding, it was stated that "HUD should not get in the way of communities". The Committee agrees, and believes that in order to ensure that HUD is not in the way, it must identify and address any existing Federal barriers to better utilization and coordination of Federal transportation and housing funding. Since HUD expects that planning initiatives will lead to more effective use of traditional HUD programs to create sustainable communities, such as section 8, the HOME Investment Partnership Program, and Community Development Block Grants, it must work to address these barriers before communities reach the implementation stage.

Since the Partnership for Sustainable Communities was announced, the Committee has sought a list of Federal regulations and laws that act as barriers to better transportation and housing investments. The Committee sought this list in order to understand what actions the Departments could take—without new programs or funding—to make sustainable investments easier for local communities. To date, the Committee has not received the comprehensive list that it is seeking. While HUD recently provided staff with a list of barriers and challenges, it did not adequately address the Committee's request. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to work with DOT to produce a comprehensive list of provisions in federal regulation and law that act as a barrier to local efforts to coordinate housing and transportation investment. This list must include a brief description of the barrier, specific citations in the Code of Federal Regulations and public law, and an explanation of how the particular provision acts as a barrier to coordination between housing and transportation at the local level. The Committee underlines the importance of having each item in the

list relate to specific citations in Federal regulations and public law so that the list can act as a working document for the Committee and the administration. The Committee understands that the administration may want to include other kinds of barriers on the list—such as the lack of available data—but the Committee believes that these items are extraneous, and therefore expects the administration to keep these barriers separate from the rest of the list. The Committee instructs the Department to transmit a comprehensive list to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than May 15, 2011.

Rural Innovation Fund.—In fiscal year 2010, the Committee supported HUD's proposal to create the Rural Innovation Fund. However, the Committee is disappointed that HUD has yet to establish criteria for the program, and eliminated funding for the program in fiscal year 2011. The Committee has restored funding to this program in recognition of the housing and economic development needs of rural communities. Eligible recipients of this funding include Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, and local nonprofits and community development organizations.

While the administration justified the elimination of this funding because of complementary programs at the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA], the Committee believes that instead HUD should seek ways to improve collaboration with USDA. In order to ensure that funding reaches rural communities in a more timely fashion, the Committee directs HUD to publish the Notice of Funding Availability for this program within 120 days of the enactment of this act.

Continuing HUD's Partnerships with Colleges and Universities.—The Committee has included funding for colleges and universities as authorized under section 107 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. Consistent with prior years, funding will be awarded to historically black colleges and universities, tribal colleges and universities, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian institutions, and Hispanic-serving institutions. The Committee expects the Secretary to use the resources provided in a manner that will support the goals of assisting residents and revitalizing neighborhoods surrounding these colleges and universities.

Distressed Communities in Appalachia.—The Committee understands that the Department is cooperating with appropriate Federal, regional, State and local entities to help diversify and strengthen the Appalachian regional economy. The Committee encourages the Department to focus on improving the energy efficiency of the housing stock in rural Appalachia, as well as emphasize economic diversification through programs in Community Planning and Development and other appropriate means in counties designated by the Appalachian Regional Commission as distressed or at-risk in fiscal year 2010. The Committee requests a report within 90 days of enactment on efforts by the Department to promote economic diversification in Appalachia.

Portable Generators.—The Committee notes that portable generators can assist communities impacted by natural disasters. However, portable generators are not eligible under CDBG guidelines. The Committee appreciates that using CDBG funding to purchase equipment poses a challenge for HUD in conducting oversight to

ensure that the funds are being used to meet the requirements of the CDBG statue. However, the Committee encourages the Department to examine if it can allow such equipment purchase while protecting against any misuse of CDBG funds.

The Committee recommends funding for the Economic Development Initiative [EDI] and the Neighborhood Initiatives program [NI]. The Committee clarifies that funding provided through EDI and NI cannot be used to reimburse costs already incurred on a project before an award is made by HUD for that specific project.

The Committee includes language making technical corrections to economic development initiatives funded under this heading in prior appropriation acts.

The Economic Development Initiatives are as follows:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
Allegheny County, PA	For infrastructure improvements around the Allegheny Ludlum site in order to spur economic growth and create jobs	$600,000
Allen Place Center, Tacoma, WA	For facility improvements at a community center in a low-income neighborhood	1,000,000
Appalachia Service Project, TN	For free home repair to low-income families in southern West Virginia	400,000
Arkansas State University-Mountain Home, MH, AR	For construction of the Vada Sheid Community Development Center	500,000
Associated Early Care and Education, MA	For the construction of a child and family development center	500,000
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Northern Ohio, Columbus, OH	For renovations of the facilities at Camp Oty'Okwa	300,000
Big Sky Economic Development Authority, Billings, MT	For infrastructure and land acquisition in East Billings	500,000
Board of Directors of St. Louis Municipal Library, MO	To renovate the historic St. Louis Central Library including compliance with ADA requirements in MO	1,000,000
Bolivar County, MS	For the restoration of the historic Bolivar County First Judicial District Courthouse	350,000
Bonnie Brae, Liberty Corner, NJ	For the renovation of cottages that service New Jersey's at-risk children and youth	200,000
Booneville, MS	For the Booneville Hardware Building Restoration Project	425,000
Boys & Girls Club of Carbon County, Red Lodge, MT	For renovations and expansion	350,000
Boys and Girls Club of Wagner, Wagner, SD	For repairs and upgrades to the Boys and Girls Club facility	200,000
Boys and Girls Club, Bellevue, WA	For facilities improvements and expansion at community centers for youth	500,000
Boys and Girls Club, Spokane, WA	For facilities acquisition, improvements and expansion for a community center for youth	775,000
Builders Development Corporation, KS	For the Central Baptist Redevelopment Project in Kansas City, KS	800,000
Center for Veterans Issues, Ltd., Milwaukee, WI	For the construction of supportive housing for veterans	400,000
Chippewa Cree Tribe, Box Elder, MT	For renovations and safety upgrades of a tribal TANF building	200,000
Pickaway County, OH	For construction of an economic development center	600,000
City of Albany, NY	For the rehabilitation of a building in a neighborhood targeted for revitalization	500,000
City of Anderson, IN	For the Flagship Enterprise Center Certified Technology Park Buildings Project for infrastructure and laboratory equipment for hybrid electric vehicle technologies and related technologies.	650,000
City of Bangor, ME	For event and meeting space infrastructure at the Bangor Regional Arena and Meeting Complex	1,000,000
City of Bend, OR	For design and construction of new research and development facility	200,000
City of Brewer, ME	For the development of a riverfront trail system as part of the West Bayside Neighborhood Development Project	700,000
City of Bristol, CT	To acquire blighted property and renovate facilities to create an industrial park	500,000
City of Chicopee, MA	For the construction of a community and senior center	350,000
City of Coffman Cove, AK	For the construction of an elevated concrete dock with related improvements	300,000
City of Columbus, MS	For the Columbus Riverwalk Lighting Extension project	300,000
City of Council Bluffs, IA	For demolition of facilities located near 1st Avenue in Council Bluffs for the purpose of improving the West Broadway Corridor.	400,000
City of Covington, LA	For the acquisition of facilities in Covington, LA to be used for community services and economic development	1,000,000
City of East Hartford, CT	For the repair and upgrade of crucial public infrastructure in and around North Meadows Industrial Park	500,000
City of Flint, MI	For the upgrade of energy efficiency and services at an economic and community development center which provides economic and community development.	700,000

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
City of Grants Pass, OR	For the acquisition and renovation of a community center	500,000
City of Grenada, MS	For the Taylor Hall Renovation Project	250,000
City of Gretna, LA	For planning and construction of a new Senior Center to meet the demands of the elderly population	500,000
City of Hattiesburg, MS	For redevelopment of the Hattiesburg East Jerusalem Municipal Center Complex including acquisition of equipment	600,000
City of Hyattsville, MD	For the rehabilitation of an existing structure to a mixed-use, community meeting facility	250,000
City of Inkster, MI	For construction of a senior wellness center	1,000,000
City of Jackson, MS	For the renovation of youth-oriented public facilities	500,000
City of Kingstree, SC	For the Kingtree Train Depot Renovation Project including meeting ADA compliance	200,000
City of Lacey, WA	For expansion of a community facility providing services for seniors	500,000
City of Lancaster, PA	For renovation buildings and streetscaping as part of the revitalization of the City's Market District	800,000
City of Las Cruces, NM	For expansion of a central kitchen and associated equipment to provide home meal delivery services to seniors	400,000
City of Las Vegas, NV	For construction of low-income elderly housing	1,000,000
City of Linton, ND	For housing and commercial redevelopment	700,000
City of Madison, WI	For construction of a public market for regionally grown and produced products	200,000
City of Marshalltown, IA	For the removal of blight and related housing development requirements for the Grant Park Redevelopment Project	700,000
City of Memphis, TN	For improvements to the Pigeon Harbor Industrial Park	1,300,000
City of Milan, MO	To renovate the historic Sullivan County Building including enhancing safety, spurring economic development and for streetscape investments.	250,000
City of New Orleans, LA	For the Federal City Urban Redevelopment Project	500,000
City of Pascagoula, MS	For construction of a Beach Park Promenade in Pascagoula, MS	900,000
City of Peoria, IL	For revitalization efforts on Peoria's Southside	200,000
City of Piedmont, OK	For the Elevated Water Storage Tower project for water storage and water line installations	700,000
City of Rockford, IL	For land acquisition, demolition, and infrastructure improvements	500,000
City of Ruleville, MS	For the development of a walking trail	125,000
City of Springfield, IL	For construction of a new building for a Crisis Nursery in Springfield	200,000
City of Springfield, MA	For improvements to public buildings in downtown Springfield	350,000
City of Springfield, MO	For improvements to the Commercial Club Building including making it ADA compliant	750,000
City of Springfield, OH	For the redevelopment of an industrial Brownfield site	750,000
City of West Warwick, RI	For planning and community development, including the acquisition and rehabilitation of property and the improvement of public infrastructure.	500,000
City of Wilkes-Barre, PA	For the planning, design, and renovations in a downtown business district	200,000
City of Winsted, CT	For renovations and streetscape enhancements in the downtown business district	200,000
City of Woonsocket, RI	For site demolition and environmental remediation to accommodate a public drinking water facility	600,000
City of Clearfield, UT	For Clearfield City Downtown Development Project West Phase 1 & 2 for the city to acquire blighted properties	100,000
Clyde Malone Community Center, Lincoln, NE	For the expansion and renovation of the Malone Center facilities	300,000

Commission on Economic Opportunity for the Greater Capital Region, Troy, NY.	For construction of community building to serve as a child care and family resource center for low- to moderate-income individuals.	250,000
Community Foundation of NJ, Newark, NJ	For facility renovations to the Essex County Family Justice Center	500,000
Copper River Native Association, Glenallen, AK	For the construction of a health and multi-use facility serving tribal members medical and basic health service needs	500,000
County of Santa Barbara, CA	For repairs and renovations to the Lompoc Veterans Building Renovation	450,000
Covenant House Alaska, Anchorage, AK	For construction of a new facility for Covenant House, a center providing immediate and long-term needs of homeless youth in Alaska.	500,000
Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Fort Thompson, SD	For construction of a new community facility in Fort Thompson, SD to serve low-income tribal members	300,000
CRSA Wounded Warrior Care Project, Augusta, GA	For the Wounded Warrior Transitional Housing Project	2,100,000
Dayton, OH	For Improved Solutions for Urban Systems, Inc. to renovate workshops and laboratories using LEED Standards and renewable energy technology.	250,000
Delta City, UT	For improvements and construction related to the Delta City Learning and Community Center	500,000
Denton, TX	For the Denton Downtown Improvement Project to upgrade the streets and streetscape	500,000
Department of Community Services Housing Authority, Charles County, MD.	For the installation and/or repair of indoor plumbing for the poor	300,000
Domestic Violence Services of Snohomish County, Everett, WA	For expansion and rehabilitation of a domestic violence facility	500,000
Easter Seals Hawaii, HI	For the construction and renovation of building space to provide programs and services for children and adults with disabilities.	300,000
Enosburg Falls Economic Development Corporation, Enosburg Falls, VT.	For improvements to an industrial park	200,000
Eritrean Association, Seattle, WA	For facility improvements and expansion of a community center	600,000
Family Crisis Center, Inc., Farmington, NM	For expansion of the existing Family Crisis Center	643,500
Family Service Association of San Antonio, TX	For facility repairs to the Family Service Center	1,000,000
Fargo Housing & Redevelopment Authority, Fargo, ND	For rehabilitation of low-income housing	700,000
Federal Way Chamber of Commerce, Federal Way, WA	For acquisition and facility improvements of a regional small business incubator	1,200,000
First Best Place, Columbia Falls, MT	For construction of a community center	1,000,000
First Steps Primeros Pasos, Georgetown, DE	For construction and start-up costs for a bilingual early care and education facility	175,000
Food Self-Reliance, The Kohala Center, HI	For equipment purchase to make infrastructure improvements to increase economic development opportunities, for low- and moderate-income farmers in rural communities.	250,000
Forgotten Harvest, Oak Park, MI	For facilities improvements, equipment, and service fleet	542,000
Franklin County, MS	For restoration of the Historic Franklin County Courthouse	175,000
Friends of Buena Library, Buena, WA	For construction of a community center in a high-poverty area	400,000
Gaston County, NC	To create a Gastonia Technology Park in Gaston County, NC	760,000
Grace Hill Settlement House, St. Louis, MO	To renovate housing for low-income working families at the College Hill Community Redevelopment Project	1,000,000
Grand Rapids Downtown Development Authority, MI	For the construction of a mixed-use facility for use as a farmers market in a distressed urban area	700,000
Great Falls Development Authority, Great Falls, MT	For infrastructure improvements for development of an industrial park	800,000
Great Rivers Greenway, St. Louis, MO	For the removal of blight and related redevelopment concerns at the St. Louis Regional Greenways project	1,000,000
Hancock County, KY	For expansion of the Owensboro Community Technical College—Hancock County Extension Campus for local training programs.	300,000

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
Hanover Township, Washington County, PA	For construction and excavation in Hanover Township, Washington County, Pennsylvania to new business to distressed community.	200,000
Harriet Tubman Center, Maplewood, MN	For the renovation of a building in order to consolidate youth and family services, and relocate two domestic violence shelters.	600,000
Heritage Services, Omaha, NE	For construction of facility that will accommodate an education and interactive learning center	800,000
Hocking Co. Community Improvement Corporation, Logan, OH.	To construct an incubator/light manufacturing building	750,000
Housing Vermont, Burlington, VT	For expansions and improvements to low-income housing	500,000
Iowa Department of Economic Development, Des Moines, IA	For the restoration and rehabilitation of buildings, re-introduce upper floor housing, and add economic value in Iowa's historic Main Street districts.	1,000,000
Ivins, UT	For the Old Town Ivins Street Improvements Project including safety concerns	100,000
Jackson Medical Mall, Jackson, MS	For the expansion of the Jackson Medical Mall Development Project	600,000
Jefferson County Department of Human Services, CO	For a facility for Jefferson County Department of Human Services in Colorado to provide housing for homeless veterans	600,000
Jewish Family Service, Seattle, WA	For improvements and expansion of a facility providing family and community services	800,000
Jewish Vocational Service, MO	To renovate the facility for the Jewish Vocational Service and to provide equipment and furnishings	1,000,000
John Hope Settlement House, Providence, RI	For facility upgrades and energy retrofits	200,000
Kauai Economic Development Board, Kauai, HI	For the rehabilitation and improvement of an abandoned facility, to provide employment training for low- and moderate-income agricultural workers.	300,000
Keene Family YMCA, Keene, NH	For the construction of a new Keene YMCA allowing for the expansion childcare and other services	300,000
Kentucky Blood Center, Somerset, KY	For construction of a Kentucky Blood Center Building	1,000,000
Laiopua 2020, Kailua-Kona, HI	For planning, design, and construction of the Laiopua 2020 Community Center	300,000
Logan, UT	For the Logan Northwest Park Project to continue an ongoing park project	200,000
Longview Housing Authority, Longview, WA	For acquisition and improvements of a facility to serve as a regional center for Veterans	675,000
Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule, SD	For the Domestic Violence Building Project	400,000
Luke-Dorf, Inc., Portland, OR	For the construction of a Behavioral Healthcare Housing Facility, with medically monitored treatment, for individuals	300,000
Mandell Jewish Community Center, West Hartford, CT	For community facilities renovations and improvements	700,000
MARC Community Services Corporation, KS	To acquire and renovate vacant and abandoned properties as part of the NeighborhoodsNOW Redevelopment Plan in Wyandotte County, Kansas.	400,000
Maui Economic Development Board, HI	For equipment purchase and construction to support business incubation and economic development for Molokai cooperatives.	250,000
Milwaukee Department of City Development, Milwaukee, WI	For the preservation and improvement of affordable housing	400,000
Missouri Institute for Biotechnology and Innovation, MO	To renovate and equip the historic Missouri Institute for Biotechnology and Innovation in Cole County, Missouri	1,000,000
Molokai Habitat for Humanity, HI	For construction and rehabilitation of low- and very low-income housing using the Molokai Habitat for Humanity self-help housing model.	400,000
New Hampshire Community Loan Fund, Concord, NH	For support for Community Loan Fund programs for the New Hampshire Community Loan Fund	500,000

North Carolina Research Campus, Kannapolis, NC	For the High Speed Optical Networking at NCRC	500,000
Northeast Iowa Food Bank, Waterloo, IA	For construction of a new facility to serve as a food warehouse and distribution center for northeast Iowa	300,000
Northern Hills Alliance for Children, Deadwood, SD	For Childcare Center building modifications	550,000
Nye County–Pahrump, NV	For the construction and expansion of a senior center	200,000
Ocean Community YMCA Westerly, RI	For construction of a drop-off area for children	250,000
Opportunity Resources, Inc., Missoula, MT	For facility improvements for an employment and service organization for the disabled	200,000
Our City Reading, Inc., PA	For the planning, design, renovation, and construction of housing	200,000
Parents and Children Together, HI	For renovation and equipment purchase to expand the Community Technology Center at Kuhio Park Terrace	300,000
Pillar Community Development Corporation, Bloomfield, CT	For the construction of a community wellness center	200,000
Port of Lewiston, ID	For expansion of the container dock	850,000
Puerto Rican Action Board, New Brunswick, NJ	For the repair of facilities that assist low-income families with foreclosure mitigation and other economic independence initiatives.	260,000
Regional Economic Development, Inc., Columbia, MO	For renovations and equipment for a small business incubator at the Enterprise Center	425,000
Regional Foodbank, Akron-Canton, OH	For energy conservation improvements for the food bank facility	250,000
River Ridge Development Authority, Jeffersonville, IN	For the development of housing as part of the River Ridge Commerce Center Infrastructure Planning Project	350,000
Roadrunner Food Bank, Albuquerque, NM	For a permanent warehouse for the Roadrunner food collection agency for homeless and poverty stricken families in New Mexico.	250,000
Tuscaloosa Housing Authority, Tuscaloosa, AL	For rehabilitation of distressed low-income housing, including renovation and reconstruction to promote safety and security	5,000,000
Rural Alaska Community Action Program in Toksook Bay, AK	To construct a early childhood development center	500,000
Salt Lake County, UT	For construction related to the Salt Lake County Transitional Housing project	750,000
Share of Vancouver, Clark and Cowlitz County, Vancouver, WA.	For rehabilitation of a facility to provide for transitional homeless housing and other services	900,000
Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate, Agency Village, SD	For restoration efforts and safety upgrades at the Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate pow wow grounds	150,000
South Coast Development Council, Coos Bay, OR	For site preparation and construction of a public plaza	500,000
Springfield YMCA, Springfield, IL	For construction of a new building	500,000
St. Joseph Community Center, Lorain, OH	For demolition, remediation, and renovation of the St. Joseph Community Center facility	400,000
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Ft. Yates, ND	For housing renovation	300,000
Storey County Community Chest, Virginia City, NV	For the creation of the Storey County Youth and Community Center	400,000
Syracuse, UT	For the Legacy Park Handicap Renovations project, including meeting ADA requirements	100,000
The Ministry of Caring, Inc., Wilmington, DE	For the renovation of the Josephine Bakhita House	300,000
The Planning Office for Urban Affairs, Boston, MA	For the construction of affordable housing and mixed-use space	400,000
Tierra Madre, Sunland Park, NM	For construction of a capacity building center to help facilitate homeownership opportunities	200,000
Tooele, UT	For infrastructure development to the Tooele City Commercial Park	750,000
Town of Carmel, NY	For acquisition and construction of a new economic center	400,000
Town of Cheraw, SC	To eliminate blighted housing structures under the Cheraw Stabilization Program	200,000
Town of Dover-Foxcroft, ME	For infrastructure improvements to the former Moosehead Manufacturing facility	700,000
Town of Silas, AL	To renovate abandoned school property into a community center	300,000
TRF Development Partners, City of Baltimore, MD	For the planning, design, rehabilitation, and construction of affordable housing in the Oliver neighborhood	500,000
Turtle Mountain Chippewa Tribe, Belcourt, ND	For construction of a youth center	300,000
Union County Child Advocacy Center, Elizabeth, NJ	For construction and renovation of new child advocacy center for sexually abused children in Union County	200,000

