AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

107TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 107–740

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2003

OCTOBER 10, 2002.—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

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 5605]

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, 2003, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page number Bill	Report
Title I—Department of Veterans Affairs	2	4
Title II—Department of Housing and Urban Development	23	23
Title III—Independent Agencies	68	84
American Battle Monuments Commission	68	84
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	69	85
Community Development Financial Institutions	69	86
Consumer Product Safety Commission	70	86
Corporation for National and Community Service	71	87
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims	72	89
Department of Defense—Civil, Cemeterial Expenses, Army	72	89
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	73	90
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	73	91
Environmental Protection Agency	74	91
Office of Science and Technology Policy	84	130

82–274

	Page number Bill	Report
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	85	130
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	85	131
Federal Emergency Management Agency	86	131
Federal Citizen Information Center	92	141
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	93	143
National Credit Union Administration	97	153
National Science Foundation	97	154
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	100	163
Selective Service System	100	163
Title IV—General Provisions	101	164

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee recommends $122,568,881,000 in new budget (obligational) authority for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and 20 independent agencies and offices.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the appropriations for fiscal year 2002 and budget estimates for fiscal year 2003.

ACCRUAL FUNDING OF RETIREMENT COSTS AND POST-RETIREMENT HEALTH BENEFITS

The President's Budget included a legislative proposal under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Government Reform to charge to individual agencies, starting in fiscal year 2003, the fully accrued costs related to retirement benefits of Civil Service Retirement System employees and retiree health benefits for all civilian employees. The Budget also requested an additional dollar amount in each affected discretionary account to cover these accrued costs.

Without passing judgment on the merits of this legislative proposal, the Committee has reduced the dollar amounts of the President's request shown in the "Comparative Statement of New Budget Authority" and other tables in this report to exclude the accrual funding proposal. The disposition by Congress of the legislative proposal is unclear at this time. Should the proposal be passed by Congress and enacted, the Committee will make appropriate adjustments to the President's request to include accrual amounts.

The Committee further notes that administration proposals requiring legislative action by the authorizing committees of Congress are customarily submitted in the budget as separate schedules apart from the regular appropriations requests. Should such a proposal be enacted, a budget amendment formally modifying the President's appropriation request for discretionary funding is then transmitted to the Congress.

The Committee is concerned that this practice, which has always worked effectively for both Congress and past administrations, was not followed for the accrual funding proposal. In this case, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) decided to include accrual amounts in the original discretionary appropriations language request. These amounts are based on legislation that has yet to be considered and approved by the appropriate committees of Congress. This led to numerous misunderstandings both inside and outside of Congress of what was the "true" President's budget re-

quest. The Committee believes that, in the future, OMB should follow long-established procedures with respect to discretionary spending proposals that require legislative action.

OPERATING PLAN AND REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES

The Committee continues to have a particular interest in being informed of reprogrammings which, although they may not change either the total amount available in an account or any of the purposes for which the appropriation is legally available, represent a significant departure from budget plans presented to the Committee in an agency's budget justifications, the basis of this appropriations Act.

Consequently, the Committee directs the Departments, agencies, boards, commissions, corporations and offices funded at or in excess of $100,000,000 in this bill, to consult with the Committee prior to each change from the approved budget levels in excess of $500,000 between programs, activities, object classifications or elements unless otherwise provided for in the Committee report accompanying this bill. For agencies, boards, commissions, corporations and offices funded at less than $100,000,000 in this bill, the reprogramming threshold shall be $250,000 between programs, activities, object classifications or elements unless otherwise provided for in the Committee report accompanying this bill. Additionally, the Committee expects to be promptly notified of all reprogramming actions which involve less than the above-mentioned amounts. If such actions would have the effect of significantly changing an agency's funding requirements in future years, or if programs or projects specifically cited in the Committee's reports are affected by the reprogramming, the reprogramming must be approved by the Committee regardless of the amount proposed to be moved. Furthermore, the Committee wishes to be consulted regarding reorganizations of offices, programs, and activities prior to the planned implementation of such reorganizations.

The Committee also directs that the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, as well as the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board shall submit operating plans, signed by the respective secretary, administrator, or agency head, for the Committee's review within 120 days of the bill's enactment.

RELATIONSHIP WITH BUDGET OFFICES

Through the years, the Committee has channeled most of its inquiries and requests for information and assistance through the budget offices of the various departments, agencies, and commissions. The Committee has often pointed to the natural affinity and relationship between these organizations and the Committee which makes such a relationship workable. The Committee reiterates its longstanding position that while the Committee reserves the right to call upon all offices in the departments, agencies, and commissions, the primary conjunction between the Committee and these

entities must normally be through the budget offices. The Committee appreciates all the assistance received from each of the departments, agencies, and commissions during the past year. The workload generated by the budget process is large and growing, and therefore, a positive, responsive relationship between the Committee and the budget offices is absolutely essential to the appropriations process.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$58,131,067,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation [1]	52,379,398,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	56,938,897,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+5,751,669,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+1,192,170,000

[1] Includes supplemental funding of $1,100,000,000 for Compensation and Readjustment benefits and $142,000,000 for Medical Care.

The Department of Veterans Affairs is the third largest Federal agency in terms of employment with an average employment of approximately 212,000. It administers benefits for more than 25,300,000 veterans, and 41,400,000 family members of living veterans and survivors of deceased veterans. Thus, close to 66,700,000 people, comprising about 23.3 percent of the total population of the United States, are potential recipients of veterans benefits provided by the Federal Government.

A total of $58,131,067,000 in new budget authority is recommended by the Committee for the Department of Veterans Affairs programs in fiscal year 2003. The funds recommended provide for compensation payments to 2,746,615 veterans and survivors of deceased veterans with service-connected disabilities; pension payment for 581,797 non-service-connected disabled veterans, widows and children in need of financial assistance; education training, tuition assistance, and vocational assistance of 632,415 veterans, servicepersons, and reservists, and 51,746 eligible dependents of deceased veterans or seriously disabled veterans; housing credit assistance in the form of 248,000 guaranteed loans provided to veterans and servicepersons; administration or supervision of life insurance programs with 4,203,880 policies for veterans and active duty servicepersons providing coverage of $599,263,090,000; inpatient care and treatment of beneficiaries in 172 medical centers; 43 domiciliaries, 137 nursing homes and 864 outpatient clinics which includes independent, satellite, community-based, and rural outreach clinics involving 49,222,000 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 2003 recommendation	$28,949,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation [1]	26,044,288,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	28,949,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+2,904,712,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

[1] Includes a supplemental appropriation of $1,100,000,000.

This appropriation provides funds for service-connected compensation payments to an estimated 2,746,615 beneficiaries and pension payments to another 581,797 beneficiaries with non-service-connected disabilities. The average cost per compensation case in 2003 is estimated at $9,217, and pension payments are projected at a unit cost of $5,980. The estimated caseload and cost by program for 2002 and 2003 are as follows:

	2002	2003	Difference
Caseload:			
Compensation:			
Veterans	2,356,600	2,433,216	+76,616
Survivors	308,165	312,297	+4,132
Children	1,044	1,102	+58
Clothing allowance (non-add)	(79,618)	(81,104)	(+1,486)
Pensions:			
Veterans	347,178	340,374	−6,804
Survivors	234,619	221,072	−13,547
Minimum income for widows (non-add)	(523)	(488)	(−35)
Vocational training (non-add)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Burial allowances and service connected deaths	97,602	97,393	−209
Funds:			
Compensation:			
Veterans	$18,711,705,000	$21,191,850,000	+$2,480,145,000
Survivors	3,866,386,000	4,113,572,000	+247,186,000
Children	17,974,000	16,742,000	−1,232,000
Clothing allowance	46,178,000	47,640,000	+1,462,000
Payment to GOE (Public Laws 101–508 and 102–568)	1,286,000	966,000	−320,000
Medical exams pilot program (Public Law 104–275)	37,000,000	38,300,000	+1,300,000
Pensions:			
Veterans	2,596,916,000	2,595,459,000	−457,000
Survivors	733,584,000	761,037,000	+27,453,000
Minimum income for widows	3,444,000	3,292,000	−152,000
Vocational training	0	0	0
Payment to GOE (Public Laws 101–508, 102–568, and 103–446)	8,564,000	7,000,000	−1,564,000
Payment to medical care (Public Laws 101–508 and 102–568)	8,090,000	8,575,000	+485,000
Payment to medical facilities (non-add)	(891,000)	(937,000)	(+46,000)
Burial benefits	141,817,000	159,470,000	+17,653,000
Other assistance	4,887,000	4,935,000	+48,000
Unobligated balance and transfers	−133,543,000	−838,000	+132,705,000
Total appropriation [1]	26,044,288,000	28,949,000,000	+2,904,712,000

[1] Totals do not add due to rounding.

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee is recommending the budget estimate of $28,949,000,000 for compensation and pensions. The bill also includes requested language not to exceed $17,138,000 of

reimbursements of which $8,563,000 goes to the general operating expenses account and $8,575,000 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 VA pension cap for Medicaid-eligible single veterans and surviving spouses alone in Medicaid-covered nursing homes. 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 to provide a cost-of-living adjustment, based on the change in the Consumer Price Index, to all compensation beneficiaries, including dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) for spouses and children. It is currently estimated at 1.8 percent. This is the same as the COLA that will be provided, under current law, to veterans pension and Social Security recipients. The increase would be effective December 1, 2002, and would cost an estimated $278,900,000 during 2003. Funding for this COLA is reflected in the Compensation and pensions obligations in the 2003 budget.

The Administration has proposed language that would provide indefinite 2003 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.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$2,264,808,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	2,135,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	2,264,808,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+129,808,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

This appropriation finances the education and training of veterans and servicepersons whose initial entry on active duty took place on or after July 1, 1985. These benefits are included in the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program. Eligibility to receive this assistance began in 1987. Basic benefits are funded through appropriations made to the readjustment benefits appropriation and transfers from the Department of Defense. Supplemental benefits are also provided to certain veterans through education assistance to certain members of the Selected Reserve and are 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 $2,264,808,000 for readjustment benefits in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $129,808,000 over the current year funding level.

The Administration has proposed language that would provide indefinite 2003 supplemental appropriations for readjustment benefits because of legislative changes or year-end funding shortages. The Committee believes the current funding procedures are adequate and has not included the requested language in the bill.

The estimated number of trainees and costs by program for 2002 and 2003 are as follows:

	2002	2003	Difference
Number of trainees:			
Education and training: dependents	49,949	51,746	+1,797
All-Volunteer Force educational assistance:			
Veterans and servicepersons	326,425	325,815	-610
Reservists	79,000	81,721	+2,721
Vocational rehabilitation	64,556	64,879	+323
Tuition assistance	160,000	160,000	0
Total	679,930	684,161	+4,231
Licensing and certification tests	25,450	81,150	+55,700
Funds:			
Education and training: dependents	$206,181,000	$217,472,000	+$11,291,000
All-Volunteer Force educational assistance:			
Veterans and servicepersons	1,460,321,000	1,759,683,000	+299,362,000
Reservists	135,750,000	142,858,000	+7,108,000
Vocational rehabilitation	440,896,000	452,029,000	+11,133,000
Tuition assistance	79,040,000	79,040,000	0
Licensing and certification tests	5,982,000	19,071,000	+13,089,000
Housing grants	24,960,000	24,960,000	0
Automobiles and other conveyances	8,750,000	8,995,000	+245,000
Adaptive equipment	27,200,000	27,100,000	-100,000
Work-study	45,900,000	51,408,000	+5,508,000
Payment to States	14,000,000	13,000,000	-1,000,000
Reporting fees	3,500,000	3,500,000	0
Unobligated balance and other adjustments [1]	-317,480,000	-534,308,000	-216,828,000
Total appropriation	2,135,000,000	2,264,808,000	+129,808,000

[1] Includes offsetting collections.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$27,530,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	26,200,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	27,530,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+1,330,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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 $27,530,000 for veterans insurance and indemnities in fiscal year 2003 is included in the bill, and increase of $1,330,000 over the current year funding level. The amount pro-

vided will enable VA to transfer more than $18,920,000 to the service-disabled veterans insurance fund and transfer $9,150,000 in payments for the 2,970 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.

The Administration has proposed language that would provide indefinite 2003 supplemental appropriations for the insurance program. The Committee believes the current funding procedures are adequate and has not included the requested language in the bill.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans for specially adapted housing loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$437,522,000	$300,000	$168,207,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	203,278,000	300,000	164,497,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	437,522,000	300,000	168,207,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+234,244,000	0	+3,710,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0	0	0

The purpose of the VA home loan guaranty program is to facilitate the extension of mortgage credit on favorable terms by private lenders to eligible veterans. This appropriation provides for all costs, with the exception of the native American 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 down payment if the lender agrees. The Department requires that a down payment 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 such sums as may be necessary (estimated to total $437,522,000) for funding subsidy payments, $300,000 for the limitation on direct loans for specially adapted housing loans, and $168,207,000 for administrative expenses which is the budget request. The appropriation for administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the General Operating Expenses account.

The Committee directs the Secretary to continue the vendee program. An independent study estimated a savings of over $1,000 per vendee loan property sale, a savings to the Department of $15–25 million annually. Until the Administration can provide a study to show that the vendee program is not of financial benefit to the De-

partment, the Committee directs the VA to continue the vendee loan program.

The Committee directs the Secretary to implement a housing counseling requirement for first-time homebuyers. Studies by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC) demonstrate that pre-purchase counseling effectively reduced default rates for first-time homebuyers. The Committee suggests that the Department consult with NRC on how to implement this requirement.

The Committee encourages the Department to consider the usefulness of automated collateral management systems as a means to detect predatory loans.

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$1,000	$3,400	$70,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	1,000	3,400	64,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	1,000	3,400	70,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0	0	+6,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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 $70,000 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 2003 recommendation	$55,000	$3,626,000	$289,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	72,000	3,301,000	274,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	55,000	3,626,000	289,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	-17,000	+325,000	+15,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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 $896 (based on indexed chapter 31 subsistence allowance rate) are available to service-connected disabled veterans enrolled in vocational rehabilitation programs when the veterans is temporarily in need of additional assistance. Repayment is made in 10 monthly installments, without interest, through deductions from future payments of compensation, pen-

sion, 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 $55,000 for funding subsidy program costs and $289,000 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 $3,626,000. It is estimated that VA will make 5,300 loans in fiscal year 2003, with an average amount of $684.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Administrative expenses:	
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$558,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	544,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	558,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+14,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

This program tests the feasibility of authorizing VA to make direct home loans to native American veterans who live on U.S. trust land. This is a pilot program which began in 1993 and expires on December 31, 2005. The bill includes the budget request of $558,000 for administration expenses, which may be transferred to and merged with the General Operating Expenses account.

The Committee directs the Secretary to implement a housing counseling requirement for first-time homebuyers. Studies by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC) demonstrate that pre-purchase counseling effectively reduced default rates for first-time homebuyers. The Committee suggests that the Department consult with NRC on how to implement this requirement.

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Public Law 105–368, the Veterans Programs Enhancement Act of 1998, established this program. All funds authorized for this program were appropriated in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, no appropriation request has been included for fiscal year 2003. Bill language is included allowing the use of funds in Medical Care and General Operating Expenses to administer this program.

The Committee directs the VA to report on the status of the guaranteed transitional housing loans for homeless veterans program by March 14, 2003. The report should include the number of applicants as of January 1, 2003, the number of qualified applicants, the grant selection criteria, and the names of any grant recipients as of March 1, 2003.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$23,889,304,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	21,473,164,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	22,743,761,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+2,416,140,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+1,145,543,000

The Department of Veterans Affairs operates the largest Federal medical care delivery system in the country, with 172 medical centers, 43 domiciliaries, 137 nursing homes, and 864 outpatient clinics which includes independent, satellite, community-based, and rural outreach clinics.

This appropriation provides for medical care and treatment of eligible beneficiaries in VA 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 is also provided by the private sector for certain dependents and survivors of veterans under the civilian health and medical programs for the Department of Veterans Affairs. Funds are also used to train medical residents, interns, and other professional, paramedical and administrative personnel in health-science fields to support VA's medical programs.

The bill includes $23,889,304,000 for medical care in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $2,416,140,000 above the enacted level and $1,145,543,000 over the budget request. In addition, the Committee estimates $1,386,000,000 will be collected and available from the Medical Care Collections Fund (MCCF). The Committee has not included the bill language requested in the budget authorizing the VA to implement a $1500 cost share plan for veterans using the VA medical system and has instead provided additional funds to cover the cost.

The Committee is providing two-year spending authority for $900,000,000 of the Medical Care appropriation to provide the Department more planning flexibility 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 $250,000,000 of funds requested for the equipment and land and structures object classifications until August 1, 2003, $250,000,000 less than the budget request. The bill also includes requested language in the Compensation and Pensions appropriation transferring $8,575,000 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 Committee supports VHA Directive 2002–057, Priority for Outpatient Medical Services and Inpatient Hospital Care. The Committee directs the VA to create a system ensuring that VA medical and support services are readily available to service-connected and impoverished veterans. The Committee urges the Department to be mindful of its core mission to provide first for those injured in service to our Nation, the impoverished, the homeless, and the mentally ill.

