AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

106TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 106–674

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001

JUNE 12, 2000.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4635]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page number Bill	Page number Report
Title I—Department of Veterans Affairs	2	4
Title II—Department of Housing and Urban Development	19	21
Title III—Independent Agencies	51	39
American Battle Monuments Commission	51	39
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigations Board	52	40
Community Development Financial Institutions	52	40
Consumer Product Safety Commission	53	41
Corporation for National and Community Service	54	42
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims	54	42
Cemeterial Expenses, Army	55	43
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	55	44
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	56	44
Environmental Protection Agency	57	45

64–896

	Page number	
	Bill	*Report*
Office of Science and Technology Policy	64	63
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	65	64
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	65	64
Federal Emergency Management Agency	66	65
Federal Consumer Information Center	71	71
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	72	72
National Credit Union Administration	75	77
National Science Foundation	76	79
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	78	84
Selective Service System	79	84
Title IV—General Provisions	79	84

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee recommends $101,096,836,000 in new budget (obligational) authority for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and 20 independent agencies and offices. This is $8,218,918,000 above the 2000 appropriations level.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and budget estimates for fiscal year 2001.

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

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	70,000	64,000	70,000	.....	+6,000
American Battle Monuments Commission	28,359	26,196	28,000	-359	+1,804
Cemeterial Expenses, Army	12,426	15,949	17,949	+5,523	+2,000
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	7,970	8,000	8,000	+30	.....
Community Development Financial Institutions	95,000	125,000	105,000	+10,000	-20,000
Consumer Product Safety Commission	48,814	52,500	51,000	+2,186	-1,500
Corporation for National and Community Service	357,138	538,700	5,000	-352,138	-533,700
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,816	3,020	2,900	+84	-120
Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims	11,408	12,500	12,500	+1,092	.....
Department of Housing and Urban Development	25,860,183	32,458,550	29,962,030	+4,101,847	-2,496,520
Department of Veterans Affairs	44,255,165	46,948,405	46,849,667	+2,594,502	-98,738
Environmental Protection Agency	7,432,811	7,164,072	7,148,888	-283,923	-15,184
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (transfer)	(33,666)	(33,660)	(33,661)	(-5)	(+1)
Federal Consumer Information Center Fund	2,622	6,822	7,122	+4,500	+300
Federal Emergency Management Agency	3,338,421	3,580,477	876,730	-2,461,691	-2,703,747
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	60,000	48,527	60,000	.....	+11,473
Office of Science and Technology Policy	5,089	5,201	5,150	+61	-51
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	13,600,819	14,035,300	13,713,600	+112,781	-321,700
National Credit Union Administration	996	1,000	1,000	+4	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	.....	(600,000)	(3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)	(+2,400,000)
National Science Foundation	3,897,184	4,572,400	4,064,300	+168,216	-508,100
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	74,715	90,000	90,000	+15,285	.....
Selective Service System	23,909	24,480	23,000	-909	-1,480
Other provisions	-14,000	-1,832,000	-1,832,000	-1,818,000	.....
Budget scorekeeping adjustments	-6,293,927	-354,000	-173,000	+6,120,927	+181,000
Grand total	92,877,918	107,595,099	101,096,836	+8,218,918	-6,498,263

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$46,849,667,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	44,255,165,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	46,948,405,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+2,594,502,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−98,738,000

The Department of Veterans Affairs is the third largest Federal agency in terms of employment with an average employment of approximately 204,000. It administers benefits for more than 25,000,000 veterans, and 45,000,000 family members of living veterans and survivors of deceased veterans. Thus, close to 70,000,000 people, comprising about 25 percent of the total population of the United States, are potential recipients of veterans benefits provided by the Federal Government.

A total of $46,849,667,000 in new budget authority is recommended by the Committee for the Department of Veterans Affairs programs in fiscal year 2001. The funds recommended provide for compensation payments to 2,586,811 veterans and survivors of deceased veterans with service-connected disabilities; pension payment for 615,958 non-service-connected disabled veterans, widows and children in need of financial assistance; education training and vocational assistance of 431,185 veterans, servicepersons, and reservists, and 48,530 eligible dependents of deceased veterans or seriously disabled veterans; housing credit assistance in the form of 250,000 guaranteed loans provided to veterans and servicepersons; administration or supervision of life insurance programs with 4,353,921 policies for veterans and active duty servicepersons providing coverage of $446,997,000,000; inpatient care and treatment of beneficiaries in 172 medical centers; 40 domiciliaries, 134 nursing homes and 829 outpatient clinics which includes independent, satellite, community-based, and rural outreach clinics involving 41,837,000 visits; and the administration of the National Cemetery Administration for burial of eligible veterans, servicepersons and their survivors.

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$22,766,276,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	21,568,364,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	22,766,276,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+1,197,912,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

This appropriation provides funds for service-connected compensation payments to an estimated 2,586,811 beneficiaries and pension payments to another 615,958 beneficiaries with non-service-connected disabilities. The average cost per compensation case in 2001 is estimated at $7,600, and pension payments are projected at a unit cost of $4,957. The estimated caseload and cost by program for 2000 and 2001 are as follows:

	2000	2001	Difference
Caseload:			
Compensation:			
Veterans	2,290,710	2,285,075	−5,635
Survivors	302,575	300,872	−1,703
Children	864	864	0
Clothing allowance (non-add)	(75,785)	(75,598)	−187
Pensions:			
Veterans	372,635	363,060	−9,575
Survivors	266,101	252,898	−13,203
Minimum income for widows (non-add)	(594)	(562)	−32
Vocational training (non-add)	(7)	(5)	−2
Burial allowances	95,180	94,050	−1,130
Funds:			
Compensation:			
Veterans	$15,421,550,000	$16,010,051,000	+$588,501,000
Survivors	3,522,325,000	3,600,000,000	+77,675,000
Children	9,499,000	9,734,000	+235,000
Clothing allowance	40,049,000	39,949,000	−100,000
Payment to GOE (Public Laws 101–508 and 102–568)	1,388,000	1,266,000	−122,000
Medical exams pilot program	26,324,000	28,390,000	+2,066,000
Pensions:			
Veterans	2,342,253,000	2,366,889,000	+24,636,000
Survivors	707,003,000	683,070,000	−23,933,000
Minimum income for widows	3,697,000	3,581,000	−116,000
Vocational training	20,000	15,000	−5,000
Payment to GOE (Public Laws 101–508, 102–568, and 103–446)	9,343,000	8,521,000	−822,000
Payment to medical care (Public Laws 101–508 and 102–568)	5,018,000	7,632,000	+2,614,000
Payment to medical facilities (non-add)	(2,879,000)	(3,027,000)	+148,000
Burial benefits	126,293,000	129,681,000	+3,388,000
Other assistance	3,406,000	3,413,000	+7,000
Contingency	0	0	0
Unobligated balance and transfers	−649,804,000	−125,916,000	+523,888,000
Total appropriation [1]	21,568,364,000	22,766,276,000	+1,197,912,000

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

The Administration has again proposed dividing the compensation and pensions appropriation into three separate accounts; compensation, pensions, and burial benefits and miscellaneous assistance. The Committee has again disapproved this proposal and recommends a single compensation and pensions appropriation in fiscal year 2001.

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee is recommending the budget estimate of $22,766,276,000 for compensation and pensions. The bill also includes requested language not to exceed $17,419,000 of reimbursements of which ($9,787,000) goes to the general operating expenses account and ($7,632,000) to the medical care account for administrative expenses of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, Public Law 101–508, the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992, Public Law 102–568, and the Veterans' Benefits Improvements Act of 1994, Public Law 103–446. These cost savings provisions include verifying pension income against Internal Revenue Service and Social Security Administration (SSA) data; establishing a match with the SSA to obtain verification of Social Security numbers; and the $90 monthly Department pension cap for Medicaid-eligible single veterans and surviving spouses alone in Medicaid-covered nursing homes. Also, the bill includes requested language permitting this appropriation

to reimburse such sums as may be earned to the medical facilities revolving fund to help defray the operating expenses of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners.

The Administration has proposed language that would provide indefinite 2001 supplemental appropriations for compensation and pension payments. The Committee believes the current funding procedures are adequate and has not included the requested language in the bill. The Committee recognizes that additional funding may be necessary when the final disposition of proposed legislation is known.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$1,664,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	1,469,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	1,634,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+195,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	+30,000,000

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

The Committee recommends the budget estimates of $1,664,000,000 for readjustment benefits in fiscal year 2001. The Committee rejects the proposal to move $30,000,000 from this appropriation to the "General operating expenses" appropriation. The estimated number of trainees and costs by program for 2000 and 2001 are as follows:

	2000	2001	Difference
Number of trainees:			
Education and training: dependents	46,420	48,530	+2,110
All-Volunteer Force educational assistance:			
Veterans and servicepersons	279,100	309,300	+30,200
Reservists	71,300	70,900	−400
Vocational rehabilitation	51,630	50,985	−645
Total	448,450	479,715	+31,265
Funds:			
Education and training: dependents	$141,806,000	$148,148,000	+$6,342,000
All-Volunteer Force educational assistance:			
Veterans and servicepersons	890,736,000	1,118,903,000	+228,167,000
Reservists	100,860,000	105,875,000	+5,015,000
Vocational rehabilitation	416,718,000	421,887,000	+5,169,000

	2000	2001	Difference
Housing grants	21,065,000	21,065,000	0
Automobiles and other conveyances	7,589,000	7,589,000	0
Adaptive equipment	23,700,000	23,600,000	−100,000
Work-study	33,400,000	35,100,000	+1,700,000
Payment to States	13,000,000	13,000,000	0
Reporting fees	3,530,000	3,771,000	+241,000
Unobligated balance and other adjustments	−183,404,000	−234,938,000	−51,534,000
Total appropriation	1,469,000,000	1,664,000,000	+195,000,000

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$19,850,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	28,670,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	19,850,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−8,820,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The budget estimate of $19,850,000 for veterans insurance and indemnities in fiscal year 2001 in included in the bill. The amount provided will enable Department to transfer more than $11,840,000 to the service-disabled veterans insurance fund and transfer $8,820,000 in payments for the 3,310 policies under the veterans mortgage life insurance program. These policies are identified under the veterans insurance and indemnity appropriation since they provide insurance to service-disabled veterans unable to qualify under basic NSLI.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$165,740,000	$300,000	$161,484,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	282,342,000	300,000	156,958,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	165,740,000	300,000	166,484,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−116,602,000	0	+4,526,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0	0	−5,000,000

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

VA loan guaranties are made to servicemembers, veterans, reservists and unremarried surviving spouses for the purchase of

homes, condominiums, manufactured homes and for refinancing loans. The Department guarantees part of the total loan, permitting the purchaser to obtain a mortgage with a competitive interest rate, even without a downpayment if the lender agrees. The Department requires that a downpayment be made for a manufactured home. With a Department guaranty, the lender is protected against loss up to the amount of the guaranty if the borrower fails to repay the loan.

The Committee recommends the budget requests of such sums as may be necessary (estimated to total $165,740,000) for funding subsidy payments, $300,000 for the limitation on direct loans, and $161,484,000 for administrative expenses which is a reduction of $5,000,000 below the budget request. The appropriation for administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the general operating expenses account.

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$1,000	$3,400	$220,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	1,000	3,000	214,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	1,000	3,400	220,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0	+400	+6,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0	0	0

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

The bill includes the budget requests of $1,000 for funding subsidy program costs $3,400 as the limitation on direct loans, and $220,000 for administrative expenses. The appropriation for administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the general operating expenses account.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$52,000	$2,726,000	$432,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	57,000	2,531,000	415,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	52,000	2,726,000	432,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−5,000	+195,000	+17,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0	0	0

This appropriation covers the funding subsidy cost of direct loans for vocational rehabilitation of eligible veterans and, in addition, it includes administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program. Loans of up to $841 (based on indexed chapter 31 subsistence allowance rate) are available to service-connected disabled veterans enrolled in vocational rehabilitation programs when

the veteran is temporarily in need of additional assistance. Repayment is made in 10 monthly installments, without interest, through deductions from future payments of compensation, pension, subsistence allowance, educational assistance allowance, or retirement pay. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 requires budgetary resources to be available prior to incurring a direct loan obligation. In addition, the Act requires all administrative expenses of a direct loan program to be funded through a program account.

The bill includes the budget requests of $52,000 for funding subsidy program costs and $432,000 for administrative expenses. The administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the general operating expenses account. In addition, the bill includes requested language limiting program direct loans to $2,726,000. It is estimated that the Department will make 4,700 loans in fiscal year 2001, with an average amount of $580.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Administrative expenses:	
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$532,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	520,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	532,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+12,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

This program is testing the feasibility of authorizing the Department to make direct home loans to native American veterans who live on U.S. trust land. This is a pilot program which began in 1993 and expires on December 31, 2001. The bill includes the budget request of $532,000 for administration expenses, which may be transferred to and merged with the general operating expenses account.

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

This program was established by Public Law 105–368, the Veterans Programs Enhancement Act of 1998. All funds authorized for this program were appropriated in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, no appropriation request has been included for 2001. Bill language is included to use funds in "Medical care" and "General operating expenses" to administer this program.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$20,281,587,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	18,926,481,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	20,281,587,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+1,355,106,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

The Department of Veterans Affairs operates the largest Federal medical care delivery system in the country, with 172 medical centers, 40 domiciliaries, 134 nursing homes, and 829 outpatient clin-

ics which includes independent, satellite, community-based, and rural outreach clinics.

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

The bill includes $20,281,587,000 for medical care in fiscal year 2001, an increase of $1,355,106,000 above the enacted level and level with the budget request. In addition, the Committee estimates $638,000,000 will be collected and available from the Medical Care Collections Fund (MCCF).

The bill includes a new limitation on the amount of resources in this account that the Department may use for the maintenance and operations of its buildings. According to a recent GAO report, VA is spending one of every four medical care dollars for the upkeep of facilities and needs to better address capital asset needs and planning. The Committee directs the Department to continue working with GAO to finalize a methodology for isolating the cost of maintaining its facilities. The Committee applauds the CARES initiative and considers this initiative to be a Department priority. The Committee further directs the Department to work with GAO to create a new methodology for distributing maintenance and operations funds based on CARES principles.

The Committee is again providing two-year spending authority for $900,000,000 of the "Medical care" appropriation, a provision from the administration's budget request intended to provide the Department more flexibility for planning year to year. The Committee emphasizes that the two-year funding provision is not meant to create "emergency funds" and that all resources should be spent in a timely and responsible manner addressing veterans health needs.

The bill includes language delaying the availability of $927,000,000 of funds requested for the equipment and land and structures object classifications until August 1, 2001. The budget requested the delayed availability of $900,000,000 of such funds. The bill also includes requested language in the compensation and pensions appropriation transferring $7,632,000 for administrative expenses of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992.

The bill includes transferring $28,134,000 to the "General operating expenses" appropriations for the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Compliant Adjudication. Additional information on this transfer is included under the VA's administrative provisions section of this report.

The bill includes a provision prohibiting the Department from transferring funds to the Department of Justice for the purposes of supporting a lawsuit against tobacco companies. The Committee

feels resources in this appropriation should remain for the purposes of providing medical care to veterans.

The fiscal year 2001 budget justification included estimates of millions of dollars in receipts generated from TRICARE agreements with the Department of Defense (DoD), yet there is no sign of support for this agreement from DoD. GAO reports that both departments could save millions of dollars by combining procurement practices for the purchase of pharmaceutical drugs and supplies. The Committee directs the Department to work with DoD to coordinate service delivery, cost collections and procurement and directs the Department of Veterans Affairs to include in its fiscal year 2002 budget submission (a) the amount of revenue generated from providing TRICARE services in 2001 and anticipated revenue in 2002, (b) the locations involved in TRICARE delivery with negotiated agreements in place, and (c) any procurement-sharing agreements with DoD and the amount of resources saved by those contracts.

The Committee has noted the alarming rise in the percentage of veterans infected with the hepatitis C virus, and is concerned about the Department's management of this epidemic. The Committee directs the GAO to report on the Department's activities related to hepatitis C four months after the date of enactment. The report should include, by VISN, the amount of fiscal year 2000 resources spent on hepatitis C testing and treatment, the number of veterans tested and treated for hepatitis C, the percentage of tested veterans who are infected with hepatitis C, and how fiscal year 2001 funds will be allocated for hepatitis C testing and treatment. Further, the Committee directs GAO to examine whether the Department's allocation methodology provides adequate funding for VISNs with statistically higher percentages of veterans testing positive for hepatitis C.

In addition, the Committee directs the Department to include hepatitis C as a new patient classification under the Complex Care Component and to calculate VISN resources using this new methodology.

The Committee continues to have concerns about the Department's national drug formulary, and directs the Department to conduct an internal review of each VISN's formulary to ensure all VISNs have waiver procedures allowing veterans to obtain necessary non-formulary medications and supplies and any statistics on the number or percentage of non-formulary medicines and supplies prescribed and dispensed to veterans. The Department is directed to report its findings to the Committee within four months after enactment of this bill.

The Committee is concerned that the Department is unaware of how many VA nursing home beds are unoccupied nationally, and that VA nursing home beds might be empty while veterans, some 100 percent service-connected, are waiting for space in state veterans nursing homes. The Department is directed to report to the Committee by February 1, 2001 the number of unoccupied nursing home beds by VISN and to conduct a feasibility study of using unoccupied nursing home beds for transitional and respite care for veterans awaiting a state nursing home bed.

The Committee directs the Department to continue providing medical care for all upper category veterans and those veterans already enrolled with the Department healthcare system.

The Committee strongly discourages the Department from transferring critical care services from areas with a high veterans population to an area with a smaller veterans population.

The Committee directs the Department to study the feasibility and costs associated with establishing a long-term care facility in northwestern Ohio in conjunction with the Toledo Clinic and the Riverside Mercy Hospital and submit the findings to the Committee within six months of enactment of the bill.

The Committee is aware that the Veterans Health Administration is testing automated medication dispensing technology to reduce medication errors and improve hospital efficiency and patient care. The Department should apply evidence-based best practices to reduce medication errors. The Committee urges the Department to fully support this test and promptly evaluate the technology for potential use throughout the health system.

As the Department consolidates more services, the Committee is concerned about the safety of veterans traveling long distances. The Committee directs the Department to ensure all spinal cord injury buses, especially in areas with a high number of veterans with spinal cord injuries, are in safe, working order and replace any spinal cord injury buses which are in a state of unacceptable disrepair.

The Committee directs the VA to spend its fiscal year 2001 medical resources, except where otherwise specified, in the same manner as described in the budget justification. This includes resources for prosthetics, increases in nurse pay, hepatitis C, and long term care.

The Committee is concerned about the planned FTE reductions in the area of psychiatric care. The Committee reminds the Department of its obligation to provide quality psychiatric care to veterans. The Committee directs the Department to submit a report with the fiscal year 2001 operating plan detailing how these planned cuts in FTEs will improve mental health services and what performance indicators are in place to measure an improvement in care.

The Committee strongly urges the Department to use up to $5,000,000 to establish five centers of excellence for motor-neuron diseases such as Parkinson's disease and multiple sclerosis.

The Committee supports the Department's plan to provide primary care services in Alamogordo, New Mexico and directs the Department to give strong consideration to using the recently vacated Gerald R. Champion Memorial Hospital.

This year, the Under Secretary for Health's Committee on Care of Severely Chronically Mentally Ill Veterans examined five VISNs which have experienced unusually large decreases in funding and staffing for substance abuse care. The Committee directs the Department to routinely examine substance abuse care across the entire system to ensure substance abuse programs are maintained.

The Committee recommends the Department establish community based outpatient clinics in the Galax area of Virginia, the Nantucket area of Massachusetts, and in Yakima, Washington.

The Committee recommends the Department establish a Class A affiliation between the Toledo VA clinic and the Medical College of Ohio.

The Committee recognizes the Department is taking steps to provide proper care to veterans who can no longer live independently, but do not qualify for permanent hospital or nursing home care. The Committee believes veterans deserve the opportunity to maintain their dignity and family structure during their frail years. In order to develop a comprehensive plan that meets the needs of veterans and their families, the committee expects the VA to work in conjunction with a not-for-profit organization with expertise in the developing assisting living plans for seniors.

The Committee expects that funds will be available from the National Reserve (not to exceed $2,000,000) to ensure the smooth operations of the VAMC during the 2002 Winter Olympics and Paralympics.

The Committee is concerned that many of the antibiotics upon which modern medicine relies are becoming ineffective and commends the VA for its sensitivity to this issue. VA hospitals and clinics can serve as innovators and examples for other hospitals on this important public health matter. The Committee therefore urges the VA to use its south Florida facilities to implement and evaluate innovative antibiotic-use practices, including the routine use of vaccinations against streptococcus pneumonia among elderly and immunocompromised veterans and their dependents.

The Committee received the report on the telemedicine initiative at the Huntsville, Alabama VAMC as requested in last year's report and encourages project implementation.

The statement of managers accompanying the fiscal year 2000 conference report urged the VA to partner with existing, federally funded Community Health Care Centers to provide outpatient primary and preventative health care systems to area veterans in their home communities. The Committee understands that the VA has begun negotiations with health centers in the named counties in Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee, but agreements have not been completed. The Committee reiterates its support for establishing these partnerships in a manner that fully respects the needs of the veteran population in the respective communities. The VA is directed to report 30 days after enactment of the act on the status of the partnerships.

The Committee notes with some concerns the Department's single, national means test, based on annual income level, applies across the board, differing only based upon the number of a veterans' dependents. This means test is used to determine veterans' copayments for treatment at VA facilities. Given that some regions of the country face a higher cost of living than others, the Committee requests GAO to examine the Department's current system, and to provide recommendations to correct any regional disparities that may exist. The report should include a comparison of how other federal health care programs compensate for regional differences in the cost of living, the extent that the current means test standard may potentially disadvantage veterans in some regions of the country, an analysis of the Department's new proposal for the collection of third-party payments, and how the Department's recognition of regional costs differences affecting collection of third

party payments remains inconsistent with the national, uniform means test standard.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$321,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	321,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	321,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The Committee recommends $321,000,000 for medical and prosthetic research in fiscal year 2001. This is the same funding level as fiscal year 2000 and the 2001 budget request.

The Committee applauds a departmental initiative to align the VERA research allocation with designated time for clinician-investigators to conduct research. The Committee directs the Department to extend through fiscal year 2001 policy that assigns administration of the VERA research allocation to medical centers. The Committee also directs the Department to implement and evaluate new accounting systems for identifying and tracking research salaries, as well as research facilities and administrative costs, for their effectiveness in ensuring adequate research support.

The Committee again this year encourages the Department to increase funding for prostate cancer research with emphasis on clinical trials within the VA. Further, the Committee urges the Department to increase its emphasis on research related to diabetes treatment.

The Committee encourages the Department to continue working with Garden State Cancer Center on its pending research proposal.

The Committee remains supportive of the Department's efforts in technology transfer.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$62,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	59,703,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	64,884,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+2,297,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−2,884,000

This appropriation provides funds for central office executive direction (Under Secretary for Health and staff), administration and supervision of all Department medical and construction programs,

including development and implementation of policies, plans, and program objectives.

The bill provides $62,000,000, an increase of $2,297,000 over the fiscal year 2000 funding level and $2,884,000 below the budget request.

GENERAL POST FUND, NATIONAL HOMES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	0	0	0
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	$7,000	$70,000	$54,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	0	0	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−7,000	−70,000	−54,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0	0	0

A legislative proposal will be submitted to repeal section 8 of Public Law 102–54, terminating the Transitional Housing Loan Program. No loan activity on this program has occurred since its inception in September 1994. The Committee accepts the administration's proposal not to request funding for the Transitional Housing Loan Program which has never made a loan and does not provide funding in this bill. The portion of this account which accepts gifts to the department and uses those resources to promote comfort and welfare to veterans in hospitals, nursing homes and domiciliaries is still operational as a trust fund.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$1,006,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	912,594,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	1,061,854,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+93,406,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−55,854,000

The general operating expenses appropriation provides for the administration of non-medical veterans benefits through the Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) and top management direction and support. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 changed the accounting of Federal credit programs and required that all administrative costs associated with such programs be included within the respective credit accounts. Beginning in fiscal year 1992, costs incurred by housing, education, and vocational rehabilitation programs for administration of these credit programs are reimbursed by those accounts. The bill includes the budget requests totalling $162,668,000 in other accounts for these credit programs. In addition, $9,787,000 is transferred from the compensation and pensions account for administrative costs of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992. Section 107 of the administrative provisions provides requested language which permits excess revenues in three insurance funds to be used for administrative expenses. The Department estimates that $36,520,000 will be utilized for such purposes in fiscal year 2001. Prior to fiscal year 1996, such costs were included in the general operating expenses

appropriation. Thus, in total, $1,297,717,000 is requested in fiscal year 2001 for administrative costs of non-medical benefits.