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
United Community Center, Milwaukee, WI	For construction of a senior center within a low-income elderly housing complex	2,000,000
United Indians of All Tribes Foundation, Seattle, WA	For rehabilitation and revitalization of a facility serving disadvantaged youth	600,000
Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle, Seattle, WA	For improvements to a facility to allow for the expansion of affordable housing	300,000
Ute Mountain Housing Authority, Durango, CO	For an affordable housing project for Ute Mountain Ute tribal members	800,000
Valley Council of Governments, Derby, CT	For property renovation and reconstruction	400,000
Vermont Community Loan Fund, Montpelier, VT	For the construction of community facilities, including child care centers	300,000
Vermont Division for Historic Preservation, Montpelier, VT	For historic preservation improvements throughout Vermont	200,000
Vermont Housing & Conservation Board Montpelier, VT	For enhancement of affordable housing, community development initiatives, economic development, land conservation, and historic preservation.	3,000,000
Waterboro, ME	For a technology and infrastructure project for the Waterboro Community Center	500,000
Waterloo, IA	For building renovation and improvements for Cedar Valley TechWorks for laboratory and incubator space	300,000
West DuPage, IL	For construction of an Educare center in West Dupage to serve at-risk children	200,000
Western Arkansas Regional Intermodal Transportation Authority, Fort Smith, AR.	For infrastructure improvements related to the development of an industrial park	500,000
Western Nebraska Community College, Scottsbluff, NE	For the construction and equipment purchase in support of a renewable energy training center	400,000
Westminster College, Salt Lake City, UT	For improvement to the Garfield School Renovation and Revitalization project	500,000
Women's Intercultural Center, Anthony, NM	For renovation of a facility that provides educational and economic opportunities to women	450,000
Yakima Housing Authority, Granger, WA	For development activities and construction of affordable housing for farmworkers	675,000
YMCA of Pierce and Kitsap Counties, Silverdale, WA	For the construction of a community center	1,000,000
YWCA of Greater Portland, OR	For design and construction of a facility that provides safety and services to victims of Human Trafficking	300,000

The Neighborhood Initiatives are as follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVES

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
Abyssinian Development Corporation, New York, NY	For the development and rehabilitation of new and existing low- and moderate-income housing units in the central Harlem area.	$300,000
Center for Planning Excellence, LA	To build capacity in land use planning and community preservation throughout Louisiana	750,000
City of Boise, ID	For a Petroleum Terminal Relocation Feasibility Study	350,000
City of Cranston, RI	For community planning and development	200,000
City of Longview, WA	For revitalization and renewal of the city's downtown region	1,000,000
City of Philadelphia, PA	For mixed-use transit oriented development in the area around the 9th and Berks rail station	350,000
City of Ranson, WV	For the redevelopment of a blighted former industrial site into a mixed-used center, including retail and affordable workforce housing using smart growth design and green infrastructure.	400,000
City of Spokane, WA	For the restoration and redevelopment of a blighted area	2,000,000
Community Voice Mail, Seattle, WA	To improve and expand employment services for homeless veterans	350,000
Consumer Credit Counseling Services, Las Vegas, NV	For foreclosure related assistance services	500,000
Florida's Heartland Rural Economic Development Initiative, Sebring, FL.	To create a research park	400,000
Hire America's Heroes, Redmond, WA	To expand employment services for veterans	250,000
Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS	For the Development of the Civic Capacity Development Initiative Project at Mississippi State University	750,000
New Hampshire Food Bank, Manchester, NH	To expand the food assistance program for the New Hampshire Food Bank	1,250,000
Northern Comm. Investment Corp., St. Johnsbury, VT	To continue to expand high-speed, high-technology broadband connectivity as part of the North Country Community Broadband Initiative.	1,000,000
Ocean Springs, MS	For the construction of the Walter Anderson Education Center	400,000
Scott County Housing Council, IA	For loans and grants to local nonprofit housing service providers and developers to create affordable housing	300,000
Southwest Organizing Project, Chicago, IL	To assist the Southwest Organizing Project "Keep Our Homes" campaign, a foreclosure prevention initiative in Chicago neighborhoods.	250,000
TechRanch, Bozeman, MT	For entrepreneurship programs and support for a business incubator	200,000
Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Montpelier, VT	For expansion and improvement of low-income housing	300,000
Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund, Montpelier, VT	For capitalizing a revolving loan fund	500,000
Washington State Farmworker Housing Trust, Seattle, WA	For capacity building to support the expansion of affordable housing for farmworkers	200,000

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

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 has recommended an appropriation of $6,435,000 to support a loan level guarantee of $275,000,000 for the section 108 loan guarantees account for fiscal year 2011. This guaranteed loan level is equal to both the fiscal year 2010 level.

This loan level is $225,000,000 less than the President's request. However, the President proposed to charge fees for this program, which the Committee has not approved.

This program enables Community Development Block Grant recipients to use their CDBG dollars as leverage as part of economic development projects and housing rehabilitation programs. Communities are allowed to borrow up to five times their most recent CDBG allocation. The Committee strongly supports this program, which is even more critical with limited credit in the private market.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2010	$17,500,000
Budget estimate, 2011	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

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 does not recommend an appropriation for the Brownfield Redevelopment program, consistent with the budget request. The Committee notes that other Federal appropriations are available for the same purpose through the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]. Communities may also use CDBG funds to redevelop Brownfield's sites.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010	$1,825,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	1,650,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,825,000,000

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 $1,825,000,000 for the Home Investment Partnership Program. This amount is the same funding level provided in fiscal year 2010, and $175,000,000 above the budget request.

The Home Investment Partnership Program is HUD's major housing production program. Since 1992, the HOME program has succeeded in producing over 925,000 units. The majority of the units produced serve low-income or extremely low-income residents and include homeownership, rental and homeowner rehabilitation. In addition to construction and rehabilitation, HOME funds can also be used for rental assistance. Since its inception, over 228,000 households have received rental assistance through the HOME program. The flexibility provided in the HOME program allows participating jurisdictions to use HOME funds to effectively meet the needs of their communities.

In recent years, HUD has encouraged the use of green buildings and energy efficient technologies in the HOME program, a practice the Committee continues to support.

Technical Assistance.—The Committee has not included funding for technical assistance within the amount provided for the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, but has instead allowed funding provided under this heading to go toward the Transformation Initiative as requested. However, the Committee expects that technical assistance funding will still be awarded to qualified nonprofit intermediaries to provide technical assistance to Community Housing and Development Organizations [CHDOs], as well as for technical assistance for jurisdictions participating in the HOME program.

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2010	$82,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	.....
Committee recommendation	82,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program is comprised of the Self-Help Homeownership Program [SHOP], which assists low-income homebuyers willing to contribute

"sweat equity" toward the construction of their houses. The funds will increase nonprofit organizations' ability to leverage funds from other sources and produce approximately 2,000 new homeownership units. This account also includes funding for the Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing Program, as well as assistance to rural communities as authorized under sections 6301 through 6305 of Public Law 110–246. These grantees develop the capacity of nonprofit community development entities to undertake community development and affordable housing projects.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $82,000,000 for the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Program, which is $82,000,000 more than the budget request and the same as the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee has included $27,000,000 for the Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Extension Act of 1996.

The Committee recommends $50,000,000 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. The Committee provides $5,000,000 to carry out capacity building activities in rural communities as authorized under section 6301 through 6305 in Public Law 110–246.

During this economic crisis, the need for affordable housing has only increased. Congress has provided funding through such programs as the Neighborhood Stabilization Program to create additional affordable housing, and undertake economic development in communities across the Nation, especially those hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis and recession. However, the success of these efforts relies, in large part, on the capacity of States, local governments, and organizations to develop and implement effective housing and community development plans. The funding recommended under this program is intended to ensure that these communities have the skills and technical capabilities necessary to undertake effective community development activities. In addition, resources have been targeted to rural communities to address their unique needs and challenges.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010	$1,865,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	2,055,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,055,000,000

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, prevention, rapid re-housing, and supportive services to homeless persons and families. The emergency solutions grant is a formula

funded grant program, while the Continuum of Care and Rural Housing Stability 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 $2,055,000,000 for Homeless Assistance Grants in fiscal year 2011. This amount is equal to the President's request, and $190,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

As part of the Committee recommendation, $1,844,000,000 will support the Continuum of Care Program, including the renewal of existing projects, and the new Rural Housing Stability Assistance Program. The recommendation also includes $200,000,000 for the emergency solutions grants program, representing an increase of 25 percent over what was formerly the emergency shelter grant program. This increased funding will allow communities to take advantage of the additional flexibility provided under the Homeless Emergency and Rapid Transition to Housing [HEARTH] Act to allow communities to do prevention and rapid re-housing. Finally, $6,000,000 is included for technical assistance and data analysis.

The economic recession has had a significant impact on the Nation's most vulnerable, pushing many low-income families into homelessness. In 2009, 1.56 million Americans spent at least one night in a shelter. While homelessness among individuals has decreased 7 percent since 2007, the number of homeless families has increased by 30 percent during that same time.

The HEARTH Act represents an important step in addressing the needs of persons experiencing homelessness by allowing providers to modify their programs to incorporate the most effective strategies into their existing housing models. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act [ARRA] included $1,500,000,000 to jumpstart this change by providing communities with the resources to do prevention and rapid re-housing activities. These models are especially effective for homeless families that lack housing due to economic hardship. The Committee is focused on ensuring that communities have the ability to continue programs supported by ARRA funding by transitioning these activities into existing homeless programs.

Permanent Housing.—In fiscal year 1999, the Committee began to include a requirement that 30 percent of McKinney homeless funding be set-aside for permanent housing. This policy supported research demonstrating the effectiveness of permanent housing in ending homelessness, particularly for the chronically homeless. This requirement has had the intended effect. In 2009, the number of beds in permanent supportive housing surpassed the number of beds in emergency or transitional housing. As a result, we are seeing real decreases in chronic homelessness. According to the point-in-time estimate, there was a 10 percent decrease in chronic homelessness from 2008 to 2009, which builds on declines seen for the

past several years. The Committee is pleased that the HEARTH Act put this 30 percent requirement into permanent law, so that we can continue to create more permanent housing, and permanent solutions for those experiencing homelessness.

Annual Homeless Assessment Report [AHAR].—The Annual Homeless Assessment Report stems 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 of each year. The Committee applauds the Secretary's efforts to improve and collect more real time data on homelessness in our communities. Because of the importance of these data and the AHAR report, the Committee has retained some funding within the account to support those efforts.

The Committee requests that HUD submit the AHAR report by June 14, 2011. 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 projections, 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 2011 budget justifications.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010 [1]	$8,551,525,000
Budget estimate, 2011 [1]	9,382,328,000
Committee recommendation [1]	9,382,328,000

[1] Includes an advance appropriation.

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, subject primarily to certain rent caps. Amounts in this account include funding for the renewal of and amendments to expiring section 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 $9,382,328,000 for the annual renewal of project-based contracts, of which not to exceed $322,000,000 is for the cost of contract administrators. The recommended level of funding is $830,803,000 more

than the amount provided for this program in fiscal year 2010 and equal to the budget request.

The section 8 project-based rental assistance [PBRA] program provides more than 1,300,000 low-income Americans with safe, stable and sanitary housing. For many years, the program was plagued by inadequate budgets that threatened this supply of affordable housing. Moreover, its policy of short-funding contracts devised to keep the program within its budget jeopardized the Department's credibility. Congress provided significant resources through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to address this shortfall and enable HUD to fully fund contracts; sufficient funding was then provided in fiscal year 2010 to continue this practice. Now that the program is on sound footing, HUD must focus its attention on improving program management to preserve this housing while better controlling costs.

Operating Cost Adjustment Factors [OCAF].—The annual growth in the cost of providing PBRA is driven by both the first-time renewal of expiring contracts, as well as an adjustment factor intended to account for increased costs of operating the housing. The Committee notes that in publishing the OCAF for fiscal year 2010, HUD acknowledged flaws in its methodology for determining it. The Federal Register notice states, "[t]he Department continues to reexamine the methodology for computing the operating cost adjustment factors so that they more closely mirror actual operating expenses." It further states, "Future OCAF releases will likely include methodology improvements."

HUD must improve its ability to accurately determine the cost of operating these projects. The increasing cost of the program, as well as expected budget constraints in future years, demand that HUD give its full attention to aligning actual operating costs with the OCAF. The Committee directs HUD to include the methodology for determining the OCAF when it publishes the Federal Register notice for fiscal year 2011.

In addition, HUD must include detailed information about the OCAF in its fiscal year 2012 congressional justification, including how the methodology has changed, and the projected rate for fiscal year 2012. The justification should also include detail on the number of contracts and required funding associated with first-time renewal of expiring contracts in fiscal year 2012 and subsequent years.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010	$825,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	273,700,000
Committee recommendation	825,000,000

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 $825,000,000 for the section 202 program. This level is $551,300,000 more than the budget request and equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee recommends $90,000,000 for service coordinators and for the continuation of existing congregate service grants; up to $25,000,000 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 is disappointed by the administration's budget request for Housing for the Elderly. The budget proposes to redesign the program to better meet the housing and supportive services needs of very low-income elderly households, but the Committee can point to no progress by the Department in this area in the 6 months since the release of the budget. In the absence of a roadmap to strengthen the program and put it on a sustainable path, the Department has instead proposed a steep reduction, all the while acknowledging the significant needs of this vulnerable and growing population. While the Department has its hands full responding to the mortgage crisis, reforming the Department's operations, and pursuing a number of potentially promising innovations in other programs, the Committee expects it to also devote attention and resources to addressing the effectiveness of Housing for the Elderly. The Committee has a long history of rejecting arbitrary cuts to this program.

The Committee notes that the number of Americans aged 65 and older is growing in number, as well as a percentage of the total U.S. population. Unfortunately, the supply of affordable housing to assist our Nation's low-income elderly is not sufficient to meet this increased demand. According to a May 2010 report from HUD to Congress, elderly households constituted 21 percent of the Nation's worst case housing needs in 2007, a slight improvement from 2005 findings, but still far worse than the 2003 level. In order to address these housing needs, new units of affordable elderly housing are needed. HUD's section 202 program, the HUD program exclusively for the elderly, is an important source of additional units to meet this growing need. As such, the Committee has increased resources for this account above the request in order to increase the supply of housing for the elderly.

The Committee expects HUD to use the additional funding, and make any programmatic changes necessary to ensure that we are increasing our production of affordable housing for the low-income elderly. The Committee directs HUD, within 120 days of enactment of this act, to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a comprehensive list of both nonlegislative "regulatory" changes and legislative changes that would improve the effectiveness of the program; this information shall include a schedule for making all needed regulatory changes.

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010	$300,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	90,037,000
Committee recommendation	[1] 200,000,000

[1] The recommended level reflects the transfer in fiscal year 2011 of $113,600,000 in mainstream vouchers to the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance account.

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. Funding may be made available for project-based rental assistance [PRAC] to support operational costs for such units. Funding for mainstream vouchers formerly funded under this heading has been moved to the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance account.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $200,000,000 for the section 811 program. This level is $109,963,000 more than the budget request and $100,00,000 below the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. However, this level does not reflect $113,600,000 in mainstream vouchers previously funded in this account that the Committee has moved to the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance account, consistent with the request. The Committee directs HUD to ensure these vouchers remain available for persons with disabilities upon turnover. Factoring in the vouchers increases the total level of funding available for section 811-related activities to $313,600,000 in fiscal year 2012.

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 urges HUD to evaluate REAC's effectiveness and ensure the inspectors are competent in their expertise. The Committee recommends the use of State housing finance agencies for REAC, where appropriate.

The Committee is disappointed by the steep cuts to Housing for the Disabled proposed in the administration's budget. In May 2010, HUD issued its Worst Case Housing Needs Assessment based on 2007 data. As in earlier reports, HUD found that more than 1,000,000 households with disabilities had some of the Nation's worst case housing needs. This information underscores the importance of the section 811 program, which provides both capital and rental assistance to help low-income disabled Americans find affordable housing in order to live independently. The Committee has restored funding for the section 811 program in order to increase the number of units created for low-income disabled Americans. The Committee expects that in addition to utilizing this funding to support more supportive housing projects to serve the disabled, the Department will also examine ways to make the program and project process more efficient. The Committee directs HUD, within

150 days of enactment of this act, to identify and submit a list of all regulatory issues for this program that will improve implementation, as well as a proposed schedule for issuing such reforms.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

Appropriations, 2010	$87,500,000
Budget estimate, 2011	88,000,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Housing Counseling Assistance Program provides comprehensive housing counseling services to eligible homeowners and tenants through grants to nonprofit intermediaries, State government entities, and other local and national agencies. Eligible counseling activities include pre- and postpurchase education, personal financial management, reverse mortgage product education, foreclosure prevention, mitigation, and rental counseling.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $100,000,000 for the Housing Counseling Assistance program, which is $12,000,000 more than the budget request and $12,500,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee has increased funding over the President's budget to ensure that HUD can meet all of its responsibilities under the "Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act" recently passed by Congress. In addition, the Committee expects that the increased funding will enable HUD to meet the demand for housing counseling services for minorities that have been severely impacted by the foreclosure crisis.

The current housing crisis has resulted in millions of Americans defaulting on their mortgages, with many losing their homes to foreclosure. Housing counselors are a critical tool in helping troubled borrowers. They can assess the financial standing of troubled homeowners, work with lenders to obtain mortgage modifications, and help homeowners through the foreclosure process.

In addition to foreclosure prevention activities, HUD counseling funds also support activities such as pre-purchase counseling, rental counseling, and Home Equity Conversion Mortgage [HECM] counseling. While using HUD counseling funds to address the foreclosure crisis is necessary to meet the great demand for assistance, HUD must continue to support pre-purchase and other forms of counseling to help renters and first-time homebuyers make judicious decisions.

Federal Coordination Around Foreclosure Prevention.—The Committee continues to emphasize the importance of coordination with other Federal partners around foreclosure prevention activities. In addition to foreclosure prevention counseling, HUD funding in fiscal year 2011 will also be dedicated to combating fair lending abuse, as well as outreach and education to vulnerable homeowners. Since demand for foreclosure prevention assistance will continue to outstrip available resources, HUD must work to coordinate its efforts across the Department and with other Federal agencies to maximize the effective use of Federal funding including,

where appropriate, tying counseling efforts with enforcement. The Committee notes that the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation is working on outreach and public education around loan scams. The Committee directs HUD to work with NRC on any materials developed to ensure a clear and consistent message to consumers.

ENERGY INNOVATION FUND

Appropriations, 2010	$50,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The objective of the Energy Innovation Fund is to provide support for promising local initiatives that can be replicated across the Nation, and to stimulate private investment in cost-saving energy efficiency retrofits of existing housing through improved use of FHA single family and multifamily mortgage products.

In the single-family housing sector, the Energy Innovation Fund will be used to develop an Energy Efficient Mortgage [EEM] Innovation pilot program, which will extend the benefits of the existing FHA EEM and title I Energy Efficient Property Improvement loan programs to more homeowners. Funding will also be used to develop a Multifamily Energy Pilot [MEP], which will target borrowers in the FHA Multifamily programs seeking energy efficiency improvements in multifamily rehabilitation projects.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee does not recommend any funding for the Energy Innovation Fund in fiscal year 2011. The recommended level is equal to the budget request and $50,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee continues to support the goal of improving the energy efficiency of housing, and looks forward to the results of the pilot. However, additional funds cannot be justified at this time.

OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Appropriations, 2010	$40,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	40,600,000
House allowance	40,600,000
Committee recommendation	40,600,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides amendment funding for housing assisted under a variety of HUD housing programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $40,600,000 for HUD-assisted, State-aided, noninsured rental housing projects, which is the same as the budget request and $600,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

RENT SUPPLEMENT

(RESCISSION)

The Committee recommends a rescission of $40,600,000 for section 236 payments to State-aided, noninsured projects, which is equal to the budget request and $31,436,000 less than the 2010 enacted level.

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, 2010	$16,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	14,000,000
Committee recommendation	14,000,000

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 $14,000,000 to support the manufactured housing standards programs, of which $7,000,000 is expected to be derived from fees collected and deposited in the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund account and not more than $7,000,000 shall be available from the general fund. The total amount recommended is equal to the budget request.

The Manufactured Housing Standards Program [MHSP] continues to transform its enforcement program to emphasize production quality control, as well as better controlling enforcement cost.

The Committee commends these initiatives and supports HUD's efforts to ensure manufacturers are code-compliant. Eliminating defects and safety hazards in manufactured housing is central to MHSP's mission, and HUD should continually look for ways to make its enforcement more effective. The Committee expects HUD to provide annual updates with MHSP's congressional budget justification detailing the progress of its oversight transformation and the cost-efficiency/effectiveness initiatives.

Prior to fiscal year 2009, MHSP was funded exclusively through revenue generated by label fees. Since then, however, perennial production decreases have necessitated direct appropriations in order to maintain the program. The proposed label fee increase will help restore label proceeds, and the Committee expects to see data on the revenue generated by the fee increase. In addition, the direct appropriation will allow MHSP to begin to implement its new Installation and Dispute Resolution programs. As these programs are implemented, the Committee expects to receive data regarding actual and expected user fee revenue.

Manufactured housing serves as a quality affordable housing option for millions of American families. The Committee is concerned that, despite strong congressional guidance in this area, there has been a lack of effort in dutifully serving the needs of the manufactured housing market, as specified in the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008. In its role as a lead regulator of the manufactured housing industry, the Department of Housing and Urban Development is directed to work with the Government-sponsored enterprises, including Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and the Federal Housing Finance Agency to establish a secondary market for manufactured home loans secured by personal property.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on guaranteed loans	Administrative contract expenses	Program costs
Appropriations, 2010	$50,000,000	$400,000,000,000	$188,900,000	.....
Budget estimate, 2011	50,000,000	400,000,000,000	207,000,000	$250,000,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000	400,000,000,000	220,000,000	150,000,000

[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	Program costs
Appropriations, 2010	$20,000,000	$15,000,000,000	$8,600,000
Budget estimate, 2011	20,000,000	20,000,000,000	.....
Committee recommendation	20,000,000	20,000,000,000	.....

[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. These include the mutual mortgage insurance [MMI] fund, cooperative management housing insurance [CMHI] fund, general insurance fund [GI] fund, and the special risk insur-

ance [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 $400,000,000,000; a limitation on direct loans of $50,000,000; and $220,000,000 for administrative contract expenses, of which up to $71,500,000 may be transferred to the Working Capital Fund to be used solely for the maintenance of FHA information technology systems.

The Committee has also provided an appropriation of $150,000,000 to support guaranteed loans under the Home Equity Conversion Mortgage, or reverse mortgage program. The HECM program provides an opportunity for our Nation's elderly to take equity out of their homes so they can pay for medicine or other critical services while remaining in their homes. This program is especially important for many elderly today who have experienced financial losses in their retirement accounts.

For the GI/SRI account, the Committee recommends $20,000,000,000 as a limitation on guaranteed loans and a limitation on direct loans of $20,000,000.

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.