The Committee believes the VA's response to last year's concerns regarding atypical anti-psychotic medications is a step forward and continues to encourage the VA to ensure uniform information across VA's health system with regard to prescribing practices. Providing care for the seriously mentally ill is one of VA's top priorities and requires a special level of commitment, as this population is especially vulnerable and difficult to treat. To this end, the Committee encourages the Secretary to remain vigilant in implementing the Department's policy that physicians are to use their best clinical judgment when choosing atypical anti-psychotic medications as referenced in House Report 107–272.

The Committee directs the VA to ensure that each VISN follows through on plans to implement mental health services in each community based outpatient clinic (CBOC) and recommends that the VA expedite the deployment of adequate mental health services to CBOCs. Further, the Committee strongly urges the Department to continue increasing the number of Mental Health Intensive Case Management teams and fully fund existing teams.

The Committee is encouraged by the findings of the Department's Procurement Reform Task Force and supports implementation of the reforms with the intended savings to be re-invested in healthcare for veterans. The Committee encourages the VA to focus on the prompt implementation of prosthetics procurement reforms as a model for further VA healthcare contracting operations and a continued emphasis on product standardization, quality assurances, servicing and outcomes tracking that will maximize veteran care and acquisition efficiencies due to improved economies of scale, product reliability, repair, maintenance and inventory management.

The Committee reiterates its concern for veterans with hepatitis C, and applauds the Department for the progress made so far, including establishing screening and testing services that have reached an estimated 40% of VA health care users, funding a prevalence study to better define risk factors among veterans, and creating a National Hepatitis C registry to better track and manage patients. The Committee recommends that the Department do more to improve screening and testing for hepatitis C among all Vietnam veterans; provide tests to other veterans in the VA system who have risk factors for hepatitis C; and participate in a national outreach effort with the American Liver Foundation and veterans service organizations to inform all veterans not enrolled in the VA medical system about the disease. The Committee is aware of the August 2002 NIH Management of Hepatitis C Consensus Conference final statement which presents new opportunities for treatment of individuals with hepatitis C and complicating co-morbid conditions as well as the need for expanded patient education regarding hepatitis C.

The Committee is aware of studies that have found collagen based therapies can reduce the need for amputations by increasing wound healing rates and recommends that VA consider the utilization of such therapies.

The Committee strongly encourages the continuation of the partnership and deployment of the Joslin Vision Network.

The Committee is aware of several new cutting-edge prosthetic and sensory aids devices now available that allow disabled vet-

erans more mobility, enhanced employability, and full integration into community life. The Committee encourages the VA to test these devices with veterans, where and when medically appropriate.

The Committee believes the CARES recommendation for the development of a comprehensive resource sharing agreement between the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center (NCVAMC) and the Navy Hospital Great Lakes (NHGL) is a perfect opportunity to provide quality care to both the naval and veterans populations. However, the Committee is becoming increasingly frustrated by the unwillingness of VA and Navy officials to see beyond their jurisdictional squabbles and move forward with the agreed upon recommendations. The Committee directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit a report that identifies (1) restrictive regulations, policies, and regulatory redundancies that specifically inhibit resource sharing between the NCVAMC and NHGL, (2) how the NCVAMC and NHGL can share mental health, physical therapy and rehabilitation services, (3) milestone dates for the VA to address each restrictive issue, and (4) directives the Secretary issues to VISN 12 leadership regarding network support of all CARES recommendations for the joint operations of the two facilities. This report should be transmitted to the Committee by March 1, 2003. The Committee expects the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue working with the Secretary of the Navy to make maximum use of the NCVAMC.

The Committee recognizes the need for the Department to be more responsive to the needs of minority veterans and increase minority participation in VA medical professions, administration, training and research. The Committee encourages the VA to create more affiliations with minority-serving universities, such as Barry University, for internship, residency and research opportunities.

The Committee strongly recommends the establishment of CBOCs in Hayward, Wisconsin; Storm Lake, Iowa; Athens, Tennessee; Lynchburg, Virginia; and Gladstone, Michigan.

The Committee recognizes the excellent work being done by the Department of Veterans Affairs to combat antibiotic resistant infections, particularly its outstanding vaccination against pneumonia program. The Committee is fully supportive of this effort and directs the Secretary to be prepared to testify to the Committee during the fiscal year 2004 budget hearings on the steps taken by the Department to combat this growing public health crisis of antibiotic resistance, focusing on the VA's use of its sophisticated computerized patient databases to correlate antibiotic usage data with patient outcomes, and with antibiotic resistant infections throughout the VA healthcare network.

MEDICAL CARE COLLECTIONS FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The Committee expects the Department to collect $1,386,000,000 from first and third party payers in fiscal year 2003. Bill language is included transferring those receipts to the Medical Care account to remain available until expended.

The Department issued a press release in August 2002 lauding the record levels of collections. While this is a welcome improve-

ment, the Committee is aghast at the millions of dollars that go uncollected or are lost due to the extreme tardiness in submitting correct bills to third-party payers. The Committee directs the Department to refrain from approving any performance awards for facility directors and billing teams that fail to submit bills on average of 30 days after service or cut the average billing time in half from the previous year.

In last year's report to accompany the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Act (House Report 107–272), the Committee directed the Department to initiate a multi-year demonstration at a VISN to enhance the collection efforts for "third party/first party" revenues. Additionally, in a report issued last September, the GAO found the Department's efforts in this area lacking, substantiating the need for action in the enhanced collection area. Subsequently, the conference agreement with the Senate on last year's bill ratified the need to undertake a demonstration.

The Department has not yet initiated this demonstration. The Committee understands that the Department is continuing to work on a comprehensive plan to overcome the deficiency that exists in third party collections. The Committee believes both these efforts need to be undertaken. The demonstration could provide valuable input into the broader, long-term plan.

Accordingly, the Committee reiterates and redirects the Department to undertake the demonstration called for in last year's in fiscal year 2003. The Committee again directs that not less than $3,000,000 be available to continue the demonstration. The Committee believes that there is tremendous value in undertaking a small-scale demonstration while the planning for a Department-wide solution is ongoing. The lessons learned from a successful demonstration would provide tremendous input to the overall system design. This demonstration should not be viewed as a distraction to any overall system-wide collection efforts, but rather supplemental to such an effort.

The collections demonstration must provide the VA with the ability to identify and collect third party/first party insurance coverage and a National Master Patient File that provides access to administrators and clinicians to complete an accurate patient information from any location. The Secretary shall undertake this effort by obtaining a private sector contractor to install and operate this system as a prototype at the hospitals and clinics of a single VISN. The demonstration shall include the software, hardware, networks, interfaces, and other resources to provide all the functionality necessary to solve the current deficiencies, including: the capability to verify insurance coverage or other responsible payer for treatment; the capability to determine what the nature of the third party coverage; the capability to accurately accumulate all charges for services provided; the capability to insure that the treatment provided is properly coded; the capability to produce timely and accurate bills; and the capability to adequately manage the entire collection processes. The Committee recognizes the success of the VistA system from a clinical standpoint so the financial system must be compatible with the VistA clinical functionality.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$405,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	371,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	394,373,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+31,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+10,627,000

This account includes medical, rehabilitative and health services research. Medical research is an important aspect of the Department's programs, providing complete medical and hospital services 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 $405,000,000 for medical and prosthetic research in fiscal year 2003. This funding level is $31,000,000 over the fiscal year 2002 appropriation and $10,627,000 over the budget request. The bill includes language transferring $5,000,000 to the Medical Care account for oversight activities of the research program. The Committee directs the Department to include funding for this activity under Medical Care in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

The Committee is encouraged by the progress made by the VA and the National Technology Transfer Center in the past year in identifying promising VA technological advances that offer the potential for commercial applications. The Committee directs $1,000,000 for the continuation of this partnership.

The VA has made genuine progress in recent years in funding for psychiatric research at the VA; however, such research remains disproportionate to the utilization of mental illness treatment services by veterans. The Committee supports increasing the level of research devoted to severe mental illness, the co-morbidity of substance abuse and mental disorders and post-traumatic stress disorder.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$74,716,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	66,731,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	69,716,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+7,985,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+5,000,000

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 $74,716,000, an increase of $7,985,000 from the fiscal year 2002 funding level and $5,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee has included an additional $5,000,000 for the reorganization of the VHA headquarters. The Committee is hopeful that the additional staff will bring much needed oversight and guidance to the system. Further, the Committee is hopeful that the new management of the MCCF office will greatly improve collections. The Committee strongly encourages the new VHA business office to carefully evaluate the contracts and contracting staff employed at the headquarters office for their efficacy and necessity.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$1,251,418,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	1,195,728,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	1,256,418,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+55,690,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−5,000,000

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 totaling $169,124,000 in other accounts for these credit programs. In addition, $8,563,000 is transferred from the compensation and pensions account for administrative costs of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992. Section 107 of the administrative provisions provides requested language which permits excess revenues in three insurance funds to be used for administrative expenses. The VA estimates that $38,110,000 will be utilized for such purposes in fiscal year 2003. Prior to fiscal year 1996, such costs were included in the general operating expenses appropriation. Thus, in total, $1,679,657,000 is requested in fiscal year 2003 for administrative costs of non-medical benefits.

The Committee recommends $1,251,418,000 for General Operating Expenses. This amount represents an increase of $55,690,000 above the current level, and a decrease of $5,000,000 from the budget request. The bill includes requested language allowing $60,000,000 of the funds appropriated to be available for obligation for two years, the purchase of two motor vehicles for the VBA office in Manila, Philippines, and a travel limitation of $17,082,000. The bill also includes language directing the VBA to be funded at not less than $992,100,000.

Of the remaining $259,318,000 for general administration, the Committee directs the Offices of the Board of Contract Appeals, Board of Veterans Appeals, Assistant Secretary for Management, Assistant Secretary for Information Technology, Assistant Secretary for Human Resources and Administration, Assistant Sec-

retary for Policy and Planning, Assistant Secretary for Public and Intergovernmental Affairs, and Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Legislative Affairs be funded at not less than the levels specified in the fiscal year 2003 budget justification minus the amounts for the proposed accrual benefit transfer.

The Committee has not provided any funds for a new Assistant Secretary of Operations, Security and Preparedness and does not recommend funding for such office, other than a coordinator, at the Department. The Committee is very concerned with the Department's ability to simply fulfill the basic requirements of providing benefits and medical services in a correct and timely manner and feels that the Department should concentrate on meeting the basic mission of the VA rather than looking to expand its portfolio of responsibilities into the homeland security area. The Committee feels confident that other agencies and departments specifically responsible for homeland security and defense activities are adequately managing and funding those initiatives.

The Committee suggests that GOE general administration funds would be better spent to hire more lawyers in the Office of General Counsel to assist the Department when negotiating enhanced use lease agreements, especially since CARES is underway, instead of undertaking a regulation rewrite exercise.

The Committee concurs with the Department's decision to consolidate management of information technology initiatives in the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO). The Committee directs that all cyber-security and enterprise architecture activities be managed by the CIO.

The Committee is pleased with the Department's progress in establishing a comprehensive baseline Enterprise Architecture during the past year and supports the Department's initiatives to modernize its computing infrastructure against cyber attack and provide continuing operations. The Committee directs the VA to fund information technology initiatives, including data replication technologies, at no less than the levels put forth in the fiscal year 2003 budget justification materials for all appropriations accounts and report to the Committee on the results of these prototype activities and future plans for implementation by June 30, 2003.

The Committee supports the new management structure and proposed claims processing system in VBA. However, the Committee is concerned that by constantly changing the claims processing system over the past 5 years the Department has not been able to accurately assess the success of each new initiative or employee performance. The Committee strongly urges the Department to keep the proposed claims processing system in place long enough so that all regional offices can implement the system, each regional office can standardize its information technology package, and VBA employees can be fully trained and fairly evaluated before the Department realigns its benefits operations again. The Department should quickly establish new employee performance goals and decision targets for fair and defendable employee evaluations. Further, the Committee has provided $100,000 for the Department to work with the Office of Personnel Management to correctly align VBA positions with comparable government positions.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$133,149,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	121,169,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	133,149,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+11,980,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

The National Cemetery Administration was established in accordance with the National Cemeteries Act of 1973. It has a fourfold mission: to provide for the interment in any national cemetery with available grave space the remains of eligible deceased servicepersons and discharged veterans, together with their spouses and certain dependents, and to permanently maintain their graves; to mark graves of eligible persons in national and private cemeteries; to administer the grant program for aid to States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans' cemeteries; and to administer the Presidential Memorial Certificate Program. This appropriation provides for the operation and maintenance of 154 cemeterial installations in 39 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

The Committee recommends $133,149,000 for the National Cemetery Administration in fiscal year 2003. This funding level is $11,980,000 over the 2002 level and the same as the budget request. The Committee is providing funds to meet needs associated with new cemeteries and the increased workload projected by the Department.

The Committee appreciates the completion of the national cemetery needs and National Shrine study. The Committee directs the Department to follow the criteria and findings of those studies when planning and budgeting for new and expanded cemetery projects.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$61,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	52,308,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	55,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+8,692,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+6,000,000

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

The Committee has provided $61,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General in fiscal year 2003. This amount is an increase of $8,692,000 above the current year appropriation and $6,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee has provided additional funding for the Office of Inspector General to hire up to its statutory floor.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$193,740,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	183,180,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	193,740,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+10,560,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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 VA, including planning, architectural and engineering services, Capital Asset Realignment Enhanced Services (CARES) activities, assessments 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 $193,740,000 for construction, major projects, in fiscal year 2003 as requested in the budget justification, an increase of $10,560,000 over last year's funding level. Also, the bill includes requested language providing $5,000,000 for CARES and $10,000,000 for the judgment fund.

The Committee is fully supportive of the CARES initiative and applauds the Department for moving forward with the implementation of the VISN 12 plan and Phase II of the study. The Committee directs VA to keep the Committee apprised of any additional needs to ensure that the studies and implementation can move along as scheduled.

The Committee directs the VA to fully fund any CARES implementation plans in future budgets and report to the Committee the framework for prioritization of the capital improvement projects that will be identified as priorities resulting from the CARES studies. The Committee further directs the VA to only present CARES recommendations for a VISN if supporting funds are requested by the Department in budget justification materials or budget amendments, or provided in advance by the Congress.

Some VA facilities are consuming tens of millions of dollars for non-recurring maintenance and repairs and the facilities themselves are a hindrance to providing safe and quality medical care. The Committee directs the CARES study to examine the possibility where, in some markets, the best recommendation, both in terms of economics and service delivery, is to build a new facility in full cooperation with another entity such as the Department of Defense or the state. In these instances, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs must actively consult with non-VA public entities to plan for a new, jointly held and funded facility.

The Committee directs that any major construction project included in future budget submissions be approved by the CARES study and realignment plan or the national cemetery study.

The Committee's funding recommendation includes $2,000,000 for security studies. These funds are in addition to the $2,000,000 provided under General Operating Expenses in Public Law 107–38 and are to be used to evaluate the security and safety of VA facilities. VA should emphasize security methods which will not increase FTEs and can be utilized by all VA facilities. Also, the Committee expects VA to consult with the General Services Administration (GSA) to ensure that VA's proposals are within the guidelines set

by GSA for other Federal facilities. These funds are not to be used to evaluate expanded homeland security opportunities.

The specific amounts recommended by the Committee are as follows:

DETAIL OF BUDGET REQUEST

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and description	Available through 2002	2003 request	House Recommendation
Veterans Health Administration (VHA):			
Palo Alto (Palo Alto Division), CA Seismic Corrections, Building 2	0	14,013	14,013
Palo Alto (Palo Alto Division), CA Seismic Corrections, Building 4 (Research)	0	21,750	21,750
San Francisco, CA Seismic Corrections, Building 203	0	31,000	31,000
West Los Angeles, CA Seismic Corrections, Building 500	0	27,200	27,200
Subtotal, Seismic	0	93,963	93,963
Advance planning fund: various stations	0	17,500	17,500
CARES Fund	0	5,000	5,000
Asbestos abatement: various stations	0	7,977	7,977
Subtotal, VHA	0	124,440	124,440
National Cemetery Administration (NCA):			
Pittsburgh, PA National Cemetery, Phase I Development [1]	0	16,400	16,400
Southern Florida National Cemetery, Phase I Development [1]	0	23,300	23,300
Willamette National Cemetery, Phase I Development [1]	0	8,400	8,400
Design Fund: Detroit MI and Sacramento, CA	0	3,400	3,400
Subtotal, NCA [2]	0	53,300	53,300
Department Advance Planning	0	2,000	2,000
Claims Analyses: Various locations	0	1,500	1,500
Security Study	0	2,000	2,000
Judgment Fund: Various locations	0	10,000	10,000
Hazardous Waste: Various locations	0	500	500
Subtotal, Other line items	0	16,000	16,000
Total construction, major projects	0	193,740	193,740

[1] Land acquisition funds ($15,000,000) in 2001 and design funds ($2,000,000) in 2002 were provided for a new cemetery in Southern Florida. Eighteen million dollars was provided in 2002 for land acquisition in Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Sacramento areas.