The Committee recommends $1,006,000,000 for general operating expenses in fiscal year 2001. This amount represents an increase of $93,406,000 above the current level and $55,854,000 below the budget request.

The Committee rejects the request to transfer $30,000,000 from the readjustment benefits appropriation to the general operating expenses account. In addition, the general operating expenses appropriation is $25,854,000 below the budget request.

The Committee directs the VBA to be funded at not less than $782,000,000. The Committee supports VBA's hiring initiative in the Compensation and Pension program and expects VBA to achieve the FTE increases requested in the budget request. VBA reductions should be applied to the various initiatives requested based on VBA priorities and actual progress. The Committee understands the Virtual VBA project is behind schedule and recognizes reductions could be applied to this area as the scope and implementation of this initiative continues to evolve.

The Committee is greatly alarmed by the lack of improvement in claims processing. The Committee directs VBA to continue reporting on its progress in this area as directed by last year's report.

The Committee is aware that under present law, veterans are precluded from utilizing their veterans housing benefits to purchase residential cooperative units, although these guaranteed loans may currently be used to purchase a house, a condominium, or a mobile home. In some communities, residential cooperative units comprise a significant portion of housing currently available for purchase. The Committee therefore directs the VA to conduct a study of this problem and the feasibility of including cooperative rental units under the housing benefit and report back its findings to the Committee by February 2001.

VA is presently occupying space at various locations within the District of Columbia for its central office staff. The Administration has determined that it would be in the best interest of the Department and of the Government if all of the VA's Central Office Operations could be consolidated in one or two buildings within close proximity of the main VA office building at 810 Vermont Avenue, N.W. The Lafayette building is located at 811 Vermont Avenue, N.W., directly across the street from the main VA building and currently accommodates some of the VA operations in approximately 60% of the building. The US Export-Import Bank occupies most of the remaining 40% of the building.

While the General Services Administration is responsible for the Lafayette building and its operations, it has been unable to secure the needed funds to undertake the major renovations necessary to replace all of its outdated systems. The Department currently has authority to enter into enhanced-use leases with the private sector where property under VA's control or jurisdiction is leased to a private lessee that expends private funds to renovate, rehabilitate, or construct facilities on such property. The Department has successfully used its enhanced-used leasing authority for such purposes. This authority, if utilized in this situation, would permit VA and other federal tenants, if space were available after VA consolidates

its operations, to occupy a fully renovated facility without the need for major construction appropriations.

The Committee supports consideration of an enhanced-used leasing alternative and requests VA, in conjunction with GSA, to provide a report by November 1, 2000 on the feasibility of this effort.

The Committee strongly supports VA's initiative to replace its core accounting system with a new integrated system. The Committee expects the new system, core FLS, will allow the Department to strengthen financial information management, improve data integrity, and track the costs and workload associated with various initiatives, such as those noted in the Medical Care section of this report. The Office of Financial Management will coordinate the Department's investment in this area.

The current estimate for the core FLS project in 2001 is approximately $43 million, which will fund specific tasks for the acquisition and the prototyping and implementation phases of the project. The Committee has provided these funds and expects this project to be implemented as a top priority. These funds will be provided through reimbursements from each of the VA Administrations and the Supply Fund to General Administration in this appropriation. The Committee directs VA to submit a report on the milestones for the core FLS project through FY 2002 by December 1, 2000.

The bill includes language redirecting up to $2,022,000 for Office of Resolution Management and Office of Employment Discrimination Compliant Adjudication.

NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$106,889,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	97,256,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	109,889,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+9,633,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−3,000,000

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

The fiscal year 2000 appropriation increased 5.8 percent above the fiscal year 1999 amount. The recommended fiscal year 2001 level is 9.9 percent higher than fiscal year 2000 appropriation. These relatively large increases are necessary to provide for the operations of new cemeteries, and to cover increased workloads at existing cemeteries.

The Committee recommends $106,889,000 for the national cemetery administration in fiscal year 2001. This funding level is $9,633,000 over the 2000 level and $3,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee is providing funds to meet needs associated

with new cemeteries opening in 2000 and 2001 and the increased workload projected by the Department. The Committee is only able to provide $2,000,000 of the requested $5,000,000 for the national shrine initiative.

The Committee supports planning efforts for the 2002 Paralympic Games.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$46,464,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	43,200,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	46,464,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+3,264,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The Committee has provided $46,464,000 for the Office of Inspector General in fiscal year 2001. This amount is an increase of $3,264,000 above the current year appropriation and equal to the budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$62,140,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	65,140,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	62,140,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−3,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The bill provides $62,140,000 for construction, major projects, in fiscal year 2001 as requested in the budget justification. The Committee again directs that adequate planning funds are available for national cemeteries in Detroit, Michigan; South Florida; Sacramento, California; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Atlanta, Georgia. The Committee directs the Department to start planning efforts for a national cemetery in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The specific amounts recommended by the Committee are as follows:

DETAIL OF BUDGET REQUEST

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and description	Available through 2000	2001 request	House recommendation
Medical Program:			
Seismic corrections: Palo Alto, CA	0	26,600	26,600

DETAIL OF BUDGET REQUEST—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and description	Available through 2000	2001 request	House recommendation
Advance planning fund: various stations	0	14,500	14,500
Asbestos abatement: various stations	0	2,025	2,025
Less: Design fund	0	−1,330	−1,330
Subtotal, medical programs	0	41,795	41,795
Veterans Benefits Administration: Advance planning fund	0	250	250
National Cemetery Program:			
Ft. Logan National Cemetery gravesite development	0	16,100	16,100
Advance planning fund: various stations	0	2,500	2,500
Design fund	0	1,600	1,600
Less: Design fund	0	−805	−805
Subtotal, NCA	0	19,395	19,395
Claims Analyses: various stations	0	700	700
Total construction, major projects	0	62,140	62,140

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$100,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	160,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	162,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−60,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−62,000,000

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

The Committee recommends $100,000,000 for the construction, minor projects appropriation in fiscal year 2001. The amount recommended is $62,000,000 below the budget request.

The Committee directs that VHA's minor construction resources should be utilized in a manner that is consistent with the current Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) initiative. Therefore, beginning in fiscal year 2001 all VHA minor construction projects must be reviewed by a central office work group that will consist of both VHA and other Department officials. For evaluation purposes, the work group is to utilize criteria that is consistent with those developed for CARES. If total costs of projects being initiated at any facility exceeds $4 million (the Capital Investment Board threshold), the recommendations of the work group must be approved by the Deputy Secretary.

The Committee directs the Department to expeditiously expend remaining funds previously appropriated in Public Law 103–211 to repair the earthquake-damaged gymnasium on the VAMC campus in Sepulveda, California.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

This appropriation provides funds for the construction, alteration, and acquisition (by purchase or lease) of parking garages at

Department medical facilities. The Secretary is required under certain circumstances to establish and collect fees for the use of such garages and parking facilities. Receipts from the parking fees are to be deposited in the revolving fund and can be used to fund future parking garage initiatives.

No new budget authority is requested for the parking revolving fund in fiscal year 2001. Leases will be funded from parking fees collected. The bill includes the requested language permitting operation and maintenance costs of parking facilities to be funded from the medical care appropriation.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$60,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	90,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	60,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−30,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The Committee recommends $60,000,000 for grants for construction of State extended care facilities in fiscal year 2001. This amount represents a decrease of $30,000,000 below last year's funding level but is equal to the budget request.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$25,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	25,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	25,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The Committee recommends the budget request of $25,000,000 for grants for the construction State veterans cemeteries in fiscal year 2001.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING THE TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The bill continues the existing seven administrative provisions as proposed in the budget. The budget proposes bill language to fund the new Office of Resolution Management (ORM) and Office of Employment Discrimination Compliant Adjudication (OEDCA) on a reimbursable basis from other VA appropriations in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee provides definite levels of funding for these offices, as is the case with other administrative functions, language transferring the amounts assumed in "Medical care" ($28,134,000—$26,069,000 for ORM and $2,065,000 for OEDCA), "National cemetery administration" ($125,000—$111,000 for ORM and $14,000 for OEDCA), "Office of Inspector General" ($28,000—$28,000 for ORM and no funding for OEDCA) appropriations, has been included in the bill. In addition, up to $2,022,000 ($1,847,000 for ORM and $175,000 for OEDCA) is assumed in "General operating expenses" for these activities. All funds for these two offices should be requested in the general operating expenses appropriation in fiscal year 2001.

The bill also includes several new provisions. The Committee does not accept the administration's request to return $350,000,000 to the Department of Treasury. Instead, Sec. 108 is included to offset receipts collected under the Veterans Millennium Health Care Act in fiscal year 2001 against the "Medical care" appropriation.

The Committee included bill language allowing the extension of specific resources in the research program to be available until 2003.

Two administrative provisions are included as technical adjustments to the budget request. At this time, HR LINK$ is not ready for operation in the Franchise Fund as proposed and Sec. 110 is included allowing the Department to transfer those amounts back to the "General operating expenses" appropriation for that purpose. In addition, Sec. 111 is included to properly fund personnel in the Office of General Counsel from the "General operating expenses" account instead of "Medical care"

The Committee included language requested in the budget submission moving the compensation and pension pay date back to fiscal year 2000 with Sec. 112.

The Committee also included language directing the Department to fully utilize the Capital Investment Board when evaluating procurement proposals. The Committee also directs the Department to fully utilize the Veterans Affairs Resource Board when making policy decisions to ensure the Department is consistent with the "One VA" policy.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$29,967,030,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	25,860,183,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	32,458,550,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+4,106,030,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−2,490,167,000

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

In carrying out the mission of serving the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and of the people who live and work in them, HUD administers mortgage and loan insurance programs,

rental and homeownership subsidy programs for low-income families, neighborhood rehabilitation programs, and community development programs.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $29,967,030,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a decrease of $2,490,167,000 below the request and an increase of $4,106,030,000 above the fiscal year 2000 appropriation.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$13,275,388,459
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	11,376,695,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	14,127,824,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+1,898,693,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−852,436,000

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

The Committee recommends $13,275,388,459, plus any recaptures from the HCF accounts. As requested by the Administration, the Committee recommends $4,200,000,000 in advance appropriations.

The appropriated amount provided is sufficient to renew all expiring section 8 contracts at a 100% utilization rate, and to provide relocation assistance at the requested funding level. By adding to the total appropriation the recaptures, which historically have amounted to more than $1,000,000,000, and combining them with the $1,295,000,000 offset requested by the Administration, the total appropriation will adequately fund not only renewals, but relocation assistance, amendments, shelter plus care renewals, contract administrators, and new section 8 incremental assistance as well. Confirming that the recommendation is adequate are virtually identical CBO and OMB outlay estimates for the HCF account, which both indicate a 93% utilization rate. Finally, CBO analysis confirm that the amount provided adequately funds the activities included in this account.

In addition to renewals and relocation assistance, $37,000,000 is for shelter plus care renewals, $25,000,000 is for nonelderly disabled families, $192,000,000 is for section 8 contract administrators, $66,000,000 is for vouchers that work in tandem with the low-income housing tax credit program, $60,000,000 is for incremental vouchers to be distributed within four months of enactment on a fair share basis to PHAs that have a 97 percent utilization rate, and $660,000 is for monitoring PHAs that increase the payment standard of a voucher through legislation provided in section 206 of the general provisions of this Act. Additionally, pursuant to HUD's Budget Justifications, $11,000,000 is transferred to the Working Capital Fund. Funds are not provided for welfare to work vouchers as requested by the Administration, or for the Moving To Work program, which is fully funded with fiscal year 2000 funds. Finally, the Committee recommends a rescission of $275,388,459.

The Committee notes that earmarking recaptures prior to their actual receipt is an unusual practice, and should be considered a one-time event. Nevertheless, recaptures of this magnitude indicate an under-utilization problem of monumental proportions. Because $1,432,000,000 was recaptured from PHAs last year, more than 237,000 families were not served by funds Congress appropriated. HUD and public housing authorities should strive to increase utilization rates to levels that more closely replicate the conventional rental market. HUD is studying this issue and the Committee directs HUD to report to the Committees on Appropriations their findings by January 15, 2001.

Another problem confounding the HCF account is the slowness with which incremental section 8 assistance is awarded. Consistently, HUD fails to award assistance within the fiscal year in which it is appropriated. This programmatic inefficiency is unacceptable; consequently, language is included requiring HUD to award incremental assistance on a fair share basis within four months of enactment of this legislation, or funds are to be returned to the general treasury. New incremental assistance shall be provided only to those PHAs that have a 97 percent utilization rate. Additionally, language is included in the bill that precludes HUD from paying increased administrative fee costs in the tenant-based section 8 program that result from the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998.

To increase section 8 utilization rates, the Committee has included language in section 206 of the General Provisions of Title II authorizing PHAs to increase the payment standard under certain conditions. Furthermore, a section 8 homeownership demonstration program is provided in the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC) program account.

Finally, the Committee directs HUD to work closely with organizations like the National Apartment Association to ameliorate those requirements that are detrimental to creating partnerships between section 8 client and apartment owner partnerships in meeting our nation's housing needs and to come up with solutions to the impediments apartment owners face in offering affordable housing to section 8 clients.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$2,800,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	2,900,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	2,955,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	–100,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	–155,000,000

The Public Housing Capital Fund provides funding for all public housing capital programs, like public housing development, modernization, and amendments. Examples of capital modernization projects include replacing roofs and windows, improving common spaces, upgrading electrical and plumbing systems, and renovating the interior of an apartment.

The Committee recommends funding this program at $2,800,000,000, which is $100,000,000 below the fiscal year 2000 level of $2,900,000,000 and $155,000,000 below the request. Of the amount provided, no more than $50,000,000 may be used for tech-

nical assistance, contract expertise, training, interventions in troubled authorities, independent physical inspections, and management improvements. Additionally, pursuant to HUD's Budget Justifications, $43,000,000 is transferred to the Working Capital Fund. Finally, rather than using the calculation authorized in section 9(k) of the 1937 Housing Act for repairs required because of natural disasters and emergencies, up to $75,000,000 is provided for these purposes. Funds are not provided for the following Administration requests: $55,000,000 for the Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) program—this request is funded in the Community Development Fund; $10,000,000 for promoting consortia or other consolidations of PHAs; and $1,000,000 for the design of a capital financing program.

Public housing for the elderly serves the poorest, the most racially and ethnically diverse, the oldest, and the largest number of seniors of the assisted housing programs. The Committee is therefore interested in further examining the Elderly Plus demonstration to retrofit public housing for elderly to efficiently and economically serve their assisted living needs.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$3,138,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	3,138,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	3,192,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	–54,000,000

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

The Committee recommends funding operating subsidies at the fiscal year 2000 level of $3,138,000,000, a decrease of $54,000,000 below the request. Language is included prohibiting HUD from spending any funds on section 9(k) activities.

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$300,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	310,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	345,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	–10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	–45,000,000

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

The Committee recommends funding this program at $300,000,000, which is $10,000,000 below the fiscal year 2000 level and $45,000,000 below the request. Of the amount provided, $5,000,000 is for technical assistance and program assessment, $10,000,000 is set-aside for Operation Safe Home administered by

the HUD Inspector General and $10,000,000 is for the Inspector General for other Operation Safe Home activities. The request of $20,000,000 for the New Approach Anti-Drug Program is not appropriated nor is the request for the Community Gun Safety and Violence Reduction Initiative, a proposal that is not authorized.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$565,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	575,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	625,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	–10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	–60,000,000

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

The Committee recommends funding HOPE VI at $565,000,000, which is $10,000,000 below fiscal year 2000 and $60,000,000 below the request. Of the amount, $10,000,000 is for technical assistance, which is the same level as fiscal year 2000 and is a decrease of $5,000,000 below the request. The request to set-aside $180,000,000 for converting sites to assisted living is not provided.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$620,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	620,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	650,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	–30,000,000

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

The Committee recommends funding this program at the fiscal year 2000 level of $620,000,000, which is $30,000,000 below the request. Of the amount provided $6,000,000 is set-aside for the section 601 Loan Guarantee Program, $6,000,000 is set-aside for inspections, training, travel costs, and technical assistance, of which $2,000,000, pursuant to HUD's Budget Justifications, is transferred to the Working Capital Fund, and $2,000,000 of the total appropriation is for the National American Indian Housing Council to conduct training programs and to provide technical assistance. The Committee has not provided $5,000,000 for a new initiative called the Indian Homeownership Intermediary Initiative, as requested by the Administration.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$6,000,000	$71,956,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	6,000,000	71,956,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	6,000,000	71,956,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0	0

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

The Committee recommends funding this program at the request of $6,000,000, which is the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$232,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	232,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	260,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−28,000,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends $232,000,000, which is the same level as fiscal year 2000, and $28,000,000 below the request. In addition, the Committee recommends that one percent of the funds be used for technical assistance and for tracking and monitoring systems.

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$20,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	25,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	27,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−7,000,000

The Committee has provided $20,000,000, which is $5,000,000 below fiscal year 2000 and is $7,000,000 below the request.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$4,505,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	4,800,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	4,900,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−295,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−395,000,000

The Community Development Fund provides funding to state and local governments, and to other entities that carry out community and economic development activities under several authorized programs.

The Committee recommends appropriating $4,505,000,000 for the community development fund. The account was modified from previous years to show all programs, including the CDBG formula grant program, as set-asides within the overall account. Presenting the accounts in this manner make it easier to see how funding levels change from year to year.

Set-asides within the CDF account include:

$4,214,050,000 for Community Development Block grants;

$67,000,000 for Native Americans;

$3,000,000 for the Housing Assistance Council;

$3,000,000 for the National American Indian Housing Council;

$39,500,000 for section 107 activities;

$20,000,000 for the Self-Help Housing Opportunity Program (SHOP);

$23,450,000 for the National Community Development Initiative (NCDI) including set-asides of $3,400,000 for Habitat for Humanity for its capacity building activities and of $4,000,000 for rural areas;

$55,000,000 for the Resident Opportunity and Social Services program;

$10,000,000 for neighborhood initiatives;

$45,000,000 for Youthbuild which includes a $3,740,000 set-aside for capacity building activities;

$10,000,000 for economic development initiatives; and

$28,000,000 for the cost of guaranteeing loans for the section 108 program.

Additionally, pursuant to HUD's Budget Justifications, $15,000,000 is transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

Set-asides within the section 107 grant account include:

$10,000,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities;

$8,000,000 is for Community Outreach Partnership Centers

$3,000,000 is for Community Development Work Study;

$6,500,000 is for Hispanic-Serving Institutions Assisting Communities;

$0 for technical assistance;

$7,000,000 for Insular Areas; and

$5,000,000 for Management Information System Support to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

Programs requested by the Administration but for which funds are not provided include:

$5,000,000 for Tribal Colleges and Universities;

$2,000,000 for the Native American Economic Development Access Center;

$5,000,000 for New Markets University Partnership pilot grants;

$22,000,000 for economic revitalization and community development initiatives in the Mississippi Delta Region;

$2,000,000 to support Alaska Native serving institutions and native Hawaiian serving institutions;

$100,000,000 for the Economic Development Initiative;

$125,000,000 for Regional Connections/Smart Growth;

$15,000,000 for technical assistance; and,

$20,000,000 for the Center for Community and Interfaith Partnership initiative.

As requested by the Administration, the commitment level for the section 108 Loan Guarantee program is limited to $1,217,000,000, which is $44,000,000 below the fiscal year 2000 limitation.

Funds for America's Private Investment Companies (APIC) and the communities in schools programs are not appropriated because the proposal is unauthorized.

The Committee directs HUD to provide information to all state and local jurisdictions that people with disabilities and their advocates must be at the table when Consolidated Plans are developed. In addition, the Committee directs HUD to evaluate Consolidated Plans for this inclusion, as well as to determine if the needs reflected in the final plan match the proposed uses of federal funds. The Committee also directs HUD, when reviewing Consolidated Plans, to take into consideration a community's adoption of a building code that complies with the Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines, and a community's efforts to remove "impediments" to fair housing.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$20,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	25,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	50,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−30,000,000

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

The Committee recommends appropriating $20,000,000, which is $5,000,000 below fiscal year 2000, and $30,000,000 below the request.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$1,585,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	1,600,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	1,650,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−15,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−65,000,000

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

The Committee recommends appropriating $1,585,000,000, which is $15,000,000 below fiscal year 2000 and $65,000,000 below the request. Of the amount appropriated, $15,000,000 is for Housing Counseling, which is the same level as fiscal year 2000 and is $9,000,000 below the President's request and, pursuant HUD's Budget Justifications, $17,000,000 is transferred to the Working Capital fund for the development and operation of integrated community development management information systems. Language requested by the Administration making three percent of the total funds appropriated available for use by Native Americans is not included.

To address the Committee's concerns about HUD's lack of performance data in the Housing Counseling program, several organizations have been working to design a system to measure the outcomes of counseling services. The Committee reserves the right to review this proposal, and to consider its suggestions during Conference negotiations with the Senate, and to revise the appropriation accordingly.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$1,020,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	1,020,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	1,200,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−180,000,000

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

The Committee recommends funding homeless programs at $1,020,000,000, the same level as fiscal year 2000 and a decrease of $180,000,000 below the request. Language is included requiring HUD to use not less than 30 percent of the funds appropriated for Homeless programs for permanent housing. Language requested by the Administration is included that requires all homeless programs

to coordinate their programs with mainstream health, social services and employment programs for which homeless populations are eligible. Finally, language is included providing that 1.5 percent of the funds is available for technical assistance and management information systems of which .5 percent is to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund. The Committee did not provide $105,000,000 for section 8 rental assistance for homeless families from this account as requested by the Administration though $37,000,000 is provided in the HCF account to renew shelter plus care vouchers.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$911,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	911,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	989,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−78,000,000

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

The Committee recommends funding the Housing for Special Populations program at the fiscal year 2000 level of $911,000,000, which is $78,000,000 below the request. Of the amount provided, the fiscal year 2000 level of $710,000,000 is for section 202 housing, which is $69,000,000 below the request. For the section 811 disabled housing program, the Committee recommends the fiscal year 2000 level of $201,000,000, which is $9,000,000 below the request. Language is included transferring $1,000,000, to be equally divided between section 202 and section 811, to the Working Capital Fund pursuant to HUD's Budget Justifications.

Of the amount provided for section 202, $50,000,000 is to renew existing service coordinator and congregate services contracts, and $50,000,000 is for the section 202 conversion program. Language requested by the Administration is not included making elderly persons living in the neighborhood but not in assisted projects eligible to receive assistance. Language requested by the Administration creating a construction and insurance program, and intergenerational learning centers, is not included.

The Committee strongly opposes the Administration's proposal to increase the set-aside for section 8 for the disabled from at least 25 percent to up to 50 percent. For many years, the section 811 program has played a critical role in "housing production." The program has added to the stock of affordable and accessible housing and has been proven to be one of HUD's most effective programs, successfully investing federal funding through nonprofit disability organization. The Committee strongly supports the role of tenant-based rental assistance but recognizes that it is not the only component of an effective, broad-based housing policy for people with disabilities.

Likewise, the Committee is concerned that HUD's current practice of converting section 811 tenant-based rental assistance may discourage nonprofit disability organizations from applying for and administering tenant-based rental assistance. Therefore, the Committee directs HUD to refrain from converting section 811 appropriations to section 8 rental subsidies.