Since the foreclosure crisis began, FHA's presence in the housing market has expanded dramatically—now representing nearly 30 percent of all mortgage originations. FHA has provided mortgage insurance to eligible first time homebuyers as well as existing homeowners seeking to refinance, enabling millions of Americans to take advantage of low interest rates and affordable home prices. In this role, FHA has provided much-needed liquidity to the market. Yet, this increased role comes with its own risks. Last fall, FHA reported that its capital reserve had fallen below the 2 percent required by Congress.

For many years, the Committee has sounded the alarm about the solvency of FHA's Mutual Mortgage Insurance [MMI] Fund. The recent losses sustained by the Fund, and the diminished capital reserve validate those concerns. But the Committee has not simply sounded the alarm, it has also provided FHA with additional resources to increase its staff and modernize its IT systems in an effort to improve the agency's capacity to detect and mitigate risk. In fiscal year 2011, the Committee has once again provided resources for FHA to continue modernizing its IT systems and increase its staff. The Committee has closely monitored FHA staffing and believes that FHA has made progress in bringing on a more robust and experienced workforce, but expects FHA to continue

providing regular updates to the Committee on its staffing in fiscal year 2011.

As part of improving its workforce, FHA named its first Chief Risk Officer. It is also reorganizing the agency to place a greater focus on risk. The Committee supports these efforts and believes FHA must continue to enhance its risk analysis, including improving its modeling to more accurately project revenues and losses to the MMI Fund.

In addition to an enhanced focus on risk, FHA has also made several policy changes to improve the quality of its portfolio, including increasing upfront premiums, establishing minimum FICO scores, increasing downpayment requirements for riskier borrowers, and expanding enforcement authorities. FHA has also sought additional legislative authorities, and the Committee has included language, as requested, that will allow HUD to increase annual premiums on FHA-insured mortgages. Increased premiums will provide FHA with additional revenue to offset future losses and help to ensure that the American taxpayer is not forced to subsidize the cost of FHA.

While FHA is appropriately focusing on attracting quality borrowers, it is also stepping up enforcement against fraudulent and predatory lenders. Over the past year, FHA has moved to suspend or remove lenders from the program that have violated FHA rules and subjected the agency—and the taxpayer—to increased losses. FHA has taken enforcement actions against six times as many lenders during the past 20 months as it did over the preceding 9 years. This focus on enforcement must continue, since FHA's larger role in the market makes it more vulnerable to fraudulent and predatory lenders. The Committee also expects FHA to continue working with the OIG to hold fraudulent lenders accountable and recoup losses to the MMI Fund.

Improving HAMP and Holding Servicers Accountable.—Last year, the administration announced the Home Affordable Modification Program [HAMP] to provide eligible homeowners an opportunity to obtain loan modifications in order to avoid foreclosure. While the program has the potential to help millions of homeowners, many continue to face excessive delays in receiving permanent modifications from lenders. In some instances, these delays end up leaving homeowners further behind financially than when they started the process. The Committee is dismayed that many of the banks participating in the program continue to drag their feet or unfairly deny loan modifications to troubled homeowners after receiving billions in taxpayer dollars. As such, the Committee expects the administration to hold these institutions accountable for fulfilling their commitment to participate in the program and assist eligible homeowners. With continued instability in the housing market, it is vital that the program do a better job of helping eligible families avoid foreclosure. Thus, the Committee directs FHA to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 90 days of enactment of this act outlining the measures the administration is taking to increase oversight of servicers, and hold them accountable for providing eligible homeowners with a permanent modification in a fair and timely manner.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010: Limitation on guaranteed loans	$500,000,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011: Limitation on guaranteed loans	500,000,000,000
Committee recommendation: Limitation on guaranteed loans	500,000,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Government National Mortgage Association [Ginnie Mae], through the mortgage-backed securities program, guarantees privately issued securities backed by pools of mortgages. Ginnie Mae 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. Ginnie Mae 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 [FHA], the Rural Housing Service, or the Department of Veterans Affairs. Ginnie Mae'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 $500,000,000,000. This level is the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2010 level.

Since the near collapse of the private mortgage market, homeowners have relied on Federal programs, such as FHA, to purchase or refinance homes. Given that Ginnie Mae serves as a secondary market for FHA, its market share has also grown dramatically. In fact, over the past 2 years, the value of Ginnie Mae's portfolio has nearly doubled. The Committee understands the important role that FHA and Ginnie Mae are currently playing in providing liquidity to the housing market. However, this increased role cannot come at the price of greater risk for the American taxpayer.

The HUD Inspector General has raised concerns about Ginnie Mae's focus on risk, particularly its ability to identify fraudulent lenders. The Committee expects the new leadership at Ginnie Mae to focus greater attention on improving risk management, and to work closely with the Office of the Inspector General to implement measures that will strengthen risk management practices. The Committee has also provided Ginnie Mae with additional resources to significantly expand its staffing to improve its oversight. This staffing is critical to conducting the level of oversight necessary to protect taxpayers from risk, and the Committee expects Ginnie Mae to move swiftly to bring the appropriate staff on board.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriations, 2010	$48,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	87,000,000
Committee recommendation	62,000,000

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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $62,000,000 for research, technology, and community development activities in fiscal year 2011. This level is $14,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and $25,000,000 less than the budget request.

The Committee has included significant new resources to support increased data collection and research at the Department. HUD is the Federal agency responsible for developing and implementing the Nation's housing policy. In order to address the housing needs of the country, it is critical for HUD to have current and comprehensive data to develop and support effective housing policies.

The effects of risky subprime mortgages on the housing market, and the economy as a whole, have been devastating. While HUD must continue to work to address the problems stemming from the foreclosure crisis, it must also work to better anticipate other areas of risk in the housing market. In order to effectively do this, HUD must have the necessary information on which to base policy decisions and resource allocation. The Committee expects that the additional funding provided in fiscal year 2011 will allow the Department to gather the data necessary to track and evaluate trends in the housing market, including better regional data. This information should allow the agency to identify, among other things, the potential impacts various mortgage products may have on the stability of the housing market in different regions and across the entire country. In particular, the Committee expects the Department to gather better data on Alternative documentation or Alt-A loans, a large number of which are going to reset in the near future. HUD must seek to ensure that the Department has the necessary tools to respond to any needs or problems associated with these mortgages. The Committee encourages HUD to also collect data on and consider how other areas of the economy are affecting credit markets, access to credit for prospective homebuyers and how deterio-

ration in credit markets can affect homeownership, foreclosure rates and the housing market overall. Further, the Committee directs the Agency to provide additional information on the specific research projects, reports, studies, and demonstrations being conducted by the Office of Policy, Development and Research, including the budget for each activity and proposed completion date, in the annual budget justification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2010	$72,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	61,100,000
Committee recommendation	72,000,000

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 recommends an appropriation of $72,000,000 for the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. Of the amounts provided, $29,500,000 is for the fair housing assistance program [FHAP] and $42,500,000 is for the fair housing initiatives program [FHIP]. The total amount is $10,900,000 more than the budget request and equal to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

With the increasing number of Americans falling behind on mortgage payments and at risk of foreclosure, mortgage rescue scams have become more prevalent. In 2009, Congress provided an increase to FHIP to increase enforcement efforts against those perpetrating mortgage rescue scams. Last year, Congress supported an increase in FHIP funding to bolster and expand this effort to also include discriminatory lending practices and other illegal practices related to the housing crisis. The Committee is disappointed that the administration has been slow to allocate funding for this purpose, and has not requested additional funding to combat mortgage rescue scams and assist homeowners affected by the crisis. The

Committee has provided funding above the President's request to assist local fair housing organizations address these needs. It is critical that HUD moves quickly to distribute these resources to local communities so that assistance doesn't arrive too late to help families. Therefore, the Committee has dedicated $10,000,000 to efforts to combat mortgage rescue scams and unfair lending practices in fiscal year 2011, and has added language requiring HUD to publish a notice of funding availability for this funding within 60 days of the bill's enactment.

The Committee expects this funding will be awarded to national and local organizations to identify loans scams, build the capacity of local fair housing groups to address emerging issues, and support enforcement against those behind these scams and other discriminatory activities related to the housing crisis. The Committee notes the prevalence of both Internet scams and toll-free phone numbers that may be difficult to address locally, and may be better addressed on the national level. The Committee also encourages HUD to work with FHA and other relevant entities to improve information sharing and cooperation between fair housing groups and services that may be receiving information from consumers about scams.

The Committee urges HUD to work closely with the other Federal partners including the Federal Trade Commission, Department of Justice and NeighborWorks to increase the effectiveness of Federal efforts to target mortgage rescue scams. The Committee advises that State housing finance agencies have a unique perspective on State and local housing issues, where such experience may be valuable in limiting and eliminating mortgage rescue scams.

The Committee notes that Congress has provided NeighborWorks America with resources to continue its public education and awareness of scams, so this funding should not be used to develop new materials or Web sites. However, HUD and its fair housing grantees can provide enforcement components which will strengthen awareness and education efforts.

Section 3.—The Committee notes a statutory requirement that when HUD resources are used for housing or community development, economic opportunities must be given to section 3 residents and businesses located nearby. This preference provides public housing residents with a greater opportunity to improve their financial circumstances and increase their self-sufficiency, as well as supporting small businesses in communities where HUD funding is being spent. The Committee appreciates the Department's increased attention to tracking how closely grant recipients are following this requirement. Tracking this information signals the importance of the requirement, and can also help to identify any barriers that limit its application. The Committee hopes that with greater focus on these requirements, an increasing number of public housing residents and small businesses will benefit economically.

The Committee has also provided $500,000 for HUD to continue the creation and promotion of translated materials that support the assistance of persons with limited English proficiency.

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

Appropriations, 2010	$140,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	140,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

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. Based on information from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], about 210,000 children had elevated blood levels in 2009, down from 1.7 million in the late 1980s. Despite this improvement, lead poisoning remains a serious childhood environmental condition, with some 1.1 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 an appropriation of $140,000,000 for lead-based paint hazard reduction and abatement activities for fiscal year 2010. This amount is equal to both the budget request and amounts available in fiscal year 2010. Of this amount, HUD may use up to $40,000,000 for the Healthy Homes Initiative under which HUD conducts a number of activities designed to identify and address housing-related illnesses. The Committee includes bill language requiring $250,000 of the total amount made available to the Lead Hazard Reduction Program to be used in conducting communications and outreach activities to potential applicants of the Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant program.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $48,000,000 for the lead hazard reduction program established in fiscal year 2003 to focus on major urban areas where children are disproportionately at risk for lead poisoning. These funds are awarded on a competitive basis to the areas with the highest lead abatement needs.

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.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriations, 2010	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	243,500,000
Committee recommendation	243,500,000

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 an appropriation of $243,500,000 for the Working Capital Fund for fiscal year 2011. This level of funding is $43,500,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request. The Working Capital Fund is also supported with additional funding provided through a transfer of $71,500,000 from the FHA's Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund as proposed by the President.

The Committee notes that HUD proposed, and the Committee has approved, to address the major systems changes necessary at HUD through the Transformation Initiative. As such the funding provided to the Working Capital Fund will be used to support the maintenance and operations of HUD systems.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2010	$125,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	122,000,000
Committee recommendation	125,000,000

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 an appropriation of $125,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General [OIG]. The amount of funding is equal to the level provided in fiscal year 2010 and $3,000,000 more than the President's request.

The Committee expects the OIG to continue to monitor and conduct oversight over HUD's programs. This is especially important as HUD implements new initiatives funded in this bill.

The Committee directs the HUD OIG to use the additional $3,000,000 above the budget request to target fraud and abuse by lenders, sellers, mortgage bankers and brokers, and homebuyers, including those seeking to refinance mortgages under the FHA Mutual Mortgage Insurance program. The HUD OIG should seek to maximize its funding by partnering with other Federal agencies and entities with similar programs, and take advantage of individuals with financial expertise. FHA single family mortgage has ex-

ploded as a share of the market, growing from 3 percent in 2006 to nearly 30 percent today. FHA is filling an important role in the market today, as credit in the private market remains limited. However, the Committee has provided the additional resources to the OIG to ensure that since FHA has grown so significantly, it is not taking on excessive risk, and has the necessary expertise to manage and oversee the increased volume.

TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

Appropriations, 2010	$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	20,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Transformation Initiative is the Department's effort to improve and streamline the systems and operations at HUD. Managed by the Office of Strategic Planning and Management, this initiative has four elements: (1) research, evaluation, and program metrics; (2) program demonstrations; (3) technical assistance and capacity building; and (4) information technology. Funding to support these activities is provided by transfer from HUD programs. In addition, the funding provided will support the administration's efforts to combat rescue fraud by investing in anti-fraud technologies and conducting education and outreach to counseling providers and consumers.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee includes a recommended level of funding of up to $228,731,000 for the Transformation Initiative. This level of funding includes an appropriation of $20,000,000 for efforts to combat mortgage fraud, which is equal to the President's request. In addition, up to $208,731,000 is included by transfer from other HUD accounts, to be available for 3 years.

In fiscal year 2010, the administration launched the Transformation Initiative [TI] to improve the operations and capacity of HUD. TI funds research, demonstrations and systems modernization to better equip HUD and to address the Nation's housing needs. In addition to improving HUD's own operations, TI also includes funding to improve the capacity and performance of its grantees through technical assistance.

While the Committee supports making these investments, it also believes that oversight of TI funding is critical. Therefore, the Committee has once again limited the flexibility to use these funds requested by HUD. As it did when funding was provided last year, the Committee is recommending minimum funding levels for IT modernization and technical assistance. The Committee is also requiring HUD to submit a plan for approval detailing how much funding will be transferred from each program and how that funding is intended to be used within 30 days of enactment of this act.

The Committee notes that for the second year in a row, the Department has submitted a request for the Transformation Initiative while providing limited information in the congressional justification on the specific projects and activities it will fund. The Committee has had to separately request this detailed information. For

fiscal year 2012, the Committee directs HUD to include detailed information in the budget on the activities it is seeking to fund within the TI account, the benefits of each activity, as well as the estimated cost.

Technology.—Of the amount provided, the Committee has set at least $80,000,000 aside for information technology investments. The Committee has placed the greatest priority on this activity because it is elemental to improving the operations of the Department and to protecting taxpayer dollars.

The Committee has focused particular attention on the modernization of FHA's IT systems and the Voucher Management System [VMS]. FHA processes and manages a portfolio of millions of mortgages for single-family homes, multi-family properties and healthcare facilities. It is critical that HUD have the technical capabilities to do automated underwriting, as well as track and analyze loan performance and participating lenders. Therefore, development of FHA IT systems that can better assess risk is critical.

An upgraded Voucher Management System [VMS] is also urgently needed. Public Housing Authorities [PHAs] input section 8 voucher data in VMS so that HUD can track their leasing and use of funds. However the system lacks the capabilities to accurately capture many of the variations in the program. Since the section 8 tenant-based rental assistance program is market-based program, it is dynamic and varies greatly by local market. HUD must develop the capabilities to conduct market level analysis in order to evaluate cost and use trends in the program.

While these investments are critical, they are also multi-year, multi-million dollar projects that require oversight to ensure that they deliver the capabilities needed while remaining on-time and on-budget. In fiscal year 2010, the Committee required HUD to produce a spend plan for its IT investments funded under TI, which the Government Accountability Office [GAO] was instructed to review. GAO's input in the process has been invaluable to the Committee. While the Committee awaits GAO's final briefing on the spend plan, it is clear that GAO's involvement in the process is helping to ensure that HUD is focused both on completing these projects, as well as on identifying and addressing potential risks. Therefore, the Committee is once again requiring HUD to develop a spend plan for its information technology projects. This plan should include the identification of projects to be undertaken, project goals and costs. In addition, the Committee directs the GAO to evaluate this plan, and monitor HUD's progress in achieving project goals and staying on time and on budget. This plan may also include additional IT system investments that will improve the efficiency of HUD programs.

Technical Assistance.—The Committee has provided at least $60,000,000 for technical assistance. The Committee supports the administration's effort to evaluate grant recipients and target them for additional oversight and technical assistance [TA]. The Committee also appreciates that HUD is refocusing its technical assistance on improving outcomes, and not just concentrating on timely execution of activities and funding. The Committee expects that HUD will spend at least $23,000,000 on the OneCPD: Integrated Practitioner Assistance System to deliver comprehensive TA to

HUD grantees. This assistance should support improving grantees' ability to achieve results using HUD funding, such as CDBG and HOME. In addition, the Joint Core Skills Certification proposal to provide grantees with core skills to administer HUD programs across Public and Indian Housing, Community Planning and Development, and Multifamily Housing will also help increase the capacity of HUD grantees. The Committee also directs HUD to work with the OIG to identify grantees that have capacity challenges and provide additional assistance to them to ensure that problems are resolved.

Among the technical assistance activities funded in fiscal year 2010 were section 3 training for HUD grant recipients to increase coordination to help low-income residents and local businesses successfully competed for HUD-funded contracts. In addition, HUD funded the Fair Housing Initiatives Program [FHIP] enforcement testing and training for FHA's business and industry. The Committee expects these activities to be funded in fiscal year 2011.

Research, Demonstrations, and Evaluations.—The Committee supports HUD's effort to fund important research that will result in more informed and data-driven housing policies. The Committee has provided the Secretary flexibility to determine how much funding will be allocated to research and how much will be allocated to demonstrations and evaluations. However, the Committee notes the TI plan that was approved reduced the number of research and demonstrations, and instead sought to fully-fund a more limited number of projects. The Committee still believes that HUD should focus its efforts and attention on fewer projects instead of trying to undertake too many initiatives at once.

In allocating funding, the Committee expects HUD to provide the funding to continue any projects not fully funded in fiscal year 2010. In addition, HUD should prioritize research designed to get better information and cost estimates for core programs, as well as for proposed projects such as Transforming Rental Assistance [TRA]. The Committee encourages HUD to seek outside expertise to improve it cost modeling for TRA.

HUD should use research funding to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the worst public housing. HUD is directed to report to the House and Senate Committee on Appropriations within 6 months of enactment on the location of this housing and its condition and provide a cost estimate for the repair of the worst or obsolete (where the cost to repair outstrips the cost to replace) public housing. The report should include an evaluation and viability of the various options available to these PHAs for the payment of these capital costs.

The Committee also supports HUD's plans to conduct a review of trouble PHA policies, and evaluate the homeless demonstration initiative funded within the tenant-based rental assistance program.

The foreclosure crisis continues to hit families and communities across the country. While at the beginning of the crisis most foreclosures were the result of subprime mortgages, today an increasing number are the result of unemployment. Today, States and communities are developing innovative approaches to addressing these issues. For example, in Connecticut they have developed a

program that combines foreclosure mitigation efforts with job training. The Committee encourages HUD to evaluate the effectiveness of these innovative approaches, and share ideas and best-practices with other communities.

Combating Mortgage Fraud Initiative.—In addition to amounts transferred into this account, the President has requested, and the Committee has included, and appropriation of $20,000,000 to support the Combating Mortgage Fraud Initiative. Activities for this effort supported by the transformation initiative include, but are not limited to, developing anti-fraud IT data tools and providing technical assistance to assist housing counseling agencies in combating fraud.

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 quarterly reports on all uncommitted, unobligated and excess funds associated with HUD programs.

SEC. 209. This section makes a number of corrections to the award of HOPWA funding.

SEC. 210. This section requires HUD to submit its fiscal year 2011 budget justifications according to congressional requirements.

SEC. 211. 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. 212. 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. 213. This section provides allocation requirements for Native Alaskans under the Native American Indian Housing Block Grant program.

SEC. 214. This section exempts GNMA from certain requirements of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 215. This section reforms certain section 8 rent calculations as to athletic scholarships.

SEC. 216. This section expands the availability of Home Equity Conversion Mortgages during fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 217. This section requires HUD to maintain section 8 assistance on HUD-held or owned multifamily housing.

SEC. 218. This section authorizes the Secretary to waive certain requirements on adjusted income for certain assisted living projects for counties in Michigan.

SEC. 219. This section requires HUD to report quarterly to the Appropriations Committees on the use of sole-source contracting by HUD.

SEC. 220. This section allows the recipient of a section 202 grant to establish a single-asset nonprofit entity to own the project and may lend the grant funds to such entity.

SEC. 221. This section clarifies the use of the 108 loan guaranteed program for nonentitlement communities.

SEC. 222. This section extends the HOPE VI program until September 30, 2011.

SEC. 223. This section allows public housing authorities with less than 400 units to be exempt from management requirements in the operating fund rule.

SEC. 224. This section restricts the Secretary from imposing any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits the use of capital funds for central office costs, up to the limit established in QWHRA.

SEC. 225. This section requires allotment holders to meet certain criteria of the CFO.

SEC. 226. This section requires the Secretary to report quarterly on the status of all project-based section 8 housing.

SEC. 227. This section limits attorney fees.

SEC. 228. The section modifies the NOFA process to include the Internet.

SEC. 229. This section would allow refinancing of certain section 202 loans.

SEC. 230. The section makes reforms to the Federal Surplus Property Program under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

SEC. 231. This section establishes reprogramming and reallocation requirements within HUD's salaries and expenses accounts.

SEC. 232. This section allows the Disaster Housing Assistance Programs to be considered a program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the purpose of income verification and matching.

SEC. 233. This section allows the Secretary to transfer funding from salaries and expenses accounts to the "Working Capital Fund" or the "Transformation Initiative" to support technology improvements.

SEC. 234. This section provides the Secretary with the authority to increase annual premiums on Federal Housing Administration [FHA] mortgage insurance by up to 1.5 percent.

SEC. 235. This section eliminates an unnecessary transfer from the Rental Housing Assistance Fund to the Flexible Subsidy Fund.

SEC. 236. This section extends the current FHA loan limits for high cost areas through fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 237. This section extends the current GSE loan limits for high cost areas through fiscal year 2011.

SEC. 238. This section extends the current HECM loan limits for high cost areas through fiscal year 2011.

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010	$7,300,000
Budget estimate, 2011	7,300,000
Committee recommendation	7,367,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Access Board (formerly known as the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance 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, and for medical diagnostic equipment under section 510 of the Rehabilitation Act. 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 $7,367,000 for the operations of the Access Board. This level of funding is $67,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and the President's fiscal year 2011 request.

Across all levels of government, Access Board is regarded as a leading source of information on accessible design, and as an effective coordinating body. The Committee encourages Access Board to continue to take a leadership role in developing standards of accessibility, and to further harmonize Federal and private requirements by identifying model codes and cooperating with other standards-setting organizations. The Committee provides $67,000 more

than the President's fiscal year 2010 request in order to provide the Access Board with sufficient resources to manage the expanded responsibilities described below.