[2] National Cemetery Administration total estimated costs include the purchase of pre-placed crypts, which are funded by the Compensation and Pensions appropriation.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$240,700,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	210,900,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	210,700,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+29,800,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+30,000,000

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, CARES activities, assessment of needs, architectural and engineering services, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is less than $4,000,000.

The Committee recommends $240,700,000 for the construction, minor projects appropriation in fiscal year 2003, $30,000,000 over the budget request and an increase of $29,800,000 over the fiscal year 2002 appropriation. The Committee directs that $25,000,000

of the funds provided be used specifically to address quality and safety issues in VA research facilities.

The Committee directs that VHA's minor construction resources should be utilized in a manner that is consistent with current CARES initiatives and the national cemetery study. A central office work group consisting of both VHA and other Department officials must review all VHA minor construction projects. For evaluation purposes, the work group is to utilize criteria that are consistent with those developed for CARES. If total costs of projects being initiated at any facility is or exceeds $4,000,000 (the Capital Investment Board threshold), the recommendations of the work group must be approved by the Deputy Secretary.

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for water utility improvements at the Bay Pines National Cemetery and $847,000 for entrance accessibility improvements at the Syracuse Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$0
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	4,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−4,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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

No new budget authority is requested for the parking revolving fund in fiscal year 2003. Leases will be funded from parking fees collected.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$100,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	100,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	100,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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 $100,000,000 for grants for construction of State extended care facilities in fiscal year 2003. This amount is equal to the budget request.

The Committee encourages the Department to work with the State of Louisiana as that state applies for a grant to construct a home.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$32,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	25,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	32,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+7,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

This program provides grants to assist States with the establishment, expansion, and improvement of State veterans' cemeteries which are operated and permanently maintained by the States. Grants under this program fund up to 100 percent of construction costs 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 $32,000,000 for grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $7,000,000 over the current year's funding level.

The Committee encourages the Department to work with the States of Louisiana, Texas, and California as those states apply for grants to construct cemeteries.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The bill continues the first ten administrative provisions from title I contained in Public Law 107–73, the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill, one provision listed in Public Law 107–73 under title IV, and six new provisions.

Section 110 allows the Department to use the services of the Office of Resolution Management (ORM) and the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication (OEDCA) on a reimbursable fee basis with a fund limitation of $29,318,000 for ORM and $3,010,000 for OEDCA.

Section 111 requires the Department to notify the Committee prior to the VA entering into a new property lease if the rent is more than $300,000.

Section 112 limits funds for medical treatment of non-service connected veterans to only those who have provided to the VA accurate third-party reimbursement information and annually provided income information.

Section 113 delays the implementation of the geographic means test for one year. While the Committee agrees that thresholds used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development might be too disparate for use in VHA's system, the Committee strongly urges the VA to create an alternate geographic means test which addresses the concerns of the original legislation and is practical for VHA to implement.

Section 114 prohibits VBA funds from being used to adjudicate claims arising from any new concurrent receipt legislation. The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that enacting concurrent receipt of compensation benefits and military retirement pay would result in estimated mandatory costs to VA of approximately $16,000,000,000 over ten years, as well as administrative costs of

$124,000,000 in the first year and $245,000,000 over a five year period. These estimates do not include the additional costs to the Department of Defense. The Department estimates the concurrent receipt claims workload would add more than 800,000 claims over the next three years. VA has been working diligently over the years to reduce the claims backlog and adjudication time. As of August, VA adjudicated almost 730,000 claims in fiscal year 2002 and still has a current workload of over 355,000 claims with a lag time of 225 days. Regardless of the policy surrounding concurrent receipt, the Committee is concerned that the deluge of new concurrent receipt claims will paralyze the system and those veterans who have been waiting for years to get a determination will never see the benefit. The Committee directs the Administration to budget appropriate VA funding for both mandatory and administrative costs should such new concurrent receipt legislation be enacted.

Section 115 merges the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Improvement Fund into the Medical Care Collections Fund for purposes of simplicity in accounting and scorekeeping, and extends the Department's ability to collect medical co-payments.

Section 116 provides that $19,900,000 of the Department's total information technology budget shall be used for conducting prototypes for VA's corporate and regional computing architecture and be managed by the Department's Office of the Chief Information Officer.

Section 117 prohibits funds from being used to implement the provisions of H.R. 3253, and section 118 limits the funds available in Medical Care and the Medical Care Collections Fund for security training and equipment to $110,000,000. The Committee feels the VA needs to focus its efforts on providing health care and services to veterans, an area clearly needing improvement, and provide a safe environment for VA employees and beneficiaries. The Committee believes that any efforts relating to homeland security and responsiveness is best handled by other agencies and departments charged specifically with that mission.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation:	
Program Level	$36,090,314,000
Fee Collections	−3,336,000,000
Rescissions	−1,408,000,000
Net Appropriation	[1] 31,346,314,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation:	
Program Level	34,304,395,000
Fee Collections	−2,930,000,000
Rescissions	−1,225,700,000
Net Appropriation	[2] 30,148,695,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request:	
Program Level	35,893,091,000
Fee Collections	−3,336,000,000
Rescissions	−1,208,000,000
Net Appropriation	[1] 31,349,091,000

Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation:	
Program Level	+1,785,919,000
Fee Collections	−588,000,000
Rescissions	−182,300,000
Net Appropriation	[1] +1,197,619,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request:	
Program Level	+197,223,000
Fee Collections	—
Rescissions	−200,000,000
Net Appropriation	[1] −2,777,000

[1] The fiscal year 2003 totals do not reflect legislative proposals assumed in the budget request regarding accrual funding of retirement costs and post-retirement costs, the transfer of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Emergency Food and Shelter Program to the Department, and a new Colonias initiative.

[2] The fiscal year 2002 totals do not include one-time emergency funding and rescissions included in the fiscal year 2002 supplemental appropriations Acts.

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 a total program level of $36,090,314,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a $1,785,919,000 increase above the fiscal year 2002 level, and $197,223,000 above the request. The recommendation reflects the Committee desire to invest resources in a manner which best ensures that funds provided can be used to provide safe, decent and affordable housing and to promote economic development in communities across the country. Over the last five years, the Committee has struggled to balance the need to provide significant increases for the Section 8 program while also trying to meet the needs of other important housing and community development programs. Consequently, the Committee has grown increasingly frustrated as the huge amounts of Section 8 funding continue to go unspent each year. The Committee believes that funding decisions for all programs, including Section 8, must be made based on a realistic assessment of both the need for, and the ability of the program to use, the resources provided. The recommendations made reflects that view.

The Committee recommends increases above the fiscal year 2002 enacted level for the following programs:

Section 8	+$946,012,000
HOME Investment Partnerships	+375,000,000
Public Housing Operating Subsidies	+105,132,000
Homeless Assistance	+127,745,000
Section 202/Section 811 Programs	+75,849,000
Lead Hazard Reduction Program	+16,242,000
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS	+14,568,000

In addition, the Committee has also restored funding for programs proposed for reduction or elimination in the budget the following:

Public Housing Capital Fund	+$417,500,000
Community Development Fund	+284,500,000
Rural Housing and Economic Development	+25,000,000
Enterprise Zones/Enterprise Communities	+30,000,000

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$16,586,987,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	15,640,975,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	17,526,559,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+946,012,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−939,572,000

The Housing Certificate Fund (HCF) provides funding for costs associated with the Section 8 program. The account includes funding for the renewal of expiring Section 8 project-based contracts, amendments to existing Section 8 project-based contracts, renewal of expiring Section 8 vouchers, new tenant protection vouchers including enhanced vouchers, new incremental Section 8 vouchers, relocation assistance, payment of fees to public housing agencies administering Section 8 voucher programs, and payment of fees to contract administrators for project-based Section 8 contracts.

The Committee recommends a total program level of $18,354,987,000 for the HCF in fiscal year 2003. Of this amount, $16,586,987,000 is provided as a direct appropriation, $938,000,000 is available from unobligated carryover balances in program reserve accounts, and $830,000,000 is available from unobligated balances in administrative fee reserve accounts. The recommendation represents an increase of $946,012,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2002.

For the last four years, funding for the Section 8 voucher program has consumed an increasing amount of the Committee's discretionary resources, driven largely by the rapidly growing estimates of renewal costs for Section 8 vouchers. Since fiscal year 1999, the Section 8 program has realized a net increase of $5,764,433,000, even after accounting for rescissions of unspent Section 8 funds included in the bill each year. Despite the Committee's growing concern about the inability of some public housing agencies (PHAs) to use the funds provided, the Committee continued to budget for the Section 8 program assuming PHAs would improve their utilization of vouchers so that assistance would reach individuals and families as intended. Unfortunately, after five years, there has been no significant improvement in the use of these funds. In fiscal year 1999, 17 percent of the funds appropriated went unspent, resulting in only 89 percent of the intended families and individuals being served. By fiscal year 2001, 13 percent of funds went unspent, resulting in only 84 percent of the intended families and individuals being served. Consequently, the Department continues to consistently recapture between $1,000,000,000 and $1,400,000,000 in unspent Section 8 voucher

funds each year, representing over 200,000 unused vouchers each year.

The Committee recognizes that under-utilization of Section 8 voucher funds has been, and continues to be, a chronic problem heavily concentrated in a small number of PHAs. In each of the last five years, over 50 percent of all recaptures of unused funds came from less than 4 percent of the PHAs. Last year, the Committee was told by the Department it would reallocate unused vouchers to PHAs which have proven to be able to use them, beginning in July 2002. Accordingly, the Department's fiscal year 2003 budget request assumed implementation of this reallocation in its budget estimate for fiscal year 2003. However, the Committee has learned that the reallocation was not implemented in fiscal 2002. Consequently, large numbers of Section 8 vouchers would again go unused in fiscal year 2003.

The Committee appreciates that there is disagreement as to the causes of, and appropriate solutions to, under-utilization of Section 8 vouchers. However, the Committee can no longer continue to provide large budget increases in the Section 8 voucher program each year when it is clear that huge portions of those funds will never actually be spent. The Committee does not believe that this represents sound housing policy, nor does it represent sound fiscal policy. Therefore, the Committee has provided funding for the Section 8 voucher program in fiscal year 2003 in a manner which more closely reflects the ability of PHAs to fully utilize the funds provided.

The Committee understands that the Department is currently completing an in-depth study which should help identify the root causes of the under-utilization problem. The Committee believes it is imperative that the Department and the relevant congressional Committees focus their efforts on identifying and developing effective solutions to those problems, and look forward to the results of the Department's study. The Department is directed to provide the Committee with a copy of this study no later than January 8, 2003.

The recommendation includes the following:

—*Renewal of expiring Section 8 contracts:* $14,614,970,000 for renewals of project-based Section 8 contracts and Section 8 vouchers.

The Committee recommendation provides an appropriation of $10,278,000,000 for Section 8 voucher and moderate rehabilitation renewals, the total amount necessary to renew all housing units currently leased using a Section 8 voucher and moderate rehabilitation including Moving-To-Work vouchers, as reported by PHAs on their most recent financial statements. Language is included in the bill allocating Section 8 voucher renewal funds based upon the number of units leased and local and regional inflation factors.

In addition, the Committee has provided additional funding in a central reserve fund, as described below, to be allocated by the Secretary should a PHA require additional renewal funding for leased units not reflected on their financial statements. The Committee expects PHAs to utilize their available program reserves to the extent possible to cover these additional renewal costs prior to requesting additional funds from the central reserve fund. While funds made available to a PHA for renewal costs, including central reserve funds, may be used to enable a PHA to lease up to its fully

authorized (reserved) level, a PHA may not use such funds to exceed its reserved level.

Pursuant to the budget request, no new funding is provided for project-based Section 8 contract amendments for fiscal year 2003, and instead assumes that amendment requirements will be met through recaptures.

Consistent with the manner in which project-based Section 8 administrative costs are funded, the Committee has appropriated funds for administrative costs and other expenses of the Section 8 voucher program separately rather than including this amount within the funds provided for voucher renewals.

—*Central Reserve Fund:* $280,000,000 for a central reserve fund to be allocated by the Secretary to PHAs requiring additional renewal funds beyond amounts otherwise available to a PHA. The Secretary may also use such amounts as necessary to replenish PHA program reserve accounts.

In addition, the Committee recognizes that some PHAs can successfully use additional section 8 vouchers above their current authorized level to increase the number of families and individuals served by the program. For the last three years, the Committee provided additional funding for this purpose as incremental voucher funding to be distributed competitively to eligible PHAs. However, delays in the award of these vouchers each year resulted in the vast majority of these vouchers going unused for that year. Therefore, the Committee has instead included language to permit the Secretary to use any amounts remaining in the central reserve fund which are not otherwise needed for renewal costs to provide additional vouchers to eligible PHAs. In order to be eligible for additional vouchers, a PHA must have a 97 percent lease up rate and be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such additional vouchers will be put under lease within 90 days of funds being provided. Should such additional vouchers not be put under lease within 180 days, the Secretary shall recapture the unused vouchers for reallocation to other eligible PHAs. The Committee expects the Secretary to establish such criteria as necessary to ensure an equitable distribution of additional vouchers among eligible applicants. Language is included limiting the amount of additional voucher assistance provided to an individual PHA to not more than 10 percent of the total funds available.

Funding included for the central reserve fund is only to be for rental subsidy costs and replenishment of program reserves. Funding for associated administrative expenses has been provided for separately within this account.

Language is included which sets forth the allowable uses of the fund and reporting requirements.

Language is also included directing the Secretary to provide quarterly reports to the Committee on the use of funds from the central reserve fund in accordance with the following direction: such report shall include, at a minimum, the amount of funding distributed for additional renewal costs, delineated by PHA; the amount of funding used to replenish program reserves, delineated by PHA; the amount of additional voucher assistance provided to eligible PHAs, delineated by PHA; the amount of any recaptures, delineated by PHA; and the total balance remaining in the fund.

The Secretary is directed to provide the first quarterly report no later than January 31, 2003.

—*Tenant Protection:* $234,017,000 for tenant protection activities to replace lost project-based section 8 assistance with tenant-based assistance; for conversion of section 202 and section 23 projects to section 8 assistance; for the family unification program; and for the witness protection program. Again this year, funding for new vouchers under the HOPE VI program is provided within the Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI) account. Funding included for tenant protection is only to be used for rental subsidies. Funding for associated administrative expenses is provided separately within this account.

—*Incremental Vouchers:* $36,000,000 for incremental vouchers to be made available to non-elderly, disabled residents who are affected by the designation of public and assisted housing as "elderly-only" developments. The recommendation reflects the Committee's belief that Section 8 voucher assistance is an effective and necessary tool for helping people with disabilities live integrated lives in their home communities. Many people with disabilities are dependent on Supplemental Security Income or have very low paying jobs. Absent this rental subsidy, affordable housing for individuals with disabilities is extremely difficult to find. Therefore, language is included in the bill earmarking these amounts for additional vouchers for the Section 8 voucher program for people with disabilities.

Funding included for incremental vouchers is only to be used for rental subsidies. Funding for associated administrative expenses is provided separately within this account.

—*Family Self-Sufficiency Coordinators:* $46,000,000 for service coordinator staff in each eligible public housing agency.

—*Administrative Costs—Section 8 Voucher Program:* not to exceed $1,177,000,000 for PHA administrative costs and other expenses to administer the Section 8 program, of which $50,000,000 is for associated administrative expenses related to incremental vouchers and new tenant protection vouchers, as well as additional administrative costs associated with renewals funded from the central reserve fund.

For the last four years, the Committee has attempted to limit the increase in administrative costs and other expenses of the section 8 program by including a limitation in the bill. However, administrative costs have continued to rise, and now account for 10 percent of the total cost of the Section 8 program. The Committee believes that appropriate funding should be made available to ensure that PHAs can effectively run their Section 8 voucher programs, including providing assistance to hard to house families and individuals. However the Committee believes that a 10 percent rate is more than sufficient to provide the necessary resources to effectively run a successful Section 8 voucher program. In addition, the Committee is concerned that HUD currently allows PHAs to deposit any excess fees not used to administer the Section 8 program into an administrative fee reserve account which can then be used for other purposes unrelated to the Section 8 program. This practice has resulted in current unspent balances in these administrative fee reserve totaling over $830,000,000. Language is therefore included in the bill to limit administrative fees and other expenses to no more

than 10 percent of the rental subsidy paid, and to require that administrative fee reserve balances be used to support the Section 8 program, particularly activities which assist hard to house families and individuals.