Last year, this Committee directed the Secretary to use waiver authority and make nonprofit disability organizations eligible applicants for the tenant-based rental assistance funded through the section 811 program. The Committee is pleased that the Secretary did so. Last year, approximately 100 non-profit disability groups applied to administer these funds. Unfortunately, only 14 could be funded with the rest of the funds going to PHAs. The Committee, once again, directs the Secretary to use his waiver power and continue the eligibility of these non-profit disability organizations.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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

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

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

FHA-MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of direct loans	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$100,000,000	$160,000,000,000	$330,888,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	100,000,000	140,000,000,000	330,888,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	250,000,000	160,000,000,000	330,888,000
Comparison with 2000 Appropriation	0	+20,000,000,000	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−150,000,000	0	0

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

The mutual mortgage insurance program account covers unsubsidized programs, and consists of primarily the single-family home mortgage program, the largest of all the FHA programs. The cooperative housing insurance program provides mortgages for coopera-

tive housing projects of more than five units that are occupied by members of a cooperative housing corporation.

The Committee recommends limiting commitments in the FHA–MMI program account to $160,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, which is $20,000,000 above the fiscal year 2000 level, and is the same level requested by the Administration through a budget amendment. The Committee recommends the request of $330,888,000 for administrative expenses, which is the same level as fiscal year 2000. Furthermore, the Committee recommends the request to limit direct loans to $50,000,000, which is the same level as the fiscal year 2000 appropriation. Finally, of the $160,000,000 provided for administrative contract expenses, pursuant to HUD's Budget Justifications request, $96,500,000 is transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

Though requested by the Administration, $2,000,000 is not provided for a data warehouse operated by the Federal Housing Credit Consortium. Additionally, language increasing the FHA limitation on individual mortgages to insure single family loans to the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac conforming loan limit is not included. Finally, legislation to allow FHA to insure a new Adjustable Rate Mortgage (ARM) product is not included.

The Committee encourages HUD to work with training organizations with strong community ties and workforce development experience to provide low-income residents the skills to rebuild their communities and to learn new construction trades.

FHA-GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of direct loans	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses	Program costs
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$50,000,000	$21,000,000,000	$211,455,000	$101,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	50,000,000	18,100,000,000	[1] 64,000,000	[2] 0
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	50,000,000	21,000,000,000	211,455,000	101,000,000
Comparison with 2000 Appropriation	0	2,900,000,000	147,455,000	101,000,000
Comparison with 2001 budget request	0	0	0	0

[1] Actual spending in fiscal year 2000 was $211,000,000 due to $145,000,000 in unobligated balances being used for this purpose.
[2] Actual spending in fiscal year 2000 was $153,000,000 due to $153,000,000 in unobligated balances being used for this purpose.

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

As requested, the Committee recommends to limit loan guarantee commitments for the FHA-general and special risk insurance program account to $21,000,000,000, which is $2,900,000,000 above the fiscal year 2000 level. The Committee recommends the budget request of $101,000,000 for credit subsidy purposes, whereas, in fiscal year 2000, $153,000,000 of unobligated balances were used to

fund credit subsidy. Likewise, the Committee recommends the request of $211,455,000 for administrative expenses. This is the same level as last year, however, in fiscal year 2000, $147,000,000 in unobligated balances were used to reduce the appropriated level of budget authority, an offset that is not available in fiscal year 2001. Additionally, the Committee recommends the request on limiting direct loans to $50,000,000, which is the same level as the fiscal year 2000 appropriation. Finally, as requested, $33,500,000 of the $144,000,000 provided for administrative contract expenses, is transferred to the Working Capital Fund.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES

LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$200,000,000,000	$9,383,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	200,000,000,000	9,383,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	200,000,000,000	9,383,000
Comparison with 2000 appropriation	0	0
Comparison with 2001 budget request	0	0

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

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

Language requested by the Administration to provide $40,000,000 for administrative contract expenses is not provided.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$40,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	45,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	62,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−22,000,000

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 directs the Secretary to undertake programs of research, studies, testing, and

demonstrations related to the HUD mission. These functions are carried out internally through contracts with industry, non-profit research organizations, and educational institutions and through agreements with state and local governments and other federal agencies.

The bill includes $40,000,000 for research and technology, which is $22,000,000 below the budget request. Of this amount, the Committee recommends $30,000,000 for research, technology, and policy analysis. Additionally, the Committee recommends the fiscal year 2000 level of $10,000,000 for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) initiative, which is $2,500,000 below the request.

Of the amount provided for research, technology, and policy development, $3,000,000 to be used exclusively for program evaluation and data collection to support strategic planning, performance measurement, and budget. In its 1999 report on Government Performance Results Act (GPRA) in HUD, the National Academy of Public Administration noted that full implementation of GPRA—especially for managing to results—requires an investment in both the collection of data which might not be available as well as in evaluation to determine the links between the every-day activities of the Department and the ultimate goals specified in the department's strategic and annual performance plans.

The NAPA report states, in connection with one program that, ". . . the department may not be able to measure this intermediate outcome using existing data sources; the department may need to develop additional data sources, in this case through the use of surveys. These new sources may need to be developed in cooperation with other federal agencies and non-federal service partners." The Committee directs HUD to establish a process for using these funds that shall be sent to the Committee for approval within 60 days after the enactment of this bill.

In fiscal year 1998, this Committee recommended that HUD study how new technologies contribute to lowering the costs of constructing and operating affordable housing. Based on this directive, HUD proposed the PATH program. One of its goals is to coordinate the governmental effort to increase Federal support for housing research, development, and demonstration programs. As a research tool, it would be inappropriate to move PATH from the Office of Policy Development and Research (PDR) to the Federal Housing Administration, a home loan insurance program with little research capacity. Therefore, the Committee directs HUD to retain the program, and its administration, in the Office of PDR. Furthermore, HUD is directed to cooperate fully with the home building industry, and particularly the National Association of Homebuilders (NAHB) Research Center, which coordinates industry participation and research planning for PATH. HUD is also directed to recognize the role of manufactured homes in providing housing to Americans and research through the Manufactured Housing Research Alliance (MHRA).

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$44,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	44,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	50,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−6,000,000

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

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

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

The Committee recommends providing $44,000,000 for this account; $22,000,000 for FHAP, and $22,000,000 for FHIP. The Administration requested $50,000,000 for the account, with FHIP receiving $29,000,000. In the FHIP account, the Committee recommends $7,500,000 to fund the final year of a three-year audit-based enforcement initiative. The requests of $2,500,000 for the Project for Accessibility Training and Technical Assistance (PATTA), $1,000,000 for a fair housing enforcement training academy, and $3,500,000 for the Fair Housing Partnership are not provided.

The Committee is unsatisfied with the large carryover of funds in this account and directs HUD to put mechanisms into place that will result in funds being dispersed before the end of the last quarter of the fiscal year. If HUD is unable to comply with this direction, the Department is directed to provide a detailed briefing and report to the Committees on Appropriations on how the obligation rate in this program can be improved.

Like last year, the Committee continues to be concerned with the lack of accessible housing options available to people with disabilities in the community. Therefore, the Committee directs HUD to inform those who receive federal funds of the need for compliance with the Fair Housing Act accessibility Guidelines and to closely monitor this compliance.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION PROGRAM AND HEALTHY HOMES INITIATIVE

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$80,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	80,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	120,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−40,000,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $80,000,000 for this program, which is the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000 and is $40,000,000 below the request. Of the amount appropriated, $1,000,000 is for CLEARCorps, and $10,000,000 is for the Healthy Homes Initiative.

The Committee is concerned about several provisions in the proposed Lead-Based Paint rule, and plans to carefully monitor ongoing negotiations between HUD and the industry on the impact of the rule. While the Committee does not have a recommendation at this time, the Committee reserves the right to revisit this issue, should it be necessary, in Conference.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

		By transfer						
	Appropriation	FHA funds	GNMA funds	CPD	Title VI	Indian Housing	APIC	Total
FY 2001 recommendation	$475,647,000	$518,000,000	$9,383,000	$1,000,000	$150,000	$200,000	$0	$1,004,380,000
FY 2000 appropriation	477,000,000	518,000,000	9,383,000	1,000,000	150,000	200,000	0	1,005,733,000
FY 2001 budget request	565,000,000	518,000,000	9,383,000	1,000,000	150,000	200,000	1,000,000	1,094,733,000
Comparison with 2000 appropriation	−1,353,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	−1,353,000
Comparison with 2001 budget request	−89,353,000	0	0	0	0	0	−1,000,000	−90,353,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,004,380,000, a decrease of $90,353,000 below the request. This appropriation is premised on no more than 9,100 employees. Funds for object classes are dispersed in the following manner:

Personal Services—$745,000,000.

Travel and transportation of persons—$10,000,000.

Rent, communications, and utilities—$120,000,000.

Transportation of Things—$800,000.

Printing and Reproduction—$3,500,000.

Other Services—$123,480,000.
Supplies and Materials—$300,000.
Furniture and Equipment—$1,000,000.
Indemnities—$300,000.

The Committee is very concerned that for the last two fiscal years, HUD has threatened reductions in force (RIFs) claiming insufficient personal services funds for 9,300 FTEs. Though the Committee provided funds for 9,300 FTEs, as of January 29, 2000, HUD had only 9,040 FTEs, indicating an inflated personnel requirement in the budget. Again, in the fiscal year 2001 budget, HUD resource estimates are based on 9,300 FTEs. As a practical matter, this estimate requires that, with attrition, HUD hire 748 new staff by the end of fiscal year 2000. Hiring to this level is unnecessary, unachieveable, and unacceptable to the Committee. Accordingly, the Committee has provided funds sufficient for 9,100 FTEs, which is an increase over current services.

Furthermore, according to the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) October, 1999 report entitled "Aligning Resources and Priorities at HUD: Designing a Resource Management System," HUD is beginning to implement a resource management system. The Committee has long felt that the lack of such a system within the Department served as a major detriment to the efficient operation of Departmental programs in a period of staff downsizing and increasing workload, and has contributed to HUD's inclusion on GAO's "High Risk" list. NAPA has also briefed the Committee on the implementation plan it has prepared for HUD. The Committee expects the Department to proceed with implementation, as detailed in the NAPA plan, and to provide a briefing to the Committees on Appropriations as soon as possible on the implementation plan along with a proposed implementation schedule. This briefing should also discuss how HUD intends to decrease it's FTE cost, which is now $78,800 per employee. This cost is exacerbated by 400 community builders who make, on average, $91,000 per individual. Following this initial briefing, the Committee directs the Department to provide the Committee quarterly progress reports on the efforts to implement its resource management system.

Of the funds provided for "Other Services," HUD is directed to spend $100,000,000 on ADP systems, for the working capital fund in accordance with the Justifications. Remaining funds from this account shall first be spent on statutorily mandated systems and contracts. If additional funds remain, they may be spent on other contracts.

The Committee is committed to improving HUD's capacity to disseminate useful information about program performance. To a large extent, Congress' ability to oversee the effectiveness of HUD is undermined because data is simply inaccessible. Perennially, this deficiency is cited by the Inspector General, and is a major reason the General Accounting Office (GAO) retains HUD on its high-risk list. In an attempt to resolve this problem, the Committee recommends transferring specific amounts from various programmatic accounts. In addition, HUD is directed to include in its Budget Justifications, a comprehensive multi-year budget plan that creates, maintains, and refines HUD's information technology systems. This plan should prioritize expenditures based on the defi-

ciencies cited by GAO and the Inspector General, and should be described on a program-by-program basis.

Finally, language is included that terminates the "community builder" program. The Committee is extremely concerned about reports that HUD has retained the community builder program and intends to supplement it by hiring at least 200 personnel, contrary to the spirit of the agreement reached during extensive negotiations in the fiscal year 2000 VA, HUD Conference report. Therefore, HUD is directed to terminate the community builder program by October 1, 2000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	FHA funds	Drug elim. grants	Total
FY 2001 recommendation	$50,657,000	$22,343,000	$10,000,000	$83,000,000
FY 2000 appropriation	50,657,000	22,343,000	10,000,000	83,000,000
FY 2001 budget request	52,000,000	22,343,000	10,000,000	84,343,000
Comparison with 2000 appropriation	0	0	0	0
Comparison with 2001 budget request	−1,343,000	0	0	−1,343,000

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

The Committee recommends the $83,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General, which is the same level as fiscal year 2000 and a $1,343,000 below the request. Of the amount, $10,000,000 is for Operation Safe Home, which is the request and the same as fiscal year 2000. Transfers of $22,343,000 from FHA funds and $10,000,000 from Drug Elimination Grants are in addition to the appropriation, and are the same levels as the request and the fiscal year 2000 appropriation.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$22,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	19,493,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	25,800,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−2,507,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−3,800,000

The Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) was established in 1992 to regulate the financial safety and soundness of the two housing government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs)—the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae)

and the Federal home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac). The office was authorized in the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, and gave the regulator enhanced authority to enforce these standards. In addition to financial regulation, the OFHEO monitors the GSEs compliance with affordable housing goals that were contained in the Act.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $22,000,000 which is $2,507,000 above fiscal year 2000 and $3,800,000 below the budget request. OFHEO requires additional staff to conduct safety and soundness work, as well as additional new computer equipment to enhance examiner ability.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The bill contains a number of administrative provisions.

Section 201 relates to the division of financing adjustment factors.

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

Section 203 corrects an anomaly in the HOPWA formula that results in the loss of funds for a state when the incidence of AIDS in a large city increases.

Section 204 extends enhanced disposition authority to fiscal year 2001.

Section 205 amends section 8(t)(1)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to cap enhanced vouchers.

Section 206 authorizes PHAs, in areas designated by the Secretary, to increase the payment standard for section 8 vouchers.

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$28,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	28,467,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	26,196,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−467,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	+1,804,000

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

The Committee recommends $28,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 to administer, operate and maintain the Commission's monuments, cemeteries, and memorials throughout the world. This amount represents an increase of $1,804,000 above the budget request and is the fourth increment provided the Commission to reduce the maintenance backlog identified prior to passage of the fiscal 1998 appropriation. The Committee notes and commends the work performed in this regard so far by the Commission, and intends over the next few years that the backlog be further reduced. These actions will ensure that the cemeteries and memorials under ABMC's jurisdiction are maintained at a high standard to reflect the nation's continuing commitment to its Honored War Dead and their families.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$8,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	8,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	8,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	0

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee is recommending $8,000,000, the same as the 2000 funding level and the budget request.

Again this year, bill language has been included which limits the number of career senior executive service positions to three. Bill language has also been included which makes $3,000,000 of appropriated funds available for two fiscal years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$105,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	95,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	125,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−20,000,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $105,000,000 for the program in fiscal year 2001. The recommendation is a decrease

of $20,000,000 below the budget request and is an increase of $10,000,000 above the fiscal year 2000 appropriation.

Like last year, the Committee is very pleased with CDFI's significant contributions to communities across the country, and has increased funding for the account accordingly. For a minimal federal investment of $34,000,000, community development loans and investments worth $565,000,000 were made; 12,412 jobs were created or retained; 8,614 units of affordable housing were developed; 98 childcare centers served 7,168 children; 17 health care facilities served 32,723 clients; and 10,641 individuals received business training, credit counseling, homebuyer training and other redevelopment services. Of the beneficiaries, 70% were low-income, 60% were minorities, 50% were women, 53% lived in the inner cities, 36% lived in suburban areas, and 11% lived in rural areas.

The Committee acknowledges the efforts that the CDFI Fund has made to support credit unions that are CDFIs and/or emerging CDFIs. As of June 6, 2000, the Fund has certified 78 credit unions as CDFIs and invested $19.3 million in credit unions and the National Federation of Community Development Credit Unions. The Committee recognizes that credit unions are excellent vehicles for community development efforts and expects that the CDFI Fund will continue its efforts to support credit unions that are CDFIs through such means as financial assistance, technical assistance, and training programs. In addition, the Committee asks the CDFI Fund to strengthen its efforts to encourage eligible credit unions, particularly community development credit unions to apply to its programs through outreach activities and implementing a Small and Emerging CDFI Access Program.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$51,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	48,814,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	52,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+2,186,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−1,500,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $51,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $2,186,000 over the fiscal year 2000 appropriation and a decrease of $1,500,000 from the budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $1,500,000 which is to be applied by the Commission in an equitable manner rather than applying all of the reduction to only one or two programs.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$0
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	353,153,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	533,700,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−353,153,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−533,700,000

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

The fiscal year 2001 budget request for program and administrative activities of the Corporation for National and Community Service is $533,700,000. The Committee recommends no funding for this program in fiscal year 2001. Language is included in the bill which directs the Corporation to use any funds remaining from prior year's appropriations to accomplish the orderly closure of the Corporation.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$5,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	3,985,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+1,015,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, the same as the budget request and an increase of $1,015,000 when compared to the appropriation for fiscal year 2000.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$12,500,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	11,450,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	12,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+1,050,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The bill includes the budget request of $12,500,000 for the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims in fiscal year 2001, an increase of $1,050,000 above the current year appropriation. This increase continues funding for the additional law clerks as temporary FTE's to assist the Court with the large number of backlogged cases coming from the Department of Veterans Affairs Board of Veterans Appeals.

The bill also fully funds pro bono representation program request of $895,000 as an earmark.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$15,949,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	12,473,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	15,949,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+3,476,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

The Secretary of the Army is responsible for the administration, operation and maintenance of Arlington National Cemetery and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery. At the close of fiscal year 1999, the remains of 277,932 persons were interred/inured in these cemeteries. Of this total, 237,323 persons were interred and 25,960 remains inured in the Columbarium in Arlington National Cemetery, and 14,649 remains were interred in the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery. There were 3,586 interments and 2,152 inurnments in fiscal year 1999. It is projected that there will be 3,700 interments and 2,200 inurnments in fiscal year 2000; and 3,700 interments and 2,300 inurnments in fiscal year 2001. In addition to its principal function as a national cemetery, Arlington is the site of approximately 2,700 nonfuneral ceremonies each year and has approximately 4,000,000 visitors annually.

The Committee shares the concern expressed through the budget request that additional funds are necessary and appropriate to meet the backlog of long and short-term maintenance needs as well as important capital improvement projects within Arlington National Cemetery. An additional $2,000,000 beyond the budget submission has therefore been provided in order to "jump-start" the highest priority projects as identified in the Cemetary's ten-year plan. The Cemetery is requested to provide the Committee an updated project priority list on a semi-annual basis, which list should include a brief explanation of the plans, timing, and progress toward completion of each such project.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$60,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation [1]	60,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request [1]	48,526,700
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	+11,473,300

[1] Fiscal year 2000 appropriation and fiscal year 2001 request included in the Hazardous Substance Superfund account of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, an agency within the National Institutes of Health, was authorized in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to conduct certain research and worker training activities associated with the nation's Hazardous Substance Superfund program.

For fiscal year 2001 the Committee has recommended a funding level of $60,000,000, the same as the fiscal year 2000 level and an increase of $11,473,300 over the budget request. The Committee's recommendation includes $37,000,000 for research and $23,000,000 for the worker training program.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$70,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation [1]	70,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request [1]	64,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	+6,000,000

[1] Fiscal year 2000 appropriation and fiscal year 2001 request included in the Hazardous Substance Superfund account of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), an agency of the Public Health Service, was created in section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980. The ATSDR's primary mission is to conduct surveys and screening programs to determine relationships between exposure to toxic substances and illness. Other activities include the maintenance and annual update of a list of hazardous substances most commonly found at Superfund sites, the preparation of toxicological profiles on each such hazardous substance, consultations on health issues relating to exposure to hazardous or toxic substances, and the development and implementation of certain research activities related to ATSDR's mission.

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee has recommended a funding level of $70,000,000, the same as for fiscal year 2000 and an increase of $6,000,000 above the budget request.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$7,148,888,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	7,591,659,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request [1]	7,164,072,300
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−413,923,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−15,184,300

[1] Line does not include budget request for NIEHS and ATSDR totalling $112,526,700. These requests are noted in the new account structure for these two agencies.

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

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

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

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

Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

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

Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

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

Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended.

Clean Air Act, as amended.

Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended.

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

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

Pollution Prevention Act of 1990.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended.

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee has recommended a total program and support level of $7,150,888,000, a decrease of $411,923,000 below last year's appropriated level and $13,184,300 below the budget request. Programmatically, when adding the $130,000,000 provided to ATSDR and NIEHS in the preceding, new account, rather than in the Hazardous Substances Superfund account at EPA as in past years, the Committee's recommendation is $3,401,000 above the budget request.

Of the amounts approved in the following appropriations accounts, the Agency must limit transfers of funds between objectives to not more than $500,000, except as specifically noted, without prior approval of the Committee. No changes may be made to any

account or objective except as approved by the Committee, if it is construed to be policy or a change in policy. Any activity or program cited in the report shall be construed as the position of the Committee and should not be subject to reductions or reprogramming without prior approval of the Committee. It is the intent of the Committee that all carryover funds in the various appropriations accounts are subject to the normal reprogramming requirements outlined above. The Agency is expected to comply with all normal rules and regulations in carrying out these directives. Reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes applying for Partnership Grants do not need to be submitted to the Committee for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations. Finally, the Committee wishes to continue to be notified regarding reorganizations of offices, programs, or activities prior to the planned implementation of such reorganizations.

The Committee believes it is in the public interest for EPA to measure and report its progress under the Government Performance and Results Act primarily in terms of environmental outcomes, such as healthier people and better habitat. This is not the approach currently being taken. The Committee recognizes that a precise understanding of the relationship between Agency action and each environmental outcome does not currently exist and may never be fully established. In environmental policy, as in every other area of public policy, action must often be taken in the face of scientific uncertainty. Nevertheless, the Act calls on the Agency to make its best professional judgment of this relationship under the assumption that the Agency's effectiveness will improve by doing so.

Therefore, the Committee directs EPA, in its implementation of the Act, to define its long-term strategic goals in terms of environmental, health, and other appropriate outcome measures. Outcome measures are direct measures of the health of humans, animals, plants, and ecosystems. (Among examples of such measures are those classified as "Level 6" on the "Hierarchy of Indicators," a framework of indicators created by EPA and in current use by EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program and a number of states.) The Committee directs EPA in reporting its performance to present measures of activities and materials that may present a hazard to the health of humans, animal, plants, and ecosystems, as well as activities intended to prevent or control such hazards. Further, it calls on the Agency to organize and present performance measures in a manner that strengthens agency management, budgeting, performance evaluation, and effectiveness, including reporting performance by EPA regions and individual states.

The Committee directs the Agency to make the necessary changes to the Strategic Plan by September 2001 and reflect such changes in subsequent GPRA plans and reports. The Committee realizes that the Agency may not be able to measure all the necessary outcomes by September 2001. However, the Agency must show significant progress each year, and include within its Annual Performance Plans an explanation of when and how the agency expects to improve data quality, ensure data integration and comparability, and establish sufficient publicly available information upon which to base conclusions. In addition, the Agency must iden-

tify resource constraints and legal impediments that may prevent the Agency from achieving its mission.

Finally, the Committee expects the Agency to evaluate and measure the effectiveness of all its program activities (including, but not limited to, compliance monitoring, enforcement, the dissemination of environmental information, education, and technical assistance) which are designed to meet long-term goals, and to share the results of those evaluations with the public and the Committee. These studies shall include estimates of program costs in a manner that allows comparison of the effectiveness of different intervention strategies. Performance reports should also indicate the accuracy, sufficiency, and level of certainty regarding performance information reported.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation [1]	$650,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	645,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	674,348,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−24,348,000

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

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

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $650,000,000 for Science and Technology for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $5,000,000 above last year's spending level, and a decrease of $24,348,000 below the budget request.

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

1. +$2,500,000 for EPSCoR.
2. +$3,000,000 for Water Environmental Research Foundation.
3. +$4,000,000 for the American Water Works Association Research Foundation.
4. +$2,000,000 for the National Decentralized Water Resource Capacity Development Project, in coordination with EPA, for continued training and research and development program.

Other Science and Technology program levels include:

1. CCTI Transportation research is funded at the 2000 level of $27,000,000.
2. Climate Change research is funded at $20,592,200, the fiscal 2000 level.
3. STAR Fellowships are funded at $9,726,400, an increase of $773,800 above the fiscal 2000 level.
4. Project EMPACT is funded $6,000,000.

5. Mobile sources research is provided $50,000,000, an increase $1,943,100 above the fiscal 2000 level.

For Science and Technology, no general reduction is proposed.