Access Board has taken steps to contain some administrative costs, including making greater use of teleconferencing to reduce travel expenses, bringing IT support services in-house, and pursuing a reimbursable usage agreement for renting meeting space to another agency. The Committee supports these efforts and expects Access Board to continue to seek ways to reduce expenses.

Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.—With the passage of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act [PPACA], Access Board is charged with developing accessibility standards for medical diagnostic equipment within 24 months of the law's enactment. Previous standards, as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act, did not address medical diagnostic equipment, and consequently Access Board generally lacked such guideline-setting authority. The additional funding provided by the Committee will support the additional rulemaking requirements mandated by the PPACA. The Committee encourages Access Board to become a leader in developing state-of-the-art accessibility codes and standards for medical diagnostic equipment. Ultimately, ensuring that individuals with disabilities can physically access such equipment is fitting to the spirit and tenor of the PPACA's aims, and consistent with Access Board's mission.

Performance Metrics.—The Committee encourages Access Board to develop and improve its performance metrics and data collection capabilities. Accordingly, the agency should follow through on plans to transition from an inadequate and outdated database to a new, state-of-the-art system to ensure the usefulness of collected information. Bolstering the quality and utility of collected data will allow Access Board to create more meaningful metrics, and further improve its programs. The Committee expects Access Board to ensure that the new system is useful for collecting a wide range of data, and conducive to the development of sound and informative metrics for relevant programs.

Training and Technical Assistance.—Continuing the intensified rulemaking process initiated in fiscal year 2010, Access Board will issue four final rules and two new proposed rules in fiscal year 2011. This includes the new rule required by the PPACA. The Committee recognizes potential demand increases for training and technical assistance stemming from the new rules, particularly from new medical equipment accessibility guidelines. Access Board has a track record of providing timely and judicious guidance to agencies. In order to strengthen this capability, the Committee encourages the continued development of relevant training and technical assistance materials and tools.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010	$24,135,000
Budget estimate, 2011	25,498,000
Committee recommendation	25,498,000

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.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee includes $25,498,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 2011. This amount is $1,363,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010	$19,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	[1] 22,000,000
Committee recommendation	19,500,000

[1] The administration requested this funding as a grant from the Federal Railroad Administration.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Inspector General [OIG] for Amtrak was created by the Inspector General Act Amendment of 1988. The Act recognized Amtrak as a "designated Federal entity" and required the railroad to establish an independent and objective unit to conduct and supervise audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of Amtrak; to provide leadership and coordination and recommend policies for activities designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of Amtrak, and for activities designed to prevent and detect fraud and abuse in Amtrak operations; and to provide a means for keeping the Amtrak leadership and the Congress fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of Amtrak and the necessity for and progress of corrective action.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $19,500,000 for the Amtrak Office of Inspector General. This funding level is $2,500,000 less than the budget request and $500,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

Direct Appropriations to the Amtrak OIG.—Historically, the Amtrak OIG received its funding from Amtrak itself. Last year, how-

ever, animosity between the Amtrak OIG and the railroad cast doubt on Amtrak's willingness to act in good faith with its OIG, as well as the OIG's ability to offer unbiased oversight of Amtrak. As a result of this strife, the Committee provided appropriations directly to the Amtrak OIG for fiscal year 2010, asserting that the office can no longer be dependent on Amtrak for its funding. The Committee argued, "The budgets of these two entities must be separated in order to support an independent and objective OIG for the railroad."

The Committee continues to believe that the Amtrak OIG must have an independent source of funding. For fiscal year 2011, the Committee recommendation again provides the Amtrak OIG with direct appropriations in order to protect its role in monitoring Amtrak without bias. This policy is consistent with the funding recommendation for the Department of Transportation's OIG, which provides all of the resources for the OIG directly to that office rather than funding a portion of the OIG's activities through transfers and reimbursements from the agencies that the OIG oversees.

The administration has proposed to fund the Amtrak OIG with grants awarded by the Federal Railroad Administration. According to the administration, these grants would mirror the Federal grants that FRA awards to Amtrak. The Committee reminds the administration that awarding grants to Amtrak gives FRA a role in overseeing the railroad. In fact, FRA's responsibility to oversee Amtrak has grown in recent years. FRA, however, does not—and should not—assume a similar role for the Amtrak OIG. FRA advocates for specific policies related to Amtrak and railroads in general, and so it cannot monitor the Amtrak OIG absent a potential conflict of interest.

Amtrak OIG Staffing Levels.—The current IG for Amtrak accepted his position at a time when many publicly questioned whether the Amtrak OIG had the skills necessary to oversee the railroad. The Committee commends the IG for taking these concerns seriously, and for working to improve the OIG's reputation for objective and analytical work.

The Amtrak OIG also has submitted an ambitious budget request, seeking to increase its staffing levels by 10 FTE in fiscal year 2011. This budget request would result in an increase of 20 full time positions by fiscal year 2012. The Committee recognizes the importance of building a strong workforce for the Amtrak OIG, but notes that the office continues to experience a high level of staff turnover. The Committee therefore encourages the office to use its vacancies as an opportunity to hire staff with the necessary experience and expertise.

In addition, the Committee continues to include language that requires the Amtrak OIG to submit a budget request in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies in the Federal Government. The Committee first included this requirement last year, and for fiscal year 2011 the Amtrak OIG submitted documents that provide most of information the Committee required. The documents, however, do not delineate what part of the OIG request represents mandatory adjustments to the previous year's funding level, and what part represents funding for new activities. Such delineation is especially useful in evaluating requests

for additional staff members. The Committee directs the Amtrak OIG to include this information in the budget documents for its fiscal year 2012 budget request.

Reports Posted on the Web.—The Committee believes that the Amtrak OIG must conduct its work with a high level of transparency and accountability. Therefore, the Committee directs the Amtrak OIG to post all of its final reports on its Web site, and to maintain a Web site that is well organized and easy to navigate.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2010	$98,050,000
Budget estimate, 2011	100,400,000
Committee recommendation	104,300,000

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 $104,300,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board, which is $3,900,000 more than the budget request and $6,250,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level. The Committee has also continued to include language that allows NTSB to make payments on its lease for the NTSB training facility with funding provided in the bill.

Staffing Levels.—The Administration's budget request for the NTSB would have significant consequences for the agency. In order to accommodate its new board members and still live within funding level requested by the Administration, the NTSB would need

to slash its workforce by 13 FTE. The Committee does not consider such cuts to be acceptable.

The NTSB plays a unique and vital role in ensuring the safety of our Nation's transportation system. The board investigates every aviation accident and significant accidents in all other modes of transportation. The NTSB maintains a highly skilled workforce with the expertise necessary to investigate accidents, determine their probable causes, and extract important lessons so that future accidents may be prevented. In fulfilling its duties, the NTSB acts as an honest broker, offering unbiased analysis and safety recommendations.

Unfortunately, the NTSB experienced years of disinvestment. Between fiscal years 2003 and 2007, the staff of the NTSB dropped by a total of 50 FTE. For the past 3 years, however, the Committee placed a clear priority on rebuilding the NTSB workforce, and the Committee will not see its investment go to waste. For this reason, it has recommended a funding level that would protect the NTSB's current workforce as well provide an additional $1,177,000 to increase its staff by 11 FTE.

Maintenance of the NTSB Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation includes $800,000 for continued investment in the NTSB laboratory.

Last year, the Committee provided additional funds for the NTSB to modernize its data recorder laboratory. The Committee noted at the time that data recorders play an increasingly large role in determining the probable cause of an accident in all modes of transportation. The NTSB laboratory, however, had become outdated as the technology used in data recorders grew more sophisticated over the years. Too often, the NTSB had been forced to turn to agencies outside of the United States in order to perform data analysis that is essential to its own investigations.

After making this initial investment in modernizing its laboratory, the NTSB developed a 5-year plan for maintaining the currency of its technology. Consistent with this plan, the funding provided by the Committee recommendation will allow the NTSB to sustain its laboratory and keep its capabilities from being lost as technology continues to improve.

Reimbursements for the OIG.—For the past several years, the Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the NTSB to reimburse the Department of Transportation's OIG for the cost of auditing the NTSB's financial statements. In order to simplify the relationship between the OIG and the agencies that it audits, the Committee recommendation provides all funding for OIG activities directly to the OIG itself. The Committee has therefore lowered its funding recommendation for the NTSB by $100,000. This funding decrease will have no impact on the level of resources available to the board for its own activities.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2010	$233,000,000
Budget estimate, 2011	250,000,000
Committee recommendation	300,000,000

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 an appropriation of $300,000,000 for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation [NRC] for fiscal year 2011. This amount is $50,000,000 more than the budget request and $67,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted 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 2011 budget justification.

Housing Counseling Assistance.—The Committee has included $125,000,000 to continue the National Foreclosure Mitigation Counseling Program [NFMC] initiated by Congress in fiscal year 2008.

According to the most recent data from Lender Processing Services, more than 12 percent of U.S. mortgages are in default or foreclosure, with many more struggling to stay current on their payments. As a result, there continues to be a great need for housing counseling. NeighborWorks reported more than 3 times as much funding being requested by counseling agencies than was available in the last round of NFMC funding. The NFMC funding is being put to use across the country and is successfully helping troubled homeowners modify mortgages, reduce their monthly payments, and avoid foreclosure. A preliminary analysis of the program by the Urban Institute found that it was achieving its goals. According to this analysis, homeowners that were in foreclosure that sought help from an NFMC counselor were more than one-and-a-half times more likely to avoid foreclosure than homeowners who received no counseling.

The Committee supports NeighborWorks's effort to target funds not only to areas of greatest need, as required, but also to low-income and minority communities, since minorities have been affected disproportionately by the foreclosure crisis. The Committee will continue to track the use of these funds through the required

regular reporting by NeighborWorks, and looks forward to the complete study by the Urban Institute.

Mortgage Rescue Scams.—Of the amount provided for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, $3,000,000 shall be available to continue its outreach and education campaign to combat mortgage rescue scams. Congress initially funded these efforts in fiscal year 2009, and with these funds NeighborWorks launched a multi-language anti-rescue scam public education campaign in October 2009. The campaign includes public service announcements, fliers, and a Web site that assists people in finding help, as well as to report scams. The Committee expects the funding provided in fiscal year 2011 will be used to maintain the loanscamalert.org Web site, and continue outreach and education activities in target communities.

NeighborWorks is also part of a national coalition called the Anti-Fraud Campaign Coordination Committee, which includes partners such as HUD, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, and State Attorneys General. Since outreach and education will be strengthened by strong enforcement action, it is important that the coalition includes partners that can use their authority to catch and punish those perpetrating loan scams. The Committee expects NeighborWorks to continue its work with these groups, and to consider adapting its messages to incorporate an enforcement component, while ensuring a clear, consistent message.

Capital Assistance To Create or Sustain Affordable Housing.—The Committee has included an additional $35,000,000 for capital grants to assist NeighborWorks organizations in lacquering or rehabilitating affordable housing, as well as creating financing or lending tools. The Committee has included this additional funding in order to assist communities that have been adversely impacted by the foreclosure crisis and the economic recession.

With the additional funding provided in fiscal year 2010, NeighborWorks grantees in nearly every State received an award. These grants will enable organizations to take advantage of the supply of affordable housing, as well as low-cost financing, to acquire and rehabilitate properties. In the process, grantees expect to create more than 1,100 local jobs. The Committee expects that the funding provided in fiscal year 2011 will allow additional grantees to create more, needed affordable housing, particularly in smaller and rural communities.

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, 2010	$2,450,000
Budget estimate, 2011	2,680,000
Committee recommendation	2,680,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness is an independent agency created by the McKinney-Vento Homeless As-

sistance 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 $2,680,000 for the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness [ICH]. This amount is $230,000 more than the fiscal year 2010 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

In June 2010, the Interagency Council on Homelessness released Opening Doors: The Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness. This plan includes goals for ending homelessness in America, including: finishing the job of ending chronic homelessness in 5 years; preventing and ending homelessness among Veterans in 5 years; preventing and ending homelessness for families, youth and children in 10 years; and setting a path to ending all types of homelessness. The Committee is pleased that the ICH put forward a plan that included specific goals, as well as objectives and strategies for achieving them. This is the first step to achieving these ambitious goals. Implementation of the plan will be both more important and challenging. It will require the effort of various Federal agencies, as well as State and local governments and the private sector. Since the plan was developed with input from all of these partners, a good foundation for collaboration has been set.

The ICH has also demonstrated a clear understanding of its role to improve communication and collaboration among Federal agencies—a role that was minimized for far too long. The effect of better collaboration can be seen in the results of the partnership between HUD and the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA]. As HUD has shared its knowledge of the Housing First approach to housing the chronically homeless, as well as homeless prevention models, these strategies are now being incorporated into VA homeless programs. This Federal collaboration should be replicated across the Federal Government to address the needs of those experiencing homelessness comprehensively.

Importantly, Federal Departments are assigned leadership roles for each of the 10 objectives included in the plan. By assigning responsibilities, each of the Federal partners now has ownership of the plan. This is a good start, and the Committee expects that in future reports, the strategies and objectives will be refined further so that there are clear targets and benchmarks to measure progress in reaching the plan's goals.

Preventing Veterans' Homelessness.—The ICH is encouraged to work with the Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs and HUD, as well as other Federal and local agencies, regard-

ing the risks of homelessness to newly discharged military veterans. This is a critical point in time to make homeless prevention programs available and to provide positive intervention to newly discharged veterans to prevent or limit the risk of homelessness, now or in the future, and help create positive outcomes. In many cases, veterans often face a higher risk of homelessness, as well as other significant problems, such as post traumatic stress syndrome at the time of discharge. As a result, the Committee believes the ICH and its Federal and State and local partners should focus on addressing the needs of veterans at the time of discharge to the maximum extent possible or feasible.

Workforce Training.—Preventing and ending homelessness isn't simply about housing; it is about addressing the underlying problems that cause people to become homeless. This includes providing help to address mental illness, physical disabilities, and substance addiction. It also involves addressing inadequate income. Yet, many low-income and homeless persons have difficulty accessing the job training services that will assist them in gaining self-sufficiency. The Committee sees an opportunity for the ICH to assist in expanding opportunities for homeless persons by improving the relationships between Workforce Investment Boards [WIB], public housing authorities [PHA], and homeless service providers involved in HUD's Continuum of Care. These entities all have a role in assisting low-income and homeless persons, and better coordination on the local level will result in improved outcomes for those most in need. The Committee directs the ICH to identify ways in which these relationships can be improved, and to conduct joint trainings with WIBs, PHAs and members of homeless Continuums of Care in order to share best practices and build relationships among these different groups.

Department of Education's Role in Ending Homelessness.—Education plays a critical role in shaping a child's future; for low-income and homeless children, it can be the key to breaking the cycle of poverty. Therefore, any effort to prevent and end homelessness for children must include the Department of Education [ED]. As part of Opening Doors, ED shares responsibility for 4 of the 10 objectives. The Committee would like to see additional detail about the actions that ED will take in order make the goal of ending homelessness among children in 10 years a reality. The Committee expects ICH to provide greater detail on the specific actions that ED is taking as part of this effort in the next annual update of the strategic plan to end homelessness.

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 prohibits 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.

Section 414 prohibits funds for first-class airline accommodation in contravention of section 301–10.122 and 301–10.123 of title 41 CFR.

Section 415 prohibits funds from being used to purchase light bulbs for an office building unless, to the extent practicable, the light bulb has an Energy Star or Federal Energy Management Program designation.

Section 416 prohibits funds from being used to establish, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any prohibition or restriction on occupancy preference for veterans in HUD facilities located/leased on VA property.

Section 417 prohibits funds in this act or any prior act for going to the group ACORN or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, or allied organizations.

Section 418 requires the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide through each department's Web site a disclosure of all primary information for each program that is equal to or exceeds $100,000,000 in its annual budget. The primary information is first required once all applications for a program are received by a department, and includes a summary of each application as well as grantee information. Once awards are made, a department is then required to post on its Web site the successful grantees, grant amounts, selection criteria and program goals. This information is expected to provide the public with needed transparency on grant information and assist with program information and credibility. These requirements are not intended to overburden Government with unnecessary work to the detriment of a program but instead to provide the American people with insights that will allow a candid and frank understanding of how taxpayer money is spent for the overall benefit of the Nation.

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 2011:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration:
- Operations
- Facilities and Equipment
- Research, Engineering, and Development
- Grants-in-Aid for Airports

Federal Highway Administration:
- Federal-aid Highways

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration:
- Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs
- Motor Carrier Safety Grants

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration:
- Operations and Research
- National Driver Register
- National Driver Register Modernization
- Highway Traffic Safety Grants

Federal Transit Administration:
- Administrative Expenses
- Formula and Bus Grants
- Research and University Research Centers
- Capital Investment Grants
- Grants for Energy Efficiency and Greenhouse Gas Reduction

Maritime Administration:
- Operations and Training
- Ship Disposal
- Maritime Security
- Title XI

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration:
- Administration Expenses
- Pipeline Safety

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
- Choice Neighborhoods

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

Self Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity:
- Capacity Building
- Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program
- National Housing Development Corporation
- Housing for the Elderly
- Housing for Persons with Disabilities
- Energy Innovation Fund

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

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

National Transportation Safety Board

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(c), RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 22, 2010, theCommittee ordered reported en bloc an original bill (S. 3636) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending

September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; an original bill (S. 3635) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; and an original bill (S. 3644) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; with each subject to amendment and subject to the Committee spending guidance, and authorized the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee to offer the text of the Senate-reported bill as a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to the House companion measure, by a recorded vote of 17–12, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Inouye	Mr. Cochran
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Bond
Mr. Harkin	Mr. McConnell
Ms. Mikulski	Mr. Shelby
Mr. Kohl	Mr. Gregg
Mrs. Murray	Mr. Bennett
Mr. Dorgan	Mrs. Hutchison
Mrs. Feinstein	Mr. Brownback
Mr. Durbin	Mr. Alexander
Mr. Johnson	Ms. Collins
Ms. Landrieu	Mr. Voinovich
Mr. Reed	Ms. Murkowski
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Pryor	
Mr. Tester	
Mr. Specter	

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 12—BANKS AND BANKING

CHAPTER 13—NATIONAL HOUSING

§ 1709. Insurance of mortgages

(a) Authorization

* * * * * * *

(c) Premium charges

(1) * * *
(2) * * *
(A) * * *

[(B) In addition to the premium under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall establish and collect annual premium payments in an amount not exceeding 0.50 percent of the remaining insured principal balance (excluding the portion of the remaining balance attributable to the premium collected under subparagraph (A) and without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments) for the following periods:]

(B) In addition to the premium under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may establish and collect annual premium payments in an amount not exceeding 1.50 percent of the remaining insured principal balance (excluding the portion of the remaining balance attributable to the premium collected under subparagraph (A) and without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments). The Secretary, by publication of a notice in the Federal Register, may establish or change the amount of the premium under subparagraph (A) or the annual premium, and the period of the mortgage term for which an annual premium amount shall apply.

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 2010.] *fiscal year 2011.*

* * * * * * *

(o) Sunset

No assistance may be provided under this section after [September 30, 2010.] *September 30, 2011.*

McKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT, 1986, PUBLIC LAW 100–77

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, 2010] *October 1, 2012.*

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005, PUBLIC LAW 108–447

DIVISION I—DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

HOUSING PROGRAMS

[FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND]

[(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)]

[From the Rental Housing Assistance Fund, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 2004, and any collections made during fiscal year 2005 and all subsequent fiscal years, shall be transferred to the Flexible Subsidy Fund, as authorized by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended.]

SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS, 2005, PUBLIC LAW 109–59

SEC. 1702. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Subject to section 117 of title 23, United States Code, the amount listed for each high priority project in the following table shall be available (from amounts made available by section 1101(a)(16) of this Act) for fiscal years 2005 through 2009 to carry out each such project:

Highway Projects
High Priority Projects

No.	State	Project Description	Amount
1	CA	Construct safe access to streets for bicyclists and pedestrians including crosswalks, sidewalks and traffic calming measures, Covina	$400,000

Highway Projects
High Priority Projects—Continued

No.	State	Project Description	Amount
*	*	* * *	* *
54	IA	[Study of a direct link to I–80, Pella] *Study of a direct link to 1–80 and Iowa Highway 92, in proximity to Pella*	$400,000
*	*	* * *	* *
249	WA	[Complete preliminary engineering and environmental analysis for SR 14 through Camas and Washougal] *Complete preliminary engineering, environmental and construction for SR 14 through Camas and Washougal*	$1,500,000
*	*	* * *	* *
[374	NJ	Reconstruct Route 168 from Route 41 to 6th Avenue in Runnemede	$526,400]
*	*	* * *	* *
382	MI	Construct Road Improvements to North Henry St. from Vermont Ave. to Wilder Rd. Bay City	[$2,160,000] *$20,446,640*
*	*	* * *	* *
400	AK	[Unalaska, AK Construction of AMHW ferry terminal including approach, staging, and upland improvements] *Road, sidewalk, and drainage constuction and improvements, City of Unalaska*	$7,500,000
*	*	* * *	* *
549	FL	Construct Flagler Avenue Improvements, City of Key West, Florida	$808,000
*	*	* * *	* *
744	WA	[Widen I–5 through Lewis County] *I–5 Frontage Road and I–5 Interchange Improvements in Lewis County*	$3,750,000
*	*	* * *	* *
1399	NM	[I–40/Munoz Reconstruction in the City of Gallup] *I–40 Frontage Road Reconstruction in the City of Gallup*	$1,200,000
*	*	* * *	* *
1934	WA	I–90 Two-Way Transit-HOV Project *(to include the Montgomery Outer Loop)*	$3,200,000

Highway Projects
High Priority Projects—Continued

No.	State	Project Description	Amount
*	*	* * *	* *
2406	TX	Construct U.S. Business 287 through the Trinity Uptown Project from 7th St. NE to 11th St. NE [in Fort Worth] *, or construct SH 199 (Henderson St.) through the Trinity Uptown Project between the West Fork and Clear Fork of the Trinity River, in Fort Worth*	$6,400,000
*	*	* * *	* *
2827	WA	[Construct SR 9 Pedestrian Overpass in Arlington] *State Route 9/Crown Ridge Blvd. Improvements*	$880,000
*	*	* * *	* *
3557	WA	[Improve Mill Plain Blvd. between SE 172nd and SE 192nd in Vancouver] *Extend 18th Street between 87th Avenue and NE 192nd Avenue in Vancouver*	$1,250,000
*	*	* * *	* *
3730	AL	Preliminary Engineering, Design, ROW Acquisition and Construction of the I–85 Extension *(to include the Montgomery Outer Loop)*	$50,000,000
*	*	* * *	* *
[4892	SD	Construction of 4-lane highway on U.S. 79 between Maverick Junction, and the Nebraska border	$27,000,000]
*	*	* * *	* *
4924	SD	South Dakota Department of Transportation; for those projects it has identified as its highest priorities	[$3,450,000] *$6,149,733.82*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1934. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsections (a) and (b) is as follows:

Transportation Improvements

No.	State	Project Description	Amount
105.	IA	[Study of Direct Link to I–80, Pella (HP: 54)] *Study of a direct link to 1–80 and Iowa Highway 92, in proximity to Pella*	$110,000

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 3044. PROJECTS FOR BUS AND BUS-RELATED FACILITIES AND CLEAN FUELS GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) PROJECTS.—Of the amounts made available to carry out section 5309(m)(2)(C) of title 49, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009, the Secretary shall make funds available for the following projects in not less than the amounts specified for the fiscal year:

Project Description	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09
1. Glendale, CA Purchase of CNG Buses for Glendale Beeline Transit System	$88,833	$92,696	$100,420	$104,283
* * *	*	*	*	*
160. [Kearney, Nebraska—RYDE Transit Bus Maintenance and Storage Facility] *Nebraska Statewide Vehicles, Facilities and Related Equipment*	$384,560	$401,280	$434,720	$451,440
* * *	*	*	*	*
422. [C Street Expanded bus facility and intermodal parking garage, Anchorage, AK] *Anchorage People Mover transit needs, Anchorage, AK.* ...	$1,150,000	$1,200,000	$1,300,000	$1,350,000
* * *	*	*	*	*
586. [Nebraska Department of Roads/Bus Maintenance and Storage Facility for RYDE in Kearney, NE] *Nebraska Department of Roads—Statewide Vehicles, Facilities and Related Equipment*	$458,000	$476,000	$517,000	$549,000

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3046. ALLOCATIONS FOR NATIONAL RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.— * * *

(1) PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION NATIONAL SECURITY STUDY.—* * *

* * * * * * *

(22) GREATER NEW HAVEN TRANSIT DISTRICT [FUEL CELL-POWERED BUS] *HYDROGEN-POWERED TRANSIT* RESEARCH.—$500,000 in fiscal year 2006, $540,000 in fiscal year 2007, $550,000 in fiscal year 2008, and $625,000 in fiscal year 2009 for the Greater New Haven Transit District [Fuel Cell-Powered Bus] *Hydrogen-Powered Transit* Research.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006, PUBLIC LAW 109–115

DIVISION A—TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

[FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND]

[(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)]

[From the Rental Housing Assistance Fund, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 2005, and any collections made during fiscal year 2006 and all subsequent fiscal years, shall be transferred to the Flexible Subsidy Fund, as authorized by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended.]

SAFETEA–LU TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2008 (PUBLIC LAW 110–244)

TITLE I—HIGHWAY PROVISIONS

SEC. 105. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) * * *

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(13) in item number 576 by striking the project description and inserting "[Design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of Nebraska Highway 35 between Norfolk and South Sioux City, including an interchange at Milepost 1 on I-129]*Design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of Nebraska Highway 35 between Norfolk and South Sioux City and for design, right-*

of-way acquisition and construction of an interchange east of Dakota Avenue on I–129";

* * * * * * *

(289) in item number 4507 by striking the project descriptionand inserting "**[**Design, right-of-way acquisition, andconstruction of Highway 35 between Norfolk and South SiouxCity, including an interchange at milepost 1 on U.S. I-129**]***Design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of Nebraska Highway 35 between Norfolk and south Sioux City and for design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of an interchange east of Dakota Avenue on I–129*";

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 guidance [1]	Amount of bill	Committee guidance [1]	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee spending guidance to its subcommittees for 2011: Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies:				
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Discretionary	67,950	67,900	NA	[2] 135,781
Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2011	.....	.....	.....	[3] 48,796
2012	.....	.....	.....	36,053
2013	.....	.....	.....	15,622
2014	.....	.....	.....	7,021
2015 and future years	.....	.....	.....	8,705
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2011	NA	35,670	NA	31,133

[1] There is no section 302(a) allocation to the Committee for fiscal year 2011.
[2] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[3] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

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.

As defined in Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the term "congressional directed spending item" 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 item, a Member is required to provide a certification that neither the Member nor the Senator's immediate family has a pecuniary interest in such congressionally directed spending item. Such certifications are available to the public on the website of the Senate Committee on Appropriations (www.appropriations.Senate.gov/Senators.cfm).

Following is a list of congressionally directed spending items included in the Senate recommendation discussed in this report, along with the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the Committee of jurisdiction for each item so identified. Neither the Committee recommendation nor this report contains any limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits as defined in rule XLIV.

PRESIDENTIALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Agency	Account	Project	Amount
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Access to Region's Core [ARC] Tunnel, NJ	$200,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Austin, MetroRapid BRT, TX	$24,229,796
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project , MN	$42,345,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Dallas, Northwest/Southeast LRT MOS, TX	$91,249,717
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Dulles Corridor Rail Project, VA	$96,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Fort Collins, Mason Corridor BRT, CO	$5,128,989
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project, HI	$55,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Houston, North Corridor LRT, TX	$75,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Houston, Southeast Corridor LRT, TX	$75,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	King County, West Seattle BRT, WA	$21,274,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	New Britain-Hartford Busway, CT	$42,345,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	New York City, Nostrand Ave BRT, NY	$26,723,039
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	New York, Long Island Rail Road East Side Access, NY	$202,315,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase I, NY	$185,548,262
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Oakland, East Bay BRT, CA	$15,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Orlando, Central Florida Commuter Rail Transit—Initial Operating Settlement, FL.	$34,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Perris Valley Line, Riverside, CA	$23,490,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	RTD FasTracks East Corridor, Denver, CO	$40,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	RTD FasTracks Gold Corridor, Denver, CO	$40,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	RTD FasTracks West Corridor, Denver, CO	$37,808,439
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Salt Lake City, Mid Jordan LRT, UT	$100,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Salt Lake City, Weber County to Salt Lake City Commuter Rail, UT	$80,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	San Bernardino, E Street Corridor sbX BRT, CA	$40,114,830
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	San Francisco Muni Third St. Light Rail, Central Subway Project, CA	$20,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	San Francisco, Van Ness Avenue BRT, CA	$14,115,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Seattle, University Link LRT Extension, WA	$110,000,000
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	VelociRFTA Bus Rapid Transit, CO	$24,163,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary [OST].	Transportation, Planning, and Development [TPR&D].	I–81 Corridor Coalition, PA	$700,000	Senators Specter, Casey
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary [OST].	Transportation, Planning, and Development [TPR&D].	PSRC Sustainable Transportation and Growth Modeling Demonstration Project, King County, WA.	$750,000	Senator Murray
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary [OST].	Transportation, Planning, and Development [TPR&D].	International Mobility and Trade Corridor Project, Whatcom County, WA.	$750,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary [OST].	Transportation, Planning, and Development [TPR&D].	Aviation Futures Alliance Employment, Export and Industry Growth Analysis, WA.	$500,000	Senator Murray
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary [OST].	Transportation, Planning, and Development [TPR&D].	Missouri River Freight Corridor Development Study, MO	$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Air Cargo Apron Expansion, International Intermodal Center, Huntsville-Madison County Airport, AL.	$500,000	Senator Shelby
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Airport Runway Extension at Middle Georgia Regional Airport, Macon, GA.	$1,400,000	Senators Isakson, Chambliss
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Augusta Airport Runway Reconstruction and Safety Area Improvements, Augusta, ME.	$1,000,000	Senators Snowe, Collins
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Devils Lake Regional Airport Authority, ND	$1,000,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Expansion of Tunica Airport Commercial Terminal, MS	$1,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Grand Forks International Airport, ND	$2,500,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Gulfport-Biloxi Regional Airport, Taxiway ''J'' North, MS	$2,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Jackson-Evers International Airport Essential Airfield Improvements, MS.	$2,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Lanett Municipal Airport Runway Construction, Lanett, AL	$1,500,000	Senator Shelby
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Lawrence Smith Memorial Airport, MO	$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Macon-Fowler Memorial Airport, MO	$1,600,000	Senator Bond
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Memphis Airport Runway Seismic Retrofit, TN	$1,000,000	Senator Alexander
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Metropolitan Topeka Airport Authority Hangar Restoration	$400,000	Senator Brownback
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	New Richmond Regional Airport, WI	$1,000,000	Senator Kohl
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Provo Municipal Airport Development, Provo City, UT	$2,000,000	Senators Hatch, Bennett
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Quincy Airport, IL	$600,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Rapid City Regional Airport Terminal Expansion, SD	$500,000	Senator Thune
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Reno Stead Emergency Operations Center, NV	$500,000	Senator Reid
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Tuscaloosa Regional Airport, Extension of Taxiway B and the Environmental Assessment for Runway 4–22, Tuscaloosa, AL.	$500,000	Senator Sessions
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Warsaw Municipal Airport, MO	$1,500,000	Senator Bond
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	West Virginia Statewide Airport Activities, West Virginia	$1,000,000	Senator Rockefeller

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	AIP—Airport Improvement Program	Wittman Regional Airport, WI	$800,000	Senator Kohl
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	F&E—Facilities and Equipment	Honolulu International Airport Runway Warning Status Lights, HI	$1,000,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	F&E—Facilities and Equipment	Weather Camera Installation Program, HI	$1,000,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	RED—Research, Engineering, and Development	Advanced Materials in Transport Aircraft Structures, University of Washington, WA.	$750,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	RED—Research, Engineering, and Development	Alaska Aviation Safety Project, AK	$1,000,000	Senator Murkowski
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	RED—Research, Engineering, and Development	Composite Airframe Maintenance and Airworthiness Education and Training, NIAR (WSU), KS.	$500,000	Senators Roberts, Brownback
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	RED—Research, Engineering, and Development	NIAR Advanced Materials Research, KS	$500,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Terminal Air Traffic Facilities	Greenwood-Leflore Airport Control Tower, MS	$250,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Terminal Air Traffic Facilities	Lihue Airport Tower Replacement, HI	$1,500,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Delta Regional Transportation Development Program.	Highway 82 Improvements, MS	$2,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Delta Regional Transportation Development Program.	Interchange of Business 67 and Oakgrove, MO	$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Delta Regional Transportation Development Program.	Interstate-55 Interchange, MO	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Delta Regional Transportation Development Program.	Lake Harbour Drive Extension, MS	$1,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Delta Regional Transportation Development Program.	US–412 Bypass Center Turn Lane, MO	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Delta Regional Transportation Development Program.	Washington Street Bridge, MS	$1,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FB—Ferry Boats and Terminal Facilities	Keller Ferry Replacement Project, Lincoln and Ferry Counties, WA	$2,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FB—Ferry Boats and Terminal Facilities	Port Lions City Dock and Ferry Terminal Replacement, AK	$2,000,000	Senator Murkowski
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FB—Ferry Boats and Terminal Facilities	Port Townsend Passenger Only Ferry, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FB—Ferry Boats and Terminal Facilities	Washington State Ferries System Investments, WA	$2,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	BIA 25, Spirit Lake Nation, ND	$1,000,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Boulder City Bypass Improvement, NV	$1,000,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	BRAC-related improvements in Anne Arundel County, MD	$2,200,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	BRAC-related improvements in Montgomery County, MD	$2,200,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	BRAC-related improvements in Prince George's County, MD	$2,200,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	BRAC-related improvements, Harford County, MD	$2,200,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Columbia Pike Realignment, Arlington, VA	$400,000	Senators Warner, Webb
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Elwha Valley Road Improvements, WA	$1,300,000	Senator Murray

Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Federal Lands Improvement Project, HI	$4,000,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	FH–24, Banks to Lowman, ID	$1,500,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Ghost Hawk Road Improvements (BIA Route 7 to SD Hwy 18), SD	$150,000	Senators Thune, Johnson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	I–15 Corridors of the Future, NV	$800,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Improvements and 4 R Work to SD 73 in Jackson County, SD	$1,000,000	Senator Thune
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	NM 4 Jemez Pueblo Bypass, NM	$1,000,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Onville Road Upgrades, VA	$400,000	Senators Webb, Warner
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Pikes Peak-America's Mountain, Colorado Springs, CO	$500,000	Senator Mark Udall
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Pyramid Highway Corridor, Sparks, NV	$2,000,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	SR 160 from I–15 to Pahrump, NV	$1,000,000	Senators Ensign, Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	Standing Rock Sioux Tribe—Community Streets Project, Old Bear Soldier, SD.	$750,000	Senator Johnson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	US 50–CO 194 Road Construction, Bent County, CO	$1,400,000	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	US 15 at Monocacy Boulevard in Frederick County, MD	$500,000	Senator Mikulski
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FL—Federal Lands (Public Lands Highways)	US–20 Sisters Downtown Improvements, Salem, OR	$1,500,000	Senators Merkley, Wyden
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Augusta North Connections—Exit 113, ME	$4,000,000	Senators Collins, Snowe
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Columbia River Crossing, OR	$750,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Columbia River Crossing, WA	$2,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	East Belgrade I–90 Interchange, MT	$750,000	Senator Baucus, Tester
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Exit 120 Reconstruction, NV	$1,500,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–10 Grand Prairie Highway (La Hwy 98) Interchange and Frontage Road, LA.	$400,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–10 Pecue Lane Interchange, Baton Rouge, LA	$750,000	Senators Vitter, Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–15 Helena Custer Avenue Interchange and Montana Rail Link Overpass Structures, MT.	$1,000,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–280 Mission Bay Off-Ramp and Improvements, CA	$1,500,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–29/I–229 Bridges and Interstate Mainline Reconstruction from Near Tea Exit to North of 69th Street and East to Louise Avenue, SD.	$750,000	Senators Thune, Johnson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–5 North Stockton Widening and HOV Lane Project, CA	$1,000,000	Senator Boxer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–5 Ridgefield Interchange Replacement Project, City of Ridgefield, WA.	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–5 West Coast Green Highway, WA	$1,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–75/ Everglades Project Development and Environment Study, FL	$1,000,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–84, West of Wendell to Juniper Rest Area Pavement Rehabilitation, ID.	$1,000,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–84/184, Caldwell to Glenns Ferry, Pavement Rehabilitation, ID	$750,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–85 Widening in Davidson and Rowan Counties, NC	$1,000,000	Senator Burr

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–95 Pawtucket River Bridge Replacement, RI	$3,000,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–95/SR1 Interchange Project, DE	$1,000,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	I–95/US Hwy. 301 Interchange Improvement Project, SC	$500,000	Senator Graham
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Interchange at State Hwy. 89 and I–40 in Lonoke, AR	$1,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Interstate 280 Interchange Improvements, Harrison, NJ	$1,500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Interstate 430/630—Interchange Modification, AR	$3,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Interstate 69/Great River Bridge: Highway 65-MS Highway 1, AR	$1,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Interstate 74 Corridor Project, Bettendorf, IA	$3,000,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Interstate 81 Improvements in Washington County, MD	$500,000	Senator Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Interstate-95/Fairfax County Parkway Interchange at Newington Road, VA.	$1,000,000	Senators Warner, Webb
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Kapolei Interchange Complex Phase 2, HI	$1,500,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	Starr Road Interchange, NV	$2,000,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	IM—Interstate Maintenance Discretionary	US 84, El Camino East/West Corridor, AL	$1,000,000	Senator Sessions
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Burlington Waterfront North Improvemets, VT	$500,000	Senator Leahy
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	7th Street Gateway Enhancement Project, NJ	$500,000	Senators Menendez, Lautenberg
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	9th Street Safety Improvements Project, Pierce County, WA	$700,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	A1A/State Road 200, FL	$750,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Access Road for Hospital in St. Bernard Parish, LA	$2,500,000	Senator Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Airport Road Repair and Resurface and Construction of Western Entrance to Bryan Field, Starksville, MS.	$800,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Ann Arbor-Detroit Regional Rail Project, MI	$2,000,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Appalachian Development Highway System Corridor H, WV	$2,000,000	Senator Rockefeller
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Ash Avenue Extension, Macon County, IL	$400,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Assembly Square Station, MA	$860,000	Senator Kerry
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Autumn Street Parkway, San Jose, CA	$800,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Bench Boulevard Improvements, Billings, MT	$1,000,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Bloomfield Six Points Intersection Streetscape, Bloomfield, NJ	$500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Brady/Harrison Sustainability Corridor, Davenport, IA	$600,000	Senator Harkin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus Streetscape and Infrastructure Improvements, NY.	$1,000,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Carson City Freeway Phase II, NV	$500,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Center at Horseheads Access Project, Chemung County, NY	$750,000	Senator Schumer

Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Central Business District Streetscape, City of Milan, MO	$800,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	City of Detroit Dequindre Cut Greenway, Phase II, MI	$1,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	City of Harlingen North Rail Relocation, TX	$1,000,000	Senator Hutchison
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	City of Monroe Fourth Street Underpass Project, Monroe, LA	$800,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Congress Street Bridge, Bridgeport, CT	$1,200,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	ConnectVermont, VT	$1,000,000	Senator Leahy
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Crosby Street Reconstruction Project, Hornell, NY	$500,000	Senators Schumer, Gillibrand
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Defense Facility Access Road, West Point, MS	$750,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Denali Commission Transportation Program, AK	$800,000	Senator Begich
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Denali Commission, AK only for the Anaktuvuk Pass Bridge Replacement, Scammon Bay Community Streets, Alakanuk Community Streets and King Salmon & Naknek School Bus Road, AK.	$1,000,000	Senators Murkowski, Begich
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Division Street Corridor Improvements, Spokane, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Downtown Farmingdale Revitalization Master Plan, NY	$100,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Downtown Infrastructure Project, Somersworth, NH	$300,000	Senator Shaheen
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Downtown Streetscape, City of Custer, SD	$400,000	Senator Johnson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Downtown Streetscape, Yankton, SD	$300,000	Senator Johnson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	East Brandon By-Pass, Brandon, MS	$2,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	East Metropolitan Corridor, Brandon, MS	$2,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	East Mississippi Intermodal Rail Corridor, MS	$1,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Embarcadero Goods Movement Project, Oakland, CA	$2,000,000	Senator Boxer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Fairbanks Rail Line Relocation, AK	$1,000,000	Senator Murkowski
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Faulkner Lake Road Improvements, AR	$500,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Fort Campbell KY–911 Road Widening Project from US–41A to Oak Grove, Christian County, KY.	$3,000,000	Senators McConnell, Bunning
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Fort Knox Access Road, Hardin County, KY	$1,600,000	Senators McConnell, Bunning
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Fortification Street Improvements, Jackson, MS	$2,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Freight Rail Modernization: Improving the Freight Rail and Transfer Facility at the Hunts Point Terminal Produce Market, South Bronx, NY.	$500,000	Senator Gillibrand
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Grace Avenue Safety Improvements, City of Battle Ground, WA	$1,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Grand Technology Gateway—Phase 1, West Des Moines, IA	$500,000	Senator Harkin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Greensboro Downtown Greenway, Greensboro, NC	$300,000	Senator Hagan
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Hattiesburg Longleaf Trace Rails To Trails, Hattiesburg, MS	$500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Hendersonville Area Infrastructure Improvements, Hendersonville, NC.	$250,000	Senators Hagan
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	High Street/Route 89 Reconstruction, Caribou, ME	$1,000,000	Senator Collins
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 112 Improvement, AR	$500,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 14 Project, Owatonna to Dodge Center, MN	$250,000	Senators Klobuchar, Franken
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 226: Highway 67 to Highway 49, Little Rock, AR	$1,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 47 Bridge Replacement, MO	$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 6, Batesville, MS	$500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 7 Sidewalk Infill, City of Blue Springs, MO	$800,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 93 and Kalispell Bypass, MT	$600,000	Senator Baucus
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 965 Project, Phase 2, North Liberty, IA	$500,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Highway 98 Access Improvements, Lamar County, MS	$1,750,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Holly Springs Road, DeSoto County, MS	$2,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Horsehoe Bend Parkway Extension, MO	$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	I–15 Corridor: Devore Interchange Improvements, San Bernardino, CA.	$1,500,000	Senators Boxer, Feinstein
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	I–15 MP 8, Bicycle/Pedestrian Passageway, City of St. George, UT	$500,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	I–40 Realignment Ingress/Egress Project, Oklahoma City, OK	$750,000	Senator Inhofe
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	I–49 between I–40 and US Hwy. 71 South, Little Rock, AR	$2,500,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Icicle Station—Phase II, City of Leavenworth, WA	$900,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Illinois pedestrian and bicycling road and trail improvements and enhancements, IL.	$2,500,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Indian River Inlet Bridge, Dover, DE	$800,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Intallation of the Sterling Highway/Birch Street Traffic Signal Light, Soldatna, AK.	$400,000	Senator Begich
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Interchange CSAH7/TH23, Lyon County, MN	$1,000,000	Senators Klobuchar, Franken
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Interstate 44 and Range Line Road Interchange, MO	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Interstate 44 Crossroads Interchange Study, City of Joplin, MO	$250,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Interstate 64 and 22nd St. Interchange Reconfiguration, MO	$1,500,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Iowa Highway 14–57 Complete Streets Corridor Improvements, Parkersburg, IA.	$750,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Jordan Valley Gateway Plaza Streetscape, City of Springfield, MO	$600,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Khrushchev in Iowa Trail, Guthrie County, IA	$400,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	LA 1 Project Phase II Design-Golden Meadow, Leeville, LA	$500,000	Senators Vitter, Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Lafayette Interchange, MO	$1,500,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Lake St. Clair Shoreline Trail, Harrison Township, MI	$1,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Lewis and Clark Legacy Trail, ND	$600,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad

Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Lone Elm Road Improvements, City of Olathe, KS	$750,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Lower Hill Infrastructure Project, PA	$600,000	Senators Specter, Casey
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Lower Main Street Infrastructure Project, Claremont, NH	$500,000	Senator Shaheen
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Maritime Fire and Safety Administration, WA	$500,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Martin Road Expansion from Zierdt Road West to Laracy Drive, AL	$10,000,000	Senator Shelby
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	MD 404 improvements in Caroline, Talbot and Queen Anne's Counties, MD.	$600,000	Senator Mikulski
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Memorial Boulevard Improvements, Picayune, MS	$1,450,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	MLK Blvd Grade Separation Safety Improvements, Yakama, WA	$1,300,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	MO–740—East Columbia Transportation Extension, MO	$1,500,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Monongalia Health Systems, Morgantown, WV	$1,000,000	Senator Rockefeller
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Monte Vista Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad Grade Separation Project, CA.	$700,000	Senator Boxer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Naugatuck River Greenway/Waterbury Segment, CT	$750,000	Senators Lieberman, Dodd
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	NC 12, Dare County, NC	$750,000	Senators Hagan, Burr
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Nevada Pacific Parkway Extension, Fernley, NV	$500,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	New Bedford Fast Track Freight Bridges, MA	$1,000,000	Senator Kerry
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	New York Ave. from 32nd to 48th St, Union City, NJ	$500,000	Senators Menendez, Lautenberg
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	New York State Route 12, Chenango County, NY	$450,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Newport Cliff Walk Restoration, RI	$1,000,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	North 5th Street Arterial, NV	$2,000,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	North Manhattan Avenue Widening, Manhattan, KS	$750,000	Senator Brownback
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Northern Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation, Boston, MA	$1,000,000	Senator Kerry
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Northern Nevada Traffic Management, NV	$500,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Northside Drive Corridor, Clinton, MS	$2,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Ogdensburg-Prescott International Bridge Rehabilitation Project, NY.	$750,000	Senators Schumer, Gillibrand
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Paducah Waterfront Development Project, KY	$1,000,000	Senator McConnell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Port of Anchorage Intermodal Expansion Project, AK	$1,000,000	Senator Murkowski
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Port of Pasco Rail Infrastructure Construction, WA	$1,400,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Quincy Center Redevelopment, Quincy, MA	$400,000	Senator Kerry
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Rail and Infrastructure Improvements in Northern Maine	$3,000,000	Senator Collins
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Rail Infrastructure Investments, Port of Grays Harbor, WA	$2,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Rail Infrastructure Investments, Port of Moses Lake, WA	$2,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Raleigh Street Extension, Martinsburg, WV	$1,000,000	Senator Rockefeller
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Reconstruction of Hunter Street Bridge, County of Gloucester, NJ	$1,000,000	Senators Menendez, Lautenberg
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Red Mountain Transportation Improvements, Benton County, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Regional Planning Commission, St. Tammany Parish LA 21 Widening, New Orleans, LA.	$1,300,000	Senator Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Rehabilitation of the Ashford Avenue Bridge, Westchester County, NY.	$750,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Rickenbacker Pickaway East-West Connector, OH	$500,000	Senators Voinovich, Sherrod Brown
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Riverside Freeway (State Route 91) Congestion Relief Project, Orange County, CA.	$1,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Route 1/Route 123 Interchange Improvements, VA	$400,000	Senators Warner, Webb
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Route 160 Bridge over I–44, MO	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Route 54 Corridor, MO	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Sellwood Bridge Replacement Project, OR	$500,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Shelby Intermodal Hub, Shelby, MT	$2,000,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	South Dakota Highway 100 right-of-way and construction Sioux Falls, SD.	$1,200,000	Senator Johnson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Southeast Connector, Des Moines, IA	$2,000,000	Senator Harkin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Southpark Bridge Replacement Project, King County, WA	$3,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Southridge Transportation Improvements, City of Kennewick, WA	$500,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Sparks Rail Yard Relocation Study, City of Sparks, NV	$200,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	SR 6247 Section 000 Valley View Business Park Access Road, Lackawanna County, PA.	$750,000	Senators Casey, Specter
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	SR24, Love Creek to SR1, Dover, DE	$500,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	SR–522 Corridor Improvements, City of Kenmore, WA	$600,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	St. John's Heritage Parkway Interchanges, FL	$1,500,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Stamford Pedestrian Safety Improvements, CT	$500,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Stamford Street Underpass Reconstruction, Stamford, CT	$1,000,000	Senators Lieberman, Dodd
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	State Route 19 from State Route 492 to Philadelphia, MS	$1,750,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	State Route 794 Realignment, Springfield, OH	$750,000	Senators Sherrod Brown, Voinovich
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Stonewall Jackson State Park, WV	$500,000	Senator Rockefeller
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Sunport Boulevard Extension, Bernalillo County, NM	$1,700,000	Senators Bingaman, Udall
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	TH 5/Oak Avenue Pedestrian Underpass, City of Waconia, MN	$400,000	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	TH 610 from CSAH 81 to I–94, MN	$250,000	Senators Klobuchar, Franken
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Town of Bristol Road and Drainage Improvements, RI	$350,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse

Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Transportation Infrastructure to serve the Kansas Logistics Park, Newton, KS.	$500,000	Senator Roberts
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Trunk Highway 13 & County State Aid Highway 5 Interchange, MN	$250,000	Senators Klobuchar, Franken
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US 113 improvements in Worcester County, MD	$600,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US 12 Safety Improvements, Walla Walla County, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US 2 and Sultan Basin Road Safety Improvements, Sultan, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US 287 Business Route, Fort Worth, TX	$3,500,000	Senator Hutchison
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US Route 322 Corridor Safety Improvements, PA	$500,000	Senators Specter, Casey
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US Route 422/Sanatoga Interchange, PA	$700,000	Senators Specter, Casey
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Umatilla Depot Rail Switches Replacement Project, Umatilla County, OR.	$400,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Urban Collector Road Project, Jackson County, MS	$2,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US 52 Interchange & Overpass, relocate Goodhue County 24 at Cannon Falls, MN.	$400,000	Senators Franken, Klobuchar
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US 93 Corridor, MT	$1,000,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US Highway 30, Whiteside County, IL	$500,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	US Highway 63/Future Interstate 555 Interchange Improvements, Little Rock, AR.	$2,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Vancouver Waterfront Access Improvement Project, WA	$2,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Vermont Downtown Streetscape and Sidewalk Improvements in Johnson, Ludlow, Northfield, Springfield, and Townshend, VT.	$3,250,000	Senator Leahy
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Village West Access Improvements, KS	$400,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Warrensville/Van Aken Transit Oriented Development, Shaker Heights, OH.	$500,000	Senators Voinovich, Sherrod Brown
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	West College Street Improvements, Bozeman, MT	$750,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	West Virginia Route 10, Logan County, WV	$1,500,000	Senator Rockefeller
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Surface Transportation Investments	Wilmington to Newark Commuter Rail Improvement Program, DE	$1,300,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Alice's Road/105th Street Interchange and Connecting Roads, Waukee, IA.	$900,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Bellingham Waterfront Transportation Improvements, Bellingham, WA.	$700,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Brookstown Redevelopment Project, Winston-Salem, NC	$1,000,000	Senators Burr, Hagan
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Centennial Trail Expansion, Snohomish County, WA	$375,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Center Point Greenway and Pedestrian Walkway Project, AL	$500,000	Senator Sessions

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Cregg Lane/Wyoming Street Connector, MT	$1,825,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Cushman Trail Project, Pierce County, WA	$525,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Denver Bike Sharing, Denver, CO	$500,000	Senator Mark Udall
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Downtown Streetscape Improvements, City of Pine Bluff, AR	$1,100,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana Downtown Greenway, LA	$250,000	Senator Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Environmental Improvement and Cost Savings Pavement Study, SC	$350,000	Senator Graham
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Essex County Riverfront Park, Newark, NJ	$1,000,000	Senator Menendez
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Fountain Avenue Rehabilitation and Veteran's Bridge Connectivity, Springfield, OH.	$350,000	Senator Sherrod Brown
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Highway 212 Expansion—Carver County, MN	$400,000	Senators Franken, Klobuchar
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	I–49 North, LA	$1,000,000	Senators Vitter, Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	I–55 Business Loop to Memorial Hospital, City of Lincoln, IL	$2,000,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	John N. Hardee Expressway, SC	$1,000,000	Senator Graham
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Loop 82 Railroad Overpass, San Marcos, TX	$1,500,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Medford Safe Sidewalks, Medford, OR	$300,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Midtown Revitalization Transportation Infrastructure, Rochester, NY	$2,000,000	Senators Schumer, Gillibrand
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Piedmont Triad Research Park Transportation Improvements, NC	$500,000	Senator Burr
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Qwuloolt Access Trail Project, Marysville, WA	$500,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Reconstruction of the Hudson River Waterfront Walkway, Hoboken, NJ.	$1,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez

Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Rivers Edge Roadway Infrastructure and Streetscape Initiative, MI	$1,300,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Saddle Road Improvement Project, HI	$2,000,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Shoulder Widening and Paving of SC Highway 22, SC	$1,000,000	Senator Graham
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Southern Nevada Beltway Interchanges, NV	$1,000,000	Senators Ensign, Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	State Road 133 from Albany to Valdosta, GA	$1,000,000	Senator Chambliss
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	SW 27th Street—Strander Connection Project, Renton, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	Tacoma Downtown Streetscape Improvements, Tacoma, WA	$500,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	US Highway 97 & J Street Project, Madres, OR	$750,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	TCSP—Transportation & Community & System Preservation.	West Ninth Avenue Extension and Overpass Construction, Belton, TX.	$750,000	Senator Cornyn
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Research and Development	San Diego—Positive Train Control, CA	$1,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	Research and Development	High-Speed Rail from Orlando to Miami, FL	$500,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Research and Development	PEERS Rail-Grade Crossing Safety, Statewide, IL	$500,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Research and Development	RR Whistle Free Zone Project, Goodview and Minnesota City, MN	$400,000	Senators Klobuchar, Franken
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Research and Development	Metrolink—Positive Train Control, CA	$1,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis	Innovation in Transportation Infrastructure Systems Planning, College of Staten Island, NY.	$450,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis	JTA Commuter Rail Alternative Analysis, Jacksonville, FL	$1,200,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis	Las Cruces to El Paso Transportation Corridor, NM	$1,000,000	Senators Tom Udall, Bingaman
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis	Mountain View Corridor Transit, UT	$1,000,000	Senators Bennet, Hatch
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis	North Main Line Rehabilitation Project, Chicago Transit Authority, IL.	$500,000	Senator Burris, Durbin
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis	Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement/Preliminary Engineering, Atlanta, GA.	$1,000,000	Senators Chambliss, Isaakson
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	1st Congressional District Buses and Bus Facilities, MI	$1,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	ACE Boulder Highway System, NV	$1,000,000	Senator Reid
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Ben Franklin Transit Vehicle Replacements, Benton and Franklin Counties, WA.	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Brookings Area Transit Authority Bus Storage and Transit Operations Facility, SD.	$1,000,000	Senator Johnson

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Bus and Bus Facilities, Santa Fe, NM	$500,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Bus and Bus Facilities, UT	$8,000,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Bus Maintenance Facility, Sacramento, CA	$1,800,000	Senator Boxer
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Bus Purchases, DE	$1,000,000	Senator Carper
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Bus Replacement, Kansas City, MO	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Bus Turnouts for Downtown Las Vegas Roads, NV	$750,000	Senator Reid
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Cedar Avenue Bus Rapid Transitway, MN	$500,000	Senators Klobuchar, Franken
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	City of Janesville Transit Services Center, WI	$3,065,000	Senator Kohl
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Clallam Transit Maintenance Facility Improvements, Clallam County, WA.	$200,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Coach Bus for Commuter Campus, Campbell County, KY	$690,000	Senator Bunning
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Community Transit Vehicle Replacements, Snohomish County, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	C–TRAN 4th Plain BRT, Clark County, WA	$1,500,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Deerfield Valley Transit Association Facilities, Buses, and Equipment, VT.	$2,500,000	Senator Leahy
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Dubuque Intermodal Facility, IA	$400,000	Senator Harkin
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Everett Transit Vehicle Replacements, Snohomish County, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Glassboro/Rowan Local Transit System, NJ	$500,000	Senators Menendez, Lautenberg
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Grant County Transit Vehicle Replacement and Facilities Construction, Grant County, WA.	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Harrison County Multimodal Project, MS	$2,250,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Idaho Transit Coalition Bus and Bus Facilities, ID	$1,500,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Illinois Bus and Bus Facilities, IL	$4,000,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Innovation Station, East Lansing, MI	$2,500,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Intercity Transit Vehicle Replacements, Thurston County, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	JATRAN Fleet Replacement and Bus Shelters, MS	$600,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Jefferson Transit Vehicle Replacements, Jefferson County, WA	$400,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Kitsap County Vehicle Replacements, WA	$500,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Link Transit Vehicle Replacements, Chelan and Douglas Counties, WA.	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Longview Transit Vehicle Replacements, Clark County, WA	$650,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Maine Statewide Bus Replacement, ME	$1,000,000	Senators Snowe, Collins
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	MARTA Bus, Bus Facilities and Security Improvements, GA	$2,000,000	Senator Isakson

Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Metro Area Transit—Bus and Bus Facilities, Omaha, NE	$1,500,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Moultrie Intermodal Facility, City of Moultrie, GA	$400,000	Senator Chambliss
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Naugatuck Transportation Facility, CT	$500,000	Senators Lieberman, Dodd
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	North Central Regional Transit District Pueblo Buses, NM	$800,000	Senators Tom Udall, Bingaman
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	North Dakota Statewide Capital Transit, ND	$1,500,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Oxford-University Transit System Bus Purchase, MS	$400,000	Senator Cochran, Wicker
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Pierce Transit Clean-Fuel Bus Replacements, Pierce County, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Reconstruction of the Mayfield Road Rapid Transit Station and Bridge, OH.	$2,000,000	Senators Voinovich, Sherrod Brown
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Replacement Buses at Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky [TANK], Kenton County, KY.	$1,000,000	Senator Bunning
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Replacement of the Fixed Route Fleet, Springfield, MO	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Rural Bus Program for Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, HI	$3,500,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Senior Transportation Program, AL	$500,000	Senator Shelby
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Skagit Transit Vehicle Replacements, Skagit County, WA	$500,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	South Burlington Transit Center, VT	$1,000,000	Senator Leahy
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Southest Missouri Transportation Service Facility, MO	$800,000	Senator Bond
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Spokane Transit paratransit Vehicles, Spokane County, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities Fund, IA	$2,500,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, MO	$4,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, NM	$1,000,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus Purchases and Facility Improvements, CO	$2,500,000	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Statler Intermodal Facility, Buffalo, Erie County, NY	$3,000,000	Senators Schumer, Gillibrand
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Tacoma Intermodal Transit Center, Tacoma, WA	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Tennessee Statewide Bus Program, TN	$12,000,000	Senator Alexander
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	TRANSPO Paratransit Replacement Vehicles, IN	$352,000	Senator Lugar
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Twin Transit Vehicle Replacements, Lewis County, WA	$500,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	Washoe County Bus Facilities, NV	$500,000	Senator Reid
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus and Bus Facilities	White Earth Tribal Transit Service Bus Garage Facility, MN	$500,000	Senators Franken, Klobuchar
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Access to Region's Core [ARC] Tunnel, NJ	$200,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Austin, MetroRapid BRT, TX	$24,229,796	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Baltimore Red Line, MD	$1,500,000	Senators Cardin, Mikulski
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project , MN	$42,345,000	Senators Franken, Klobuchar

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Chicago Tansit Authority—Green Line—South Branches Project, IL	$2,200,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	City of Charlotte, Charlotte Area Transit System's Blue Line Extension—Northeast Corridor Project, NC.	$3,700,000	Senators Burr, Hagan
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Columbia River Crossing, WA	$40,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor, CA	$1,250,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Dallas, Northwest/Southeast LRT MOS, TX	$91,249,717	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Downtown Connector/Westside Subway Extension, CA	$6,500,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Draper Light Rail, UT	$2,100,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Dulles Corridor Rail Project, VA	$96,000,000	Senators Warner, Webb
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project, HI	$55,000,000	Senators Inouye, Akaka
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Houston, North Corridor LRT, TX	$75,000,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Houston, Southeast Corridor LRT, TX	$75,000,000	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	King County, West Seattle BRT, WA	$21,274,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	New Britain-Hartford Busway, CT	$42,345,000	Senators Lieberman, Dodd
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	New York, Long Island Rail Road East Side Access, NY	$202,315,000	Senator Gillibrand
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	New York, Second Avenue Subway Phase I, NY	$185,548,262	Senator Gillibrand
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Northstar Phase II Project—Extension of Northstar Commuter Rail to the St. Cloud Area, MN.	$1,500,000	Senators Franken, Klobuchar
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Oakland, East Bay BRT, CA	$15,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Perris Valley Line, Riverside, CA	$23,490,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Purple Line, MD	$1,500,000	Senators Cardin, Mikulski
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	RTD FasTracks East Corridor, Denver, CO	$40,000,000	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	RTD FasTracks Gold Corridor, Denver, CO	$40,000,000	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	RTD FasTracks West Corridor, Denver, CO	$37,808,439	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Salt Lake City, Mid Jordan LRT, UT	$100,000,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Salt Lake City, Weber County to Salt Lake City Commuter Rail, UT	$80,000,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	San Francisco Muni Third St. Light Rail, Central Subway Project, CA.	$20,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Seattle, University Link LRT Extension, WA	$110,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Tampa Light Rail, Preliminary Engineering, FL	$1,000,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	VelociRFTA Bus Rapid Transit, CO	$24,163,000	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall

Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Capital Investment Grants	Virgina Railway Express Rolling Stock, VA	$1,000,000	Senators Warner, Webb

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Allegheny County, PA	For infrastructure improvements around the Allegheny Ludlum site in order to spur economic growth and create jobs.	$600,000	Senator Casey
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Allen Place Center, Tacoma, WA	For facility improvements at a community center in a low income neighborhood.	$1,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Appalachia Service Project, TN	For free home repair to low-income families in Southern West Virginia.	$400,000	Senator Rockefeller
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Arkansas State University-Mountain Home, MH, AR.	For construction of the Vada Sheid Community Development Center.	$500,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Associated Early Care and Education, MA.	For the construction of a child and family development center.	$500,000	Senator Kerry
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Big Brothers Big Sisters of Northern Ohio, Columbus, OH.	For renovations of the facilities at Camp Oty'Okwa.	$300,000	Senator Sherrod Brown
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Big Sky Economic Development Authority, Billings, MT.	For infrastructure and land acquisition in East Billings.	$500,000	Senator Tester, Baucus
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Board of Directors of St. Louis Municipal Library, MO.	To renovate the historic St. Louis Central Library including compliance with ADA requirements in MO.	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Bolivar County, MS	For the restoration of the historic Bolivar County First Judicial District Courthouse.	$350,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Bonnie Brae, Liberty Corner, NJ	For the renovation of cottages that service New Jersey's at risk children and youth.	$200,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Booneville, MS	For the Booneville Hardware Building Restoration Project.	$425,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Boys & Girls Club of Carbon County, Red Lodge, MT.	For renovations and expansion	$350,000	Senator Tester
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Boys and Girls Club of Wagner, SD	For repairs and upgrades to the Boys and Girls Club facility.	$200,000	Senator Johnson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Boys and Girls Club, Bellevue, WA	For facilities improvements and expansion at community centers for youth.	$500,000	Senator Murray

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Boys and Girls Club, Spokane, WA	For facilities acquisition, improvements and expansion for a community center for youth.	$775,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Builders Development Corporation, KS	For the Central Baptist Redevelopment Project in Kansas City, Kansas.	$800,000	Senator Brownback
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Center for Veterans Issues, Ltd., Milwaukee, WI.	For the construction of supportive housing for veterans.	$400,000	Senator Kohl
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Chippewa Cree Tribe, Box Elder, MT	For renovations and safety upgrades of a tribal TANF building.	$200,000	Senator Tester
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Albany, NY	For the rehabilitation of a building in a neighborhood targeted for revitalization.	$500,000	Senator Schumer
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Anderson, IN	For the Flagship Enterprise Center Certified Technology Park Buildings Project for infrastructure and laboratory equipment for hybrid electric vehicle technologies and related technologies.	$650,000	Senator Lugar
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Bangor, ME	For event and meeting space infrastructure at the Bangor Regional Arena and Meeting Complex.	$1,000,000	Senators Collins, Snowe
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Bend, OR	For design and construction of new research and development facility.	$200,000	Senators Merkley, Wyden
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Brewer, ME	For the development of a riverfront trail system as part of the West Bayside Neighborhood Development Project.	$700,000	Senators Snowe, Collins
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Bristol, CT	To acquire blighted property and renovate facilities to create an industrial park.	$500,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Chicopee, MA	For the construction of a community and senior center.	$350,000	Senator Kerry
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Coffman Cove, AK	For the construction of an elevated concrete dock with related improvements.	$300,000	Senators Murkowski, Begich
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Columbus, MS	For the Columbus Riverwalk Lighting Extension project.	$300,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Council Bluffs, IA	For demolition of facilities located near 1st Avenue in Council Bluffs for the purpose of improving the West Broadway Corridor.	$400,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Covington, LA	For the acquisition of facilities in Covington, LA to be used for community services and economic development.	$1,000,000	Senator Landrieu
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of East Hartford, CT	For the repair and upgrade of crucial public infrastructure in and around North Meadows Industrial Park.	$500,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Flint, MI	For the upgrade of energy efficiency and services at an economic and community development center which provides economic and community development.	$700,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Grants Pass, OR	For the acquisition and renovation of a community center.	$500,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Grenada, MS	For the Taylor Hall Renovation Project	$250,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Gretna, LA	For planning and construction of a new Senior Center to meet the demands of the elderly population.	$500,000	Senator Landrieu
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Hattiesburg, MS	For redevelopment of the Hattiesburg East Jerusalem Municipal Center Complex including acquisition of equipment.	$600,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Hyattsville, MD	For the rehabilitation of an existing structure to a mixed-use, community meeting facility.	$250,000	Senator Cardin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Inkster, MI	For construction of a senior wellness center.	$1,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Jackson, MS	For the renovation of youth-oriented public facilities.	$500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Kingstree, SC	For the Kingtree Train Depot Renovation Project including meeting ADA compliance.	$200,000	Senator Graham
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Lacey, WA	For expansion of a community facility providing services for seniors.	$500,000	Senator Murray