Given the large amount of excess balances, the Committee believes that the current fee structure should be re-evaluated to assess the actual costs associated with running a successful Section 8 voucher program. Language is included in the bill requiring the Department to provide a report to the Committee no later than March 1, 2003 on the administrative costs and other expenses associated with the Section 8 voucher program. Such report shall include, but not be limited to, the following: the total amount of administrative fees paid compared to actual administrative costs in fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002; the total amount of administrative fee reserve funds used to support non-Section 8 programs, and the purposes for which the funds were used; a comparison of the administrative fees structure used for the Section 8 voucher program as compared to the current administrative fee structure used for the Section 8 project-based program; and recommendations for changes to the administrative fee structures to better align fees with actual costs.

—*Administrative Costs—Project-Based Section 8 Program:* $196,000,000 for contractors to administer the project-based section 8 program.

—*Working Capital Fund:* not less than $3,000,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems.

Consistent with the budget request, the Committee recommends $4,200,000,000 in advance appropriations. In addition, the Committee recommends a rescission of $1,300,000,000 from this account to be derived from the recapture of section 8 funds provided in fiscal year 2002 and prior years, instead of $1,100,000,000 assumed in the budget request.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$2,843,400,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	2,843,400,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	2,425,900,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	.....
Comparison with Fiscal year 2003 budget request	+417,500,000

The Public Housing Capital Fund provides funding for public housing capital programs, including 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 recommendation includes $2,843,400,000 for this program, an increase of $417,500,000 above the request and the same amount provided in fiscal year 2002.

The Committee appreciates the need to modernize public housing and continues to believe that the residents of public housing deserve timely facilities improvements. Congressional concerns over delays in the expenditure of public housing capital funds led to the enactment of several provisions in the Quality Housing and Work

Responsibility Act (QHWRA) of 1998 to compel more timely completion of needed repair and modernization work to the public housing stock. Section 9(j) of QHWRA required PHAs to obligate their funds within 24-months and spend such funds within 48 months. Pursuant to the statute, a PHA failing to comply with these statutory deadlines would have all capital funding withheld and unspent funds would be subject to recapture. Under QHWRA, funds withheld and recaptured are to be redistributed to PHAs which have proven capable of utilizing their funds. The Committee remains concerned that four years after enactment of the statute, HUD has yet to implement these statutory provisions. Therefore, language is included in the bill requiring the Secretary to issue final regulations to implement that statute no later than May 1, 2003.

In the interim, the Committee has continued language, included in the fiscal year 2002 bill, designating $550,000,000 to be distributed only to those PHAs which have met the 24-month and 48-month statutory requirements to obligate and expend their funds in accordance with QHWRA. This will ensure that those PHAs which have demonstrated an ability to fully utilize their funds receive funds in addition to their annual accrued maintenance allocation to continue addressing their backlog requirements in fiscal year 2003.

The Committee appreciates the quarterly reports on the obligation and expenditure of capital funds which have been provided by HUD. The Committee directs HUD to continue to provide these quarterly reports to the Committee, with the first such report to be provided no later than February 1, 2003.

The Committee recommendation does not include funding, or the necessary authorization language, for the Public Housing Reinvestment Initiative proposed by the Administration. While the Committee is interested in exploring additional mechanisms to leverage private sector financing for improvements in public housing, the Committee believes that such proposals need to be more fully examined before significant statutory and funding changes are made. The Committee understands that under existing statutory authorities, some PHAs have in fact successfully pursued private financing. The Committee requests that the Department provide a report to the Committee no later than March 1, 2003, on those PHAs which have entered into private financing partnerships for capital modernization needs, and the results of those partnerships.

The recommendation also includes funding for the following activities, as proposed in the budget: $51,000,000 for technical assistance activities; $500,000 for section 23 lease adjustments; $55,000,000 for the Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency program; $15,000,000 for the Neighborhood Networks initiative program; up to $75,000,000 for emergency and natural disaster needs; and no less than $18,600,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund to support the development of and modifications to information technology systems which support Public and Indian Housing activities.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$3,600,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	3,494,868,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	3,530,000,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+105,132,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2003 budget request	+70,000,000

The Public Housing Operating Fund (PHOF) subsidizes the costs associated with operating and maintaining public housing. This subsidy supplements funding received by public housing authorities (PHA) from tenant rent contributions and other income. In accordance with section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, funds are allocated by formula to public housing authorities for the following purposes: utility costs; anticrime and anti-drug activities, including the costs of providing adequate security; routine maintenance cost; administrative costs; and general operating expenses.

The Committee recommends $3,600,000,000 to subsidize PHAs' fiscal year 2003 operating costs, an increase of $105,132,000 above the fiscal year 2002 level, and $70,000,000 above the request. Of this amount, $10,000,000 is for transfer to the Department of Justice to be allocated by the Attorney General through existing programs, such as Weed and Seed, to those areas where additional assistance is needed to augment Federal, State and local efforts to effectively fight crime and drugs in public housing.

The Committee notes that PHAs are authorized to use their operating and capital funds for anti-crime and anti-drug activities. All activities previously authorized under the public housing drug elimination program (PHDEP) are permissible activities under the operating and capital fund accounts. The Committee further notes that PHAs currently have unspent PHDEP funding which the Committee expects that PHAs continue to use. Further, the Committee encourages PHAs to continue to support such programs from within their operating and capital funds.

The recommendation does not include requested language earmarking $120,000,000 for the proposed Public Housing Reinvestment Intitiative.

Language is also continued in the bill, carried in prior years, which prohibits funds from being used for section 9(k) activities. Language is not included making funds available for two years.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$574,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	573,735,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	574,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+265,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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

The Committee recommends funding HOPE VI at $574,000,000, as requested, an increase of $265,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2002. Of the total amount provided, $6,250,000 is for technical assistance and $5,000,000 is for the Neighborhood Networks program, as requested, and the same amounts provided for these activities in fiscal year 2002.

The recommendation does not include requested language earmarking up to $50,000,000 in HOPE VI funds for the proposed Public Housing Reinvestment Initiative. Language is included in the bill making funds available for two years.

The Committee is aware of concerns that the HOPE VI Program has resulted in the displacement of existing residents of public housing. The Committee requests that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) take these concerns into account in its selection criteria and report back to the Committee on its actions by March 1, 2003.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$649,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	648,570,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	646,594,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+430,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+2,406,000

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

The Committee recommends $649,000,000 for this account, an increase of $2,406,000 above the budget request, and $430,000 above the fiscal year 2002 level. The recommendation includes the following: $2,000,000 for the section 601 Loan Guarantee program to guarantee a total loan volume of $16,658,000; $3,000,000 for inspections, training, travel costs, and technical assistance; $2,200,000 for the National American Indian Housing Council to conduct training programs and to provide technical assistance; no less than $600,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund for information technology systems development and modifications; and $150,000 for transfer to the HUD salaries and expenses account for administrative expenses.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$5,300,000	$197,243,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	5,987,000	234,283,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	5,200,000	197,243,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−687,000	−37,040,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+100,000	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 families to construct new homes or to purchase existing properties on reservations.

The Committee recommends $5,300,000 for the section 184 Loan Guarantee program to guarantee a total loan volume of $197,243,000, an increase of $100,000 above the amount requested. Of the amount provided, $5,200,000 is for costs associated with guarantees under the section 184 program, and $100,000 is for the Indian Land Title Report Commission authorized pursuant to Public Law 106–569. Language is included transferring $200,000 to the HUD salaries and expenses account for administrative expenses. Language is also included designating $100,000 for the Commission.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	[1]0
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	[1]0
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	[1] – 10,000,000

[1] In fiscal year 2002, funding for this program was provided under the Community Development Fund.

The Hawaiian Homelands Homeownership Act of 2000 created the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program to provide grants to the State of Hawaii Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) for housing and housing related assistance to develop, maintain and operate affordable housing for eligible low-income Native Hawaiian families.

The Committee does not recommend funding for this program as a separate account as proposed in the budget, but instead continues funding for this program under the Community Development Fund as provided in fiscal year 2002.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$1,035,000	$39,712,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	1,000,000	40,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	1,035,000	39,712,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+35,000	– 312,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0	0

The Hawaiian Homelands Homeownership Act of 2000 created the Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund program to provide loan guarantees for native Hawaiian individuals and their families, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and private nonprofit organizations experienced in the planning and development of affordable housing for Native Hawaiians for the purchase, construction, and/or rehabilitation of single-family homes on Hawaiian Home Lands. This program provides access to private sources of financing that would otherwise

not be available because of the unique legal status of Hawaiian Home Lands.

The Committee recommends $1,035,000 for this program to guarantee a total loan volume of $39,712,000, the full amount requested. Language is included transferring $35,000 to the HUD salaries and expenses account for administrative expenses.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$292,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	277,432,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	292,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+14,568,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

The Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program is authorized by the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Act. This program provides States and localities with resources and incentives to devise long-term comprehensive strategies to meet the housing needs of persons with HIV/AIDS and their families. Ninety percent of funding is distributed by formula to qualifying States and metropolitan areas on the basis of the cumulative number and incidences of AIDS reported to the Centers for Disease Control. The remaining 10 percent of funding is distributed through a national competition. Government recipients are required to have a HUD-approved Comprehensive Plan/Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS).

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommends $292,000,000, an increase of $14,568,000 above the fiscal year 2002 level, and the full amount requested. The increase will allow funding for new jurisdictions expected to become eligible for funding in fiscal year 2003, while maintaining funding for existing jurisdictions. Within the total amount provided, $2,000,000 is for technical assistance, training and oversight as requested.

Language is included making funds available for two years. Language is also included, carried in fiscal year 2002, which requires the Secretary to renew expiring permanent supportive housing contracts previously funded under the national competition which meet all program requirements before awarding new competitive grants.

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$25,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	25,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+25,000,000

The Committee recommends $25,000,000 for the Rural Housing and Economic Development program, the same level provided in fiscal year 2002. The fiscal year 2003 budget requested elimination of funding for this program. Language is included, carried in previous years, requiring the Department to competitively award funds for this program no later than June 30, 2003.

EMPOWERMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$30,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	45,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−15,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+30,000,000

This account provides discretionary grant funding to 15 urban Enterprise Zones and Enterprise Communities (EZ/ECs) designated in Round II.

The statute which created Round II EZ/ECs did not authorize discretionary grant funding for these communities, but instead authorized tax incentives to stimulate revitalization efforts in these communities. However, since fiscal year 1999, discretionary grant funds have been provided under this account. Therefore, the Committee recommends $30,000,000 in continued grant funding for the 15 urban Round II EZ/ECs. Language is making these funds available for obligation for three years, consistent with the funds availability provided for other community development activities funded within the Department.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$5,000,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	5,000,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	4,715,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+284,500,000

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

The Committee recommends a total of $5,000,000,000 for the Community Development Fund account, the same level provided in fiscal year 2002. Funding under this account is allocated as follows:

—$4,577,000,000 for Community Development Block Grant formula grants;

—$70,000,000 for Native American Community Development Block Grants;

—$9,600,000 for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program;

—$29,500,000 for the National Community Development Initiative (NCDI), as follows:

$4,500,000 for Habitat for Humanity capacity building activities; and

$25,000,000 for the Enterprise Foundation and LISC capacity building activities, including $5,000,000 for activities in rural areas;

—$33,500,000 for section 107 activities, as follows:

$7,000,000 for insular areas;

$10,500,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities;

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

$5,500,000 for Hispanic Serving Institutions; and

$7,500,000 for Community Outreach Partnerships;

—$3,300,000 for the Housing Assistance Council;

—$2,200,000 for the National American Indian Housing Council;

—$5,000,000 for the National Housing Development Corporation (NHDC), for continuation of its program of acquisition, rehabilitation and preservation of at-risk affordable housing;

—$5,000,000 for the National Council of La Raza, for its national HOPE Fund to leverage additional investments in affordable housing and community development projects;

—$28,500,000 for the Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program (SHOP);

—$65,000,000 for Youthbuild, including $2,000,000 for capacity building activities;

—$144,600,000 for economic development initiatives. The Committee notes that numerous programs funded throughout the bill provide assistance to communities in economic development, but recognizes that gaps in financing do exist for community economic development activities. The Committee has therefore provided funding for initial planning activities and for "brick and mortar" construction, renovation and rehabilitation activities for economic development projects. The Committee expects that this targeted Federal investment will act as a catalyst to promote additional Federal, State and local investment in these economic development projects. Thus, the Committee has not included funding under this account for water, sewer, and wastewater infrastructure, land acquisition, building demolition or acquisition, road construction, or environmental cleanup activities, as these activities are traditionally funded by other Federal, State and local programs. Consistent with previous appropriations Acts, funds provided for economic development initiatives may not be used for operating expenses of a facility, program or organization, and costs associated with grant and project administration are limited to no more than 20 percent of the total grant award. The Committee notes that projects receiving funding must comply with the environmental review requirements set forth in section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 3547); the Committee will not entertain waivers of this requirement. In addition, funds may not be used for reimbursement of expenses incurred prior to the receipt of economic development initiative funding. Targeted grants shall be provided as follows:

1. $225,000 to continue the rehabilitation of the former Alaska Pulp Company mill site in Sitka, Alaska;

2. $225,000 to the City of Craig, Alaska for construction of a Marine Industrial Park;

3. $450,000 to the City of Petersburg, Alaska for construction of an aquatic center;

4. $25,000 to the Northwest Alabama Children's Advocacy Center in Florence, Alabama for facility renovations;

5. $50,000 to the City of Athens, Alabama for construction of an Alabama Korean War Veterans Memorial;

6. $50,000 to the City of Tuscumbia, Alabama for construction of facilities associated with the Helen Keller festival;

7. $75,000 to the City of Huntsville, Alabama for facilities construction for the Alabama Constitution Village Plaza;

8. $100,000 for construction of the Northeast Etowah County Community and Senior Center, Alabama;

9. $100,000 to the Birmingham, Alabama Regional Planning Commission for an economic development planning study;

10. $100,000 to the City of Decatur, Alabama for planning for a Technical Training Center;

11. $100,000 to the Historic Huntsville Foundation in Huntsville, Alabama for sidewalks, curbs, street lighting, outdoor furniture and facade improvements in the Mill Village neighborhood;

12. $100,000 to the Northwest Alabama Mental Health Center for facilities renovation;

13. $108,000 to the Randolph County Commission for facilities renovation for the restoration of the historic Randolph County Courthouse and Annexes in Wedowee, Alabama;

14. $135,000 to the Clay County Commission for facilities renovations for the restoration of the historic Clay County Courthouse, Alabama;

15. $150,000 for Lawson State Community College in Alabama for facilities construction for an information technology training and placement service center;

16. $150,000 to Collinsville, Alabama for renovation of the Collinsville Public Library;

17. $150,000 to the Russellville Hispanic Coalition of Alabama for building renovations;

18. $200,000 to Fayette County, Alabama for construction of the Fayette County Agribusiness Facility;

19. $225,000 to Huntingdon College in Montgomery, Alabama for repairs and renovations to the Bellingrath Natural Sciences facility;

20. $225,000 to Jefferson County, Alabama for renovation and expansion of the Leroy Brown Health Education Building;

21. $225,000 to the National Peanut Festival Fairgrounds for construction of the National Peanut Festival Agriculture Arena in Dothan, Alabama;

22. $250,000 to the Northwest Alabama Council of Local Governments in Muscle Shoals, Alabama for the construction of a joint economic development facility to be used by the Shoals Economic Development Authority and the Shoals Chamber of Commerce;

23. $750,000 to the National Children's Advocacy Center in Huntsville, Alabama for construction of a research and training campus;

24. $1,800,000 to Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama for construction of a new library and Regional Resource Learning Center;

25. $200,000 to the City of Bradley, Arkansas for construction of a community center;

26. $200,000 to the Dermott City Community Nursing Home in Dermott, Arkansas for facilities construction and buildout;

27. $225,000 for construction of the North Arkansas College Conference and Workforce Center in Harrison, Arkansas;