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$1,900,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	1,900,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	2,099,461,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−199,461,000

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

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

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee has recommended $1,900,000,000 for Environmental Programs and Management, the same as last year's level and a decrease from the budget request of $199,461,000. This account encompasses most of those activities previously conducted through the Abatement, Control and Compliance and Program and Research Operations accounts. In 1996, these accounts, except for certain research operations and the state categorical grant program, were merged in order to provide greater spending flexibility for the Agency. Bill language is included which makes this appropriation available for two fiscal years and, for this

account only, the Agency may transfer funds of not more than $500,000 between programs and activities without prior notice to the Committee, and of not more than $1,000,000 without prior approval of the Committee. But for this difference, all other reprogramming procedures as outlined earlier shall apply.

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

1. +$14,500,000 for rural water technical assistance activities and groundwater protection with distribution as follows: $8,600,000 for the NWRA; $2,600,000 for RCAP; $700,000 for GWPC; $1,600,000 for Small Flows Clearinghouse; and $1,000,000 for the NETC.
2. +$1,000,000 for implementation of the National Biosolids Partnership Program.
3. +$1,500,000 for source water protection programs.
4. +$3,000,000 for section 103 grants to the states to develop regional haze programs under Title I, Part C of the Clean Air Act.

Other Environmental Programs and Management activities are funded at the following levels:

1. $42,650,000 for CCTI Buildings;
2. $2,500,000 for CCTI Transportation;
3. $22,000,000 for CCTI Industry;
4. $5,500,000 for CCTI International Capacity Building;
5. $2,500,000 for CCTI State and Local programs;
6. $1,000,000 for CCTI Carbon Removal;
7. $7,800,000 for Project EMPACT;
8. $48,500,000 for compliance monitoring;
9. $82,500,000 for civil enforcement;
10. $4,000,000 for enforcement training;
11. $32,000,000 for planning and resource management;
12. $23,500,000 for criminal enforcement activities.
13. $36,610,500 for RCRA Corrective Action; and
14. $12,000,000 for the Multilateral Fund.

The Committee has provided no funds for the new International Environmental Monitoring program, for Innovative Community Partnership Program for the new Integrated Information Initiative, and for the GLOBE program. In addition, the Committee has reduced the funding available for contracts and grants by $23,500,000, has proposed a general reduction of $23,500,000, and has directed a reduction in payroll costs of $9,444,600. This later reduction will result in no reduction-in-force requirement and can be achieved through continuation of normal attrition. The Committee appreciates the Agency's commitment to reduce its personnel level to a maximum of 18,000 FTEs by the end of fiscal year 2001, and strongly encourages the Agency to make every effort to reach and exceed this goal as early in the fiscal year as possible.

Within available funds, EPA is directed to provide the fiscal year 2000 funding level for the Environmental Finance Centers as well as for the Regional Environmental Enforcement Associations. Similarly, the Agency is directed to provide no less than the budget request levels for Pesticide Registration and Re-registration programs as well as for the Environmental Education programs.

The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for section 103 grants to the states to develop regional haze programs under title I, part C of the Clean Air Act. These funds must be used to aid states in the

development of emissions inventories, quantification of natural visibility conditions, monitoring and other data necessary to define reasonable progress and develop control strategies, and to support the states' participation in regional efforts to coordinate their strategies, where necessary, and at the election of the individual states.

In addition to funds provided to the NRWA, RCAP, the GWPC, NETC, and the Small Flows Clearinghouse, the Committee has again provided $1,500,000 for source water protection programs. The Committee intends that these funds be used to develop local source water protection programs within each state utilizing the infrastructure and process of an organization now engaged in groundwater and wellhead protection programs. These resources will provided additional technicians for in-the-field work and will virtually guarantee that nearly 1,000 more communities will adopt local, country-wide and/or regional source water protection programs targeted to the highest risk watershed areas in each state.

The Committee has included bill language which prohibits the expenditure of funds by the Administrator to make a final determination on or to implement rules relative to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program and Federal Antidegradation Policy, and the Proposed Revisions to the Water Quality Planning and Management Regulations Concerning Maximum Daily Loads, published in the Federal Register in August 23, 1999. This action was taken as a result of a multitude of concerns with the timing, impact, and cost of the proposed TMDL rule registered by numerous States and businesses throughout the country. The Committee's action should be interpreted as nothing more than a brief holding action on this rule until many of these matters get sorted out and further addressed by the EPA, Congress, the States, the business community.

With regard to this TMDL issue, the Committee is aware that EPA Region IX, and perhaps others, have recently issued and implemented guidance to impose stringent TMDL requirements in individuals permits prior to the finalization of the TMDL rulemaking. The Committee notes that such guidance may be inconsistent with a final rule and, further, that no Region of the EPA has the authority to take such actions. The Agency is strongly encouraged to direct its Regions to revoke any such guidance and to take no further actions in this regard until the TMDL rule is finalized.

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

guidance. Identical bill language to continue this prohibition has also been included in the fiscal year 2001 Act.

At this point, there still does not appear to be a clear strategy to resolve this issue. Currently, the Agency is in the process of implementing a new stakeholder process for input on many difficult issues. The Committee nevertheless remains concerned that there may be conflicts between the internal and external guidance of the Agency that will make it difficult to resolve complaints in a fair and efficient manner.

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

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

The bill language is intended to prohibit funds provided in this bill from being used to implement actions called for under the Kyoto Protocol, prior to its ratification. Based on an identical provision in the 1999 Appropriations Act, the bill language prohibits the proposing or issuing of rules, regulations, decrees, or orders, for the purpose of implementing, or in preparation of implementing, the Kyoto Protocol.

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

Again this year, bill language has been included in Title IV, General Provisions, prohibiting funds for use to promulgate a final reg-

ulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance processing fees as proposed at 64 Federal Register 31040, or any similar proposal.

The Committee is aware that the EPA is considering a policy to revoke a tolerance under section 408 (1)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, when the corresponding uses of a pesticide product have been voluntarily withdrawn or canceled by the registrant. This policy may have the unintended effect of unnecessarily undermining consumer confidence and jeopardizing foreign and domestic commerce without enhancing food safety. The Committee expects EPA to allow sufficient time for food that may contain residues of a voluntarily canceled use to clear the channels of trade before revoking the associated tolerances unless the Agency determines the dietary risk associated with such residues is unacceptable based upon a notice of intent to cancel issued by the Administrator.

The Committee is aware of bipartisan efforts in the Congress to introduce legislation to provide better public health protection from the threat of radon than the proposed Radon in Drinking Water Rule. The Committee strongly encourages EPA to work closely with the Congress in crafting this legislation and directs that final promulgation of a drinking water standard for radon be postponed until such legislation can be fully considered.

Similarly, the Committee is concerned with the Agency's efforts to force a number of communities to mitigate for naturally occurring arsenic in their drinking water in excess of EPA's interim maximum containment level at the same time the Agency is pursuing new regulatory requirements to reduce the current standard to 5 parts per billion. The costs associated with having to mitigate this natural occurring substance twice is more than many of these communities can afford, and is not justified by any definitive health studies associated with the citizens located in any of these communities. The Committee therefore strongly urges the Agency to focus its efforts on developing its new rule and cease all actions relative to the enforcement on these communities of its interim requirements.

The Committee is aware that a number of organizations including the National Academy of Sciences sponsored Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR), the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have recognized that allowing certain flexibility within the academic laboratory research environment can potentially yield superior compliance while reducing regulatory burden. The Committee is also aware of a new collaborative initiative involving environmental health professionals and academic research scientists from 10 major academic research institutions and authorized state regulatory officials from each of the EPA regions in the country to establish consensus best practices for laboratory waste management. The Committee supports this approach for development of consensus best practices for the academic research laboratory and applauds the initiative's commitment to minimize the potential for harm to human health and the environment and to promote excellence in environmental stewardship, the basis of RCRA.

The Committee strongly encourages the Administrator to participate in the initiative and to provide the maximum flexibility per-

missible under the regulatory provisions of RCRA, as appropriate, in support of the initiative. In addition, the Committee strongly encourages the Administrator to allow state agencies which have been delegated authority under RCRA to provide such regulatory flexibility, as appropriate, under the regulatory provisions of RCRA in support of the initiative.

The Committee expects to receive within 12 months a report from the Administrator evaluating the consensus best practices developed through the initiative and the need for regulatory changes, if any, to carry out the recommendations of the initiative.

In addition, the Committee encourages the Administrator to consider proposing regulatory changes within the statutory requirements of RCRA based on the consensus approach to best practices for academic research laboratory waste management developed under this initiative.

The Committee has become aware of an effort being undertaken by the major state environmental and energy organizations to attempt to integrate energy and environmental policies, programs, and regulations. State and local groups have been meeting in an effort to develop strategies to reduce multiple pollutants, improve energy efficiency, and enhance reliability. Participants include the Environmental Council of the States, the State and Territorial Air Pollution Prevention Administrators/Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials, the National; Association of State Energy Officials, and the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. The Committee also understands that other state and local organizations have been involved in this effort. A meeting of state and local representatives was held on March 23–24, 2000, with a larger meeting planned for September 24–27, 2000. Such exercises are strongly supported by the Committee, and it is hoped that this effort will be an important step in harmonizing this country's energy and environment activities, including avoiding contradictory programs, duplicative activities, and related problems. The Committee encourages EPA as well as the Department of Energy to continue to cooperate with this important effort.

Finally, the Committee notes that with the coming of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City, Utah, many requirements for participation and financial support have and will continue to fall to the Committee. Several projects necessary to the success of the Games relative to programs of the Environmental Protection Agency are currently being considered by the Committee and have thus not been included in the bill presented for the consideration of the House. However, the Committee remains committed to fulfilling its obligations in this regard and expects to address the issue in conference with the Senate.

The Committee recognizes the environmental benefits of robotic technology capable of inspecting for internal structural integrity and strongly encourages investment in the research necessary to allow for even greater environmental benefits through application of the technology to above-ground storage tanks, underground storage tanks, pipelines and other potential applications. The Committee also encourages development of the technology to permit its safety-certified application to not only tank inspection, but also tank cleaning, repair, maintenance and other potential applications.

EPA's Office of Environmental Information is urged to develop a plan of action to facilitate federal and state efforts to develop and implement integrated information systems to improve environmental decisionmaking, reduce the burden on regulated entities and improve the reliability of information available to the public. Such systems should provide the capability to implement standard environment management functions such as permitting, compliance and enforcement. The Agency should develop an integrated information system for federal use that is compatible with the integrated State systems.

The Committee recognizes that voluntary efforts to use non-ozone depleting substances prior to the Clean Air Act mandate provides benefit to stratospheric ozone recovery. The Committee encourages EPA to develop a more comprehensive strategy to promote the benefits of ozone protection. In developing this strategy, EPA should consider increased public awareness, education, and outreach on the importance of ozone protection beyond those activities employed by EPA today and should design and support voluntary incentives that encourage the use of non-ozone depleting substances.

The Committee encourages the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to work more closely with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of the Interior, and the Forest Service to develop a plan to mitigate environment degradation caused by illegal immigrants crossing into southeastern Arizona. This mitigation plan must be provided to the Committee by October 1, 2001.

The Committee is concerned about the potential lack of sound environmental insurance coverage at solid waste landfills. Currently, federal guidelines require landfill operators to assume all costs of closing a landfill and 30 years of post-closure care. A number of questions, however, have been raised about the adequacy and structure of existing financial assurance agreements covering landfill closure obligations, raising the possibility that the public could ultimately become liable for post-closure costs. The Committee, therefore, directs the Administrator to conduct a study of existing financial assurance agreements to determine if sufficient safeguards have been properly maintained and future liabilities minimized. The results of this study should be completed expeditiously and shared with the Committee as well as the public.

The VA-HUD Conference Report for fiscal year 2000 expressed the Conferee's concern over EPA's NOx reduction program and the apparent inequities created by two conflicting actions: EPA's final rule on the 126 petitions and the D.C. Circuit Court issuing a stay of the NOx SIP Call Rule. The Conferees encouraged "EPA to retain the linkage and refrain from implementing the Section 126 regulation until the NOx SIP Call litigation is complete." Unfortunately, EPA did not follow this recommendation and now individual businesses are faced with a Section 126 compliance deadline of May 2003 while both the NOx SIP Call Rule and the 126 Rule are still in litigation.

The Committee would like to see these actions harmonized so that both state regulators and affected businesses would have input into the process and the air quality enhancements that should move forward on a businesslike basis. The Committee urges

EPA to find an equitable way to work this out and to recognize that states should be the primary entities to control air pollution. States and businesses need and deserve a reasonable and harmonized amount of time in which to implement the NOx reduction requirements of each state.

To that end, should the NOx SIP Call Rule and the 126 Rule be finally adjudicated and the court uphold these rules, the Committee strongly suggests that EPA conduct a rulemaking on the appropriate deadlines for the states to submit their SIPs and the appropriate deadlines for businesses to comply with both the SIP and the Section 126 Rule.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation [1]	$34,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	32,409,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	34,094,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+1,591,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−94,000

[1] Total does not include transfer of $11,500,000 from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends a total appropriation of $45,500,000 for the Office of Inspector General, an increase of $2,091,000 above last year's funding level and a decrease of $246,000 below the budget request. Of the amount provided, $11,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$23,931,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	62,600,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	23,931,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−38,669,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The Committee is recommending $23,931,000, the budget request, for Buildings and Facilities. This funding level represents a decrease of $38,669,000 below the fiscal year 2000 funding level. This recommendation provides for necessary maintenance and repair costs at Agency facilities and the ongoing renovation of EPA's new headquarters.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation [1]	$1,270,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	1,400,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request [2]	1,337,473,300
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−130,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−67,473,300

[1] Appropriation does not include $130,000,000, the same as provided in FY2000, proposed in FY2001 for NIEHS and ATSDR in new, separate accounts.

[2] Request does not include $112,526,700 for ATSDR and NIEHS, provided in a new, separate account in this bill.

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

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

For fiscal year 2001, $1,270,000,000 has been recommended by the Committee, a decrease of $130,000,000 below last year's funding level, and a decrease of $67,473,300 from the amount included in the budget request. However, the decrease below the fiscal 2000 level is due to the transfer of $130,000,000 from this account to create new, separate accounts for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. Both agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services had previously been funded in the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

Bill language has been included which transfers $11,500,000 from this account to the Office of Inspector General and $35,000,000 to the Science and Technology account. The Committee expects EPA to prioritize resources to the actual cleanup of sites on the National Priority List and, to the greatest extent possible, limit resources directed to administration, oversight, support, studies, design, investigations, monitoring, assessment, and evaluation.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following program level:

$915,000,000 for Superfund response/cleanup actions. This level of funding includes $91,600,000, the budget request, for continued Brownfields activities.

$140,000,000 for enforcement activities.

$141,500,000 for management and support. This recommendation includes a transfer of $11,500,000 to the Office of Inspector General. Bill language is included which provides for this transfer.

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

$28,500,000 for the Department of Justice.

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

As noted above, funds previously provided through this account for the ATSDR and NIEHS programs have been provided through new, separate accounts created for these two programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

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

The Committee directs that the Agency continue to fund the hazardous substance research centers at a level of no less than $4,500,000. Similarly, the Committee continues to recognize the positive contributions of the SITE program and directs that no less than $6,500,000 be provided for this activity.

The Committee supports efforts to identify cost-effective, innovative technology solutions for contamination problems such as Brownfields, sediments, and fuel oxygenates.

In the conference reports accompanying the Appropriations Acts for fiscal years 1999 and 2000, the conferees directed EPA not to initiate or order dredging or other invasive sediment remediation technologies currently under study by the National Academy of Sciences until the NAS study is complete and the results are appropriately considered by the Agency. The pending NAS study is addressing dredging, capping, source control, natural recovery, and disposal of contaminated sediments, and comparing the risks of each technology. The NAS expects to submit its report of this study at the end of September 2000. Accordingly, the Committee continues to direct that the Agency take no action to order the use of invasive remedial technologies until the NAS report has been completed and its findings incorporated into EPA decision-making processes. Exceptions are provided for voluntary agreements and for urgent cases where contaminated sediment poses a significant threat to public health.

The Committee reaffirms that dredging and other sediment remediation actions should only be initiated where a comprehensive analysis of long and short-term health and environment impacts has been conducted as required by EPA's Contaminated Sediment Management Strategy, published in April 1998.

Once again the Committee believes that any reversal of the longstanding policy of the EPA to defer to the NRC for cleanup of NRC licensed sites is not a good use of public or private funds. The interaction of the EPA with the NRC, NRC licensees, and others with regard to sites being remediated under NRC regulatory requirements—when not specifically requested by the NRC—has created stakeholder concerns regarding the authority and finally of NRC licensing decisions, the duration and costs of site cleanup, and the potential future liability of parties associated with affected sites. However, the Committee recognizes that there may be circumstances at specific NRC licensed sites where the Agency's expertise may be of critical use of the NRC. In the interest of ensuring that sites do not face dual regulations, the Committee, in its previous report, strongly encouraged both agencies to enter into an MOU which clarifies the circumstances for EPA's involvement at NRC sites when requested by the NRC. The EPA and NRC were directed to report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than May 1, 2000 on the status of the development of such an MOU. The Committee received notice from both agencies that there is no status in the development of a MOU as of May 1, 2000. The Committee believes that both agencies have not worked in good faith to resolve the problem of dual regulation by the federal government in NRC licensed site decomissioning. As this area is of interest to the Committee, to other agencies, and state governments, the Committee directs the Administrator undertake a review of EPA action on the MOU, the costs to the NRC licensees associated with duel regulation by EPA and NRC on site cleanup, the potential costs associated with listing these facilities on the NPL, and options for resolving this issue by regulation, litigation or legislation. The Administrator will submit this review prior to March 31, 2001.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$79,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	70,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	72,096,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+9,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	+6,904,000

Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, authorized the establishment of a response program for clean-up of releases from leaking underground storage tanks. Owners and operators of facilities with underground tanks must demonstrate financial responsibility and bear initial responsibility for clean-up. The Federal trust fund is funded through the imposition of a motor fuel tax of one-tenth of a cent per gallon, which generates approximately $170,000,000 per year. Most states also have their own leaking underground storage tank programs, including a separate trust fund or other funding mechanism, in place.

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee has provided $79,000,000, an increase of $9,000,000 above last year's appropriated level and an increase of $6,904,000 above the budget request. The Committee intends that these additional funds be made available for efforts to mitigate leaking underground storage tank problems associated with the presence of MTBE.

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

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$15,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	15,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	15,712,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−712,000

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

The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, the same as that provided last fiscal year and a decrease of $712,000 from the budget request.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$3,178,957,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	3,466,650,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	2,906,957,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−287,683,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	+272,000,000

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

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends a total of $3,176,957,000, a decrease of $289,683,000 below the current fiscal year spending level, and $270,000,000 above the level proposed in the budget request.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following program level:

$1,200,000,000 for Clean Water State Revolving Funds.

$825,000,000 for Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Funds.

$1,068,957,000, the budget request, for state and tribal program/categorical grants.

$75,000,000 for high priority U.S./Mexico border projects.

$8,000,000 for Alaska rural and Native Villages.

The Committee has provided the full budget request for state and tribal program assistance/categorical grants; however, the Committee's recommendation includes an allocation different than that proposed in the budget submission for five specific programs. This recommendation includes categorical grants for the following programs: (1) air resource assistance to State, local and tribal governments under section 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act, as amended; (2) pesticides program implementation; (3) pesticides enforcement; (4) hazardous waste financial assistance; (5) lead grants; (6) pollution prevention; (7) toxic substances compliance; (8) underground storage tanks; (9) public water system supervision; (10) underground injection control; (11) wetlands program; (12) section 319 of FWPCA non-point source pollution grants, including programs

formerly eligible under the section 314 Clean Lakes program; (13) water pollution control agency resource supplementation under section 106 of FWPCA; (14) water quality cooperative agreements under section 104(b)(3) of FWPCA and; (15) Indians general assistance; (16) radon grants; and (17) enforcement and compliance assurance.

For State and local air assistance grants, the Committee has provided $214,690,000, an increase of $11,000,000 above the budget request and $16,000,000 above the fiscal 2000 level.

Section 106 pollution control grants have been provided $245,529,300, an increase of $85,000,000 above the budget request and $130,000,000 above last year's funding level. The Committee believes that an adequately funded section 106 program is necessary for the states to meet the long-term needs of the TMDL program. The Committee has not included a legislative "Rider" proposed by the Administration to require a 40% cost share for this important grant program. Section 319 non-point source pollution grants would receive $220,000,000, an increase of $20,000,000 above the 2000 funding level but a decrease of $30,000,000 below the budget request.

No funds have been provided for the newly proposed matching grant program for the Great Lakes or for the information integration initiative. Similarly, severe budget restrictions have forced the Committee to recommend, without prejudice, that no fiscal year 2001 funding be made available at this time for the new Clean Air Partnership program.

State and local air pollution control agencies have been facing a significant budget shortfall for many years. Accordingly, the Committee has increased grants to state and local air quality agencies under Section 105 of the Clean Air Act by $11,000,000 over the Administration's request for fiscal 2001.

The Subcommittee is concerned that EPA has been inappropriately setting aside and spending portions of Section 105 air grants to support activities that were historically funded and should continue to be funded through EPA's own budget (i.e., not federal grant funds intended for state and local air agencies). In the fiscal 2001 budget, EPA was intending to use Section 105 grants to support training activities, an emission inventory improvement program and a heavy-duty truck and bus idling study, for example. These are very important activities that should be funded; however, the resources to support them should not be taken from state and local air grants.

EPA's practice of setting aside and spending Section 105 grants, rather than distributing them to state and local air agencies, is particularly troublesome because the Agency has decided to make these expenditures unilaterally. There are certainly instances in which it is expeditious for EPA to withhold grant funds from state and local agencies to be spent at the national level, including making equipment purchases on behalf of state and local air agencies or to pay for projects or activities that state and local agencies have decided to support collectively and for which it is administratively more advantageous to have EPA fund directly. However, the decision to withhold state and local grant funds for expenditure directly by EPA should only be made after conferring with state and local air agencies and obtaining their concurrence. This should be

done only for activities that are the responsibility of state and local air agencies.

In this fiscal year and in the future, the Committee directs EPA to fund activities such as those identified above (i.e., training, the emission inventory project, the heavy-duty bus and truck idling study), and similar activities that are federal responsibilities, from within the agency's own budget and to allow state and local agencies to use the funds that Congress has earmarked for the many important responsibilities facing them. Additionally, in fiscal 2001 and in the future, EPA should withhold state and local grant funds at the national level to pay for activities or programs only if such activities are efforts that will benefit state and local air agencies, if the activities are the responsibility of state and local air agencies and if state and local air agencies have provided their concurrence.

Once again this year, bill language has been included to settle administrative actions taken against two communities relative to audits of construction grants which were issued and approved during the mid-1970's. In this regard, the Committee is aware that problems remain in the close-down of the title II Clean Water Act construction grant program, particularly in the final resolution of audits and grantee requests for review or waiver. In the interest of minimizing the need for additional administrative appeals, judicial review, and further legislative remedies, EPA is directed to resolve, equitably and as expeditiously as its resources will allow, grantee requests for review or waiver, audit resolutions, and appeals in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. Once a grantee has made a prima facie case establishing its entitlement to grant funding, the burden of proof should be on EPA to deny such entitlement;

2. A prior affirmative determination favoring a grantee made by the Corps of Engineers, a State agency, or the EPA, should be accepted unless it is manifestly contrary to applicable law. Upon request of a grantee, any prior negative determination should be reviewed de novo;

3. All project costs should be reviewed, without regard to whether such costs were previously claimed, and shall be deemed eligible if based upon statute, regulation, EPA or state program guidance, prior decisions, or practice of EPA or a state agency or is otherwise established according to law, when the provision or practice relied upon by the grantee is reasonably clear or adequately established;

4. The Agency should not assess interest against, nor seek payment from, a grantee until final resolution of all administrative or judicial reviews or requests for waiver, and should assess interest only if justified under the principles set forth in *Baltimore v. Browner*; and

5. EPA should take all necessary actions to preserve the availability of funds previously appropriated under title II of the Clean Water Act, including section 206, in an amount adequate to compensate grantees for their grant funding entitlements upon final administrative or judicial resolution of grantee requests for review or grant entitlements as otherwise determined by a state agency, the EPA, or the Congress.