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Lancaster, PA	For renovation of buildings and streetscaping as part of the revitalization of the City's Market District.	$800,000	Senator Casey
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Las Cruces, NM	For expansion of a central kitchen and associated equipment to provide home meal delivery services to seniors.	$400,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Las Vegas, NV	For construction of low-income elderly housing.	$1,000,000	Senator Reid
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Linton, ND	For housing and commercial redevelopment.	$700,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Madison, WI	For construction of a public market for regionally grown and produced products.	$200,000	Senator Kohl
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Marshalltown, IA	For the removal of blight and related housing development requirements for the Grant Park Redevelopment Project.	$700,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Memphis, TN	For improvements to the Pigeon Harbor Industrial Park.	$1,300,000	Senator Alexander
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Milan, MO	To renovate the historic Sullivan County Building including enhancing safety, spurring economic development and for streetscape investments.	$250,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of New Orleans, LA	For the Federal City Urban Redevelopment Project.	$500,000	Senator Vitter, Landrieu
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Pascagoula, MS	For construction of a Beach Park Promenade in Pascagoula, MS.	$900,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Peoria, IL	For revitalization efforts on Peoria's Southside.	$200,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Piedmont, OK	For the Elevated Water Storage Tower project for water storage and water line installations.	$700,000	Senator Inhofe
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Rockford, IL	For land acquisition, demolition, and infrastructure improvements.	$500,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Ruleville, MS	For the development of a walking trail	$125,000	Senator Cochran

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Springfield, IL	For construction of a new building for a Crisis Nursery in Springfield.	$200,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Springfield, MA	For improvements to public buildings in downtown Springfield.	$350,000	Senator Kerry
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Springfield, MO	For improvements to the Commercial Club Building including making it ADA compliant.	$750,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Springfield, OH	For the redevelopment of an industrial Brownfield site.	$750,000	Senators Voinovich, Sherrod Brown
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of West Warwick, RI	For planning and community development, including the acquisition and rehabilitation of property and the improvement of public infrastructure.	$500,000	Senator Reed
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Wilkes-Barre, PA	For the planning, design and renovations in a downtown business district.	$200,000	Senator Specter
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Winsted, CT	For renovations and streetscape enhancements in the downtown business district.	$200,000	Senator Lieberman
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Woonsocket, RI	For site demolition and environmental remediation to accommodate a public drinking water facility.	$600,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Clearfield City, UT	For Clearfield City Downtown Development Project West Phase 1 & 2 for the city to acquire blighted properties.	$100,000	Senators Hatch, Bennett
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Clyde Malone Community Center, Lincoln, NE.	For the expansion and renovation of the Malone Center facilities.	$500,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Commission on Economic Opportunity for the Greater Capital Region, Troy, NY.	For construction of community building to serve as a child care and family resource center for low to moderate income individuals.	$250,000	Senator Schumer
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Community Foundation of NJ, Newark, NJ.	For facility renovations to the Essex County Family Justice Center.	$500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Copper River Native Association, Glenallen, AK.	For the construction of a health and multi-use facility serving tribal members medical and basic health service needs.	$500,000	Senator Begich
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	County of Santa Barbara, CA	For repairs and renovations to the Lompoc Veterans Building Renovation.	$450,000	Senator Boxer

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Covenant House Alaska, Anchorage, AK	For construction of a new facility for Covenant House, a center providing immediate and long-term needs of homeless youth in Alaska.	$500,000	Senators Murkowski, Begich
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Fort Thompson, SD.	For construction of a new community facility in Fort Thompson, SD to serve low-income tribal members.	$300,000	Senator Johnson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	CRSA Wounded Warrior Care Project, Augusta, GA.	For the Wounded Warrior Transitional Housing Project.	$2,100,000	Senator Isakson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Dayton, OH	For Improved Solutions for Urban Systems, Inc to renovate workshops and laboratories using LEED Standards and renewable energy technology.	$250,000	Senator Voinovich
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Delta City, UT	For improvements and construction related to the Delta City Learning and Community Center.	$500,000	Senator Bennett
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Denton, TX	For the Denton Downtown Improvement Project to upgrade the streets and streetscape.	$500,000	Senator Cornyn
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Department of Community Services Housing Authority, Charles County, MD.	For the installation and/or repair of indoor plumbing for the poor.	$300,000	Senator Mikulski, Cardin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Domestic Violence Services of Snohomish County, Everett, WA.	For expansion and rehabilitation of a domestic violence facility.	$500,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Easter Seals Hawaii, HI	For the construction and renovation of building space to provide programs and services for children and adults with disabilities.	$300,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Enosburg Falls Economic Development Corporation, Enosburg Falls, VT.	For improvements to an industrial park	$200,000	Senator Sanders
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Eritrean Association, Seattle, WA	For facility improvements and expansion of a community center.	$600,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Family Crisis Center, Inc., Farmington, NM.	For expansion of the existing Family Crisis Center.	$643,500	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Family Service Association of San Antonio, TX.	For facility repairs to the Family Service Center.	$1,000,000	Senator Hutchison

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Fargo Housing & Redevelopment Authority, Fargo, ND.	For rehabilitation of low-income housing.	$700,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Federal Way Chamber of Commerce, Federal Way, WA.	For acquisition and facility improvements of a regional small business incubator.	$1,200,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	First Best Place, Columbia Falls, MT	For construction of a community center ..	$1,000,000	Senator Baucus
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	First Steps Primeros Pasos, Georgetown, DE.	For construction and start up costs for a bilingual early care and education facility.	$175,000	Senators Kaufman, Carper
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Food Self-Reliance, The Kohala Center, HI.	For equipment purchase to make infrastructure improvements to increase economic development opportunities, for low and moderate income farmers in rural communities.	$250,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Forgotten Harvest, Oak Park, MI	For facilities improvements, equipment, and service fleet.	$542,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Franklin County, MS	For restoration of the Historic Franklin County Courthouse.	$175,000	Senator Cochran
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Friends of Buena Library, Buena, WA	For construction of a community center in a high poverty area.	$400,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Gaston County, NC	To create a Gastonia Technology Park in Gaston County, NC.	$760,000	Senator Burr
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Grace Hill Settlement House, St. Louis, MO.	To renovate housing for low-income working families at the College Hill Community Redevelopment Project.	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Grand Rapids Downtown Development Authority, MI.	For the construction of a mixed-use facility for use as a farmers market in a distressed urban area.	$700,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Great Falls Development Authority, Great Falls, MT.	For infrastructure improvements for development of an industrial park.	$800,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Great Rivers Greenway, St. Louis, MO	For the removal of blight and related redevelopment concerns at the St. Louis Regional Greenways project.	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Hancock County, KY	For expansion of the Owensboro Community Technical College—Hancock County Extension Campus for local training programs.	$300,000	Senator Bunning

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Hanover Township, Washington County, PA.	For construction and excavation in Hanover Township, Washington County, PA to new business to distressed community.	$200,000	Senator Casey
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Harriet Tubman Center, Maplewood, MN	For the renovation of a building in order to consolidate youth and family services, and relocate two domestic violence shelters.	$600,000	Senator Franken
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Hocking Co. Community Improvement Corporation, Logan, OH.	To construct an incubator/light manufacturing building.	$750,000	Senator Voinovich
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Heritage Services, Omaha, NE	For construction of facility that will accommodate an education and interactive learning center.	$800,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Housing Vermont, Burlington, VT	For expansions and improvements to low income housing.	$500,000	Senator Sanders
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	IA Dept. of Economic Development, Des Moines, IA.	For the restoration and rehabilitation of buildings, re-introduce upper floor housing, and add economic value in Iowa's historic Main Street districts.	$1,000,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Ivins, UT	For the Old Town Ivins Street Improvements Project including safety concerns.	$100,000	Senators Hatch, Bennett
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Jackson Medical Mall, Jackson, MS	For the expansion of the Jackson Medical Mall Development Project.	$600,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Jefferson County Dept of Human Services, CO.	For a facility for Jefferson County Department of Human Services in Colorado to provide housing for homeless veterans.	$600,000	Senator Mark Udall
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Jewish Family Service, Seattle, WA	For improvements and expansion of a facility providing family and community services.	$800,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Jewish Vocational Service, MO	To renovate the facility for the Jewish Vocational Service and to provide equipment and furnishings.	$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	John Hope Settlement House, Providence, RI.	For facility upgrades and energy retrofits.	$200,000	Senator Reed

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Kauai Economic Development Board, Kauai, HI.	For the rehabilitation and improvement of an abandoned facility, to provide employment training for low and moderate income agricultural workers.	$300,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Keene Family YMCA, Keene, NH	For the construction of a new Keene YMCA allowing for the expansion childcare and other services.	$300,000	Senator Shaheen
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Kentucky Blood Center, Somerset, KY	For construction of a Kentucky Blood Center Building.	$1,000,000	Senator McConnell
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Laiopua 2020, Kailua-Kona, HI	For planning, design, and construction of the Laiopua 2020 Community Center.	$300,000	Senator Akaka
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Logan, UT	For the Logan Northwest Park Project to continue an ongoing park project.	$200,000	Senators Hatch, Bennett
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Longview Housing Authority, Longview, WA.	For acquisition and improvements of a facility to serve as a regional center for Veterans.	$675,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule, SD.	For the Domestic Violence Building Project.	$400,000	Senators Thune, Johnson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Luke-Dorf, Inc., Portland, OR	For the construction of a Behavioral Healthcare Housing Facility, with medically-monitored treatment, for individuals.	$300,000	Senators Merkley, Wyden
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Mandell Jewish Community Center, West Hartford, CT.	For community facilities renovations and improvements.	$700,000	Senator Dodd
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	MARC Community Services Corporation, Wyandotte County, KS.	To acquire and renovate vacant and abandoned properties as part of the NeighborhoodsNOW Redevelopment Plan in Wyandotte County, Kansas.	$400,000	Senator Brownback
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Maui Economic Development Board, HI ...	For equipment purchase and construction to support business incubation and economic development for Molokai cooperatives.	$250,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Milwaukee Department of City Development, Milwaukee, WI.	For the preservation and improvement of affordable housing.	$400,000	Senator Kohl
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Missouri Institute for Biotechnology and Innovation, Cole County, MO.	To renovate and equip the historic Missouri Institute for Biotechnology and Innovation in Cole County, Missouri.	$1,000,000	Senator Bond

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Molokai Habitat for Humanity, HI	For construction and rehabilitation of low and very low income housing using the Molokai Habitat for Humanity self help housing model.	$400,000	Senators Inouye, Akaka
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	New Hampshire Community Loan Fund, Concord, NH.	For support for Community Loan Fund programs for the New Hampshire Community Loan Fund.	$500,000	Senators Gregg, Shaheen
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	North Carolina Research Campus, Kannapolis, NC.	For the High Speed Optical Networking at NCRC.	$500,000	Senator Burr
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Northeast Iowa Food Bank, Waterloo, IA	For construction of a new facility to serve as a food warehouse and distribution center for northeast Iowa.	$300,000	Senator Harkin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Northern Hills Alliance for Children, Deadwood, SD.	For Childcare Center building modifications.	$550,000	Senator Johnson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Nye County, Pahrump, NV	For the construction and expansion of a senior center.	$200,000	Senator Reid
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Ocean Community YMCA Westerly, RI	For construction of a drop-off area for children.	$250,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Opportunity Resources, Inc., Missoula, MT.	For facility improvements for an employment and service organization for the disabled.	$200,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Our City Reading, Inc., PA	For the planning, design, renovation, and construction of housing.	$200,000	Senator Specter
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Parents and Children Together, HI	For renovation and equipment purchase to expand the Community Technology Center at Kuhio Park Terrace.	$300,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Pickaway County, OH	For construction of an economic development center.	$600,000	Senator Sherrod Brown
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Pillar Community Development Corp., Bloomfield, CT.	For the construction of a community wellness center.	$200,000	Senator Lieberman
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Port of Lewiston, ID	For expansion of the container dock	$850,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Puerto Rican Action Board, New Brunswick, NJ.	For the repair of facilities that assist low-income families with foreclosure mitigation and other economic independence initiatives.	$260,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Regional Economic Development, Inc, Columbia, MO.	For renovations and equipment for a small business incubator at the Enterprise Center.	$425,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Regional Foodbank, Akron-Canton, OH	For energy conservation improvements for the food bank facility.	$250,000	Senators Voinovich and Sherrod Brown
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	River Ridge Dev. Authority, Jeffersonville, IN.	For the development of housing as part of the River Ridge Commerce Center Infrastructure Planning Project.	$350,000	Senator Lugar
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Roadrunner Food Bank, Albuquerque, NM.	For a permanent warehouse for the Roadrunner food collection agency for homeless and poverty stricken families in New Mexico.	$250,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Tuscaloosa Housing Authority, Tuscaloosa, AL.	For rehabilitation of distressed low-income housing, including renovation and reconstruction to promote safety and security.	$5,000,000	Senator Shelby
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Rural Alaska Community Action Program in Toksook Bay, AK.	To construct a early childhood development center.	$500,000	Senator Murkowski
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Salt Lake County, UT	For construction related to the Salt Lake County Transitional Housing project.	$750,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Share of Vancouver, Clark and Cowlitz County, Vancouver, WA.	For rehabilitation of a facility to provide for transitional homeless housing and other services.	$900,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate, Agency Village, SD.	For restoration efforts and safety upgrades at the Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate pow wow grounds.	$150,000	Senator Johnson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	South Coast Development Council, Coos Bay, OR.	For site preparation and construction of a public plaza.	$500,000	Senators Merkley, Wyden
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Springfield YMCA, Springfield, IL	For construction of a new building	$500,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	St. Joseph Community Center, Lorain, OH.	For demolition, remediation and renovation of the St. Joseph Community Center facility.	$400,000	Senator Sherrrod Brown
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Ft. Yates, ND.	For housing renovation	$300,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Storey County Community Chest, Virginia City, NV.	For the creation of the Storey County Youth and Community Center.	$400,000	Senator Reid
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Syracuse, UT	For the Legacy Park Handicap Renovations project, including meeting ADA requirements.	$100,000	Senators Hatch, Bennett

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	The Ministry of Caring, Inc., Wilmington, DE.	For the renovation of the Josephine Bakhita House.	$300,000	Senators Kaufman, Carper
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	The Planning Office for Urban Affairs, Boston, MA.	For the construction of affordable housing and mixed use space.	$400,000	Senator Kerry
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Tierra Madre, Sunland Park, NM	For construction of a capacity building center to help facilitate homeownership opportunities.	$200,000	Senator Tom Udall
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Tooele, UT	For infrastructure development to the Tooele City Commercial Park.	$750,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Town of Carmel, NY	For acquisition and construction of a new economic center.	$400,000	Senator Schumer
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Town of Cheraw, SC	To eliminate blighted housing structures under the Cheraw Stabilization Program.	$200,000	Senator Graham
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Town of Dover-Foxcroft, ME	For infrastructure improvements to the former Moosehead Manufacturing facility.	$700,000	Senators Collins, Snowe
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Town of Silas, AL	To renovate abandoned school property into a community center.	$300,000	Senator Sessions
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	TRF Development Partners, City of Baltimore, MD.	For the planning, design, rehabilitation and construction of affordable housing in the Oliver neighborhood.	$500,000	Senator Mikulski
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Turtle Mountain Chippewa Tribe, Belcourt, ND.	For construction of a youth center	$300,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Union County Child Advocacy Center, Elizabeth, NJ.	For construction and renovation of new child advocacy center for sexually abused children in Union County.	$200,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	United Community Center, Milwaukee, WI.	For construction of a senior center within a low-income elderly housing complex.	$2,000,000	Senator Kohl
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	United Indians of All Tribes Foundation, Seattle, WA.	For rehabilitation and revitalization of a facility serving disadvantaged youth.	$600,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle, Seattle, WA.	For improvements to a facility to allow for the expansion of affordable housing.	$300,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Ute Mountain Housing Authority, Durango, CO.	For an affordable housing project for Ute Mountain Ute tribal members.	$800,000	Senator Bennet

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Valley Council of Governments, Derby, CT.	For property renovation and reconstruction.	$400,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Vermont Community Loan Fund, Montpelier, VT.	For the construction of community facilities, including child care centers.	$300,000	Senator Sanders
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Vermont Division for Historic Preservation, Montpelier, VT.	For historic preservation improvements throughout Vermont.	$200,000	Senator Sanders
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Vermont Housing & Conservation Board Montpelier, VT.	For enhancement of affordable housing, community development initiatives, economic development, land conservation and historic preservation.	$3,000,000	Senator Leahy
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Waterboro, ME	For a technology and infrastructure project for the Waterboro Community Center.	$500,000	Senator Collins
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Waterloo, IA	For building renovation and improvements for Cedar Valley TechWorks for laboratory and incubator space.	$300,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	West DuPage, IL	For construction of an Educare center in West Dupage to serve at-risk children.	$200,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Western Arkansas Regional Intermodal Transportation Authority, Fort Smith, AR.	For infrastructure improvements related to the development of an industrial park.	$500,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Western Nebraska Community College, Scottsbluff, NE.	For the construction and equipment purchase in support of a renewable energy training center.	$400,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Westminster College, Salt Lake City, UT ..	For improvement to the Garfield School Renovation and Revitalization project.	$500,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Women's Intercultural Center, Anthony, NM.	For renovation of a facility that provides educational and economic opportunities to women.	$450,000	Senator Tom Udall
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Yakima Housing Authority, Granger, WA ..	For development activities and construction of affordable housing for farmworkers.	$675,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	YMCA of Pierce and Kitsap Counties, Silverdale, WA.	For the construction of a community center.	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	YWCA of Greater Portland, OR	For design and construction of a facility that provides safety and services to victims of Human Trafficking.	$300,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVES

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Abyssinian Development Corporation, New York, NY.	For the development and rehabilitation of new and existing low- and moderate-income housing units in the central Harlem area.	$300,000	Senators Gillibrand, Schumer
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Center for Planning Excellence, LA	To build capacity in land use planning and community preservation throughout Louisiana.	$750,000	Senator Landrieu
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	City of Boise, ID	For a Petroleum Terminal Relocation Feasibility Study.	$350,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	City of Cranston, RI	For community planning and development.	$200,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	City of Longview, WA	For revitalization and renewal of the city's downtown region.	$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	City of Philadelphia, PA	For mixed-use transit oriented development in the area around the 9th and Berks rail station.	$350,000	Senator Casey
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	City of Ranson, WV	For the redevelopment of a blighted former industrial site into a mixed-used center, including retail and affordable workforce housing using smart growth design and green infrastructure.	$400,000	Senator Rockefeller
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	City of Spokane, WA	For the restoration and redevelopment of a blighted area.	$2,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Community Voice Mail, Seattle, WA	To improve and expand employment services for homeless veterans.	$350,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Consumer Credit Counseling Services, Las Vegas, NV.	For foreclosure-related assistance services.	$500,000	Senator Reid
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Florida's Heartland Rural Economic Development Initiative, Sebring, FL.	To create a research park	$400,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Hire America's Heroes, Redmond, WA	To expand employment services for veterans.	$250,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS.	For the Development of the Civic Capacity Development Initiative Project at Mississippi State University.	$750,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	New Hampshire Food Bank, Manchester, NH.	To expand the food assistance program for the New Hampshire Food Bank.	$1,250,000	Senators Gregg, Shaheen
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Northern Comm. Investment Corp., St. Johnsbury, VT.	To continue to expand high-speed, high-technology broadband connectivity as part of the North Country Community Broadband Initiative.	$1,000,000	Senator Gregg
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Ocean Springs, MS	For the construction of the Walter Anderson Education Center.	$400,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Scott County Housing Council, IA	For loans and grants to local nonprofit housing service providers and developers to create affordable housing.	$300,000	Senator Harkin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Southwest Organizing Project, Chicago, IL.	To assist the Southwest Organizing Project ''Keep Our Homes'' campaign, a foreclosure prevention initiative in Chicago neighborhoods.	$250,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	EDI	TechRanch, Bozeman, MT	For entrepreneurship programs and support for a business incubator.	$200,000	Senator Baucus
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Montpelier, VT.	For expansion and improvement of low-income housing.	$300,000	Senator Sanders
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Vermont Sustainable Jobs Fund, Montpelier, VT.	For capitalizing a revolving loan fund	$500,000	Senator Leahy
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Neighborhood Initiatives	Washington State Farmworker Housing Trust, Seattle, WA.	For capacity building to support the expansion of affordable housing for farmworkers.	$200,000	Senator Murray

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses	102,686	117,000	113,961	+11,275	−3,039
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,631)	(2,667)	(2,667)	(+36)	.....
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(986)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(+14)	.....
Office of the General Counsel	(20,359)	(19,711)	(20,211)	(−148)	(+500)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(11,100)	(13,568)	(16,568)	(+5,468)	(+3,000)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(10,559)	(20,022)	(11,216)	(+657)	(−8,806)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,504)	(2,530)	(2,200)	(−304)	(−330)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(25,520)	(25,695)	(25,695)	(+175)	.....
Office of Public Affairs	(2,055)	(2,240)	(1,800)	(−255)	(−440)
Office of the Executive Secretariat	(1,658)	(1,683)	(1,683)	(+25)	.....
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,499)	(1,513)	(1,513)	(+14)	.....
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	(10,600)	(10,999)	(10,999)	(+399)	.....
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(13,215)	(22,995)	(18,409)	(+5,194)	(−4,586)
Acquisition workforce capacity and capabilities	.....	7,623	.....	.....	−7,623
Subtotal	102,686	124,623	113,961	+11,275	−10,662
National infrastructure development	600,000	.....	800,000	+200,000	+800,000
Livable communities initiative	.....	20,000	.....	.....	−20,000
Financial management capital	5,000	21,000	21,000	+16,000	.....
Office of Civil Rights	9,667	9,767	9,767	+100	.....
Cyber security initiatives	.....	30,000	30,000	+30,000	.....
Transportation planning, research, and development	16,168	9,819	9,819	−6,349	.....
Maritime study	2,000	.....	2,000	.....	+2,000
Working capital fund	(147,596)	.....	(147,596)	.....	(+147,596)
Minority business resource center program	923	913	913	−10	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	.....	.....	(−18,367)	.....
Minority business outreach	3,074	3,395	3,395	+321	.....

Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	150,000	132,000	146,000	−4,000	+14,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	889,518	351,517	1,136,855	+247,337	+785,338
National Infrastructure Innovation and Finance Fund					
National infrastructure innovation and finance fund program account	.....	4,000,000	.....	.....	−4,000,000
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations	9,350,028	9,793,000	9,818,000	+467,972	+25,000
Air traffic organization	(7,299,299)	.....	(7,660,628)	(+361,329)	(+7,660,628)
Aviation safety	(1,234,065)	.....	(1,308,986)	(+74,921)	(+1,308,986)
Commercial space transportation	(15,237)	.....	(15,747)	(+510)	(+15,747)
Financial services	(113,681)	.....	(114,784)	(+1,103)	(+114,784)
Human resource management	(100,428)	.....	(103,297)	(+2,869)	(+103,297)
Region and center operations	(341,977)	.....	(366,354)	(+24,377)	(+366,354)
Staff offices	(196,063)	.....	(212,255)	(+16,192)	(+212,255)
Information services	(49,278)	.....	(55,949)	(+6,671)	(+55,949)
Facilities & equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,936,203	2,970,000	2,970,000	+33,797	.....
Research, engineering, and development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	190,500	190,000	198,750	+8,250	+8,750
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,000,000)	(3,550,000)	(3,550,000)	(+550,000)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,515,000)	(3,515,000)	(3,515,000)	.....	.....
Administration	(93,422)	(100,208)	(99,708)	(+6,286)	(−500)
Airport Cooperative Research Program	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	.....	.....
Airport technology research	(22,472)	(27,217)	(27,417)	(+4,945)	(+200)
Small community air service development program	(6,000)	.....	(6,000)	.....	(+6,000)
Rescission of contract authority (BY AIP)	−394,000	.....	.....	+394,000	.....
Subtotal	(3,121,000)	(3,515,000)	(3,515,000)	(+394,000)	.....
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	12,082,731	12,953,000	12,986,750	+904,019	+33,750
Appropriations	(12,476,731)	(12,953,000)	(12,986,750)	(+510,019)	(+33,750)
Rescissions of contract authority	(−394,000)	.....	.....	(+394,000)	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(3,515,000)	(3,515,000)	(3,515,000)	.....	.....
Total budgetary resources	(15,597,731)	(16,468,000)	(16,501,750)	(+904,019)	(+33,750)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses	(413,533)	(420,843)	(417,843)	(+4,310)	(−3,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(41,846,000)	(42,102,000)	(42,515,000)	(+669,000)	(+413,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(41,107,000)	(41,362,775)	(41,776,000)	(+669,000)	(+413,225)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	.....	.....
Surface transportation projects	292,829	.....	175,269	−117,560	+175,269
Rescission of contract authority (Highway Trust Fund)	.....	−263,131	−263,131	−263,131	.....
Planning capacity grants	.....	.....	200,000	+200,000	+200,000
Administration (rescission of contract authority)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Highway related safety grants (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Miscellaneous appropriations and miscellaneous highway trust funds (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Additional highway investment (Sec. 122)	650,000	.....	.....	−650,000	.....
Total, Federal Highway Administration	942,829	−263,131	112,138	−830,691	+375,269
Appropriations	(942,829)	.....	(375,269)	(−567,560)	(+375,269)
Rescissions of contract authority	.....	(−263,131)	(−263,131)	(−263,131)	.....
Rescissions	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(41,107,000)	(41,362,775)	(41,776,000)	(+669,000)	(+413,225)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	.....	.....
Total budgetary resources	(42,049,829)	(41,099,644)	(41,888,138)	(−161,691)	(+788,494)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor carrier safety operations and programs (General Fund)	.....	.....	20,050	+20,050	+20,050
Motor carrier safety operations and programs (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(239,828)	(259,878)	(239,828)	.....	(−20,050)
(Limitation on obligations)	(239,828)	(259,878)	(239,828)	.....	(−20,050)
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(310,070)	(310,070)	(310,070)	.....	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(310,070)	(310,070)	(310,070)	.....	.....
Motor carrier safety grants (HTF) (rescission of contract authority)	−1,611	.....	−18,900	−17,289	−18,900
Motor carrier safety (HTF) (rescission of contract authority)	−6,416	.....	−7,300	−884	−7,300

National motor carrier safety program (HTF) (rescission of contract authority)	−3,233	.....	−15,000	−11,767	−15,000
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	−11,260	.....	−21,150	−9,890	−21,150
(Limitations on obligations)	(549,898)	(569,948)	(549,898)	.....	(−20,050)
Total budgetary resources	(538,638)	(569,948)	(528,748)	(−9,890)	(−41,200)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research (general fund)	140,427	132,837	172,773	+32,346	+39,936
Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(105,500)	(117,376)	(117,376)	(+11,876)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(105,500)	(117,376)	(117,376)	(+11,876)	.....
Subtotal	(245,927)	(250,213)	(290,149)	(+44,222)	(+39,936)
National driver register (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,000)	(4,170)	(4,170)	(+170)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(4,000)	(4,170)	(4,170)	(+170)	.....
National driver register modernization	3,350	2,530	2,530	−820	.....
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(619,500)	(620,697)	(606,197)	(−13,303)	(−14,500)
(Limitation on obligations)	(619,500)	(620,697)	(606,197)	(−13,303)	(−14,500)
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402)	(235,000)	(235,000)	(235,000)	.....	.....
Occupant protection incentive grants (23 USC 405)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	.....	.....
Safety belt performance grants (23 USC 406)	(124,500)	(124,500)	(60,000)	(−64,500)	(−64,500)
(Distracted driving prevention grants)	.....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(+50,000)	.....
State traffic safety information system improvement grants (23 USC 408)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	.....	.....
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (23 USC 410)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	.....	.....
Grant administration	(18,500)	(19,697)	(19,697)	(+1,197)	.....
High visibility enforcement	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	.....	.....
Child safety and booster seat grants	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	.....	.....
Motorcyclist safety	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	.....	.....
National Driver Register (rescission of contract authority)	.....	.....	−78	−78	−78
Operations and research (rescission of contract authority) (Sec. 142)	−2,299	.....	−1,829	+470	−1,829
Highway traffic safety grants (rescission of contract authority) (Sec. 143)	−14,004	.....	−79,843	−65,839	−79,843
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin	127,474	135,367	93,553	−33,921	−41,814
Appropriations	(143,777)	(135,367)	(175,303)	(+31,526)	(+39,936)
Rescissions of contract authority	(−16,303)	.....	(−81,750)	(−65,447)	(−81,750)
(Limitations on obligations)	(729,000)	(742,243)	(727,743)	(−1,257)	(−14,500)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Total budgetary resources	(856,474)	(877,610)	(821,296)	(−35,178)	(−56,314)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Federal railroad operations		153,846			−153,846
Offsetting fee collections		−25,000			+25,000
Direct appropriation		128,846			−128,846
Safety and operations	172,270		205,098	+32,828	+205,098
Railroad research and development	37,613	40,000	40,000	+2,387	
Rail line relocation and improvement program	34,532			−34,532	
Railroad safety technology	50,000		150,000	+100,000	+150,000
Railroad safety		49,502			−49,502
Capital assistance for high speed rail corridors and intercity passenger rail service	2,500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	−1,500,000	
National Railroad Passenger Corporation:					
Operating grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	563,000	563,000	563,000		
Office of Inspector General		22,000			−22,000
Capital and debt service grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	1,001,625	1,052,000	1,400,000	+398,375	+348,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	4,359,040	2,855,348	3,358,098	−1,000,942	+502,750
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses	98,911	113,559	111,981	+13,070	−1,578
(Rail transit safety oversight program)					
Technical assistance and workforce development		28,647			−28,647
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(9,400,000)		(9,200,000)	(−200,000)	(+9,200,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(8,343,171)		(8,360,565)	(+17,394)	(+8,360,565)
Transit Formula Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account (Liquidation of contract authorization)		(9,200,000)			(−9,200,000)
(Limitation on obligations)		(8,271,700)			(−8,271,700)
Greenhouse gas and energy reduction (Limitation on obligations)		(52,743)			(−52,743)

Livable communities (Limitation on obligations)	.....	(306,905)	.....	.....	(−306,905)
Rail transit safety oversight program	.....	24,139	.....	.....	−24,139
Research and University Research Centers	65,670	29,729	69,750	+4,080	+40,021
Capital investment grants	2,000,000	1,822,112	2,000,000	.....	+177,888
Energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reduction grants	75,000	.....	100,000	+25,000	+100,000
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority capital and preventive maintenance	150,000	150,000	150,000	.....	.....
East Baseline Park and Ride reallocation (Sec. 166)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Federal Transit Administration	2,389,581	2,168,186	2,431,731	+42,150	+263,545
(Limitations on obligations)	(8,343,171)	(8,631,348)	(8,360,565)	(+17,394)	(−270,783)
Total budgetary resources	(10,732,752)	(10,799,534)	(10,792,296)	(+59,544)	(−7,238)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	32,324	32,150	32,324	.....	+174
Maritime Administration					
Maritime security program	174,000	174,000	174,000	.....	.....
Operations and training	149,750	164,353	172,754	+23,004	+8,401
Ship disposal	15,000	10,000	10,000	−5,000	.....
Assistance to small shipyards	15,000	.....	25,000	+10,000	+25,000
War risk insurance revolving fund	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses	4,000	3,688	4,000	.....	+312
Guaranteed loans subsidy	5,000	.....	5,000	.....	+5,000
Subtotal	9,000	3,688	9,000	.....	+5,312
Total, Maritime Administration	362,750	352,041	390,754	+28,004	+38,713
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Administrative expenses:					
General Fund	20,493	21,744	21,744	+1,251	.....
Pipeline Safety Fund	639	639	639	.....	.....
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	.....	.....
Subtotal	21,132	22,383	22,383	+1,251	.....
Hazardous materials safety	37,994	40,434	50,434	+12,440	+10,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Pipeline safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	86,334	92,206	92,206	+5,872	.....
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	18,905	18,905	18,905	.....	.....
Subtotal	105,239	111,111	111,111	+5,872	.....
Emergency preparedness grants:					
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	.....	.....
(Emergency preparedness fund)	(188)	(188)	(188)	.....	.....
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	192,683	202,246	212,246	+19,563	+10,000
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and development	13,007	17,200	16,900	+3,893	−300
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	75,114	79,772	86,406	+11,292	+6,634
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and expenses	29,066	25,988	29,934	+868	+3,946
Offsetting collections	−1,250	−1,250	−1,250	.....	.....
Total, Surface Transportation Board	27,816	24,738	28,684	+868	+3,946
Total, title I, Department of Transportation	21,455,289	22,880,116	20,836,971	−618,318	−2,043,145
Appropriations	(21,876,852)	(23,143,247)	(21,223,052)	(−653,800)	(−1,920,195)
Rescissions	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rescission of contract authority	(−421,563)	(−263,131)	(−386,081)	(+35,482)	(−122,950)
(Limitations on obligations)	(54,244,069)	(54,821,314)	(54,929,206)	(+685,137)	(+107,892)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	.....	.....
(Limitations)	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	.....	.....

Total budgetary resources	(75,699,358)	(77,701,430)	(75,766,177)	(+66,819)	(−1,935,253)
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Management and Administration					
Executive direction	26,855	30,265	30,265	+3,410	.....
Administration, operations and management	537,011	538,552	528,846	−8,165	−9,706
Acquisition workforce capacity and capabilities	.....	2,071	.....	.....	−2,071
Subtotal	537,011	540,623	528,846	−8,165	−11,777
Personnel compensation and benefits:					
Public and Indian Housing	197,074	197,282	195,508	−1,566	−1,774
Community Planning and Development	98,989	105,768	105,281	+6,292	−487
Housing	374,887	395,917	395,917	+21,030	.....
Office of the Government National Mortgage Association	11,095	10,902	16,000	+4,905	+5,098
Policy Development and Research	21,138	23,588	22,556	+1,418	−1,032
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	71,800	67,964	70,363	−1,437	+2,399
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control	7,151	6,762	7,151	.....	+389
Subtotal	782,134	808,183	812,776	+30,642	+4,593
Total, Management and Administration	1,346,000	1,379,071	1,371,887	+25,887	−7,184
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based rental assistance:					
Renewals	16,339,200	17,310,000	17,165,000	+825,800	−145,000
Tenant protection vouchers	120,000	125,000	125,000	+5,000	.....
Administrative fees	1,575,000	1,791,000	1,851,000	+276,000	+60,000
Family self-sufficiency coordinators	60,000	60,000	.....	−60,000	−60,000
Incremental family unification vouchers	15,000	.....	15,000	.....	+15,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing	75,000	.....	75,000	.....	+75,000
Sec. 811 Mainstream voucher renewals	.....	113,663	113,663	+113,663	.....
Disaster housing assistance program	.....	66,000	66,000	+66,000	.....
Homeless vouchers demonstration program	.....	85,000	85,000	+85,000	.....
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−195,507)	(−100,000)	(−100,000)	(+95,507)
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	18,184,200	19,550,663	19,495,663	+1,311,463	−55,000
Advance appropriations	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	.....	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Less appropriations from prior year advances	−4,000,000	−4,000,000	−4,000,000		
Total, Tenant-based rental assistance appropriated in this bill	18,184,200	19,550,663	19,495,663	+1,311,463	−55,000
Transforming rental assistance demonstration program		350,000			−350,000
Public Housing Capital Fund	2,500,000	2,044,200	2,510,000	+10,000	+465,800
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−20,442)	(−25,000)	(−25,000)	(−4,558)
Public Housing Operating Fund	4,775,000	4,829,000	4,829,000	+54,000	
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−48,290)			(+48,290)
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing	200,000			−200,000	
(Choice neighborhoods)	(65,000)			(−65,000)	
Choice neighborhoods		250,000	250,000	+250,000	
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−2,500)	(−2,500)	(−2,500)	
Native American housing block grants	700,000	580,000	700,000		+120,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−5,800)			(+5,800)
Native Hawaiian housing block grant	13,000	10,000	13,000		+3,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−100)			(+100)
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	7,000	9,000	9,000	+2,000	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(919,000)	(994,000)	(994,000)	(+75,000)	
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−8)			(+8)
Native Hawaiian loan guarantee fund program account	1,044		1,044		+1,044
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(41,504)		(41,504)		(+41,504)
Total, Public and Indian Housing	26,380,244	27,622,863	27,807,707	+1,427,463	+184,844
Community Planning and Development					
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	335,000	340,000	340,000	+5,000	
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−3,400)	(−3,400)	(−3,400)	
Community development fund	4,450,000	4,380,100	4,450,000		+69,900
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−43,801)	(−44,500)	(−44,500)	(−699)

Community development loan guarantees (Section 108):					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(275,000)	(500,000)	(275,000)	.....	(−225,000)
Credit subsidy	6,000	.....	6,435	+435	+6,435
Brownfields redevelopment	17,500	.....	.....	−17,500	.....
HOME investment partnerships program	1,825,000	1,650,000	1,825,000	.....	+175,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−16,500)	(−18,250)	(−18,250)	(−1,750)
Self-help and assisted homeownership opportunity program	82,000	.....	82,000	.....	+82,000
Capacity building	.....	60,000	.....	.....	−60,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−600)	.....	.....	(+600)
Homeless assistance grants	1,865,000	2,055,000	2,055,000	+190,000	.....
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−20,550)	.....	.....	(+20,550)
Total, Community Planning and Development	8,580,500	8,485,100	8,758,435	+177,935	+273,335
Housing Programs					
Project-based rental assistance:					
Renewals	8,325,853	9,054,000	9,054,000	+728,147	.....
Contract administrators	232,000	322,000	322,000	+90,000	.....
Subtotal (available this fiscal year)	8,557,853	9,376,000	9,376,000	+818,147	.....
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−89,760)	.....	.....	(+89,760)
Advance appropriations	393,672	400,000	400,000	+6,328	.....
Less appropriations from prior year advances	−400,000	−393,672	−393,672	+6,328	.....
Total, Project-based rental assistance appropriated in this bill	8,551,525	9,382,328	9,382,328	+830,803	.....
Housing for the elderly	825,000	273,700	825,000	.....	+551,300
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−2,737)	(−8,250)	(−8,250)	(−5,513)
Housing for persons with disabilities	300,000	90,037	200,000	−100,000	+109,963
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−900)	(−2,000)	(−2,000)	(−1,100)
Housing counseling assistance	87,500	88,000	100,000	+12,500	+12,000
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−880)	(−1,000)	(−1,000)	(−120)
Energy Innovation Fund	50,000	.....	.....	−50,000	.....
Rental housing assistance	40,000	40,600	40,600	+600	.....
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−406)	(−406)	(−406)	.....
Rent supplement (rescission)	−72,036	−40,600	−40,600	+31,436	.....
Manufactured housing fees trust fund	16,000	14,000	14,000	−2,000	.....
Offsetting collections	−7,000	−7,000	−7,000	.....	.....
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−70)	(−70)	(−70)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
Subtotal	9,000	7,000	7,000	−2,000	
Total, Housing Programs	9,790,989	9,841,065	10,514,328	+723,339	+673,263
Appropriations	(9,870,025)	(9,888,665)	(10,561,928)	(+691,903)	(+673,263)
Rescissions	(−72,036)	(−40,600)	(−40,600)	(+31,436)	
Offsetting collections	(−7,000)	(−7,000)	(−7,000)		
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA—Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)		
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)		
Offsetting receipts		−960,000	−960,000	−960,000	
Proposed additional offsetting receipts (Sec. 211)		−902,000	−902,000	−902,000	
Positive credit subsidy (HECM)		250,000	150,000	+150,000	−100,000
Administrative contract expenses	181,400	207,000	220,000	+38,600	+13,000
Additional contract expenses	14,000	4,000	4,000	−10,000	
Transformation initiative (transfer out)		(−1,355)	(−1,355)	(−1,355)	
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(−70,794)	(−71,500)	(−71,500)	(−706)	
Consumer education and outreach	7,500			−7,500	
FHA—General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(15,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)		
Offsetting receipts	−140,000	−315,000	−315,000	−175,000	
Credit subsidy	8,600			−8,600	
Right of first refusal	5,000	5,000		−5,000	−5,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	76,500	−1,711,000	−1,803,000	−1,879,500	−92,000

Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	.....	.....
Offsetting receipts	−720,000	−720,000	−720,000	.....	.....
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association	−720,000	−720,000	−720,000	.....	.....
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology	48,000	87,000	62,000	+14,000	−25,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities	72,000	61,100	72,000	.....	+10,900
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−611)	(−720)	(−720)	(−109)
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes					
Lead hazard reduction	140,000	140,000	140,000	.....	.....
Transformation initiative (transfer out)	.....	(−1,400)	(−1,400)	(−1,400)	.....
Management and Administration					
Working capital fund	200,000	243,500	243,500	+43,500	.....
(By transfer)	(70,794)	(71,500)	(71,500)	(+706)	.....
Office of Inspector General	125,000	122,000	125,000	.....	+3,000
Transformation initiative	20,000	20,000	20,000	.....	.....
(By transfer)	.....	(455,617)	(208,731)	(+208,731)	(−246,886)
Total, Management and Administration	345,000	385,500	388,500	+43,500	+3,000
(Grand total, Management and Administration)	(1,691,000)	(1,764,571)	(1,760,387)	(+69,387)	(−4,184)
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development	46,059,233	45,570,699	46,591,857	+532,624	+1,021,158
Appropriations	(42,604,597)	(44,115,299)	(45,136,457)	(+2,531,860)	(+1,021,158)
Rescissions	(−72,036)	(−40,600)	(−40,600)	(+31,436)	.....
Advance appropriations	(4,393,672)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(+6,328)	.....
Offsetting receipts	(−860,000)	(−2,897,000)	(−2,897,000)	(−2,037,000)	.....
1Offsetting collections	(−7,000)	(−7,000)	(−7,000)	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(70,794)	(527,117)	(280,231)	(+209,437)	(−246,886)
(Transfer out)	(−70,794)	(−527,117)	(−280,351)	(−209,557)	(+246,766)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(916,235,504)	(921,494,000)	(921,310,504)	(+5,075,000)	(−183,496)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2010 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2010 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE III—OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Access Board	7,300	7,300	7,367	+67	+67
Federal Maritime Commission	24,135	25,498	25,498	+1,363	.....
National Transportation Safety Board:					
Salaries and expenses	98,050	100,400	104,300	+6,250	+3,900
Amtrak Office of Inspector General	19,000	.....	19,500	+500	+19,500
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	233,000	250,000	300,000	+67,000	+50,000
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	2,450	2,680	2,680	+230	.....
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies	383,935	385,878	459,345	+75,410	+73,467
Grand total (net)	67,898,457	68,836,693	67,888,173	−10,284	−948,520
Appropriations	(64,865,384)	(67,644,424)	(66,818,854)	(+1,953,470)	(−825,570)
Rescissions	(−72,036)	(−40,600)	(−40,600)	(+31,436)	.....
Rescissions of contract authority	(−421,563)	(−263,131)	(−386,081)	(+35,482)	(−122,950)
Advance appropriations	(4,393,672)	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(+6,328)	.....
Negative subsidy receipts	(−860,000)	(−2,897,000)	(−2,897,000)	(−2,037,000)	.....
Offsetting collections	(−7,000)	(−7,000)	(−7,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(54,244,069)	(54,821,314)	(54,929,206)	(+685,137)	(+107,892)
(By transfer)	(70,794)	(527,117)	(280,231)	(+209,437)	(−246,886)
(Transfer out)	(−70,794)	(−527,117)	(−280,351)	(−209,557)	(+246,766)
Total budgetary resources	(122,142,526)	(123,658,007)	(122,817,379)	(+674,853)	(−840,628)
Discretionary total	(67,900,000)	(68,737,520)	(67,900,000)	.....	(−837,520)

○