28. $175,000 to the County of Santa Cruz, Arizona for restoration of a historic building;
29. $200,000 to the Town of Guadalupe, Arizona for renovations to the Mercado shopping center;
30. $225,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Scottsdale for facility construction in Fountain Hills, Arizona;
31. $405,000 to the National Law Center for Inter-American Free Trade in Tucson, Arizona for facilities construction;
32. $450,000 to Arizona State University for facilities construction for the Center for Basic Research and Applied Research within the Barry M. Goldwater Center for Science and Engineering;
33. $50,000 to Southeast-Rio Vista YMCA in Huntington Park, California for renovation of a building;
34. $75,000 to Culver City, California for facilities restoration of a theatre;
35. $90,000 to the County of San Bernardino, California for facilities renovation, sidewalk and facade improvements of the Crestline Revitalization/Houston Creek project;
36. $90,000 to the County of San Bernardino, California for facilities expansion for the Big Bear Zoo;
37. $450,000 to Kelysville Senior Center in Lake County, California for renovations of a facility into a senior center;
38. $100,000 to Occidental College in Los Angeles, California for continued construction of a science center;
39. $100,000 to the American Film Institute in Los Angeles, California for renovation of facilities;
40. $100,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of National City, California for facilities repairs at the Wayne Sevier Memorial Gymnasium;
41. $100,000 to the City of Carpinteria, California for facilities modernization and renovation of the Carpinteria Veteran's Memorial Building;
42. $100,000 to the City of El Monte, California for construction of a teen and education center;
43. $100,000 to the City of Fontana, California for restoration and renovation of recreational facilities;
44. $100,000 to the City of Fresno, California for facilities construction at the Roeding Business Park;
45. $100,000 to the City of Garden Grove, California for facilities construction at the West Haven Community Center;
46. $100,000 to the City of La Puente, California for construction of a youth activity and learning center;
47. $100,000 to the City of Lawndale, California for construction of a new senior center;
48. $100,000 to the City of Palo Alto, California for the rehabilitation and expansion of the Childrens' Library;
49. $100,000 to the City of San Diego, California for construction of the Elm Street residences for transitional housing;
50. $100,000 to the City of San Fernando, California for a feasibility study of business redevelopment focused on major commercial corridors;
51. $100,000 to the Contra Costa Community College in California for the Regional Training Institute's facility renovation;

52. $100,000 to the Intergenerational Daycare Center, Organization for the Needs of the Elderly in Van Nuys, California for facility construction;

53. $100,000 to the Tech Museum of Innovation in San Jose, California for renovations necessary for theater improvements;

54. $100,000 to the Watts Theatre and Education Center in Los Angeles, California for renovations to the center;

55. $100,000 to the YMCA of San Francisco, California for construction of a facility in the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood and rehabilitation of the Chinatown facility;

56. $125,000 for El Rescate in Los Angeles, California for renovation of a facility to house a social service agency;

57. $125,000 to the SRO Housing Corporation in Los Angeles, California for facilities construction for the James Wood Memorial Community Center;

58. $135,000 to the City of Lancaster, California for renovation of the Antelope Valley Mental Health Association headquarters building;

59. $135,000 to the City of Twentynine Palms, California for construction of the Twentynine Palms Visitor Center;

60. $135,000 to the Hi-Desert Medical Center in Joshua Tree, California for facilities expansion for the Obstetrics Center;

61. $135,000 to the History Department of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County for facility improvements for the William S. Hart Museum in Newhall, California;

62. $135,000 to the Tri-Counties Easter Seals for construction of a child development center in Ventura County, California;

63. $150,000 to the City of San Rafael, California for renovation of the Pickleweed Park Community Center;

64. $150,000 to the City of Santa Monica, California for renovation of a historic structure for use as a visitor center;

65. $150,000 to the Spanish Speaking Unity Council in Oakland, California for rehabilitation of affordable elderly housing;

66. $180,000 to the City of Lancaster, California for facilities construction and improvements for the National Soccer Center;

67. $180,000 to the City of Temecula, California for construction of the Gymnasium-Old Town Temecula;

68. $180,000 to the Community Action Partnership of Kern, California for construction of a food bank;

69. $200,000 to the City of Vallejo, California for historic structure renovations at Mare Island;

70. $200,000 to the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency in Sacramento, California for construction of a learning center;

71. $225,000 to the Agua Caliente Cultural Museum in Palm Springs, California for facilities construction;

72. $225,000 to the City of Diamond Bar, California for construction of a community center;

73. $225,000 to the City of East Palo Alto, California for facilities construction at the Ravenswood Industrial park;

74. $225,000 to the City of Ripon, California for construction of a Youth Center Complex;

75. $225,000 to the City of Riverside, California for facilities construction for the Riverside Regional Technology Transfer Center;

76. $225,000 to the City of Stockton, California for renovation of the Fox Theatre;

77. $225,000 to the East County YMCA in La Mesa, California for facilities construction and improvements;

78. $225,000 to the Sweetwater Authority for recreation facilities construction at Sweetwater and Loveland Reservoirs in San Diego County, California;

79. $250,000 to the City of Eureka, California for construction of a waterfront facility as part of the downtown revitalization;

80. $250,000 to the City of Inglewood, California for construction of a senior center;

81. $270,000 to the Fund for the Preservation of the California State Mining and Mineral Museum for facilities construction in Mariposa, California;

82. $300,000 to the City of Salinas, California for construction of recreational facilities;

83. $315,000 to the City of Citrus Heights, California for facilities construction for the Sayonara Neighborhood revitalization project;

84. $315,000 to the City of Shasta Lake, California for construction of a senior housing complex;

85. $360,000 to the Kern County Office of Education for facilities construction for the Mobility Opportunities via Education project in Southeast Bakersfield, California;

86. $360,000 to the West Side Park and Recreation District for renovation of the Taft Community Pool in Taft, California;

87. $400,000 to the City of San Francisco, California for construction of the Mission Bay Senior Housing Project;

88. $450,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Las Virgenes, Inc. for facilities construction in the City of Thousand Oaks, California;

89. $450,000 to the City of La Mesa, California for facilities construction and improvements for the La Mesa PARKS Project;

90. $100,000 to Children's Hospital, San Diego, California for facilities construction for the Convalescent Hospital;

91. $450,000 to the City of Westminster, California for construction of a community center;

92. $450,000 to the Palomar YMCA in Escondido, California for construction of an aquatic center;

93. $450,000 to the Town of Apple Valley, California for construction of an aquatic center;

94. $900,000 to the City of Rancho Cucamonga, California for construction of a senior center;

95. $100,000 to Arvada Center for the Arts and Humanities in Arvada, Colorado for facilities expansion;

96. $100,000 to the City of Aurora, Colorado for planning related to Fitzsimons Commons;

97. $450,000 to the Harp Foundation for construction of the Historic Arkansas Riverwalk "Link" Project of Pueblo, Colorado;

98. $100,000 for the Hartt School of Performing Arts Education Center in West Hartford, Connecticut for building renovations;

99. $100,000 to the City of Meriden, Connecticut for a study to determine the feasibility of the construction of a community play house and arts center;

100. $100,000 to the City of Waterbury, Connecticut for an economic feasibility study focused on construction of a multipurpose sports facility;

101. $100,000 to the Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art in Hartford, Connecticut for renovation of facilities;

102. $150,000 to the town of Newtown, Connecticut for future use planning and renovation of the Batshelder property;

103. $200,000 to Domestic Violence Services of Greater New Haven, Connecticut for renovation and construction of a facility for transitional housing;

104. $250,000 to Columbus House, Inc. in New Haven, Connecticut for construction of an emergency shelter for homeless adults;

105. $315,000 to Mystic Seaport for a facilities restoration and conversion project of the American Maritime Education and Research Center in Mystic, Connecticut;

106. $450,000 to the Environmental Learning Centers of Connecticut for facilities expansion for the Harry C. Barnes Memorial Nature Center in Bristol, Connecticut;

107. $450,000 to the New Britain Museum of American Art in New Britain, Connecticut for facility construction;

108. $100,000 to St. Petersburg, Florida for completion of facilities improvements at the Florida Botanical Garden and Folk Cultural Center;

109. $125,000 to Santa Fe Community College in Gainesville, Florida for construction of a fine arts building;

110. $125,000 to the City of Gainesville, Florida for sidewalk and curb improvements;

111. $225,000 to the City of Clearwater, Florida for waterfront facilities construction of the "Beach by Design Initiative";

112. $225,000 to the City of Jacksonville, Florida for facilities construction for the Patriots Village Transitional Housing Community;

113. $225,000 to the City of Ocoee, Florida for construction of a senior citizens/veterans services center;

114. $225,000 to the City of Riviera Beach, Florida for construction and renovation of facilities as part of the Urban Commercial Retail Development Project;

115. $225,000 to the City of Sanford, Florida for construction of a parking facility at the Hotel Conference Center;

116. $225,000 to the MainStreet Deland Association, Inc. for restoration of the Athens Theatre in Deland, Florida;

117. $225,000 to the Tampa, Florida Port Authority for facilities construction and renovation of a terminal;

118. $250,000 for Family Resources of St. Petersburg, Florida for construction of a crisis shelter and family counseling center;

119. $250,000 to Bethune Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Florida for construction of a community services center and student union;

120. $250,000 to the Community Aging and Retirement Services (CARES) of Pasco County, Florida for renovation and build out of the Crescent Enrichment Center & Theater in Dale City, Florida;

121. $360,000 to the Wolfsonian-Florida International University of Miami Beach, Florida for facilities expansion and improvements;

122. $375,000 to the City of Plantation, Florida for construction of an amphitheater;

123. $400,000 for the City of Largo, Florida for construction of a new downtown Largo library;

124. $400,000 to Refuge House in Tallahassee, Florida for construction of a battered women's shelter;

125. $450,000 to the Central Florida Community College in Marion County, Florida for facilities construction for an information technology center;

126. $450,000 to the Florida International University College of Law in Miami, Florida for construction of facilities for a student legal clinic;

127. $500,000 for facilities construction for the Stetson University College of Law Tampa, Florida campus;

128. $750,000 for facilities construction for Tampa Bay Watch in Florida;

129. $750,000 to the Christopher Newport University Foundation of Newport News, Virginia for facilities construction and renovation;

130. $1,000,000 for construction of the Eckerd College Youth Opportunity and Development Center in St. Petersburg, Florida;

131. $1,000,000 for the City of St. Petersburg, Florida Manhattan redevelopment project for facilities renovation and improvements for a business development center;

132. $1,000,000 for the historic restoration and renovation of the Biltmore Hotel in Coral Gables, Florida;

133. $200,000 to Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia for construction of a performing arts center;

134. $225,000 for facilities construction for the Dual Rail Industrial Park in Dooly County, Georgia;

135. $225,000 for the Tommy Nobis Center in Marietta, Georgia for facilities renovations and improvements;

136. $225,000 for the Warner Robins Museum of Aviation in Houston County, Georgia for expansion of facilities for the Century of Flight exhibit;

137. $225,000 to Mercer University of Macon, Georgia for facilities construction for the Critical Personnel Development Program;

138. $225,000 to Rockdale County, Georgia for facilities construction for the Georgia Veterans Park;

139. $225,000 to Wesleyan College of Macon, Georgia for the restoration and renovation of historic buildings;

140. $315,000 for the preservation of historic buildings at Georgia College and State University, a Historically Women's Public College and University;

141. $450,000 to the Liberty County, Georgia Development Authority for facilities construction at the Coastal MegaPark;

142. $150,000 to the YMCA of Honolulu, Hawaii for construction of a multi-purpose community and recreation center;

143. $100,000 to the Mahaska County Crisis Intervention Services Domestic Shelter in Oskaloosa, Iowa for facilities renovation of the domestic shelter;

144. $450,000 to Systems Unlimited, Inc. in the Iowa City/Cedar Rapids community, Iowa for facilities expansion;

145. $450,000 to the City of Des Moines, Iowa for facilities construction for the Des Moines Agrimergent Technology Park;

146. $450,000 to the City of Fort Dodge, Iowa for facility renovations for the Senior Citizens Campus project;

147. $360,000 to Idaho State University for construction of the L.E. and Thelma E. Stephens Performing Arts Center;

148. $90,000 to Family House in Peoria, Illinois for facilities construction;

149. $90,000 to the City of Normal, Illinois for facilities construction according to the downtown redevelopment plan;

150. $100,000 to Family Focus in Evanston, Illinois for facilities improvements;

151. $100,000 to Haymarket Center in Chicago, Illinois for renovations to a facility to serve as drug intervention center;

152. $100,000 to Oak Lawn Children's Museum in Oak Lawn, Illinois for facilities renovations;

153. $100,000 to the Brookfield Zoo in Brookfield, Illinois for construction of a learning center;

154. $100,000 to the Village of Hampton, Illinois for construction of the Hampton Heritage Center;

155. $100,000 to the Village of Riverside, Illinois for restoration of a historic structure;

156. $100,000 to the Village of South Holland, Illinois for facilities improvements for its community center;

157. $150,000 to Lewis and Clark Community College in Godfrey, Illinois for construction of the Great Rivers Research and Education Center;

158. $75,000 to Ridgeway Senior Center in Gallatin County, Illinois for renovation of the senior center;

159. $150,000 to the Village of Olympia Fields, Illinois for construction of a hall, public library and upgraded commuter station;

160. $180,000 to Eureka College, Illinois for continued construction of the Science and Technology Center;

161. $180,000 to Joliet Junior College in Joliet, Illinois for construction of a multipurpose agricultural education and event center;

162. $180,000 to the Centers for the Prevention of Abuse for facilities construction in Peoria, Illinois;

163. $200,000 to the Safer Foundation in Chicago, Illinois for renovation of a building into transitional housing;

164. $225,000 to DuPage County, Illinois for facilities renovations for the Convalescent Center Rehabilitation Project;

165. $225,000 to Roosevelt University of Chicago, Illinois for renovations to the auditorium building;

166. $225,000 to the American Red Cross of Greater Chicago, Illinois for facilities construction;

167. $225,000 to the City of DeKalb, Illinois for rehabilitation of facilities for the Downtown Community Center;

168. $225,000 to the Northfield Park District in Northfield, Illinois for facilities construction;

169. $270,000 for facilities renovation for Teen Challenge in Decatur, Illinois;

170. $450,000 to the City of Elgin, Illinois for construction of pedestrian improvements;

171. $675,000 to the Village of Addison, Illinois for facilities construction for the Addison Neighborhood Resource Center and Park;

172. $1,400,000 to Rush-Presbyterian St. Luke's Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois for renovations to the life safety and infant security facilities;

173. $150,000 to the City of Indianapolis, Indiana for construction at the Life Sciences Research Park;

174. $315,000 to Tri-State University for facilities construction for the Center for Technology and On-Line Resources in Angola, Indiana;

175. $450,000 to Madison Township, Indiana for construction of a construction of a community center;

176. $450,000 to the James Whitcomb Riley Hospital for Children in Indianapolis, Indiana for improving inpatient facilities for the Chistian Sarkine Autism Center;

177. $1,000,000 to Purdue University in West Lafayette, Indiana for facilities construction for the Northwest Indiana Purdue Technology Center;

178. $150,000 to the Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas for sidewalk and curb improvements;

179. $180,000 for facilities renovation and expansion of the Oaklawn Community Resource Center in Sedgwick County, Kansas;

180. $180,000 for facilities renovations and improvements for the Evergreen Public Library in Wichita, Kansas;

181. $315,000 to the City of Atchison, Kansas for construction of a riverfront plaza;

182. $315,000 to the Reno County Historical Society for the Kansas Underground Salt Museum in Hutchinson, Kansas for facilities construction and improvements;

183. $73,500 to Kentucky Refugee Ministries in Louisville, Kentucky for renovation of facilities;

184. $75,000 to the Salvation Army/Boys and Girls Club—Northfolk, in Louisville, Kentucky for the renovation of the Northfolk community center;

185. $100,000 to the Greater Community Council in Louisville, Kentucky for construction of a facility for low-income, disabled persons;

186. $150,000 to Owen County, Kentucky for facilities construction;

187. $225,000 to Interlink Counseling in Louisville, Kentucky for facilities construction;

188. $225,000 to the City of Lebanon, Kentucky for facilities construction for the Center Square project;

189. $250,000 for the Trinity Family Life Center in Louisville, Kentucky for facilities construction for afterschool programs;

190. $250,000 to the Community Economic Empowerment Corporation of Louisville, Kentucky for construction of a community and family recreation center;

191. $250,000 to the First Gethsemane Center in Louisville, Kentucky for renovation of facilities;

192. $250,000 to the Shiloh Community Renewal Center in Louisville, Kentucky for facilities reconstruction and rehabilitation;

193. $300,000 for the renovation of the Americana Community Center in Louisville, Kentucky;

194. $315,000 to the Montgomery County Fiscal Court of Kentucky for continued construction of a community center;

195. $315,000 to the the Monroe County Wellness Center, Inc. of Monroe County, Kentucky for facilities construction;

196. $450,000 to Pine Mountain Settlement School of Harlan County, Kentucky for facilities expansion and renovation;

197. $450,000 to the London-Laurel County Tourist Commission, Kentucky for facilities construction for the Blue-Gray Civil War Theme Park;

198. $50,000 to the Town of Clinton, Louisiana for facilities construction and improvements;

199. $75,000 to Iberia Parish, Louisiana for construction of the New Iberia conference center;

200. $75,000 to Plan Baton Rouge, Louisiana for building renovations;

201. $75,000 to St. Mary Parish, Louisiana for construction of a wildlife refuge interpretive center;

202. $75,000 to the City of Donaldsonville, Louisiana for construction of riverfront recreational facilities;

203. $75,000 to the City of Gonzales, Louisiana for building and facade renovations and improvements in the downtown historic district;

204. $75,000 to the City of Plaquemine, Louisiana for construction of facilities including a farmers market;

205. $75,000 to the City of Port Allen, Louisiana for economic development planning and facilities construction;

206. $75,000 to the Town of Golden Meadow, Louisiana for construction and renovation of recreation facilities;