As was the case in the past three fiscal years, no reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes applying for Partner-

ship grants need to be submitted to the Committee for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations.

The Committee remains concerned with EPA's chosen preferred alternative for constructing secondary treatment facilities at the USIWTP near San Diego. The Committee is aware of requests from EPA to raise the existing cap on construction spending at the IWTP in order to build 25 mdg of secondary ponds at the IWTP with previously appropriated monies in the Border Environmental Infrastructure Fund.

The Committee is aware that significant concerns exist regarding the limited capacity of EPA's preferred alternative, the lack of available land on which future capacity could be constructed, and its inadequacy in addressing increasing future cross-border sewage flows in the region. The Committee is also aware of at least one private sector proposal to construct in Mexico similar secondary facilities which would also reclaim the water for use in Mexico, and would have considerably greater potential capacity more suited to the long term sewage treatment needs of the rapidly growing border region.

The Committee believes that it would be in appropriate to lift the cap at this time, or to permit construction of a limited capacity secondary treatment facility at the IWTP which would not meet long term sewage treatment needs. The Committee urges EPA to continue working with the IBWC, the State Department, and its counterparts in Mexico to ascertain whether such a Mexico-based facility could become viable in a timely manner.

The Committee acknowledges the need to resolve this situation and recognizes construction of a secondary treatment facility on United States soil may be necessary in the future. The Committee therefore will continue to monitor closely progress made in negotiations with all interested parties.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$5,150,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	5,108,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	5,201,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+42,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−51,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,150,000 for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $42,000 above the fiscal year 2000 appropriation and a decrease of $51,000 from the President's budget request.

Public Law 105–261 transferred responsibility for satellite technology export licensing from the Department of Commerce to the Department of State as part of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR). An unfortunate and unintended consequence of that move has been that university-based fundamental science and

engineering research, widely disseminated and unclassified, has become subject to overly restrictive and inconsistent ITAR direction. The result has been critical delays in NASA-funded research projects and has forced some universities to forego participation in such projects. Such research traditionally has been excluded from export controls under the fundamental research exception. The Committee finds the current situation to be unacceptable and directs the Office of Science and Technology Policy Director, in consultation with the NASA Administrator and the Secretary of State, to expeditiously issue clarification of ITAR that ensures that university collaborations and exchanges vital to the continued success of federally-funded research are allowed to continue in a manner consistent with the long-standing fundamental research exception.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$2,911,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	2,816,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	3,020,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+95,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−109,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee has recommended $2,911,000 for the CEQ and OEQ, an increase of $95,000 above last year's spending level and a decrease of $109,000 from the budget request. The Committee's proposed funding for CEQ will allow full cost of living increases for the current staff of 20 FTEs as well as other necessary expense adjustments. The Committee directs that CEQs total staffing level not exceed 22 FTEs at any time during the fiscal year.

As in previous years, bill language is included which stipulates that, notwithstanding the National Environmental Policy Act, the CEQ can operate with one council member and that member shall be considered the chairman for purposes of conducting the business of the CEQ and OEQ.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$33,661,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	33,666,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	33,660,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−5,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	+1,000

Funding for the Office of the Inspector General at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is provided pursuant to 31 U.S.C.

1105(a)(25), which requires a separate appropriation account for appropriations for each Office of Inspector General of an establishment defined under section 11(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978.

The Committee recommendation, the same as the budget request, provides for the transfer of $33,661,000 from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund to finance the Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2001.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$876,730,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	3,338,421,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	3,580,477,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−2,461,691,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−2,703,747,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends $876,730,000 which represents a decrease of $2,461,691,000 from the fiscal year 2000 appropriation and a decrease of $2,703,747,000 from the 2001 budget request.

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

DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$300,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	2,768,009,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	2,909,220,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−2,468,009,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−2,609,220,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends $300,000,000 for disaster relief, a decrease of $2,609,220,000 from the budget request and a decrease of $2,468,009,000 compared to the fiscal year

2000 level. The amount recommended includes $300,000,000 in contingent emergency funding.

The Committee recommendation includes provision for the transfer of $5,500,000 to "Emergency Management Planning and Assistance" for the consolidated emergency performance grant program and the Project Impact program. Also included is a transfer of $30,000,000 to the "Flood Map Modernization Fund" for flood map modernization activities. In addition, language is included which provides that up to $50,000,000 may be obligated for pre-disaster mitigation activities and repetitive loss buyouts following disaster declarations.

PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	0
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	$30,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−30,000,000

The budget request for fiscal year 2001 proposes a new account for Pre-disaster Mitigation programs. In the past, this activity has been funded within the Emergency Management Planning and Assistance account. The Committee recommends no funding in this new account in fiscal year 2001. As in the past, the Committee believes this program should be administer as part of the Emergency Management and Planning Assistance account. For fiscal year 2001, the Committee has also included authority within the "Disaster Relief" account to use disaster relief funding for pre-disaster mitigation activities.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

STATE SHARE LOAN

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$1,295,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	1,295,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	1,678,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−383,000

LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	($19,000,000)	$420,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	(25,000,000)	420,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	(25,000,000)	427,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	(0)	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	(0)	−7,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends $1,295,000 for the cost of State Share Loans, a decrease of $383,000 from the

President's request and the same as provided in fiscal year 2000. In addition, the Committee has provided $19,000,000 for the limitation on direct loans pursuant to Section 319 of the Stafford Act, as well $420,000 for administrative expenses of the program.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$190,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	179,950,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	221,024,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+10,050,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−31,024,000

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

The bill includes $190,000,000 for salaries and expenses, a decrease of $31,024,000 from the budget request and an increase of $10,050,000 when compared to fiscal year 2000. The amount recommended by the Committee should be sufficient to fund all current employees with some modest growth for those areas where the agency's mission has been expanded.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$8,015,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	7,965,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	8,476,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+50,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−461,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,015,000 for the Office of Inspector General, an increase of $50,000 above the fiscal year 2000 appropriation and a decrease of $461,000 from the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$267,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	266,782,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	269,652,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+218,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−2,652,000

This appropriation provides program resources for the majority of FEMA's "core" activities, including, response and recovery; preparedness, training and exercises; mitigation programs, fire prevention and training; information technology services; operations support; and executive direction. Costs for the floodplain manage-

ment component are borne by policyholders and reimbursed from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

The Committee recommends a fiscal year 2001 appropriation of $267,000,000, an increase of $218,000 to the fiscal year 2000 level and a decrease of $2,652,000 to the fiscal year 2001 budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends a transfer of $5,500,000 from the Disaster Relief account to consist of $2,900,000 for the consolidated emergency performance grants program and $2,600,000 for administration of Project Impact programs.

The budget request included a new account for pre-disaster mitigation at a value of $30,000,000. The Committee does not agree that the new account is required and instead believes the program should be administered as part of the EMPA account. The Committee has included authority for FEMA to use funds from the Disaster Relief account for pre-disaster mitigation purposes. This funding will continue the Project Impact program which leverages local government and private funding to encourage communities across the country to become disaster resistant. The Committee encourages FEMA's continued support to those communities which have received support in the past to ensure the initiative has a long term effect on reducing disaster costs.

The Committee is pleased that the Federal Emergency Management Agency has worked closely with the International Hurricane Center at Florida International University in the development of a Windstorm Simulation and Modeling Program. The Committee urges FEMA to continue this effort, including such activities as improved flood and surge models, significantly more accurate flood mapping using airborne laser technology, the development of improved emergency management and mitigation tools and other measures. The ultimate benefit of this effort will be to reduce property damage and threats to human life from hurricanes and other severe windstorms.

The Committee notes that FEMA has published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on insurance requirements for public assistance. The Committee remains concerned that requiring insurance as a condition of receiving public assistance exceeds FEMA's statutory authority, discourages attempts to mitigate damage before it occurs, assumes a fundamental misunderstanding of the insurance market, and merely shifts the costs of disasters from the federal government to states, municipalities, and private non-profit hospitals and universities. In addition, the Committee notes that denying disaster assistance to underinsured or uninsured entities that suffer catastrophic losses as a result of a disaster could result in significant consequential losses of public services, medical care, and education. The Committee urges FEMA to complete a thorough cost-benefit analysis of the proposed rule and conduct extensive outreach with potentially affected entities.

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND

The fiscal year 1999 bill included language establishing the Radiological Emergency Preparedness Fund. The Committee recommendation includes continuation of this Fund in fiscal year 2001.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$110,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	110,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	140,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−30,000,000

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

The Committee has recommended $110,000,000 for the Emergency Food and Shelter Program, the same as provided in fiscal year 2000 and $30,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee continues to believe this is a well run and very worthwhile program and acknowledges and appreciates the support and commitment to the program by many religious and charity organizations.

Once again this year, bill language is included which limits administrative costs to 3.5% for fiscal year 2001.

FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$30,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	5,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+25,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	+30,000,000

In fiscal year 2000 FEMA proposed and the Congress established a Flood Map Modernization Fund through which appropriations and contributions from State and local governments would flow. The objective of the Fund is to establish a mechanism through which a comprehensive flood map modernization program can be financed. The Committee notes that the proposal to replenish the Fund through the establishment of a flood map license fee has not yet been enacted. In recognition of the need to update flood map, the Committee recommends using a portion of disaster relief funding for this purpose, with the expected result being the long term reduction in losses caused by structures being placed in flood-prone areas.

The Committee believes FEMA should prioritize its Flood Map Modernization activities to achieve the highest payoff for the investment. To this end, the Committee recommends that emphasis first be placed on initiating flood studies leading to map panels for communities with unstudied and unmapped flood hazards. Likewise, the Committee believes that the process of converting existing map panels to a digital format for use by the general population should be a lower priority since the payoff for this investment would be marginal at best. Due to their extensive experience in

similar areas, FEMA is encouraged to work with multi-jurisdictional regional planning and development organizations that serve general units of local government.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

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

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

The Committee has included bill language proposed in the budget request for salaries and expenses to administer the fund, not to exceed $25,736,000, and for mitigation activities, not to exceed $77,307,000. Also included is a limitation of $20,000,000 for expenses under Section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, which shall be available for transfer to the National Flood Mitigation Fund.

The Committee is aware that authorization to write new policies during fiscal year 2001 does not currently exist. The Committee has included bill language which extends this authority for fiscal year 2001.

NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$20,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	20,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	20,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriations	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

The budget request includes a program to address the issue of repetitive loss properties within the National Flood Insurance Program. This program targets properties with a high incidence of repetitive losses, and offer removal or elevation of structures with the goal of significantly reducing the future costs of the National Flood Insurance Fund. The Committee recommends $20,000,000 for this effort in fiscal year 2001, to be derived by transfer from the National Flood Insurance Program.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$7,122,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	2,622,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	6,822,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+4,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	+300,000

The Consumer Information Center (CIC) was established within the General Services Administration (GSA) by Executive Order on October 26, 1970, to help Federal departments and agencies promote and distribute consumer information collected as a byproduct of the Government's program activities.

On January 28, 2000, the Consumer Information Center assumed responsibility for the operations of the Federal Information Center (FIC) program with the resulting organization being officially named the Federal Consumer Information Center (FCIC). The FIC program was established within the General Services Administration in 1966, and was formalized by Public Law 95–491 in 1980. The program's purpose is to provide the public with direct information about all aspects of Federal programs, regulations, and services. To accomplish this mission, the FIC uses contractual services to respond to public inquiries via a nationwide toll-free telephone call center. The FIC was previously funded by the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act.

The new Federal Consumer Information Center combines the nationwide toll-free telephone assistance program and the database of the FIC with the CIC website and publications distribution programs. The FCIC is a one-stop source for citizens to get information about government programs and everyday consumer issues.

In fiscal year 2001, the FCIC program expects to respond to 2.7 million phone calls, distribute approximately 5,600,000 publications, and receive 13.5 million web accesses. This represents delivery of a total of 21.8 million information products to the public.

Public Law 98–63, enacted July 30, 1983, established a revolving fund for the FCIC. Under this fund, FCIC activities are financed from the following: annual appropriations from the general revenues of the Treasury, reimbursements from agencies for distribution of publications, user fees collected from the public, and any other income incident to FCIC activities. All are available as authorized in appropriation acts without regard to fiscal year limitations.

The Committee recommends $7,122,000 for the Federal Consumer Information Center. This reflects an increase of $300,000 from the fiscal year 2001 budget request and is necessary to bring FCIC's annual income more in balance with its administrative expenses and to shore up the FCIC Fund balance.

The bill includes a limitation of $12,000,000 on the availability of the revolving fund. Any revenues accruing to this fund during fiscal year 2001 in excess of this amount shall remain in the fund and are not available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts. Despite FCIC's actions to reduce costs, fixed expenses have continued to increase while the appropriation has remained stable and other funding sources, such as users fees, have declined due to the reduction in the public's demand for printed

publications. This has resulted in a projected Fund balance of $291,000 at the end of fiscal year 2001, an amount insufficient to offset administrative expenses in future years.

The appropriation will be augmented by reimbursements from Federal agencies for distribution of consumer publications, user fees from the public, and other income. FCIC's anticipated obligations for fiscal year 2001 will total approximately $10,927,000.

The Committee supports the recommendation by the General Services Administration (GSA) that the Director of the Federal Consumer Information Center is of executive level and deserves the SES designation. The additional responsibilities added as a result of the merger of FIC and CIC make the SES position even more imperative. Therefore, the Committee directs GSA to allocate one SES position from its allotment immediately for the Director of the Federal Consumer Information Center regardless of whether OPM provides an additional slot to GSA for this purpose. The Committee is aware that GSA currently has vacancies within the current allocation of SES slots and could request an additional SES slot from OPM for its next allocation if all SES positions are filled in the future.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$13,713,600,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	13,600,819,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	14,035,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+112,781,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−321,700,000

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

The Committee has recommended a total program level of $13,713,600,000 in fiscal year 2001, which is a decrease of $321,700,000 from the budget request and an increase of $112,781,000 compared to the fiscal year 2000 enacted appropriation.

The Committee has included a general provision in the bill which prohibits the expenditure of funds for joint NASA and Air Force research programs. The Committee directs NASA to terminate all joint aeronautics and space related research programs with the United States Air Force. In addition, the Committee directs NASA to terminate participation with the AF–NASA Council on Aeronautics and the AFSPC–NRO–NASA Partnership Council.

The Committee is aware of continuing concerns within the research community about NASA support for Research and Analysis (R&A) activities.

The Research and Analysis program contributes directly to NASA's mandate to engage in effective science and provides the clear scientific goals and questions which define our nation's space exploration missions. The Committee is concerned that shortfalls in R&A degrade the public return from more visible and expensive flight programs, while diminishing science capability, flexibility and overall competitiveness within space science and technology

fields Program support costs and internal "taxes" are also eroding the very marginal increases in these accounts.

The 1998 National Research Council Report "supporting Research and Data Analysis in NASA's Science Programs," offered significant new findings and important recommendations for strengthening this activity as well as Data Analysis (DA) programs. These recommendations have not been enthusiastically embraced by NASA despite their clear potential for improving the effectiveness of NASA's flight programs, and for supporting and exploiting the innovative strengths in science and technology found in academia and industry. These activities are the least costly phase of space exploration.

Therefore, the Committee directs NASA to conduct a joint study with the National Research Council and the National Academy of Public Administration on the health and resilience of R&A and DA. The study shall include: a review of the status in implementing all six recommendations contained in the 1998 NRC report, barriers to implementation, and specific guidance on optimal funding levels for R&A and DA. The Committee believes a review of the 1998 study will benefit from NAPA's involvement. In particular, NAPA will have a beneficial role in guiding a cost-benefit review of the optimal balance between flight programs and the R&A and DA programs, and measuring the effectiveness of management and strategic planning for R&A and DA activities. Preliminary findings from the study be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations no later than March 30, 2001.

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$5,499,900,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	5,487,900,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	5,499,900,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+12,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	0

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

The Committee recommends a total of $5,499,900,000 for the human space flight account in fiscal year 2001. The recommendation is the same as the budget request and $12,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted appropriation.

The conference report accompanying the FY 2000 appropriations bill for NASA included a requirement that NASA develop and deliver to the Committees on Appropriations a comprehensive plan for Space Shuttle upgrades. The Committee is pleased that NASA completed the report and provided it to the Committee in a timely manner and that NASA has supported the recommendations of the plan by requesting a total of $256 million in the budget for fiscal year 2001. The Committee recommendation includes full funding of the budget request for Shuttle Upgrades and encourages NASA to move forward in an expeditious manner to accomplish the goals outlined in the report.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$5,606,700,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	5,580,895,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	5,929,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+25,805,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−322,700,000

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

The Committee recommends $5,606,700,000 for Science, Aeronautics and Technology in fiscal year 2001. The amount recommended is $322,700,000 below the budget request and $25,805,000 more than provided in fiscal year 2000.

The budget request for Space Science is $2,398,800,000. The Committee recommends a funding level of $2,378,800,000, a reduction of $20,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee notes that the "Living with a Star" program is a new start in fiscal year 2001, and while the cost is initially quite low, the costs escalate rapidly to $64,000,000 in 2002 and balloon to $177,000,000 by 2005. The Committee is concerned with the manner in which NASA is administering the program and believes the NASA Inspector General should review the program at this time to ensure that contract awards are made only after full and open competition. Pending completion of this review, the Committee recommends no funding for the program in fiscal year 2001.

The budget request for Life and Microgravity Sciences and Applications is $304,000,000. The Committee recommends a funding level of $329,000,000, an increase of $25,000,000 to the budget request. The increase is for NASA to fund ground-based investigators to prepare for space flight opportunities, particularly in the area of life sciences. The Committee has previously expressed concern for a lack of dedicated life and microgravity research missions being flown on shuttle during assembly of the International Space Station. The lack of manifested flight opportunities, along with schedule delays in station assembly, is making research flight opportunities both unpredictable and unreliable. The lack of flight opportunities is not only leading to a backlog of critical research, but is also having harmful effects on the long-term health of the academic and commercial communities who are intended to be the primary users of the space station.

The Committee therefore directs NASA to submit a report to Congress by January 15, 2001, detailing the planned life and microgravity research opportunities in the shuttle manifest, beginning after the flight of STS–107 and extending until the space station reaches its full research capability. The Committee directs NASA to include as part of this report (1) any changes in the original schedule for development of research capabilities onboard the station, including the expected date for attaining full research capability, and (2) a plan for manifesting dedicated Shuttle research missions in order to increase and stabilize life and microgravity research flight opportunities during ISS assembly.

The Committee also encourages NASA to work closely with the academic and commercial sectors to further reduce the lead-time necessary for scheduling a research experiment for a shuttle flight opportunity, while maintaining mission safety requirements.

The Committee recommendation for Earth Sciences is $1,405,800,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee is aware of the need for NASA to obtain global wind profile data to improve the understanding of the climate. The Committee encourages NASA to obtain this data through purchase from commercial sources.

The budget request for Aero-Space Technology is $1,193,000,000. The Committee recommends a funding level of $859,000,000, a net reduction of $333,100,000 from the budget request. The Committee is concerned about NASA's commitment to long-term aeronautics research and development programs and the effect the declining funding will have on NASA's ability to provide high-risk technology advances for safer, cleaner, quieter, and more affordable air travel. In order to help reverse the trend of the last three years, during which funding for civil aircraft programs has been substantially reduced, the Committee recommendation includes an increase of $15,000,000 for the Ultra Efficient Engine Technology program, resulting in a total funding level of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001. The Committee recommendation does not include the budget request of $9,000,000 for the Small Air Transport System initiative, a new start for fiscal year 2001. However, the Committee recognizes the validity of the program and will evaluate the merits of this program should further funding become available. Likewise, the Committee is concerned that NASA has taken on the mantel of building more efficient airports which is more appropriately the mission of the Federal Aviation Administration. For this reason, the Committee recommends a reduction of $49,100,000 to the budget request for the Aviation System Capacity program. Finally, the Committee is unable to fund the entire Space Launch Initiative, a new start in fiscal year 2001, and recommends a reduction of $290,000,000. The Committee is supportive of NASA's efforts to reduce the cost of access to space for the government, academic, and commercial sectors. In particular, the Committee feels the Alternative Access proposals hold promise for decreasing dependence on the limited means currently available to resupply the International Space Station. The Committee commends NASA for developing this program and the entire Space Launch Initiative as a way to reduce space access cost and bring new participants into the space launch business. However, the Committee is unable to accommodate funding for the initiatives at this time. The Committee will continue to monitor the proposals and may be able to address the issue prior to final enactment of the bill.The Committee commends the collaboration between Wright Patterson Air Force Base and NASA Glenn on polymer battery technology research and recommends continued funding for the Polymer Energy Rechargeable System in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee recommends $529,400,000 for Space Operations, the same as the budget request.

The budget request for Academic Programs is $100,000,000. The Committee recommends $105,400,000 for fiscal year 2001, an in-

crease of $5,400,000 for the EPSCoR program to raise the level to $10,000,000, the same as provided in fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

The committee is aware that the NASA Sounding Rocket Operations Contract (NSROC) competitive subcontract procurement for rocket systems now underway requires any new rocket system to be privately developed, and that at least one such new rocket system has been formally proposed in response to this procurement solicitation. The committee has supported private development of U.S. launch capabilities as a way to strengthen the U.S. launch industry and help introduce increased efficiency into NASA's suborbital rocket program. The committee is disturbed to learn that the NSROC contractor, with NASA approval and with the planned use of appropriated funding, may now be considering funding development of a new, non-U.S. sounding rocket system when it has been demonstrated there is interest in a suitable privately developed rocket system by one or more companies in the United States. Further, government funding for development of any new rocket system is inconsistent with current U.S. commercial launch policy, which clearly states that the government must purchase transportation services from U.S. commercial providers when they are available. Given the Committee's interest and progress to date in pursuing privately funded sounding rockets, NASA is directed to utilize a privately developed rocket system and may not expend any appropriated funds for development or improvement of any other competing rocket system on a "cost reimbursable" basis when a privately developed rocket system is available and meets government requirements.

MISSION SUPPORT

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$2,584,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	2,512,024,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	2,584,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+71,976,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	0

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

The Committee recommends a total of $2,584,000,000 for the mission support account. The recommended amount is $71,976,000 above the fiscal year 2000 appropriation and the same as the budget request.

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

The Committee is aware of the significant cost savings, flexibility, and increased efficiency which have accrued in the private

corporate sector through the utilization of fractional ownership of business aircraft. Fractional ownership provides access to an entire fleet of aircraft, as well as the availability of a mix of aircraft types and sizes, all on very short notice. The Committee believes that fractional ownership of administrative aircraft could prove extremely beneficial for NASA in reducing costs and overcoming the inefficiencies of the administrative support aircraft currently owned and operated by NASA. Therefore, the Committee directs NASA to establish a two-year test program of fractional ownership for aircraft it uses for administrative support requirements to determine the flexibility, efficiency, and cost benefits for the government.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$23,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	20,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	22,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 1999 appropriation	+3,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	+1,000,000

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

The Committee recommends $23,000,000 for the Office of the Inspector General in fiscal year 2001, an increase of $3,000,000 to the amount provided in fiscal year 2000 and an increase of $1,000,000 to the budget request for fiscal year 2001.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The bill includes three administrative provisions as proposed in the budget, and carried in prior appropriations acts.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on administrative expenses	Revolving loan program
Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$3,000,000,000	$296,303	$1,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	18,600,000,000	257,000	1,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	20,700,000,000	257,000	1,000,000
Comparison with 2000 appropriation	−15,600,000,000	+39,303	0
Comparison with 2001 request	−17,100,000,000	0	0

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

In the fiscal year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act, the Committee increased the limitation on new loans to $18,600,000,000 in order to address concerns about Y2K liquidity

demands. Preliminary findings by GAO suggest that although the CLF was used to address liquidity demands in preparation for Y2K, these demands were not necessarily "emergency demands". The Committee is concerned that the use of CLF funds has expanded beyond Congressional intent and beyond the scope explicitly stated in budget material and hearing testimony. Moreover, daily demand for loans from CLF never exceeded $159,000,000. Most CLF lending was funded from CLF's own resources and credit unions also borrowed funds from the Federal Reserve discount window. CLF used $49,200,000 in borrowed funds from the Federal Financing Bank only once, for a three-day period. While data provided by GAO does not recommend or suggest an alternative limitation level, the Committee finds that the $600,000,000 borrowing limitation, which has remained unchanged since 1980, may prove inadequate to address and emergency liquidity need. The Committee also recognizes that there is no precise formula available to determine how much liquidity might be required by credit unions in the event of an unanticipated economic downturn. The current state of the credit union industry is strong and continues to grow making it more difficult to prepare for an emergency situation. The Committee recommends a limitation of $2,000,000,000 on CLF lending activity to member credit unions from borrowed funds.