207. $75,000 to the Village of Cankton, Louisiana for facilities renovations for a community center;

208. $90,000 to the City of New Iberia, Louisiana for facilities construction as described in the master plan;

209. $90,000 to the New Orleans Regional Planning Commission, Louisiana for recreational facilities improvements and buildout for St. Bernard, St. Charles and Plaquemines;

210. $90,000 to the Town of Grand Isle, Louisiana for construction and buildout of the Isle Multi-Use Facility;

211. $100,000 to the Amistad Research Center in New Orleans, Louisiana for facilities construction;

212. $100,000 to the Mirabeau Family Learning Center, Inc. in New Orleans, Louisiana for facilities construction;

213. $125,000 to the Acadia Economic Development Corporation in Crowley, Louisiana for facilities construction for a business incubator;

214. $180,000 to Nichols State University in Thibodaux, Louisiana for facilities construction for the Advanced Technology Center;

215. $180,000 to the Port of South Louisiana for facilities construction for the Globalplex Intermodal Terminal;

216. $180,000 to the Tangipahoa Parish School System in Loranger, Louisiana for renovation and restoration of the Loranger High School building;

217. $202,500 to the City of Mandeville, Louisiana for the construction of an interpretive center as part of the Mandeville Trailhead project;

218. $225,000 for the National Federation of the Blind, Center for the Blind in Louisiana for facilities construction for the National Research and Training Institute for the Blind;

219. $675,000 the Biomedical Research Foundation of Northwest Louisiana for construction of the InterTech science park;

220. $100,000 to Goodwill Industries of Springfield, Massachusetts for facilities renovations;

221. $125,000 to the Veterans Benefit Clearinghouse in Roxbury, Massachusetts for facilities renovation and modernization;

222. $150,000 to Salem State College in Massachusetts for construction of an arts center/theater;

223. $150,000 to the Main South Community Development Corporation in Worcester, Massachusetts for blight removal and construction related to the Gardner-Kilby-Hammond Street Neighborhood Revitalization project;

224. $175,000 to the City of Lowell, Massachusetts for construction of the Jackson/Appleton/Middlesex Area garage;

225. $200,000 to the Berkshire Museum in Pittsfield, Massachusetts for facilities renovation;

226. $325,000 to Girls Incorporated in Pittsfield, Massachusetts for facilities renovation;

227. $300,000 to the City of Springfield, Massachusetts for renovations of a facility to house a public market;

228. $450,000 to the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences for construction of a new multi-use educational facilities;

229. $75,000 for Arena Stage for facilities construction in the District of Columbia;

230. $75,000 to the Montgomery Housing Partnership in Maryland for renovation of the Blair Park apartments;

231. $90,000 to Montgomery County, Maryland for facilities construction for the Silver Spring Innovation Center;

232. $90,000 to the Maryland Soccer Foundation, Inc. for facilities construction for the SoccerPlex in South Germantown, Maryland;

233. $90,000 to the Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs, Maryland for building renovations, facade improvements, and sidewalk and beautification improvements in Wheaton;

234. $90,000 to the Montgomery County Government of Maryland for building renovations, facade improvements, and sidewalk and beautification improvements for the Fenton Street Village section of Silver Spring;

235. $100,000 to the City of District Heights, Maryland for facilities construction in its commercial area;

236. $100,000 to the City of La Plata, Maryland for planning of a parking facility;

237. $100,000 to the Melwood Horticultural Center in Upper Marlboro, Maryland for planning necessary to construct a multi-purpose job training and employment facility;

238. $100,000 to the Olney Theatre Center for the Arts in Olney, Maryland for the construction of a theater;

239. $100,000 to the West Arlington Improvement Association in Baltimore, Maryland for construction of youth multipurpose center;

240. $112,500 to the Rotary—PAL Building Corporation of Frederick County, Maryland for facilities expansion for the Sagner Community Center;

241. $150,000 to Prince Georges County, Maryland for renovation of a visitor center to accommodate a Space and Flight Center;

242. $180,000 to the City of Rockville, Maryland for sidewalk, pedestrian amenities, lighting, and beautification improvements for the Rockville Town Center Redevelopment Project;

243. $200,000 to St. Mary's College in Maryland for waterfront facilities construction;

244. $315,000 to Baltimore Medical System of Baltimore, Maryland for construction of a new community health center;

245. $100,000 for L/A Arts in Lewiston, Maine for the renovation and construction of the ArtsPlace program building;

246. $125,000 to the Franco-American Heritage Center at St. Mary's in Lewiston, Maine for renovate facilities into a performance hall and museum;

247. $125,000 to the University of Maine for reconstruction of the Jonesboro Blueberry Research Station;

248. $180,000 to the City of Biddeford, Maine for restoration of the City Theater;

249. $90,000 to Cleary College in Howell, Michigan for construction of the Center for Business and Community Excellence;

250. $225,000 for the National Cherry Festival of Michigan for the renovation of facilities;

251. $225,000 to the Michigan State Trust for Railway Preservation, Inc. for construction of facilities for the Steam Railroading Institute's "linear museum concept" in Shiawasse County, Michigan;

252. $250,000 for the FOCUS: HOPE Institute in Detroit, Michigan for renovation of a job-training facility;

253. $250,000 for the Structural Research and Development Center at Lawrence Tech. University in Southfield, Michigan for facilities construction and renovations;

254. $250,000 to Lighthouse of Oakland County, Inc. for facilities construction in Oakland County, Michigan;

255. $250,000 to the City of St. Ignace, Michigan for the construction of a public library;

256. $250,000 to the Michigan Jewish Institute Academic Activities facility for construction and renovation;

257. $250,000 to the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences in Ann Arbor, Michigan for facilities construction;

258. $300,000 to the Virginia Park Community Investment, Inc. in Detroit, Michigan for renovations of the Virginia Park Shopping Center;

259. $450,000 to the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe of Michigan for construction of facilities for the Victims of Crime Program;

260. $75,000 to the YWCA of St. Paul, Minnesota for facilities renovations associated with expansion;

261. $150,000 to Southside Family Nurturing Center in Minneapolis, Minnesota for facility rehabilitation;

262. $200,000 to Detroit Lakes, Minnesota for construction of a community center;

263. $200,000 to Leech Lake Tribal College in Cass Lake, Minnesota for facilities expansion;

264. $200,000 to the Audubon Center of the North Woods in Minnesota for capital construction costs and improvements;

265. $200,000 to the Vinland Center in Minnesota for facilities improvements for the rehabilitation center;

266. $360,000 to the Cornerstone Advocacy Service, Inc. in Bloomington, Minnesota for construction of a multi-purpose Emergency Shelter and Family Services Center;

267. $600,000 to Reuben Lindh Family Services in Minneapolis, Minnesota for facility rehabilitation;

268. $50,000 to the City of Arnold, Missouri for recreation facility improvements;

269. $50,000 to the City of Maplewood, Missouri for recreation facility improvements;

270. $50,000 to the Town of Herculaneum, Missouri for an economic development and land use plan;

271. $90,000 to the City of Stanberry, Missouri for revitalization of the city's bandstand;

272. $100,000 to the East-West Gateway Coordinating Council in St. Louis, Missouri for a feasibility study in cooperation with the University City Trolley Corporation;

273. $100,000 to the St. Louis, Missouri Parks Department for recreation facility improvements;

274. $100,000 to United Inner Services, Inc. in Kansas City, Missouri for construction of a community center;

275. $360,000 to the University of Missouri-Columbia for facilities construction for the Life Sciences Technology Incubator;

276. $900,000 to the City of Springfield, Missouri for construction of a community multipurpose facility;

277. $900,000 to the City of St. Louis, Missouri for lighting, sidewalks, curbs, and street furniture along Kings Highway Boulevard and Chippewa Street;

278. $100,000 to the City of Natchez, Mississippi for a feasibility study to develop a slack water port;

279. $100,000 to the town of Wesson, Mississippi for the restoration of the Wesson School building;

280. $270,000 to The Mississippi Economic Growth Alliance and Point of Presence (MEGAPOP) for facilities construction;

281. $315,000 to the Oktibbeha County Economic Development Authority in Starkville, Mississippi for facilities construction for its E-Commerce Park;

282. $315,000 to the Missoula Food Bank, Montana for facilities expansion and renovation;

283. $90,000 to the North Carolina Advanced Energy Corporation in Raleigh, North Carolina for a feasibility study of expanded application of the "System Vision" model of housing construction;

284. $100,000 to OPC Mental Health in Carrboro, North Carolina for construction, renovation and build out of Club Insight;

285. $100,000 to Orange County, North Carolina for construction and build out of a farmer's market facility;

286. $150,000 to Durham County, North Carolina for construction and build out of a senior center, and construction, renovation and build out of a homeless shelter;

287. $160,000 to the North Carolina Community Development Initiative for renovation and build out of a vocational training facility in Durham County, North Carolina and a transitional housing facility in Durham, North Carolina;

288. $180,000 to the Catawba County, North Carolina Historical Association for restoration of facilities for the Harper House—Hickory History Center;

289. $200,000 to the Town of Mooresville, North Carolina for facilities expansion of the town's historic library;

290. $225,000 for construction of the National Academy of Forensics and Computer Investigations at Central Piedmont Community College in Charlotte, North Carolina;

291. $225,000 to the Graveyard of the Atlantic Museum in Dare County, North Carolina for continued facilities construction;

292. $270,000 to the Haywood County Agriculture and Activities Center Association for construction of a multi-purpose arena in Waynesville, North Carolina;

293. $400,000 to Faquay-Varina, North Carolina for downtown revitalization consisting of sidewalks, islands, and a central plaza;

294. $400,000 to UDI Community Development Corporation in Durham, North Carolina for construction, renovation and build out for a business incubator facility;

295. $450,000 for Wake Forest University and Winston-Salem State University in North Carolina for construction of a facility for the Idealliance program;

296. $350,000 to Scotland County, North Carolina for construction and renovation of a community center;

297. $450,000 to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, a Historically Women's College and University, for restoration of historic buildings;

298. $100,000 to Fort Totten, North Dakota for facilities construction;

299. $100,000 to Fort Yates Hospital, in Fort Yates, North Dakota for facilities renovations and construction;

300. $315,000 to Father Flanagan's Girls and Boys Town of Boys Town, Nebraska for the national priority projects of Girls and Boys Town USA;

301. $585,000 to the City of Falls City, Nebraska for renovating and retrofitting a business industry incubator building;

302. $100,000 to Monmouth University in New Jersey for library facilities renovations;

303. $300,000 to the Greater Wakefield Resource Center in Wakefield, New Hampshire for renovation of facilities;

304. $450,000 to the City of Concord, New Hampshire for facilities construction of the Sears Block Redevelopment project;

305. $700,000 to the New Hampshire Community Technical College for renovation and facilities expansion for the Emerging Technology Center at Pease International Tradeport;

306. $100,000 to the Bergen County, New Jersey Community Action Program for homeless shelter expansion needs;

307. $100,000 to the Borough of Fair Haven, New Jersey for restoration of the historic Fisk Chapel;

308. $100,000 to the Hackensack University Medical Center in Hackensack, New Jersey for facilities expansion of the Woman's and Children's Pavilion;

309. $100,000 to the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey in New Brunswick, New Jersey for construction of the Child Health Institute;

310. $125,000 to Babyland Family Services in Newark, New Jersey for facilities improvements;

311. $125,000 to Englewood Hospital and Medical Center in New Jersey for modernization and expansion of the Emergency and Outpatient Clinic;

312. $125,000 to Holy Name Hospital in Teaneck, New Jersey for facilities expansion of the regional dialysis center;

313. $125,000 to the YMCA of Eastern Union County, New Jersey for a building renovations at the Elizabeth, New Jersey Branch;

314. $150,000 to the New Jersey Community Development Corporation for facilities construction related to the Transportation Opportunity Center;

315. $180,000 to Atlantic City, New Jersey for renovation of the All Wars Memorial Building;

316. $180,000 to AtlantiCare Behavioral Health of Atlantic City, New Jersey for construction of a community mental health center;

317. $200,000 to New Jersey City University for renovation of the science hall;

318. $225,000 to the YMCA of Eastern Union County for expansion of child care facilities in Union, New Jersey;

319. $270,000 to Florence Township, New Jersey for construction of a senior citizens center;

320. $450,000 to Burlington County, New Jersey for economic development planning for the revitalization of the Mount

Holly Community ($100,000) and facilities construction ($400,000);

321. $500,000 to Daytop in Morris County, New Jersey for facilities construction and renovation;

322. $500,000 to Gilda's Club of Northern, New Jersey for construction and renovation of a facility in the greater Morris/Essex County area;

323. $100,000 to the City of Aztec, New Mexico for facility and sidewalk improvements;

324. $225,000 for the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico Aviation Department for facilities expansion and renovation for the Double Eagle II Airport;

325. $450,000 to the City of Roswell, New Mexico for renovation and structural upgrades of an aircraft hanger;

326. $200,000 to the City of Las Vegas, Nevada for facilities construction for a small business incubator;

327. $150,000 to the Culinary and Hospitality Academy Center of Las Vegas, Nevada for construction related to expansion of an education training center;

328. $270,000 to the City of Sparks, Nevada for renovation of facilities for the Regional Science and Cultural Center;

329. $75,000 to Babylon, New York for building renovations at Oak Beach;

330. $75,000 to the City of New Rochelle, New York for sidewalk and curb improvements;

331. $75,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for renovations of the Syracuse Open House;

332. $75,000 to the Hebrew Academy for Special Children in Brooklyn, New York for construction renovation of a facility;

333. $75,000 to the Town of Mamaroneck, New York for facilities renovation and improvements for the Hommocks Conservation Area;

334. $90,000 to the Town of Amherst, New York for the repair of historic streetscape furniture;

335. $100,000 to New York University Medical Center for renovations to the Rusk Institute of Rehabilitation;

336. $100,000 to Onondaga County, New York for construction of the Borodino Community Center;

337. $100,000 to Phipps House in New York, New York for facilities renovation and construction in LaPuerta in the South Bronx to house an educational child care center;

338. $100,000 to the Alliance for Community Services for a study of economic development needs of newly identified immigrant communities in the Bronx, New York;

339. $100,000 to the Citizens Advice Bureau for renovations to the Girls' Club Community Center in the Bronx, New York;

340. $100,000 to the City of Mount Vernon, New York for building renovations to create a recreational and job training facility;

341. $100,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for planning related to the Hancock International Airport;

342. $100,000 to the City of White Plains, New York for an economic development study for the revitalization of Westchester;

343. $100,000 to the Flushing, Queens, New York branch of the YMCA for facilities renovation and expansion;

344. $100,000 to the Long Island Housing Partnership, Inc. in New York for a study to identify and plan revitalization efforts in distressed communities;

345. $100,000 to the McBurney YMCA in New York, New York for facility construction;

346. $100,000 to the Metropolitan Development Association in Syracuse, New York to update the VISION 2010 Strategic Economic Development Plan;

347. $100,000 to the State University of New York, College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry for planning activities for the Quality Communities Initiative;

348. $100,000 to the Town of Eastchester, New York for facilities renovation for the Eastchester Child Development Center;

349. $125,000 to the City of Yonkers, New York for facilities construction for the Empowerment Zone Assistance Center;

350. $200,000 to the Bethel Performing Arts Center in Bethel, New York for construction of a performing arts facility;

351. $150,000 to the Harlem YMCA in New York, New York for renovation of transitional housing;

352. $150,000 to the Jewish Children's Museum in Brooklyn, New York for facilities construction;

353. $180,000 for facilities renovations and improvements for the Woolworth Theatre Project in Glens Falls, New York;

354. $180,000 to the Catskill Mountain Foundation in Hunter, New York for reconstruction of the Tannersville Theatre for use as a multifunctional facility;

355. $180,000 to the Village of Valatie, New York for the renovation of the Valatie Theatre;

356. $150,000 to Boys and Girls Club of Saugerties, New York for renovation of a multi-purpose facility to house the club;

357. $200,000 to Elmcor Youth and Adult Activities, Inc. for construction of an economic development center serving the needs of Northwestern Queens, New York;

358. $200,000 to HOGAR, Inc. in the Bronx, New York for planning activities for housing needs ($100,000) and planning activities for provision of rehabilitative services to special needs populations ($100,000);

359. $200,000 to the Sunset Park Business Improvement District in Brooklyn, New York for facade renovations, sidewalk, curb and street furniture improvements;

360. $225,000 for construction of the Players Theater Performing Arts Center in Utica, New York;

361. $225,000 to Catholic Health Systems for construction activities of the Our Lady of Victory Neighborhood for Seniors Project in Lackawanna, New York;

362. $225,000 to Elmira College in Elmira, New York for renovation of Cowles Hall;

363. $225,000 to the Burchfield—Penney Art Center in Buffalo, New York for construction of a new museum;

364. $225,000 to the Suffolk Sports Hall of Fame, Sports Research Center in Patchogue, New York for facilities renovations;

365. $225,000 to the Town of Brookhaven, New York for facility improvements to the Mastic Town Pool;

366. $225,000 to the Village of Highland Falls, New York for main street revitalization;

367. $250,000 to Carnegie Hall in New York to complete construction of Carnegie Hall's Third Stage Project;

368. $250,000 to Covenant House New York in New York, New York for shelter renovations;

369. $250,000 to Onondaga County, New York for facilities construction of the Solvay Library Centennial Building;

370. $250,000 to the City of Albany, New York for renovation of the Palace Theater;

371. $250,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for facilities expansion for the Northeast Community Center;

372. $250,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for historic renovations of the Matilda Joslyn Gage House;

373. $250,000 to the Dance Theater of Harlem in New York, New York for restoration of buildings to support the Academy Charter School;

374. $250,000 to the Museum of Modern Art in New York for expansion and renovations to their Education and Research Center;

375. $250,000 to the Village of East Syracuse, New York for renovation of the Hanlon Pool;

376. $250,000 to the Village of Manlius, New York for rehabilitation of the Manlius Recreation Center;

377. $250,000 to VIP Community Services in the Bronx, New York for construction of homeless transitional housing;

378. $300,000 to Garth Fagan Dance Studio in Rochester, New York for construction of a new theater;

379. $300,000 to the Armory Foundation in New York, New York for conversion of the Washington Heights Armory into a community center;

380. $300,000 to the City of Buffalo, New York for facility renovations at Canisius High School in Buffalo, New York;

381. $400,000 to Cayuga County, New York for waterfront facilities construction;

382. $450,000 for construction of the Orpheus Performing Arts and Conference Center in Oneonta, New York;

383. $125,000 for facilities construction for the Natural History Museum of the Adirondacks in Tupper Lake, New York;

384. $450,000 to Christa House of West Babylon, New York for facilities renovations and repairs;

385. $450,000 to Orange County Community College in Middletown, New York for facilities construction and buildout for the establishment of the Benjamin A. Gilman Institute for Political and International Studies;

386. $450,000 to St. Bonaventure University in St. Bonaventure, New York for facilities upgrades for De la Roche Hall;

387. $450,000 to the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation for construction of the Purple Heart Hall of Honor in the Town of New Windsor, New York;

388. $450,000 to the Staten Island Soccer League of New York for facilities construction;

389. $500,000 to Jazz at Lincoln Center in New York City for facility construction;

390. $450,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for sidewalks, street lighting and furniture improvements and building renovations for the North Salina Street Corridor;

391. $450,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for construction of an International Tourism Center at the Carousel Center;

392. $500,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for expansion and renovation of Enable facilities;

393. $500,000 to the Rivers and Estuaries Center on the Hudson in New York for facilities construction;

394. $550,000 to Queens Borough Public Library in Queens, New York for facilities rehabilitation and expansion of the Parsons Boulevard complex;

395. $1,000,000 for facilities expansion for the Everson Museum of Art in Syracuse, New York;

396. $1,000,000 to LeMoyne College in Syracuse, New York for the construction of a Science Education and Teaching/Learning Center;

397. $1,000,000 to the New York Olympic Regional Development Authority for facilities construction for the Mount VanHoevenberg Olympic Sports Complex;

398. $90,000 to the Rabbit Run Community Arts Association for renovation of the Rabbit Run Theater located in Madison, Ohio;

399. $100,000 for facilities renovations and improvements for the West After School Center in Lancaster, Ohio;

400. $100,000 to the City of Cleveland, Ohio for economic development planning for the LTV Steel Economic Development Initiative;

401. $135,000 to GMN Tri County for construction of a community center in Guernsey County, Ohio;

402. $135,000 to the Village of Fairport Harbor, Ohio for renovation of facilities for the Lighthouse Community Arts Association's Fairport Harbor Rennaissance Village;

403. $200,000 for Catholic Social Services in Springfield, Ohio for renovation of a facility to house the Second Harvest Foodbank;

404. $200,000 for Ross County, Ohio for facilities renovations and improvements for the Blue Star Mothers Memorial Stadium in Chillicothe, Ohio;

405. $225,000 for the Community Action Organization of Scioto County, Ohio for renovation of a facility for the Head Start program in Portsmouth, Ohio;

406. $225,000 to the City of Clairsville, Ohio for renovation and restoration of the Clarendon Hotel building;

407. $225,000 to the City of Marion, Ohio for construction of an urban plaza;

408. $250,000 to the Columbiana County Port Authority in Wellsville, Ohio for construction of a cargo handling system;

409. $270,000 to the National First Ladies Library Non-Profit Group for facilities construction for the Women's History Museum in Canton, Ohio;

410. $300,000 to Where Toledo Grows/Greenhouse Row in Toledo, Ohio for construction of a welcome center;

411. $450,000 to the Johnny Appleseed Heritage Center, Inc. in Ashland County, Ohio for construction of facilities;

412. $450,000 to the University of Cincinnati for renovation of the Medical Sciences Building in Cincinnati, Ohio;

413. $500,000 for Fayette County Community Action Council, in Fayette County, Ohio to construct a new community center and Head Start facility;

414. $630,000 for facilities construction for an agro-security research center at the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center in Wooster, Ohio;

415. $1,000,000 to the Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority in Toledo, Ohio for facilities construction and renovation at the Toledo Shipyard;

416. $270,000 for the Lawton, Oklahoma Public Schools for the restoration of the historic Lawton High School;

417. $270,000 to the New Cordell Utility Authority of New Cordell, Oklahoma for renovation of commercial buildings;

418. $315,000 to Rural Enterprises, Inc. in Durant, Oklahoma for facilities renovation;

419. $810,000 to the Oklahoma City Maintenance Repair and Overhaul Technology Center for facilities construction;

420. $75,000 to the Oregon Food Bank in Portland, Oregon for facilities expansion;

421. $100,000 to the City of Portland, Oregon for planning activities for the Central City Streetcar Extension to the North Macadam District;

422. $180,000 for the renovation of the Tower Theatre in Bend, Oregon;

423. $200,000 to the Douglas County, Oregon for construction of a community recreation pavilion at the Marina RV Resort;

424. $50,000 to the Claysburg Area Community Park for construction and buildout of an amphitheater in Claysburg, Pennsylvania;

425. $50,000 to the Susquehanna Neighborhood Advisory Council in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for a feasibility study focused on Susquehanna Avenue development;

426. $75,000 to the LaRosa Boys & Girls Club of McKeesport, Pennsylvania for recreation facility construction;

427. $75,000 to the Phoenix Project in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for facility renovations;

428. $75,000 to the Sarah Jackson Black Community Center in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania for facilities renovations;

429. $75,000 to the Soldiers' & Sailors' Memorial Hall and Museum Trust in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania for facilities renovations and improvements;

430. $75,000 to the Swissvale Borough Code Enforcement Project in Pennsylvania for facility renovations and upgrades;

431. $75,000 to the Vine Memorial and Community Development Corporation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for construction of a community development center;

432. $75,000 to the YMCA of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania for facilities renovation at the East Community Branch;

433. $90,000 for the Planning Commission for Bucks County, Pennsylvania for the Penndel Economic Revitalization study;

434. $90,000 to Milford Township, Pennsylvania for development of a managed growth plan;

435. $90,000 to the Bucks County Planning Commission for economic development planning for the Lower Bucks Riverfront Corridor Initiative in Bucks County, Pennsylvania;

436. $90,000 to the Lawrence County Farm Show, Inc. for facilities construction in Lawrence County, Pennsylvania;

437. $100,000 to Connection Training Services of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for renovation and construction of their workforce training center;

438. $100,000 to the Renaissance Community Development Corporation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for construction of a shopping center in an underserved community;

439. $100,000 to the Youth Leadership Foundation of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for a facilities needs study;

440. $100,000 to Universal Companies in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for facility renovations in support of Royal Theater Redevelopment;

441. $115,000 for facilities construction and expansion of the Johnsonburg Senior Center of Johnsonburg, Pennsylvania;

442. $135,000 for facilities reconstruction and renovation of the Strand Theatre in Zelienople, Pennsylvania to serve as a Performing Arts, Education and Community Outreach Center;

443. $135,000 to the Bedford County Agricultural Society in Pennsylvania for facilities improvements at the Bedford County Fairground;

444. $150,000 to CitiVest in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania for facilities construction for commercial development;

445. $150,000 to Montgomery County, Pennsylvania for construction of a visitors center;

446. $100,000 for the Titusville Redevelopment Authority of Titusville, Pennsylvania for facility improvements;

447. $180,000 to the Volunteers of America of Pennsylvania, Inc. for facilities renovation in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania;

448. $200,000 to the Urban Education Development Research and Retreat Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for renovations at the 4601 Market Street facility;

449. $225,000 to the City of Lebanon, Pennsylvania for building renovations as part of "Operation Fight Blight";

450. $225,000 to the Historic Preservation Trust of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania for rehabilitation of facilities at the Thaddeus Stevens and Lydia Hamilton Smith historic site;

451. $225,000 to the Windber Research Institute in Johnstown, Pennsylvania for facilities expansion;

452. $225,000 to the York Agricultural Society for facilities improvements to the York Expo Center Arena/Livestock Exhibition Hall;

453. $250,000 to Fort Ligonier in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania for facilities renovation;

454. $250,000 to the Freedom Theater in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for theater renovation;

455. $250,000 to the Kiski Valley YMCA in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania for facilities expansion;

456. $250,000 to the Uptown Entertainment and Development Corporation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for renovation of an education technology center;

457. $250,000 to the Vandergrift Borough Council in Pennsylvania for recreation facilities upgrades and repairs;

458. $270,000 to the Community Action Agency of Delaware County, Inc. in Pennsylvania for renovation of emergency shelter facilities and for construction of transitional housing;

459. $270,000 to University Technology Park in Chester, Pennsylvania for facilities construction;

460. $300,000 for the Please Touch Museum in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for facilities construction;

461. $315,000 to Pike County, Pennsylvania for construction of a performing arts center;

462. $300,000 to the City of Arnold, Pennsylvania for building renovation and rehabilitation in the downtown business district;

463. $450,000 to the City of Erie, Pennsylvania for facilities construction for the Erie Technology Incubator project;

464. $500,000 to the Winnie Palmer Nature Reserve in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania for facilities construction;

465. $1,000,000 to the County of Cambria, Pennsylvania for continued construction of the Northern Cambria Recreation Facility in the Township of Cambria;

466. $1,300,000 to the American Cities Foundation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for construction of the Home Ownership Institute/Community Leadership Center;

467. $100,000 to Providence Children's Museum, Rhode Island for facilities construction;

468. $100,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Warwick, Rhode Island for construction and renovations of the Norwood and Oakland Beach Clubhouses;

469. $125,000 to the YMCA of Central Falls, Rhode Island for modernization and upgrade of a facility;

470. $150,000 to Goodwill Industries of Rhode Island for construction of a central facility located in Providence, Rhode Island;

471. $100,000 to the City of Columbia, South Carolina for facilities renovation at Drew Park;

472. $200,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Williamsburg County, South Carolina for construction related to facilities expansion;

473. $225,000 to the Housing Foundation, Inc. of Charleston County, South Carolina for construction of the Lincolnville Community Center;

474. $300,000 to the City of Rock Hill, South Carolina for a feasibility study ($100,000) and facilities renovations ($200,000) for the redevelopment of the Bleachery textile mill;

475. $315,000 to the South Carolina School for the Deaf and Blind in Spartanburg, South Carolina for facilities construction;

476. $75,000 to the City of Etowah, Tennessee/ Friends of the Old Scout Lodge for facilities rehabilitation of a historic structure;

477. $90,000 for the City of Chattanooga, Tennessee for economic development planning;

478. $90,000 for the City of Oak Ridge, Tennessee for economic development planning;

479. $90,000 to Pickett County, Tennessee for construction of a public library;

480. $90,000 to White County, Tennessee for construction of a new public library;

481. $100,000 to Dyersburg Army Air Base Memorial Association in Halls, Tennessee for facilities expansion of the association's veterans museum;

482. $135,000 to the National Medal of Honor Museum of Military History Foundation, Inc. for facilities renovation and construction in Chattanooga, Tennessee;

483. $200,000 to Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee for facilities construction;

484. $200,000 to the Second Harvest Food Bank in Middle Tennessee for facilities construction;

485. $225,000 to the Town of Spring City, Tennessee for construction of a multi-purpose business and community center;

486. $283,500 to Knox County, Tennessee for renovations and construction of parking facilities;

487. $450,000 to the Historical Tennessee Theatre Foundation, Inc. for continued renovations of the Tennessee Theatre in Knoxville, Tennessee;

488. $100,000 to Community Family Centers in Houston, Texas for construction of an early childhood development center;

489. $100,000 to the City of San Angelo Development Corporation in Texas for planning for a regional industrial park;

490. $150,000 to the Abilene Preservation League in Abilene, Texas for the restoration of historic Swenson House;

491. $150,000 to the City of Abilene, Texas for renovation of the Matera Paper Building;

492. $150,000 to the Sulpher Springs Regional Development Association in Hopkins County, Texas for construction of a regional education and cultural center;

493. $225,000 for Texas A&M International University in Laredo, Texas for construction of outreach centers in the El Azteca neighborhood and the colonias of El Cenzio and Rio Bravo;

494. $225,000 to Community Health Development, Inc. of Uvalde, Texas for facilities expansion and construction for a dental services and wellness center;

495. $225,000 to the Battleship Texas Foundation for construction of an interpretive center;

496. $250,000 to Cameron County, Texas for construction of a Boys and Girls Club facility in Santa Rosa;

497. $250,000 to the City of Fort Worth, Texas for building restoration in the city center;

498. $400,000 to the City of Waco, Texas for construction of a community center;

499. $450,000 to the Family Practice Residency of the Brazos Valley in Bryan, Texas for construction of a new center of excellence;

500. $450,000 to the Mercy Health System for facilities renovations and improvements at Mercy Hospital in Laredo, Texas;

501. $450,000 to the University of Texas at Arlington for the continued facilities construction and buildout for the Nano-Tech Research Institute;

502. $675,000 to the Old Red Courthouse Museum in Dallas, Texas for the restoration of facilities for the Museum of Dallas History;

503. $900,000 to the City of Fort Worth, Texas for waterfront facilities construction for the Trinity River Visions project;

504. $900,000 to the Globe of the Great Southwest in Odessa, Texas for facilities expansion and improvements;

505. $200,000 to the Community Legal Center in Salt Lake City, Utah for facility renovation;

506. $225,000 to West Valley City, Utah for construction of a City's Multi-Ethnic Community Center;

507. $25,000 to the Langhorne House in Danville, Virginia for facilities renovations;

508. $25,000 to the Prestwould House near Clarksville, Virginia to assist with renovations to the historic site;

509. $50,000 for the Town of Boydton, Virginia for facilities improvements in connection with the downtown revitalization project;

510. $100,000 for Henry County, Virginia for facility renovations at the Henry County technology campus;

511. $100,000 for the City of Martinsville, Virginia for the planning for the utilization of an industrial site;

512. $100,000 for the Town of Altavista, Virginia to assist with renovations of the shell building industrial site;

513. $100,000 for the Town of Clarksville, Virginia to assist with the study on the development of the downtown area;

514. $100,000 to Arlington County, Virginia for renovation and buildout for the Bonder and Amanda Johnson Community Development Corporation facility;

515. $100,000 to the Martinsville-Henry County Historical Society in Virginia for improvements to the Old Henry County Court House and Museum;

516. $175,000 to the Arlington Partnership for Affordable Housing (APAH) in Arlington, Virginia for facilities construction for a computer technology information center;

517. $180,000 to Eastern Shore Community College for construction of the Eastern Shore Workforce Training and Business Development Center in Melfa, Virginia;

518. $200,000 for the Town of South Hill, Virginia for the restoration of the Colonial Theatre;

519. $200,000 to the Arlington Housing Corporation in Arlington, Virginia for construction of a community center in the Woodbury Park development;

520. $200,000 to the Institute of Advanced Learning and Research (IALR) in Danville, Virginia for installation and improvements to high technology systems;

521. $200,000 to the Rich Valley Fair Association in Virginia for construction of a new facility to jointly serve as a community center and indoor space for the community fair;

522. $225,000 to Mary Baldwin College in Staunton, Virginia for ongoing construction of the Program for the Exceptionally Gifted Center;

523. $100,000 to the City of Manassas, Virginia for restoration of the Liberia House;

524. $225,000 to the City of Suffolk, Virginia for the renovation and restoration of the old Suffolk High School for use as a cultural center;

525. $225,000 to the Lynchburg Academy of Music in Lynchburg, Virginia for facilities construction and renovation;

526. $200,000 to the Shenandoah Valley Discovery Museum, Inc. for facilities expansion and buildout;

527. $200,000 to the Town of Edinburg, Virginia for the renovation and adaptive reuse of the Historic Edinburg Mill;

528. $225,000 to the Tredegar National Civil War Center Foundation of Richmond, Virginia for facilities construction;