While the limitation has been raised to address concerns about the adequacy of funds available during an emergency liquidity drain, the Committee does not support the use of CLF funds to indirectly enhance a member credit union portfolio. The CLF was originally created to serve as a lender of last resort for credit unions as these institutions did not have access to the Federal Reserve's discount window prior to the creation of the CLF. The current function of the CLF is to serve as an intermediary lender and should be utilized when all other sources of liquidity have been exhausted with the exception of the Federal Reserve discount window.

Since 1980, credit unions that maintain transaction accounts or accept certain other specified types of deposits qualify for the Federal Reserve discount window. Currently, 62% of credit unions meet the criteria for accessing the Federal Reserve discount window. Because of the large growth and changes within the credit union industry, the CLF may require changes to its authorizing statute. For this reasons, the Committee strongly urges the authorizing committee to investigate the current purpose for the CLF and make changes to the authorizing statute as appropriate. The Committee looks forward to working with the authorizing committee toward this end.

The Committee recommends the budget request of $296,303 for administrative expenses, and increase of $39,303 above the fiscal year 2000 appropriation. Additionally the Committee recommends that $1,000,000 be transferred to the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund of which $650,000 is provided for loans to community development credit unions and $350,000 is provided specifically to fund the technical assistance grant program. The technical assistance grant program provides assistance to credit unions serving low-income and undeserved communities. Technical assistance grants would be available to low-income designated credit unions and those credit unions that expand service to low-income commu-

nities or investment areas. The purpose of these awards is to strengthen these credit unions by funding the following activities; improved technology and service delivery systems; economic development; consumer and entrepreneurial education; microenterprise business development; employment opportunities through community business development; and credit union infrastructure and staff development.

The Committee recognizes that the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund was originally established to stimulate economic development in low-income communities. The total Fund balance is currently $11,700,000, and technical assistance grants are currently funded from interest accrued from Fund loans. The demand for technical assistance has greatly surpassed available funding.

The National Credit Union Administration is required to provide the Committees on Appropriations a detailed budget estimate of the costs associated with each activity of the community Development Revolving Loan Fund as part of the Budget Justifications. For fiscal year 2001, NCUA shall transmit this information to the Committee by November 1, 2000 for 30 days of review.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$4,064,300,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	3,897,184,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	4,572,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+167,116,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−508,100,000

Established in 1950 and receiving its first appropriation of $225,000 in 1951, the National Science Foundation celebrates its 50th anniversary as an important, highly regarded federal agency during fiscal year 2001. The primary purpose behind its creation was to develop a national policy on science, and support and promote basic research and education in the sciences filling the void left after World War II. Since its first appropriation in 1951, NSF has grown to what in fiscal 2001 will be a multi-billion dollar agency.

The Committee recommends a total of $4,064,300,000 for fiscal year 2001. This recommendation is an increase of $167,116,000 above last year's appropriation and a decrease of $508,100,000 below the President's budget request.

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

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$3,135,690,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	2,966,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	3,540,680,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+169,690,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−404,990,000

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

The Committee recommends a total of $3,135,690,000 for Research and Related Activities in fiscal year 2001, an increase of $169,690,000 above last year's funding level and a decrease of $404,990,000 below the budget request. The Committee's recommendation includes the following program levels: (1) Biological Sciences, $449,930,000; (2) Computer and Information Science and Engineering, $439,420,000; (3) Engineering, $411,040,000; (4) Geosciences, $523,800,000; (5) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, $802,130,000; (6) Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences, $157,640,000; (7) U.S. Polar Research Programs, $201,900,000; (8) U.S. Antarctic Logistical Support Activities, $62,600,000; and (9) Integrative Activities, $87,230,000.

The Committee's recommendation has been developed using the same percentage increase for each directorate as that proposed in the budget submission. In its distribution of funds within each directorate, the Foundation is directed to provide each program, project, and activity the same percentage as that proposed in the budget request.

Although acknowledging the funding flexibility afforded the Foundation through its use of the Opportunity Fund, budget constraints have forced the Committee to again this year recommend no funding for this activity within the Integrative Activities funding line. Should the NSF find it necessary to pursue funds for "emergency" research needs at any time during the fiscal year, the Committee will make every effort to respond to appropriate reprogramming requests as quickly as possible.

The NSF is commended on the NSB report, "Environmental Science and Engineering for the 21st Century: the Role of the National Science Foundation," and encourages the Foundation to consider incorporating the recommendations of that report in its fiscal 2002 budget submission.

The Committee is concerned with the lack of research addressing linkages between human health and the world's oceans. Marine systems and processes impact public health in a variety of ways included natural disasters, waterbone diseases, and toxic algal blooms. The report by the National Research Council, "Monsoons to Microbes: Understanding the Oceans Role in Human Health," describes a broad spectrum of interdisciplinary research that would

lead to a better understanding of the role of oceans in human health. The Committee urges the NSF to work with the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and other relevant agencies and research institutions to examine this report and identify specific areas of cooperation that should be jointly pursued to more fully understand and mitigate the impacts of the oceans on public health, particularly in the areas of lessening the human consequences of natural disasters, minimizing the outbreak and spread of epidemics and toxic algal blooms, keeping recreational beaches and seafood safe, and extracting life-savings products from the sea.

The Foundation is urged to provide up to $5,000,000 for an independently competed Children's Research Initiative within the funds made available for social and behavioral sciences. The Committee recognizes that previous funds provided for this purpose have funded some research on children's issues. The Committee believes, however, that NSF should more appropriately implement the National Science and Technology's Council's recommendation that this should be a separate and dedicated initiative. While the NSF should employ its normal peer reviewed approach for determining grants for the Children's Research Initiative, funding priority should be given to institutions of higher education that have both an interdisciplinary base of knowledge in child and human sciences and an existing delivery system for outreach to bring the benefits of this research to the majority of residents in any given state. A strong emphasis should also be placed on theory-driven, applied policy-related research on health and behavior, children and environmental hazards, cognition and development, influence of families and communities on development, and longitudinal studies.

Similarly, the Committee recognizes that as information technologies become increasingly prevalent in children's and adolescents' lives, vital questions arise regarding their impact on behavioral, social, emotional, cognitive and physical development. The Committee, therefore, encourages NSF to make research on the impact of emerging media on children's and adolescents' development a funding priority within both NSF's Information Technology Research Initiative and the agency's core disciplinary research programs.

The Committee recognizes that the proposed funding allocations within the astronomical sciences are governed by an overall concern and priority for individual investigator awards. However, the facilities component of the proposed allocation is slated for an increase that is marginally above zero and is less than inflation. Noting that these outstanding facilities serve the research programs of individual investigator programs nationwide and should thus be maintained at a level necessary to enhance operations, morale, and momentum within each facility program, the NSF is strongly encouraged to provide a more appropriate balance between the individual investigator awards and facilities operations.

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$76,600,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	95,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	138,540,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−18,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−61,940,000

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

The Committee recommends a total of $76,600,000 for the major research equipment account for fiscal year 2001. This appropriation reflects the budget request levels of $6,000,000 for the Millimeter Array, $16,400,000 for the Large Hadron Collider, $13,500,000 for continued construction of the new South Pole Station, and $28,200,000 for the Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation. The Committee has also included $12,500,000 to continue production of the High-Performance Instrumented Airborne Platform for Environmental Research (HIAPER). The Committee recognizes the atmospheric science community's need for such a new high-altitude research aircraft, and notes that this aircraft went through a multiple-year review and selection process prior to its approval and endorsement by the National Science Board. The Congress provided $10,000,000 for this important project in the fiscal 2000 appropriation, which amount was subsequently reduced disproportionately by the Foundation in an across-the-board reduction.

Because of budget constraints, the Committee determined not to begin funding on two new research facilities proposed in the budget submission, the USArray and San Andreas Fault Observatory at Depth (SAFOD), and the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON). The Committee believes both projects have great merit and notes that its action was taken without prejudice.

The Committee has also not included $45,000,000 for a second Terascale Computing System as requested in the budget submission. The Committee is not prepared to commit resources to the construction of this additional five teraflop computing facility until the first such facility is constructed and has become operational. Once such construction is complete and operations have commenced, the Committee expects the Foundation to provide a report detailing all aspects of this activity, including pertinent and up-to-date cost data, so that an informed decision can be made on moving forward with one or more additional such facilities.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$694,310,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	696,600,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	729,010,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−2,290,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−34,700,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends $694,310,000, a decrease of $2,290,000 belowe last year's appropriated level and a decrease of $34,700,000 below the budget request. The Committee's proposal includes the following program funding levels: (1)

Educational System Reform, $109,510,000; (2) Innovative Partnerships/ Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), $48,410,000; (3) Elementary, Secondary and Informal Education, $191,500,000; (4) Undergraduate Education, $110,860,000; (5) Graduate Education, $84,450,000; (6) Human Resource Development, $81,880,000; and (7) Research, Evaluation and Communication, $67,700,000.

Within the amount provided for Undergraduate Education, $34,250,000 has been provided for Advanced Technological Education, an increase of $5,000,000 over the fiscal 2000 level, and $13,000,000, the same as in fiscal 2000, has been recommended for the National SMETE Digital Library. No funding has been provided for the Distinguished Teaching Scholars program or for the new Scholarships for Service (SFS) program. The Committee recognizes the potential long-term value of this newly proposed SFS program. However, before financial resources are provided, the Committee is aware of several, significant operational details which must first be worked out among all interested parties.

Within the Graduate Education programs, Graduate Teaching Fellowships in K–12 Education has been provided $19,750,000, a $10,750,000 increase over the fiscal 2000 spending level.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$152,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	149,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	157,890,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+3,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−5,890,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $152,000,000 for salaries and expenses, a decrease of $5,890,000 from the President's budget request and an increase of $3,000,000 over last year's appropriated level.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$5,700,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	5,450,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	6,280,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	+250,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 request	−580,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee has recommended $5,700,000 for the Office of Inspector General. This amount is $250,000 above last year's funding level and is a decrease of $580,000 below the budget request.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$90,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	75,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	90,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	15,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	0

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

The Committee recommends the request of $90,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $15,000,000 above the fiscal year 2000 level. A set-aside of $5,000,000 is included for an innovative initiative that combines a conventional mortgage, section 8 assistance, and the NRC revolving loan fund, with pre-and post-purchase counseling thereby enabling low-income families, some of whom are on welfare, to attain the goal of homeownship.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2001 recommendation	$23,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 appropriation	24,000,000
Fiscal year 2001 budget request	24,480,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2000 appropriation	−1,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2001 budget request	−1,480,000

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

For fiscal year 2001, the bill includes $23,000,000 for the Selective Service System, $1,000,000 below the fiscal year 2000 funding level and a decrease of $1,480,000 below the budget request.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends inclusion of twenty-five general provisions, twenty of which were requested in the fiscal year 2001 budget and were carried in the fiscal year 2000 Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–76). The Committee recommendation does not in-

clude the proposed provision pertaining to the United States/Mexico Foundation. The Committee recommendation does include a provision pertaining to reporting requirements of the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs prior to entering into leases of real property, which was carried in the fiscal year 2000 Appropriations Act. The Committee also recommends new general provisions.

A new section 421 has been added this year which limits the use of funds for technical assistance, training, or management improvements until reporting requirements are completed by HUD. A new section 424 has been included in the bill which directs the General Services Administration to allocate one of its senior executive service positions to the Federal Consumer Information Center. A new section 425 has been included which prohibits the expenditure of funds for joint NASA and Air Force research programs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various require of the rules of the House of Representatives.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

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

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

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

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

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

The Committee has included language transferring not to exceed $17,419,000 from compensation and pensions to general operating expenses and medical care. These funds are for the administrative costs of implementing cost-savings proposals required by the omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992. Language is also included permitting necessary sums to be transferred to the medical facilities revolving fund to augment funding of medical centers for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized by the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992.

The Committee recommends transferring the following amounts to the VA's general operating expenses appropriation pursuant to the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990: the veterans housing benefit program fund program account ($161,484,000), the education loan fund program account ($220,000), the vocational rehabilitation loans program account ($432,000) and the Native American veteran housing loan program account ($532,000). In addition, the bill provides up to $750,000 in general operating expenses and medical

care for administration of the guaranteed transitional housing loans for homeless veterans program account.

The Committee has included language transferring the following amounts to the VA's general operating expenses appropriation for services provided by the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Compliant Adjudication: medical care ($28,134,000), office or inspector general ($28,000), and national cemetery administration ($125,000).

The Committee recommends transferring the following amounts to the VA's general operating expenses appropriation for HR LINK$ services if that function is not a part of the Franchise Fund in fiscal year 2001: the office of inspector general ($78,000), national cemetery administration ($358,000), medical care ($1,106,000), and medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses ($84,000).

The Committee included language allowing the transfer of funds up to $1,600,000 from medical care to general operating expenses to fund personnel services costs of employees providing legal services and administrative support for the Office of General Counsel.

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

The Committee recommends providing authority under administrative provisions for the Department of Veterans Affairs for any funds appropriated in 2001 for compensation and pensions, readjustment benefits, and veterans insurance and indemnities to be transferred between those three accounts. This will provide the Department of Veterans Affairs flexibility in administering its entitlement programs. Language is also included permitting the funds from three life insurance funds to be transferred to general operating expenses for the costs of administering such programs.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring all uncommitted prior balances of excess rental charges as of fiscal year 2000 and all collections made during fiscal year 2001 to the flexible subsidy fund.

The Committe has included language transferring unobligated funds from the housing certificate fund to the public housing capital fund.

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

The Committe has included language transferring $200,000 from the Native American housing block grant account to HUD's salaries and expenses account.

The Committee recommends a transfer of $150,000 from the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program Account to HUD's salaries and expense account.

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

The Committee recommends transferring a total of $518,000,000 from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration to HUD's salaries and expense account.

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

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

The Committee has included language transferring $11,000,000 from the housing certificate fund to the working capital fund of HUD's salaries and expense account.

The Committee has included language transferring $43,000,000 from the public housing capital fund to the working capital fund of HUD's salaries and expense account.

The Committee has included language transferring $15,000,000 from the community development fund to the working capital fund of HUD's salaries and expense account.

The Committee has included language transferring $17,000,000 from the HOME Investment partnerships program to the working capital fund of HUD's salaries and expense account.

The Committee has included language transferring up to 1.5 per cent of the funds appropriated for homeless assistance grants to the working capital fund of HUD's salaries and expense account.

The Committee has included language transferring $1,000,000 from housing for special populations to the working capital fund of HUD's salaries and expense account.

The Committee has included language transferring $96,500,000 from HFA's mutual mortgage insurance program account to the working capital fund of HUD's salaries and expense account.

The Committee has included language transferring $33,500,000 from FHA's general and special risk insurance program account to the working capital fund of HUD's salaries and expense account.

The Committee recommends language allowing a transfer of $22,000,000 from the federal housing enterprise oversight fund to the office of federal housing enterprise oversight account.

The Committee has included language transferring $200,000 from the Native American housing block grants account to HUD's salaries and expense account and $2,000,000 to the Working Capital Fund.

The Committee has included language under the Environmental Protection Agency transferring funds from the hazardous substance superfund trust fund ($11,500,000) to the Office of Inspector General. In addition, $35,000,000 is transferred from the hazardous substance superfund trust fund to the science and technology account.

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

The Committee has included language under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation transferring up to $33,661,000 from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund to the Office of Inspector General.

The Committee has included language under the Federal Emergency Management Agency transferring $5,500,000 from the disaster relief account to the emergency management planning and assistance account.

The Committee has included language under Federal Emergency Management Agency transferring $30,000,000 from the disaster relief account to the flood map modernization fund account.

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

The Committee has included language under National Credit Union Administration transferring $1,000,000 to the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII, CL 3(E) (RAMSEYER RULE)

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

UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

TITLE I—GENERAL PROGRAM OF ASSISTED HOUSING

* * * * * * *

LOWER INCOME HOUSING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(o) VOUCHER PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—

(A) * * *

(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF PAYMENT STANDARD.—Except as provided under [subparagraph (D)] *subparagraphs (D) and (E)*, the payment standard for each size of dwelling unit in a market area shall not exceed 110 percent of the fair market rental established under subsection (c) for the same size of dwelling unit in the same market area and shall be not less than 90 percent of that fair market rental.

* * * * * * *

(E) DIFFICULT UTILIZATION AREAS.—

(i) CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish criteria setting forth requirements for treatment of areas as difficult utilization areas with respect to the voucher program under this subsection, which may include criteria specifying a low vacancy rate for rental housing, a particular rate of inflation in rental housing costs, failure to lease units by more than 30 percent of families issued vouchers having an applicable payment standard of 110 percent of the fair market rental or higher, and any other criteria the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—Any public housing agency that serves a difficult utilization area may—

(I) increase the payment standard applicable to all or part of such area for any size of dwelling unit to not more than 150 percent of the fair market rental established under subsection (c) for the same size of dwelling unit in the same market area; and

(II) use amounts provided for assistance under this section to make payments or provide services to assist families issued vouchers under this subsection to lease suitable housing, except that the cost of any such payments or services for a family may not exceed the agency's average cost per family of 6 months of monthly assistance payments.

[(E)] *(F)* REVIEW.—The Secretary—

(i) shall monitor rent burdens and review any payment standard that results in a significant percentage of the families occupying units of any size paying more than 30 percent of adjusted income for rent; and

(ii) may require a public housing agency to modify the payment standard of the public housing agency based on the results of that review.

* * * * * * *

(t) ENHANCED VOUCHERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Enhanced voucher assistance under this subsection for a family shall be voucher assistance under subsection (o), except that under such enhanced voucher assistance—

(A) * * *

(B) during any period that the assisted family continues residing in the same project in which the family was residing on the date of the eligibility event for the project, if the rent for the dwelling unit of the family in such project exceeds the applicable payment standard established pursuant to subsection (o) for the unit, the amount of rental assistance provided on behalf of the family shall be determined using a payment standard that is equal to the rent for the dwelling unit (as such rent may be increased from time-to-time), subject to paragraph (10)(A) of subsection (o) *and any other reasonable limit prescribed by the Secretary*;

* * * * * * *

SECTION 856 OF THE AIDS HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 856. RESPONSIBILITIES OF GRANTEES.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(h) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For purposes of environmental review, a grant under this subtitle shall be treated as assistance for a special project that is subject to section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994, and shall be sub-

ject to the regulations issued by the Secretary to implement such section.

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

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

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968

TITLE XIII—NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1309. (a) All authority which was vested in the Housing and Home Finance Administrator by virtue of section 15(e) of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1084) (pertaining to the issue of notes or other obligations or the Secretary of the Treasury), as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of section 1303 of this Act, shall be available to the Director for the purpose of carrying out the flood insurance program under this title; except that the total amount of notes and obligations which may be issued by the Director pursuant to such authority (1) without the approval of the President, may not exceed $500,000,000, and (2) with the approval of the President, may not exceed $1,500,000,000 through September 30, **[**2000**]** *2001*, and $1,000,000,000 thereafter. The Director shall report to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate at any time when he requests the approval of the President in accordance with the preceding sentence.

* * * * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 1376. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary through September 30, **[**2000**]** *2001*, for studies under this title.

SECTION 312 OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

SEC. 312. (a) Appropriations for the Administration for fiscal year 2002 and thereafter shall be made in three accounts, "Human space flight", "Science, aeronautics and technology," and an account for amounts appropriated for the necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General. Appropriations shall remain available for two fiscal years. Each account shall include the planned full costs of the Administration's related activities.

(b) To ensure the safe, timely, and successful accomplishment of Administration missions, the Administration may transfer amounts for Federal salaries and benefits; training, travel and awards; facility and related costs; information technology services; publishing services; science, engineering, fabricating and testing services; and other administrative services among accounts, as necessary.

(c) The Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall determine what balances from the "Mission support" account are to be transferred to the "Human space flight" and "Science, aeronautics and technology" accounts. Such bal-

1 *ances shall be transferred and merged with the "Human*
2 *space flight" and "Science, aeronautics and technology"*
3 *accounts, and remain available for the period of which*
4 *originally appropriated.*

CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

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

Language is included in various parts of the bill to continue ongoing activities and programs where authorizations have not been enacted to date.

In some cases, the Committee has recommended appropriations which are less than the maximum amounts authorized for the various programs funded in the bill. Whether these actions constitute a change in the application of existing law is subject to interpretation, but the Committee felt that this should be mentioned.

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

Sections 401 through 420, 422 and 423 of title IV of the bill, all of which are carried in the fiscal year 2000 Appropriations Act, are general provisions which place limitations or restrictions on the use of funds in the bill and which might, under certain circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law. A new section 421 has been added this year which limits the use of funds for technical assistance, training, or management improvements until reporting requirements are completed by HUD. A new section 424 has been included in the bill which directs the General Services Administration to allocate one of its senior executive service positions to the Federal Consumer Information Center. A new section 425 has been included which prohibits the expenditure of certain NASA funds for joint research with the Air Force.

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

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

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, medical care, earmarking and delaying the availability of certain equipment and land and structures funds, and limiting funds available for the operations and maintenance of facilities.

Language is included under Department of Veterans Affairs, medical care prohibiting the transfer of funds to the Department of Justice for the purposes for supporting tobacco legislation.

Language is included under Department of Veterans Affairs providing for the deposit of receipts collected under the Millennium Health Care and Benefits Improvements Act of 1999 in the medical care collections fund.

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

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

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

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

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions, permitting transfers between mandatory accounts, limiting and providing for the use of certain funds, and funding administrative expenses associated with VA life insurance programs from excess program revenues. Seven provisions have been carried in previous Appropriations Acts. Six new provisions have been added.

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

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, revitalization of severely distressed public housing (HOPE VI), which prohibits the use of funds for awards to settle litigation or pay judgments and provides funds for technical assistance.

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

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

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, home investment partnerships program, earmarking funds for a counseling program.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, homeless assistance grants, requiring grantees to integrate homeless programs with other social service providers, and which provides for use of funds for technical assistance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, administrative provisions, which maintains and reduces annual adjustment factors, revises allocations for housing opportunities for people with AIDS recipients, allows for a cap on the value of enhanced housing vouchers, and rescinds balances in prior Appropriations Acts.

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

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

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

Language is included under the Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, toxic substances and environmental public health, limiting availability of funds for toxicological profiles.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, environmental programs and management, which limits use of funds, and expands the use of funds awarded for certain programs.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, administrative provision, which extends the availability of funds for liquidating obligations.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, state and tribal assistance grants, which provides grants to states and local tribal governments, and which eliminates certain construction grant disputes.

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

Language is included under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, disaster relief, which makes funds available only upon an emergency declaration by the President.

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

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

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

Language is included under the Federal Emergency Management Agency, national flood insurance fund, which limits administrative expenses, program costs, and the amount available for repayment of debt.

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

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

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

Language is included under the National Credit Union Administration, central liquidity facility, limiting new loans, technical assistance, and administrative expenses.

Language is included under the National Science Foundation, research and related activities, providing for the use of receipts from other research facilities, requiring under certain circumstances proportional reductions in legislative earmarkings, and use of funds.

Language is included under the National Science Foundation, education and human resources activities, requiring under certain circumstances proportional reductions in legislative earmarkings.

Language is included under the National Science Foundation, salaries and expenses, permitting funds for contracts for various services in the next fiscal year and permitting the reimbursement of funds to the General Services Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following lists the agencies in the accom-

panying bill which contain appropriations that are not authorized by law:

Department of Veterans Affairs.

Construction, Major projects.

Department of Housing and Urban Development: all programs except Public and Indian Housing programs.

Community Development Financial Institutions.

Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Corporation for National and Community Service.

Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality (not authorized above $1,000,000).

Environmental Protection Agency.

Science and Technology (except Clean Air Act and Safe Drinking Water Act).

Hazardous Substance Superfund.

State and Tribal Assistance Grants.

Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Federal Emergency Management Agency:

Emergency Food and Shelter Program.

Emergency Management Planning and Assistance (with respect to the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Urban Property Protection and Reinsurance Act).

General Services Administration—Federal Consumer Information Center.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

National Credit Union Administration Revolving Loan Fund.

Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporations.

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344) requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how the authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302(b) of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution of then budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) allocation—		This bill*	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	76,194	84,154	76,494	84,166
Mandatory	24,330	24,089	24,612	24,035

*Including scoring from the House-passed FY 2000 supplemental appropriations bill.

NOTE.—The amounts in this bill are technically in excess of the subcommittee section 302(b) suballocation. However, pursuant to section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, increases to the Committee's section 302(a) allocation are authorized for funding in the reported bill for spending designated as emergency. After the bill is reported to the House, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget will provide an increased section 302(a) allocation consistent with the funding provided in the bill. That new allocation will eliminate the technical difference prior to floor consideration.

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following information was provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

	Millions
Budget Authority in bill	$101,097
Outlays:	
2001	60,308
2002	24,176
2003	9,199
2004	3,669
2005	3,752

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the Congressional Budget Office has provided the following estimate of new budget authority and outlays provided by the accompanying bill for financial assistance to state and local governments:

	Millions
Budget Authority	25,471
Fiscal year 2001 outlays resulting therefrom	5,133

BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT

During fiscal year 2001 for purposed of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), the following information provides the definition of the term "program, project, and activity" for departments and agencies carried in the accompanying bill. The term "program, project, and activity" shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the 2001 Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, the accompanying House and Senate reports, the conference report of the joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference.

In applying any sequestration reductions, departments and agencies shall apply the percentage of reduction required for fiscal year 2001 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99–177 to each program, project, activity, and subactivity contained in the budget justification documents submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate in support of the fiscal year 2001 budget estimates, as amended, for such departments and agencies, as subsequently altered, modified, or changed by Congressional action identified by the aforementioned Act, resolutions and reports. Further, it is intended that in implementing any Presidential sequestration order, (1) no program, project, or activity should be eliminated, (2) no reordering of funds or priorities occur, and (3) no unfunded program execution, it is not intended that normal reprogramming between programs, projects, and activities be precluded after reductions required under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are implemented.

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 1

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Price.

Description of Motion: To terminate funding for the Selective Service system and transfer savings from this reduction to the Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical and Prosthetic Research account.

Results: Rejected 19 yeas to 36 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Aderholt	Mr. Bonilla
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Boyd
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Cramer
Mr. Farr	Mr. Cunningham
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Dickey
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Dicks
Mr. Knollenberg	Mr. Edwards
Mrs. Lowey	Mrs. Emerson
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Forbes
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Obey	Mr. Goode
Mr. Olver	Ms. Granger
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Hinchey
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Price	Mr. Hoyer
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Latham
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Lewis
	Mr. Miller
	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Murtha
	Mr. Nethercutt
	Mrs. Northup
	Mr. Packard
	Mr. Peterson
	Mr. Regula
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 2

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mrs. Meek.

Description of Motion: To increase funds for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's fair Housing Initiatives Program from $22,000,000 to $24,000,0000, and decrease the Department's Fair Housing Assistance Program from $22,000,000 to $20,000,0000.

Results: Rejected 26 yeas to 27 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderbolt
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Bonilla
Ms. Deluro	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Goode
Mr. Farr	Ms. Granger
Mr. Frobes	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Knolleberg
Mr. Kaptur	Mr. Kolbe
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Latham
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Miller
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Moran	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Murtha	Mr. Packard
Mr. Obey	Mr. Peterson
Mr. Olver	Mr. Regula
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Rogers
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Skeen
Mr. Price	Mr. Tiahrt
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Walsh
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Wamp
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Wicker
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 3

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Hinchey.

Description of Motion: To strike report language in the Environmental Protection Agency's Hazardous Substance Superfund account regarding dredging as a remediation tool for toxic substances.

Results: Rejected 20 yeas to 30 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderholt
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Goode
Ms. Kaptur	Ms. Granger
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Hobson
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Kingston
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Obey	Mr. Latham
Mr. Olver	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Miller
Mr. Price	Mr. Nethercutt
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Packard
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Peterson
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Porter
	Mr. Regula
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 4

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Mollohan.

Description of Motion: To strike report language in the Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Programs and Management account regarding a prohibition on spending for certain activities relating to the Kyoto Protocol, and insert new language in lieu thereof.

Results: Rejected 19 yeas to 31 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderholt
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Farr	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Hoyer	Mrs. Emerson
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Goode
Mrs. Meek	Ms. Granger
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Obey	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Olver	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Kolbe
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Latham
Mr. Price	Mr. Lewis
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Miller
Mr. Sabo	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Packard
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Peterson
	Mr. Porter
	Mr. Regula
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 5

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Mollohan.

Description of Motion: To increase funding for ten housing and community programs by $1,834,000,000.

Results: Rejected 20 yeas to 29 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Callahan
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Farr	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Goode
Ms. Kaptur	Ms. Granger
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Hobson
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Istook
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Obey	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Olver	Mr. Latham
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Lewis
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Miller
Mr. Price	Mrs. Northup
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Packard
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Peterson
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Porter
	Mr. Porter
	Mr. Regula
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 6

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Obey.

Description of Motion: To increase funding for four specific housing programs by $107,000,000.

Results: Rejected 20 yeas to 27 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Callahan
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Farr	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Goode
Mr. Hoyer	Ms. Granger
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Hobson
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Istook
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Obey	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Olver	Mr. Latham
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Lewis
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Miller
Mr. Price	Mrs. Northup
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Packard
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Porter
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Regula
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 7

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Mollohan.

Description of Motion: To strike bill and report language regarding the Community Builders program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Results: Rejected 22 yeas to 23 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderholt
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Farr	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Goode
Ms. Kaptur	Ms. Granger
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Hobson
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Istook
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Moran	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Obey	Mr. Latham
Mr. Olver	Mr. Lewis
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Miller
Mr. Price	Mrs. Northup
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Packard
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Porter
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Regula
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each rollcall vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 8

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Mollohan.

Description of Motion: To increase funding for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Science, Aeronautics and Technology account by $322,700,000.

Results: Rejected 22 yeas to 23 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Dickey
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Goode
Mr. Farr	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Kolbe
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Latham
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Lewis
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Miller
Mrs. Meek	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Packard
Mr. Moran	Mr. Petersen
Mr. Obey	Mr. Porter
Mr. Olver	Mr. Regula
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Rogers
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Sununu
Mr. Price	Mr. Taylor
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Walsh
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Wamp
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Wicker
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 9

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Obey.

Description of Motion: To increase funding for each of the National Science Foundation's five appropriations accounts by a total of $508,100,000.

Results: Rejected 21 yeas to 25 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Cunningham
Ms. DeLauro	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Farr	Mr. Goode
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Knollenberg
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Kolbe
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Latham
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Miller
Mr. Moran	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Obey	Mr. Packard
Mr. Olver	Mr. Peterson
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Porter
Mr. Price	Mr. Regula
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Rogers
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Sununu
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 10

Date: June 7, 2000.

Measure: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Boyd.

Description of Motion: To increase funding for disaster relief under the Federal Emergency Management Agency by $2,609,220,000, to be designatged as an emergency appropriation under the Budget Act.

Results: Rejected 22 yeas to 29 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Callahan
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Farr	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Goode
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Granger
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Hobson
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Kingston
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Knollenberg
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Latham
Mr. Moran	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Obey	Mr. Miller
Mr. Olver	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Packard
Mr. Price	Mr. Peterson
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Porter
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Regula
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Rogers
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Young

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions	21,568,364	22,766,276	22,766,276	+1,197,912	.....
Readjustment benefits	1,469,000	1,634,000	1,664,000	+195,000	+30,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	28,670	19,850	19,850	-8,820	.....
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite)	282,342	165,740	165,740	-116,602	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(300)	(300)	(300)	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	156,958	166,484	161,484	+4,526	-5,000
Education loan fund program account	1	1	1	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(3)	(3)	(3)	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	214	220	220	+6	.....
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account	57	52	52	-5	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(2,531)	(2,726)	(2,726)	(+195)	.....
Administrative expenses	415	432	432	+17	.....
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account	520	532	532	+12	.....
Guaranteed Transitional Housing Loans for Homeless Veterans program account	48,250	.....	.....	-48,250	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(100,000)	.....	.....	(-100,000)	.....
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration	23,554,791	24,753,587	24,778,587	+1,223,796	+25,000

Veterans Health Administration					
Medical care	18,106,000	19,381,587	19,354,587	+1,248,587	-27,000
Delayed equipment obligation	900,000	900,000	927,000	+27,000	+27,000
Total	19,006,000	20,281,587	20,281,587	+1,275,587	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-79,519	.....	.....	+79,519	.....
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-27,907)	.....	(-28,134)	(-227)	(-28,134)
Subtotal	18,926,481	20,281,587	20,281,587	+1,355,106	.....
Medical care cost recovery collections:					
Offsetting receipts	-608,000	-639,000	-639,000	-31,000	.....
Appropriations (indefinite)	608,000	639,000	639,000	+31,000	.....
Total available	(608,000)	(639,000)	(639,000)	(+31,000)	.....
Medical and prosthetic research	321,000	321,000	321,000	.....	.....
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	59,703	64,884	62,000	+2,297	-2,884
General Post Fund, National Homes:					
Loan program account (by transfer)	(7)	.....	.....	(-7)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70)	.....	.....	(-70)	.....
Administrative expenses (by transfer)	(54)	.....	.....	(-54)	.....
General post fund (transfer out)	(-61)	.....	.....	(+61)	.....
Total, Veterans Health Administration	19,307,184	20,667,471	20,664,587	+1,357,403	-2,884

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses	912,594	1,061,854	1,006,000	+93,406	-55,854
Offsetting receipts	(36,754)	(36,754)	(36,754)	.....	.....
Total, Program Level	(949,348)	(1,098,608)	(1,042,754)	(+93,406)	(-55,854)
(Transfer from medical care)	(27,907)	.....	(28,134)	(+227)	(+28,134)
(Transfer from national cemetery)	(117)	.....	(125)	(+8)	(+125)
(Transfer from inspector general)	(30)	.....	(28)	(-2)	(+28)
National Cemetery Administration	97,256	109,889	106,889	+9,633	-3,000
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-117)	.....	(-125)	(-8)	(-125)
Office of Inspector General	43,200	46,464	46,464	+3,264	.....
(Transfer to general operating expenses)	(-30)	.....	(-28)	(+2)	(-28)
Construction, major projects	65,140	62,140	62,140	-3,000	.....
Construction, minor projects	160,000	162,000	100,000	-60,000	-62,000
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	90,000	60,000	60,000	-30,000	.....
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries	25,000	25,000	25,000	.....	.....
Total, Departmental Administration	1,393,190	1,527,347	1,406,493	+13,303	-120,854

Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs	44,255,165	46,948,405	46,849,667	+2,594,502	-98,738
Appropriations	(44,334,684)	(46,948,405)	(46,849,667)	(+2,514,983)	(-98,738)
Rescissions	(-79,519)	.....	.....	(+79,519)	.....
(By transfer)	(61)	.....	.....	(-61)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(102,904)	(3,029)	(3,029)	(-99,875)	.....
Consisting of:					
Mandatory	(23,396,626)	(24,585,866)	(24,615,866)	(+1,219,240)	(+30,000)
Discretionary	(20,858,539)	(22,362,539)	(22,233,801)	(+1,375,262)	(-128,738)
TITLE II					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Housing Certificate Fund	7,176,695	9,927,824	9,075,388	+1,898,693	-852,436
(By transfer)	(183,000)	.....	.....	(-183,000)	.....
Advance appropriation, FY 2001/2002	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	.....	.....
Total funding	11,376,695	14,127,824	13,275,388	+1,898,693	-852,436
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-72,275	.....	.....	+72,275	.....
Housing set-asides:					
Expiring section 8 contracts	(10,834,135)	(13,221,824)	(13,275,388)	(+2,441,253)	(+53,564)
Section 8 relocation assistance	(156,000)	(79,000)	.....	(-156,000)	(-79,000)
Contract administration	.....	(209,000)	.....	.....	(-209,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Incremental vouchers	(346,560)	(527,000)	.....	(-346,560)	(-527,000)
Administrative fee change	.....	(66,000)	.....	.....	(-66,000)
Voucher for disabled	(40,000)	(25,000)	.....	(-40,000)	(-25,000)
Subtotal	(11,376,695)	(14,127,824)	(13,275,388)	(+1,898,693)	(-852,436)
Rescission of unobligated balances:					
Section 8 recaptures (rescission)	-1,300,000	.....	-275,388	+1,024,612	-275,388
Section 8 carryover and Tenant Protection (rescission)	-943,000	.....	.....	+943,000	.....
Subtotal	-2,243,000	.....	-275,388	+1,967,612	-275,388
Public housing capital fund	2,900,000	2,955,000	2,800,000	-100,000	-155,000
Public housing operating fund	3,138,000	3,192,000	3,138,000	.....	-54,000
Subtotal	6,038,000	6,147,000	5,938,000	-100,000	-209,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	310,000	345,000	300,000	-10,000	-45,000
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing (HOPE VI)	575,000	625,000	565,000	-10,000	-60,000
Native American housing block grants	620,000	650,000	620,000	.....	-30,000
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	6,000	6,000	6,000	.....	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(71,956)	(71,956)	(71,956)	.....	.....
Total, Public and Indian Housing	16,610,420	21,900,824	20,429,000	+3,818,580	-1,471,824

Community Planning and Development					
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	232,000	260,000	232,000	.....	-28,000
Rural housing and economic development	25,000	27,000	20,000	-5,000	-7,000
America's private investment companies program:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(541,000)	(1,000,000)	.....	(-541,000)	(-1,000,000)
Credit subsidy	20,000	37,000	.....	-20,000	-37,000
Urban empowerment zones	55,000	.....	.....	-55,000	.....
Rural empowerment zones	15,000	.....	.....	-15,000	.....
Subtotal	70,000	.....	.....	-70,000	.....
Community development block grants	4,800,000	4,900,000	4,505,000	-295,000	-395,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-18,765	.....	.....	+18,765	.....
Section 108 loan guarantees:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(1,261,000)	(1,217,000)	(1,217,000)	(-44,000)	.....
Credit subsidy	29,000	28,000	28,000	-1,000	.....
Administrative expenses	1,000	2,000	1,000	.....	-1,000
Brownfields redevelopment	25,000	50,000	20,000	-5,000	-30,000
HOME investment partnerships program	1,600,000	1,650,000	1,585,000	-15,000	-65,000
Homeless assistance grants	1,020,000	1,200,000	1,020,000	.....	-180,000
Communities in schools community development program	5,000	5,000	.....	-5,000	-5,000
Total, Community planning and development	7,808,235	8,159,000	7,411,000	-397,235	-748,000
Housing Programs					
Housing for special populations	911,000	989,000	911,000	.....	-78,000
Housing for the elderly	(710,000)	(779,000)	(710,000)	.....	(-69,000)
Housing for the disabled	(201,000)	(210,000)	(201,000)	.....	(-9,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(140,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(100,000)	(250,000)	(100,000)	.....	(-150,000)
Administrative expenses	330,888	330,888	330,888	.....	.....
Administrative contract expenses	160,000	160,000	160,000	.....	.....
Additional contract expenses	4,000	4,000	4,000	.....	.....
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,100,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(+2,900,000)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	64,000	211,455	211,455	+147,455	.....
Administrative expenses (unobligated balances)	(147,000)	.....	.....	(-147,000)	.....
Negative subsidy	-75,000	-100,000	-100,000	-25,000	.....
Subsidy	.....	101,000	101,000	+101,000	.....
Subsidy (unobligated balances)	(153,000)	.....	.....	(-153,000)	.....
Non-overhead administrative expenses	144,000	144,000	144,000	.....	.....
Additional contract expenses	7,000	7,000	7,000	.....	.....
Total, Federal Housing Administration	634,888	858,343	858,343	+223,455	.....

Government National Mortgage Association					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	9,383	9,383	9,383	.....	.....
Administrative contract expenses	.....	40,000	.....	.....	-40,000
Offsetting receipts	-422,000	-347,000	-347,000	+75,000	.....
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology	45,000	62,000	40,000	-5,000	-22,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities	44,000	50,000	44,000	.....	-6,000
Office of Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction	80,000	120,000	80,000	.....	-40,000
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses	477,000	565,000	475,647	-1,353	-89,353
Transfer from:					
Limitation on FHA corporate funds	(518,000)	(518,000)	(518,000)	.....	.....
GNMA	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	.....	.....
Community Planning & Development	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	.....	.....
America's Private Investment Companies Program	.....	(1,000)	.....	.....	(-1,000)
Title VI	(150)	(150)	(150)	.....	.....
Indian Housing	(200)	(200)	(200)	.....	.....
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,005,733)	(1,094,733)	(1,004,380)	(-1,353)	(-90,353)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General	50,657	52,000	50,657	.....	-1,343
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	.....	.....
(By transfer from Drug Elimination Grants)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	.....	.....
Total, Office of Inspector General	(83,000)	(84,343)	(83,000)	.....	(-1,343)
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight	19,493	25,800	22,000	+2,507	-3,800
Offsetting receipts	-19,493	-25,800	-22,000	-2,507	+3,800
Administrative Provisions					
Sec. 208 FHA	-319,000	.....	.....	+319,000	.....
Annual contribution (transfer out)	(-79,000)	.....	.....	(+79,000)	.....
Annual contributions (transfer out)	(-104,000)	.....	.....	(+104,000)	.....
Sec. 212 Rescissions	-74,400	.....	.....	+74,400	.....
Sec. 214 Moving to Work	5,000	.....	.....	-5,000	.....
Total, administrative provisions	-388,400	.....	.....	+388,400	.....
Total, title II, Department of Housing & Urban Development (net)	25,860,183	32,458,550	29,962,030	+4,101,847	-2,496,520
Current year, FY 2001	(21,660,183)	(28,258,550)	(25,762,030)	(+4,101,847)	(-2,496,520)
Appropriations	(24,068,623)	(28,258,550)	(26,037,418)	(+1,978,795)	(-2,221,132)
Rescissions	(-2,408,440)	.....	(-275,388)	(+2,133,052)	(-275,388)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001/2002	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(359,902,000)	(383,217,000)	(382,217,000)	(+22,315,000)	(-1,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(561,076)	(562,076)	(561,076)	.....	(-1,000)

TITLE III					
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
American Battle Monuments Commission					
Salaries and expenses	28,467	26,196	28,000	-467	+1,804
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-108	.....	.....	+108	.....
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board					
Salaries and expenses	8,000	8,000	8,000	.....	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-30	.....	.....	+30	.....
Department of the Treasury					
Community Development Financial Institutions					
Community development financial institutions fund program account	95,000	125,000	105,000	+10,000	-20,000
Consumer Product Safety Commission					
Salaries and expenses	49,000	52,500	51,000	+2,000	-1,500
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-186	.....	.....	+186	.....
Corporation for National and Community Service					
National and community service programs operating expenses	434,500	533,700	.....	-434,500	-533,700
Rescission	-80,000	.....	.....	+80,000	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-1,347	.....	.....	+1,347	.....
Office of Inspector General	4,000	5,000	5,000	+1,000	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-15	.....	.....	+15	.....
Total	357,138	538,700	5,000	-352,138	-533,700

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims					
Salaries and expenses	11,450	12,500	12,500	+1,050	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-42	.....	.....	+42	.....
Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses	12,473	15,949	17,949	+5,476	+2,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-47	.....	.....	+47	.....
Department of Health and Human Services					
National Institute of Health					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences 1/	60,000	48,527	60,000	.....	+11,473
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry					
Toxic Substances and Environmental Public Health 1/	70,000	64,000	70,000	.....	+6,000
Environmental Protection Agency					
Science and Technology	645,000	674,348	650,000	+5,000	-24,348
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	38,000	35,871	35,000	-3,000	-871
Subtotal, Science and Technology	683,000	710,219	685,000	+2,000	-25,219
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-2,697	.....	.....	+2,697	.....

Environmental Programs and Management	1,900,000	2,099,461	1,900,000	.....	-199,461
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-4,733	.....	.....	+4,733	.....
Office of Inspector General	32,409	34,094	34,000	+1,591	-94
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	11,000	11,652	11,500	+500	-152
Subtotal, OIG	43,409	45,746	45,500	+2,091	-246
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-29	.....	.....	+29	.....
Buildings and facilities	62,600	23,931	23,931	-38,669	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-238	.....	.....	+238	.....
Hazardous Substance Superfund 1/	1,170,000	1,337,473	1,170,000	.....	-167,473
Delay of obligation	100,000	.....	100,000	.....	+100,000
Transfer to Office of Inspector General	-11,000	-11,652	-11,500	-500	+152
Transfer to Science and Technology	-38,000	-35,871	-35,000	+3,000	+871
Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,221,000	1,289,950	1,223,500	+2,500	-66,450
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program	70,000	72,096	79,000	+9,000	+6,904
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-240	.....	.....	+240	.....
Oil spill response	15,000	15,712	15,000	.....	-712
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-26	.....	.....	+26	.....
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	2,581,650	1,838,000	2,108,000	-473,650	+270,000
Categorical grants	885,000	1,068,957	1,068,957	+183,957	.....
Subtotal, STAG	3,466,650	2,906,957	3,176,957	-289,693	+270,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-20,885	.....	.....	+20,885	.....
Total, EPA	7,461,659	7,164,072	7,148,888	-312,771	-15,184
Rescissions	-28,848	.....	.....	+28,848	.....
Executive Office of the President					
Office of Science and Technology Policy	5,108	5,201	5,150	+42	-51
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-19	.....	.....	+19	.....
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,827	3,020	2,900	+73	-120
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-11	.....	.....	+11	.....
Total	7,905	8,221	8,050	+145	-171
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation					
Office of Inspector General (transfer)	(33,666)	(33,660)	(33,661)	(-5)	(+1)
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Disaster relief	300,000	300,000	.....	-300,000	-300,000
Emergency funding	.....	.....	300,000	+300,000	+300,000
(Transfer out)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	(-35,500)	(-32,600)	(-32,600)
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-12,416	.....	.....	+12,416	.....
Emergency funding	2,480,425	2,609,220	.....	-2,480,425	-2,609,220
Pre-disaster mitigation	.....	30,000	.....	.....	-30,000
(Transfer out)	.....	(-2,600)	.....	.....	(+2,600)

Disaster assistance direct loan program account:					
State share loan	1,295	1,678	1,295	.....	-383
(Limitation on direct loans)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(19,000)	(-6,000)	(-6,000)
Administrative expenses	420	427	420	.....	-7
Salaries and expenses	180,000	221,024	190,000	+10,000	-31,024
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-50	.....	.....	+50	.....
Office of Inspector General	8,015	8,476	8,015	.....	-461
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-50	.....	.....	+50	.....
Emergency management planning and assistance	267,000	269,652	267,000	.....	-2,652
(By transfer)	(2,900)	(5,500)	(5,500)	(+2,600)	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-218	.....	.....	+218	.....
Radiological emergency preparedness fund	-1,000	.....	.....	+1,000	.....
Emergency food and shelter program	110,000	140,000	110,000	.....	-30,000
Flood map modernization fund	5,000	.....	.....	-5,000	.....
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(30,000)	(+30,000)	(+30,000)
National insurance development fund	(3,730)	.....	.....	(-3,730)	.....
National Flood Insurance Fund (limitation on administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses	(24,333)	(25,736)	(25,736)	(+1,403)	.....
Flood mitigation	(78,710)	(77,307)	(77,307)	(-1,403)	.....
(Transfer out)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	.....	.....
National flood mitigation fund (by transfer)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	.....	.....
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	3,338,421	3,580,477	876,730	-2,461,691	-2,703,747
Appropriations	(870,730)	(971,257)	(576,730)	(-294,000)	(-394,527)
Rescissions	(-12,734)	.....	.....	(+12,734)	.....
Emergency funding	(2,480,425)	(2,609,220)	(300,000)	(-2,180,425)	(-2,309,220)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
General Services Administration					
Federal Consumer Information Center Fund	2,622	6,822	7,122	+4,500	+300
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Human space flight	5,510,900	5,499,900	5,499,900	-11,000	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-23,000	.....	.....	+23,000	.....
Science, aeronautics and technology	5,606,700	5,929,400	5,606,700	.....	-322,700
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-25,805	.....	.....	+25,805	.....
Mission support	2,515,100	2,584,000	2,584,000	+68,900	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-3,076	.....	.....	+3,076	.....
Office of Inspector General	20,000	22,000	23,000	+3,000	+1,000
Total, NASA	13,652,700	14,035,300	13,713,600	+60,900	-321,700
Rescissions	-51,881	.....	.....	+51,881	.....
National Credit Union Administration					
Central liquidity facility:					
(Limitation on direct loans)	.....	(600,000)	(3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)	(+2,400,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)	(257)	(296)	(296)	(+39)	.....
Revolving loan program	1,000	.....	1,000	.....	+1,000
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-4	.....	.....	+4	.....
Community development credit union revolving loan fund	.....	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000

National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities	2,966,000	3,540,680	3,135,690	+169,690	-404,990
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-7,538	.....	.....	+7,538	.....
Major research equipment	95,000	138,540	76,600	-18,400	-61,940
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-1,500	.....	.....	+1,500	.....
Education and human resources	696,600	729,010	694,310	-2,290	-34,700
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-5,728	.....	.....	+5,728	.....
Salaries and expenses	149,000	157,890	152,000	+3,000	-5,890
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-100	.....	.....	+100	.....
Office of Inspector General	5,450	6,280	5,700	+250	-580
Total, NSF	3,912,050	4,572,400	4,064,300	+152,250	-508,100
Rescissions	-14,866	.....	.....	+14,866	.....
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation					
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	75,000	90,000	90,000	+15,000	.....
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-285	.....	.....	+285	.....
Selective Service System					
Salaries and expenses	24,000	24,480	23,000	-1,000	-1,480
Across the board rescission (0.38%)	-91	.....	.....	+91	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, title III, Independent agencies	29,070,497	30,374,144	26,290,139	-2,780,358	-4,084,005
Appropriations	(26,590,072)	(27,764,924)	(25,990,139)	(-599,933)	(-1,774,785)
Rescissions	(-190,514)	.....	.....	(+190,514)	.....
Emergency funding	(2,480,425)	(2,609,220)	(300,000)	(-2,180,425)	(-2,309,220)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(25,000)	(625,000)	(3,019,000)	(+2,994,000)	(+2,394,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(257)	(296)	(296)	(+39)	.....
OTHER PROVISIONS					
H.R. 202 - Preservation of Affordable Housing	-14,000	.....	.....	+14,000	.....
VA Compensation Date Shift 2/	.....	-1,574,000	-1,574,000	-1,574,000	.....
VA Pension Date Shift 2/	.....	-258,000	-258,000	-258,000	.....
Grand total (net)	99,171,845	107,949,099	101,269,836	+2,097,991	-6,679,263
Current year, FY 2001	(94,971,845)	(103,749,099)	(97,069,836)	(+2,097,991)	(-6,679,263)
Appropriations	(95,169,893)	(101,139,879)	(97,045,224)	(+1,875,331)	(-4,094,655)
Rescissions	(-2,678,473)	.....	(-275,388)	(+2,403,085)	(-275,388)
Emergency funding	(2,480,425)	(2,609,220)	(300,000)	(-2,180,425)	(-2,309,220)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001/2002	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	.....	.....

(By transfer)	(236,727)	(53,660)	(83,661)	(-153,066)	(+30,001)
(Transfer out)	(-203,061)	(-20,000)	(-50,000)	(+153,061)	(-30,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(103,043)	(103,043)	(103,043)	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(349,860)	(999,985)	(3,243,985)	(+2,894,125)	(+2,244,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(359,902,000)	(383,217,000)	(382,217,000)	(+22,315,000)	(-1,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(561,333)	(562,372)	(561,372)	(+39)	(-1,000)
Total mandatory and discretionary	92,877,918	107,595,099	101,096,836	+8,218,918	-6,498,263
Mandatory	21,306,626	24,581,866	24,611,866	+3,305,240	+30,000
Discretionary	71,571,292	83,013,233	76,484,970	+4,913,678	-6,528,263

1/ FY 2000 enacted and FY 2001 request for Department of Health and Human Services accounts reflect comparable amounts that were enacted and requested as part of the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

2/ CBO assigned request to authorizing committee.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

While the VA–HUD subcommittee and its Chairman have done the best they could within the budget limits imposed on the subcommittee, the resulting bill falls far short of what is needed to address national needs in most areas that it covers. As with other domestic appropriations bills considered this year, the Majority's insistence on using budget surpluses primarily to cut taxes for the well off have left this bill and its programs shortchanged.

The VA–HUD subcommittee made a number of laudable efforts to deal with various critical needs as best they could, given the inadequate resources available for this bill. However, that lack of resources has produced serious shortcomings in the bill:

The bill includes a substantial and welcome increase for veterans medical care, but fails to adequately provide for several other priorities for veterans. In particular, it freezes funding for veterans medical research, cuts grants for construction of state veterans homes $30 million below the current year level, and provides $56 million less than requested to improve processing of applications for benefits.

The bill once again seeks to completely eliminate the AmeriCorps national service program.

It appropriates no funds for the 120,000 new housing assistance vouchers proposed by the Administration. Rather, it allows no more than 20,000 new vouchers, to be provided only if extra recaptured funds become available in that program.

The bill cuts Community Development Block Grants $276 million below the current year level, and $395 million below the President's request. It also cuts public housing programs (including capital and operating grants and anti-drug programs) $120 million below the current year and $314 million below the request, and freezes funding for homeless assistance.

It completely rejects the President's proposal for $50 million for EPA to begin a major effort to clean up the Great Lakes.

While the measure provides an increase for research at the National Science Foundation, it falls short of the President's request in this area by $508 million.

The bill also underfunds the President's request for NASA science and technology programs by $323 million.

Finally, it appropriates only $300 million of the $2.9 billion requested by the Administration for FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund, thereby jeopardizing FEMA's ability to respond quickly and adequately to natural disasters.

Although the official tables suggest that this bill contains a $4.9 billion increase over the current fiscal year, that increase is illusory. Of the increase, $4.2 billion results from an "advance appropriation" for FY 2001 made last year—a device that simply shifted $4.2 billion of FY 2000 costs to FY 2001. The advance appropria-

tion helped fit last year's bill into that year's artificial budget constraints, but it leaves this year's bill with an automatic $4.2 billion increase.

In fact, disregarding all of the offsets, timing shifts, and other budget gimmicks done this year or last, the actual programmatic increase provided by the FY 2001 bill totals just $256 million—an increase of three-tenths of one percent. In the same programmatic terms, the bill is $6.4 billion below the President's proposal for FY 2001.

Considering the very important needs covered by the VA–HUD bill—veterans health care, environmental protection, scientific research, housing assistance, and emergency preparedness and disaster relief—it is most unfortunate that all the Majority's budget plan could provide was a 0.3 percent increase for programs over the prior year. It is particularly ironic that this anemic funding comes not at a time of budget deficits and economic crisis, but rather at a time of rising budget surpluses and the strongest economy we've seen in decades. If at this time of great prosperity the Majority still insists that we cannot afford to increase our investment in research or reduce unmet housing needs, when—if ever—do they believe we will be able to afford these things?

Despite rising surpluses, the Majority's budget plan does not allow any significant increases for domestic appropriations because the Majority's highest budget priority is tax cuts—targeted to the high end of the income scale. The shortcomings of this VA–HUD appropriations bill are one of the many direct consequences of those tax cuts. The alternative budget offered by Democrats in the House, like the President's budget, calls for considerably smaller tax cuts. With its smaller tax cuts, the Democratic budget would have allowed an additional $20 billion in domestic appropriations for FY 2001. Had that budget been adopted, this would be a far better bill.

During committee consideration of this legislation, Democrats offered several amendments to alleviate its shortcomings in areas like veterans medical research, housing assistance, and science. All were defeated on party line votes, with the Majority insisting that, while increases might be desirable, those increases simply could not be fit within Majority's budget plan. The debate graphically illustrates the fundamental problems with that budget plan and the upper-income tax cuts that drive it. All of the amendments offered to this bill by Democrats could readily be accommodated within the Democratic budget alternative with its smaller tax cuts, or within the President's budget totals.

Following are additional details regarding the shortcomings of this VA–HUD appropriations bill and Democratic efforts to improve the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

The Chairman is to be commended for making veterans programs a priority within a budget allocation which many members on both sides of the aisle find inadequate. In particular, approval of the President's $1.4 billion increase for the Medical Care account is a significant move towards addressing the essential health care needs of the growing population of older, disabled and indigent vet-

erans. This includes fully funding the expanded long term care and emergency services authorized last year under the Veterans Millenium Health Care Act. Beyond providing for medical care, however, we believe there are several weaknesses that Congress still must address before this bill can be described as adequate in terms of providing for veterans.

First, we believe that failing to increase funding for medical research, which is frozen in the bill at $321 million, is a missed opportunity to invest in high quality research at a time when Congress appears to recognize the potential of such investments in other agencies such as the National Institutes of Health. This research encourages top medical schools to work with the VA and attracts leading physicians to VA hospitals to help care for veterans with state-of-the-art medical science. Research at these institutions, whether on diseases of great urgency for veterans such as Alzheimer's disease, diabetes or substance abuse, or on health outcomes/services improvements such as its medical errors initiative, benefit not only veterans but the general public. Unfortunately the amendment offered by Rep. Price to increase funding for VA medical research was not adopted (see roll call number 1).

Second, we believe that the reduction of $30 million in grants to States for construction of extended care facilities is short sighted and ignores the high demand for such services, especially among the WW II generation of veterans. As a minimum $90 million, the same amount as provided this year, should be allocated in fiscal year 2001.

Third, we regret that funding for general operations expenses was reduced by $56 million below the request. The increase requested by the Administration is targeted at reducing the unacceptable delays in processing initial benefit applications as well as in resolving appeals. Currently it takes approximately 160 days to process an initial claim and close to two years for an appeal. These delays are not acceptable. While the Majority attempted to partially fund these initiatives, we believe the full amount requested by the President should have been approved.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

In this bill most HUD programs are either frozen at the FY 2000 level, with no increases for inflation or anything else, or are actually cut below FY 2000. Shortages of affordable housing are reaching crisis proportions in some areas of the country, but the bill makes no new commitments and provides no additional resources toward addressing those problems. Compared to the President's request, the bill makes cuts totaling between $2.2 and 2.5 billion (with the exact figure depending on whether offsets are counted or disregarded).

While the bill appears to provide a $4.1 billion increase for HUD programs, as with the bill as a whole the increases are largely illusory. The illusion of increases results from peculiarities of accounting for the cost of the section 8 housing assistance program, and from the subcommittee's inability to repeat some one-time offsets used to reduce the apparent cost of last year's bill. The "increases" in the bill do not translate into housing assistance for more fami-

lies or more resources for housing providers. In programmatic terms, the bill mainly produces small cuts, not increases.

One reason for the apparent year-to-year increase is that last year's bill rescinded $2.3 billion in balances of budget authority at HUD that were not expected to be needed in FY 2000. For FY 2001, however, the subcommittee was able to identify only about $275 million to rescind. Because rescissions are counted as offsets to the appropriations made by the bill (i.e., they count as "negative spending"), this $2 billion decrease in rescissions makes it appear that appropriations have gone up by the same amount. However, these rescissions have no effect on actual spending for HUD programs—at least not in the year they are made.

The second major reason for the apparent increase in HUD appropriations is the $2.5 billion increase provided for the section 8 housing assistance program (which provides subsidies to landlords or vouchers to tenants to help low-income people afford to rent housing on the private market). During the 1970s and 1980s, section 8 housing assistance was provided under long-term contracts (often 20 or 30 years in duration), funded in advance through appropriations made before the contracts were entered into. While these long-term contracts are in effect, no additional appropriations are usually needed. However, the old long-term contracts have been expiring, and new appropriations are needed to renew them. (Budget constraints have recently limited these renewals to one year at a time). Thus, as old long-term contracts expire and more units are added to the annual renewal pool each year, the amount of appropriations needed for section 8 assistance goes up. However, these renewals just provide the same assistance under essentially the same terms to roughly the same number of people.

These two factors more than account for the entire increase provided for HUD under this bill. Leaving aside the decrease in rescissions and the increased appropriations needed for section 8 contract renewals, everything else in HUD is either flat or reduced below FY 2000. In several cases, appropriations are actually lower than they were six years ago.

This is unfortunate, because needs for federal housing assistance are growing, not shrinking. While the economy may be booming and employment and incomes rising, in many areas rents are rising even faster. Finding a place to live is a growing problem for many working families with modest incomes or elderly people trying to live on Social Security and small pensions. HUD's latest report on housing conditions tells us that there are 5.4 million very low-income households with "worst case" housing needs—that is, households with incomes below 50 percent of the local median who are paying more than half of their income for rent and receiving no housing assistance whatsoever. The fastest growing segment of that group is people working full time.

One thing that would help meet affordable housing needs is to increase the number of families and individuals receiving section 8 housing assistance vouchers. Last year, 60,000 "incremental" (i.e., additional) vouchers were funded. This year, the Administration proposed 120,000 incremental vouchers. The bill, however, provides no appropriation at all for additional vouchers. All it does is allow HUD to provide up to 20,000 new vouchers from any extra

amounts that become available from recaptures of previously awarded funds. However, HUD does not believe there will be any recaptures beyond those already built into their budget request.

There is also an urgent need for further assistance to help foster production of housing that can be afforded by low-income families. In fact, in some areas people are having real difficulty using vouchers because they can't find any apartments to rent that are affordable even with a voucher. However, the Federal Government currently does relatively little to assist with production of new low income housing, and this bill reduces that commitment a little further.

For example, the bill freezes appropriations for development of housing for low-income elderly and disabled people (the section 202 and 811 programs), providing no increases to cover rising costs or to increase the number of units produced. The FY 2001 appropriation of $911 million represents a 45 percent cut from the $1.7 billion appropriated for FY 1995 (the last appropriation enacted while Democrats held a majority in Congress). A second example is the HOME program, which is a flexible block grant program used by local governments to expand the supply of low-income housing. Instead of an increase for HOME to at least cover rising costs, the bill actually cuts HOME $15 million below FY 2000 (and $65 million below the President's request). To give another example, this year the Administration proposed to combine 10,000 new vouchers with the low-income housing tax credit program, in order to provide a subsidy sufficient to produce housing affordable at low income levels. As already noted, this bill fails to provide appropriations for new vouchers, including these "housing production" vouchers.

Another major element of the federal housing strategy is public housing—that is, financial support for low-income housing owned and operated by local housing authorities. This bill cuts capital grants for public housing $100 million below the current year level, freezes operating assistance (thus providing no increases to cover higher costs for salaries, utilities, or anything else), and cuts drug elimination grants and "HOPE VI" grants for revitalization of severely distressed public housing by $10 million each below FY 2000. Appropriations for these four accounts together are #314 million below the President's request.

The bill also cuts Community Development Block Grants by $276 million below the current year's level and $395 million below the request. The bill's $4.505 billion appropriation for CDBG is actually $95 million less than the dollar level appropriated for FY 1995. In terms of purchasing power, CDBG will have lost roughly 15 percent since that time.

For Homeless Assistance Grants, the bill freezes appropriations at the FY 2000 level of $1.02 billion, rejecting the $120 million increase proposed by the President. This is yet another area where appropriations have declined in actual dollar terms over the past six years—the bill's level for homeless assistance is $100 million less than appropriated in FY 1995.

There are several other areas of concern in the HUD title of the bill. For example, the bill freezes funding for Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA), rather than providing the $28

million increase proposed by the President. It cuts the HUD rural housing program $5 million below last year and also cuts brownfields redevelopment $5 million. It provides no funding for the America's Private Investment Companies (APIC) initiative, despite the agreement between President Clinton and Speaker Hastert to fund this item. And it provides none of the increases requested by the President for fair housing programs, and in fact actually cuts one of these programs—the Fair Housing Initiatives Program—$2 million below FY 2000.

During consideration of the bill by the Appropriations Committee, Rep. Mollohan offered an amendment to increase funding for ten housing programs by a total of $1.834 billion. The Mollohan amendment would have funded 102,000 incremental section 8 housing vouchers, and provided increases (relative to amounts in the bill) for public housing capital grants (+$200 million), public housing operating subsidies (+$127 million), Native American Housing Block Grants (+$30 million), Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (+$43 million), CDBG (+$395 million), HOME (+$215 million), Homeless Assistance Grants (+$80 million), and Housing for the Elderly and Disabled (+$114 million). Finally, it would have funded APIC at the President's request of $37 million. The amendment was defeated on a party-line vote, however (roll call number 5).

After defeat of the Mollohan amendment, Rep. Obey offered a more limited amendment in which the proposed additions were fully offset by other savings (since one of the Majority's main stated objections to the Mollohan amendment was that it did not contain offsets). The Obey amendment would have added $78 million to Housing for the Elderly and Disabled (to bring it up to the President's request), $20 million for Homeless Assistance Grants, and $9 million for HOPWA. These increases were offset by provisions taken from a House-passed authorization bill (H.R. 1776) which expanded FHA lending activity and thereby produced increases in receipts from FHA loan guarantee fees. This amendment, too, was defeated on a party-line vote (roll call number 6).

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

While the Committee's total allocation to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is essentially at the level requested by the President, the allocation of funds among programs includes specific reductions that we believe will hamper the Agency's ability to protect the public health and the environment as well as the ability of local communities to address critical water and sewage facility problems. The 10% reduction in the request for the Agency's Operating Program, which funds the Agency's basic environmental and public health programs, will affect millions of Americans—the air they breathe, the water they drink, the quality of their lives. The Committee's cut to the Agency's enforcement programs will escalate the level of non-compliance with environmental laws, thus exacerbating the problems many Americans face from increased pollution. No funds have been provided to address the hundreds of requests from members for specific grants for water and sewer repair and upgrades in communities in their districts.

In addition, severe reductions to other targeted programs continue to restrict EPA's ability to fulfill its mandates. The Committee's action to reduce the Superfund program by $66 million below last year's level will eliminate many new construction starts next year. Important Administration initiatives have been totally eliminated. The Great Lakes grant program, which would have addressed contaminated "areas of concern" in the crown jewels of our nation's waterways, and the Integrated Information Initiative, which would have moved environmental information management to a new plane, have been totally eliminated.

Finally, the bill includes legislative riders which would impede the Agency's ability to meet its legal requirements. For example, Committee report language directs, for the first time, severe restrictions on the clean up of contaminated sediments in scores of water bodies nationwide. In addition the Majority has included new report language related to the Kyoto Protocol and its impact on EPA's activities under existing environmental laws. While the bill language is identical to previous years, this new report language goes beyond a conference agreement which was carefully negotiated in 1998, a compromise which should not be modified through a report which the House is not able to vote on.

It is time for the Committee to provide EPA with sufficient resources to enforce the environmental laws passed by Congress. Congress must also stop efforts to change these laws through the appropriations process and to allow the Agency to fulfill its promise to the American people of a safe, clean environment for all Americans.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

In the past decade, research by the National Science Foundation (NSF) has helped fuel the growth of the economy including two of its most vital sectors: information technology and biotechnology. Yet, at a critical juncture for these burgeoning industries and other NSF-supported areas, the committee has cut $508 million from the President's requested budget. While the committee's effort to add $167 million in total funding over FY 2000 levels is laudable, the shortfall from the proposed budget represents a crucial missed opportunity to invigorate and enhance the nation's technological capacity. The NSF's track record in stimulating new technology is impressive. Fifteen years ago, NSF funds created the Internet backbone, which later became the cornerstone of today's $16 billion online retail industry. At the same time, NSF researchers made the key discovery that helped launch the biotechnology revolution, creating new drugs and techniques like DNA fingerprinting. How many scientific and economic breakthroughs will be lost in the coming years if needed funding is diminished?

The recommended $90 million reduction in Computer and Information Science and Engineering will seriously hinder the NSF's cutting-edge initiative in information technology. Ongoing work of this kind could be vital to the future of computing and the Internet. The reduction of $30 million in Undergraduate Education is tremendously shortsighted at a time when the nation is starved for high-skill technical workers and Congress is considering increased immigration to bring in skilled workers from abroad. Moreover,

while the Committee is "concerned with the lack of research addressing linkages between human health and the world's oceans," and urges new initiatives in this area, the recommended appropriation in Geosciences for FY 2001 is $59.2 million below the President's request—hardly an impetus for new or expanded initiatives. Overall, the committee's funding reduction will mean that 4000 less grants will be funded involving 18,000 researchers and science educators. We believe this is a short sighted recommendation at a time when our economy, and our country, needs them most. Unfortunately the amendment proposed by Rep. Obey to restore funding for NSF to the level requested by the President was rejected by the Committee (roll call number 9).

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

While two of NASA's three main accounts are funded at the President's request, once again the bill provides less than requested for the other account, which funds scientific research and technology development programs at NASA. Under the bill, this Science, Aeronautics, and Technology account receives a very small (one half of one percent) increase over the current fiscal year, but $323 million less than requested by the President.

In particular, the measure provides none of the $20 million requested for "Living with a Star"—a new NASA initiative (building on existing programs) to improve understanding of the Sun and its impact on the Earth's environment, and to help provide early warning against solar events that can damage communications and power systems on earth and in space.

Further, the bill provides none of the $290 million requested for the Space Launch Initiative, which is NASA's program to develop the next generation of reusable launch vehicles—i.e., the vehicles that would replace or augment the Space Shuttle. By doing so, it eliminates all funding for advanced technology research, on-going work on two experimental vehicles (the X–34 and X–37), and the "alternate access to the space station" initiative which is intended to help stimulate development of launch vehicles by small and emerging companies.

The bill also greatly reduces appropriations for on-going research and development to improve air traffic control and traffic management and reduce airport and airspace congestion. The President requested $59.2 million for this "Aviation Systems Capacity" program, but the bill provides just $10.1 million.

During committee consideration of the bill, Rep. Mollohan offered an amendment to add $322.7 million to the Science, Aeronautics and Technology account, to bring the level in the bill up to the amount requested by the President. That amendment, however, was defeated on a party-line vote (roll call number 8).

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

The bill provides only $300 million of the $2.9 billion requested by the President to replenish FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund. The President's request was intended just to cover the cost of an "average" year of natural disasters. (Specifically, the request is based—as is the usual practice—on the average cost of disaster assistance over the preceding five years, excluding the unusually high costs

associated with the Northridge Earthquake.) It is necessary to maintain adequate balances in the Disaster Relief Fund so that FEMA can respond quickly to needs resulting from hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, earthquakes, and other disasters, rather than having to wait many months until Congress is able to provide supplemental appropriations. If Congress were to adjourn without having provided any funding beyond the $300 million in this bill, FEMA's ability to meet emergency needs would be placed at risk.

During committee consideration of the bill, Rep. Boyd offered an amendment to provide an additional $2.6 billion in emergency appropriations for FEMA Disaster Relief, in order to fully fund the President's request. The amendment was defeated on a party line vote (roll call number 10).

CONCLUSION

Thus, the bill falls short of what is needed in a wide range of areas. It represents a series of missed opportunities to take action to alleviate affordable housing shortages, expand scientific research, meet needs of veterans, and prepare for natural disasters.

In saying this, we mean no criticism of the Chairman of the VA–HUD subcommittee or anyone else who was involved in putting together this bill. On the contrary, they did the best they could with the allocation they were given. In several cases, they did some useful and creative things to stretch dollars as far as possible and improve programs.

The fundamental problem, however, is the Majority party's overall budget strategy, which seeks to actually shrink domestic appropriations in order to finance their agenda of tax cuts targeted to the well off. This bill with all its shortcomings is a direct consequence of that budget strategy.

ALAN B. MOLLOHAN.
DAVE OBEY.

○