529. $240,000 to the Virginia Living Museum in Newport News, Virginia for construction and renovaiton of facilities;

530. $250,000 to Edgehill Recovery Retreat Center in Winchester, Virginia for facilities construction;

531. $450,000 to the Virginia Science Center for construction of the Belmont Bay Science Center in Prince William County, Virginia;

532. $500,000 to the St. Coletta School in Alexandria, Virginia for facilities construction;

533. $100,000 to the Department of Vermont, Veterans of Foreign Wars for the construction of the Green Block Veterans Memorial in Brandon, Vermont and the Windsor, Vermont War Memorial;

534. $75,000 to the Aberdeen Museum of History in Aberdeen, Washington for facility renovations;

535. $75,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of the Olympic Peninsula for restoration of their Mt. Angeles, Washington facility;

536. $75,000 to the Jefferson County Historical Society in Jefferson County, Washington for building restoration;

537. $75,000 to the Kitsap County Historical Society in Kitsap County, Washington for facility renovations;

538. $100,000 to Friends of Youth Griffin Home in Renton, Washington for renovation of the Matsen House as a home for abused children;

539. $100,000 to the City of Mount Vernon, Washington for renovations to the historic Lincoln Theater;

540. $100,000 to the Lummi Indian Nation in Watcom County, Washington for the construction of a memorial commemorating Semiahmah and Coastal Salish heritage;

541. $225,000 to the City of Buckley, Washington for construction of the Buckley Youth Center;

542. $250,000 to the Port of Bremerton, Washington for facilities construction related to expansion of a marina;

543. $250,000 to the Port of Grays Harbor, Washington for facilities construction and buildout for a boat yard;

544. $450,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Spokane County, Washington for renovation of facilities;

545. $550,000 to Kent Youth and Family Services of Kent, Washington for construction of the Building Better Futures Family Center;

546. $100,000 to the City of Stoughton, Wisconsin for sidewalk, street lighting and furniture, and building renovations;

547. $150,000 to the City of Columbus, Wisconsin for sidewalk, street lighting and furniture, and building renovations;

548. $150,000 to the Milwaukee Center for Independence in Milwaukee, Wisconsin for construction of a Children's Diagnostic Center;

549. $225,000 to St. Norbert College of DePere, Wisconsin for construction of a library learning center;

550. $250,000 to the Metcalfe Park Residents Association in Milwaukee, Wisconsin for sidewalk, street lighting and furniture, and building renovations;

551. $700,000 to the Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College in Rice Lake, Wisconsin for construction and expansion of facilities at its new technology center;

552. $100,000 to Marshall University's Appalachian Transportation Institute for a study of economic development opportunities in southern West Virginia to support the Southern Highlands Initiative;

553. $100,000 to Marshall University's Appalachian Transportation Institute for economic development planning related to recent flooding;

554. $135,000 for the Kanawha Institute for Social Research and Action for facilities renovation for a business incubator and community center in Kanawha County, West Virginia;

555. $180,000 to the Upper Kanawha Valley Enterprise Community for facilities renovation for a business and community center;

556. $500,000 to the Greenbrier Valley Economic Development Authority for facilities construction in cooperation with the 4–County Economic Development Authority located in Oak Hill, West Virginia focused on development along the Interstate 64 corridor;

557. $500,000 to West Liberty State College in West Liberty, West Virginia for facility renovation;

558. $800,000 to the Grant County Commission in West Virginia for construction of a community center;

559. $1,000,000 to Glenville State College in Glenville, West Virginia for construction of a campus community center;

560. $1,170,000 to the Mid-Atlantic Aerospace Complex, Inc. in Bridgeport, West Virginia for facilities construction;

561. $1,250,000 to Concord College in Athens, West Virginia for facilities construction for an information technology training center;

562. $1,300,000 to the West Virginia High Technology Consortium Foundation, Inc. in Marion County, West Virginia for facilities construction for a high-tech park;

563. $1,750,000 to the Monongalia County Schools Foundation, Inc. in West Virginia for construction of recreational facilities;

564. $100,000 to Arkansas State University-Mountain Home for the construction of the Vada Sheid Community Center;

565. $100,000 to Sacred Heart University in Fairfield, Connecticut for library facilities renovations;

566. $100,000 to the Chicago, Illinois Parks District for construction of a fieldhouse located at 39th and Cottage Grove;

567. $175,000 to the City of Laurel, Maryland for facilities renovations for the Laurel Community Center;

568. $100,000 to the Sonny Montgomery Leadership Institute of Meridian, Mississippi for an economic development planning study;

569. $75,000 to Merwin Rural Services Institute for an initial planning study in northern New York;

570. $100,000 to the Village of Carthage, New York for facilities construction and building renovations;

571. $75,000 to the City of Ogdensburg, New York for facilities construction for the continued development of the Fort La Presentation project;

572. $75,000 to the Village of Clayton, New York for waterfront facilities renovations along the St. Lawrence River;

573. $200,000 to the Mary Mitchell Family and Youth Center in the South Bronx, New York for facilities planning ($100,000) and renovations ($100,000);

574. $50,000 to the Institute for the Puerto Rican/Hispanic Elderly in New York for facilities renovations;

575. $100,000 to the Jane Stevens Foundation Center in Sanford, North Carolina for facility renovations;

576. $100,000 to the City of Whiteville, North Carolina for the restoration of the Whiteville Train Depot;

577. $100,000 to the City of Toledo, Ohio for site re-use planning at the former Doehler Jarvis manufacturing facility and the site of the former Toledo Federal Building;

578. $150,000 to the Borough of Orwigsburg, Pennsylvania for sidewalks curbs and street lighting;

579. $150,000 to the City of Pottsville, Pennsylvania for sidewalks, curbs and street lighting;

580. $100,000 to the Oil Creek Railway Historical Society, Inc. of Pennsylvania for facilities renovations;

581. $300,000 to the City of New Kensington, Pennsylvania for building renovation and rehabilitation in the downtown business district;

582. $100,000 to the City of Austin, Texas Neighborhood Housing and Community Development Office for sidewalks, curbs, street lighting and facade renovations;

583. $150,000 to Texas A&M University Center for Housing and Urban Development for construction of a community center serving colonias;

584. $175,000 to New Hope Housing in Alexandria, Virginia for renovation of the Mondloch House and construction at the Kennedy Shelter;

585. $100,000 to the Northeastern Vermont Development Corporation for construction of a community center in Orleans County;

586. $75,000 for Loudon Interfaith Relief, Inc. of Virginia for planning activities for development of a community kitchen;

587. $200,000 to Vanguard Services Unlimited of Arlington, Virginia for renovation and improvement of facilities;

588. $100,000 to Bread and Rose in Olympia, Washington for renovations to a homeless shelter;

589. $75,000 to Norris City Senior Center in White County, Illinois for renovation of the senior center;

590. $100,000 to the Vienna Little League in Vienna, Virginia for facilities construction;

591. $150,000 to the Lorton Arts Foundation in Lorton, Virginia for the renovation of buildings for a creative arts center.

—$23,400,000 for the Neighborhood Initiatives program. Targeted grants shall be provided as follows:

1. $1,400,000 to the Model City Community Revitalization District Trust in Miami, Florida for the Model City Homeownership project;

2. $250,000 to the New Zion Community Foundation Development for continued renovations and improvements for a community resource center in Louisville, Kentucky;

3. $100,000 for The Neighborhood House in Louisville, Kentucky to furnish the community center;

4. $150,000 for the Portland Avenue Community Trust in Louisville, Kentucky for a multi-purpose facility;

5. $250,000 to the St. Stephen Family Life Center of Louisville, Kentucky for renovation of a facility for drug abuse counseling and transitional housing;

6. $150,000 to the New Directions Housing Corporation in Louisville, Kentucky for renovation of the historic Reeser Court Apartments;

7. $150,000 to the Shawnee Gardens Development Corporation of Louisville, Kentucky for the conversion of a building to serve as an independent living senior housing facility;

8. $120,000 to the West Broadway Community Development Corporation in Louisville, Kentucky for development of a multi-purpose facility;

9. $30,000 to the Coalition for the Homeless of Louisville/Jefferson County, Kentucky for a planning grant;

10. $5,000,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for the Neighborhood Initiative Program;

11. $500,000 to The Ohio State University for its Neighborhoods Revitalization Initiative;

12. $8,000,000 for the State of South Dakota to maintain the physical integrity of the Homestake Mine in preparation for the potential development of a major research facility on that site;

13. $1,100,000 to the Northwest Regional Planning Commission in Spooner, Wisconsin for a revolving loan fund to assist tornado-damaged areas in northwestern Wisconsin;

14. $3,000,000 for the Institute for Scientific Research for construction related to a high-technology diversification initiative;

15. $3,000,000 for the Vandalia Heritage Foundation, Inc. for community and neighborhood revitalization and economic diversification initiatives;

16. $200,000 to Langlade County, Wisconsin for the restoration of a historic building.

Additionally, not less than $3,400,000 is provided to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund to support the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under Community Planning and Development.

The recommendation does not include $16,000,000 for the Administration's proposed Colonias Gateway Initiative as this initiative is not currently authorized and the Department has not yet transmitted its proposal to the Congress for consideration.

Requested language is not included to change the current statutory formula for CDBG formula grants for certain communities.

The Committee directs HUD to provide assistance to State and local jurisdictions on how to reach out to people with disabilities and their advocates when developing their consolidated plans. The Committee again directs HUD to evaluate consolidated plan submissions for the inclusion of the housing needs of people with disabilities and the community's efforts to remove impediments to fair housing for individuals with disabilities. HUD is directed to provide a report to the Committee on the results of this evaluation no later than 30 days after completion of its review of these submissions.

Language is included in the bill, similar to language carried in prior Acts, which: (1) designates amounts available for the various programs and activities funded under this account; (2) limits administrative expenses to no more than 20 percent of any grant with certain exceptions; and (3) provides three-year availability for obligation of funds provided under this heading.

Language is also included which makes technical changes to the recipients of grants provided in Public Laws 106–377 and 107–73.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program costs	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$7,325,000	$275,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	15,000,000	608,696,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	7,325,000	275,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−7,675,000	−333,696,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0	0

The Section 108 Loan Guarantees program underwrites private market loans to assist local communities in the financing of the acquisition and rehabilitation of publicly-owned real property, rehabilitation of housing, and certain economic development projects.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,325,000 for the section 108 loan program, as requested, a decrease of $7,675,000 from the fiscal year 2002 level. Of this amount,

$6,325,000 is provided for the costs to guarantee $275,000,000 in section 108 loan commitments in fiscal year 2003, and $1,000,000 is provided for administrative expenses to be transferred to the Salaries and Expenses account. While the recommendation represents a reduction from the current year appropriation, the Committee notes that this program continues to be significantly underutilized. The recommendation reflects a realistic estimate of anticipated program demand in fiscal year 2003.

Language is included in the bill to provide two-year availability for obligation of funds provided under this account.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$25,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	25,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	25,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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 $25,000,000 for this program as requested, the same amount provided in fiscal year 2002. The recommendation retains language, proposed for deletion, to continue funding the program under current statutory authorities.

Language is included in the bill to provide two-year availability for funds provided under this account.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$2,221,040,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	1,846,040,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	2,084,100,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+375,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+136,940,000

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 $2,221,040,000 for activities funded under this account, an increase of $375,000,000 above the fiscal year 2002 level and $136,940,000 above the request. Funds are provided as follows:

—*Formula Grants:* $1,975,940,000 for formula grants for participating jurisdictions (States, units of local government and consortia of units local government) and insular areas, a $227,152,000 increase—13 percent—above the fiscal year 2002

enacted level and $104,668,000 above the request. Based on historical usage, the Committee estimates that 36 percent of funds will be used for new construction, 47 percent for rehabilitation, 14 percent for acquisition, and 3 percent for tenant-based rental assistance. Of the amount provided, pursuant to the statute, at least 15 percent of each participating jurisdiction's allocation is reserved for housing which is developed, sponsored, or owned by Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) The Committee believes that technical assistance is an important tool for helping local CHDOs respond to local affordable housing needs. While the HOME statute authorizes technical assistance to be provided through contracts with eligible non-profit intermediaries as well as with other organizations recommended by participating jurisdictions, the Committee is concerned that HUD did not utilize non-profit intermediaries in fiscal year 2002. Therefore, the Committee has provided an additional $8,000,000 above the budget request and directs the Secretary to use these additional funds to contract with qualified non-profit intermediaries to provide CHDO technical assistance in fisacl year 2003;

—*Downpayment Assistance Initiative:* $200,000,000 for the Downpayment Assistance Initiative to be allocated by the Secretary to participating jurisdictions to provide downpayment assistance to low-income families to help them achieve homeownership;

—*Housing Counseling:* $25,000,000 for housing counseling programs, an increase of $5,000,000 above the fiscal year 2002 level. The Committee has continued funding for this activity within this account, instead of creating a separate account as proposed in the budget request;

—*HOME/CHDO Technical Assistance:* $20,000,000 for technical assistance activities for State and local participating jurisdictions and non-profit CHDOs, an increase of $8,000,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2002;

—*Working Capital Fund:* no less than $1,100,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund to support the development of, and modifications to, information technology systems which serve programs and activities under Community Planning and Development.

The Committee understands that a recent survey conducted by the Manufactured Housing Institute found that many participating jurisdictions were not aware of the fact that manufactured housing is an eligible activity under the HOME statute. The Committee is aware that HUD's guidance to field offices regarding the eligibility of manufactured housing under the HOME statute expired in 1995. The Committee directs HUD to update and re-issue its guidance and notify participating jurisdictions of this guidance in order to remove any ambiguity or confusion regarding manufactured housing's eligibility under the HOME statute. The Committee expects that such guidance will include any downpayment assistance activities funded under this account.

Language is included in the bill to provide two-year availability for funds provided under this account.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$1,250,00,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	1,122,525,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	1,129,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+127,475,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

The homeless assistance grants account provides funding for the following 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 $1,250,000,000, as requested, an increase of $127,475,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2002. The increase above the request includes full funding for the costs associated with the renewal of all expiring Shelter Plus Care contracts. Language is included in the bill requiring funds to be made available for this purpose.

The recommendation also includes $11,000,000 for the national homeless data analysis project, $6,600,000 for technical assistance, and $1,500,000 for the Interagency Council on the Homeless for administrative costs, and no less than $1,500,000 is for transfer to the Working Capital Fund for development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve activities under Community Planning and Development.

In addition, the recommendation includes $10,000,000 to be used for a two-year demonstration program to test innovate approaches and document best practices to address the needs of the homeless, with particular emphasis on programs which address the housing needs of individuals suffering from the co-morbidity of mental disorders and substance addiction. The Committee intends that funds provided in this account would be used to fund the housing component of a comprehensive approach to addressing the needs to this population, with funding for the necessary social services and treatment components to be derived from other Federal departments and programs. Language is included requiring this demonstration to be conducted in consultation with, and full involvement of, the Interagency Council on the Homeless. The Committee commends the Interagency Council for its commitment to improving the coordination and delivery of assistance to individual and families suffering from homelessness and looks forward to working with the Council on homeless issues. The Department is directed to provide quarterly reports to the Committee on the progress of the programs funded. In addition, at the conclusion of the demonstration, the Department is to provide a final report to the Committee summarizing the best practices learned from the various approaches used by programs funded through the demonstration, and recommendations for integrating these best practices within the existing homeless delivery system.

Language is included in the bill which: (1) requires not less than 30 percent of the funds appropriated, excluding amounts made

available for renewals under the shelter plus care program, be used for permanent housing; (2) requires the renewal of all expiring shelter plus care contracts; (3) requires funding recipients to provide a 25 percent match for social services activities; (4) requires all homeless programs to coordinate their programs with mainstream health, social services and employment programs; and (5) provides two-year availability for obligation of funds provided under this account.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$1,100,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	1,024,151,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	1,024,151,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+75,849,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+75,849,000

The Housing for Special Populations program provides eligible private, non-profit organizations with capital grants 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.

The Committee recommends $1,100,000,000 for the Housing for special populations program account, an increase of $75,849,000 above the request and above the level provided in fiscal year 2002. The Committee recommendation also assumes $9,650,000 in recaptures and cancellations will be available to support a total program level of $1,109,650,000 in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $85,449,000 above the fiscal year 2002 level.

The Committee recommendation includes $850,553,000 for section 202 housing, of which $840,903,000 is provided as a direct appropriation and $9,650,000 is derived from recaptures. This represents an increase of $67,267,000 above the request and above fiscal year 2002 level. Of the total amount provided for section 202, $704,656,000 is for capital grants and project rental assistance contracts (PRAC), $50,000,000 is for service coordinators and the continuation of congregate services grants, $30,000,000 is for the section 202 conversion grants, $50,000,000 is for a planning grant program, $15,647,000 is for the renewal of expiring project rental assistance contracts for up to a one-year term, and no less than $250,000 is for transfer to the Working Capital Fund to support the development of and modifications to information technology systems which support Housing for Special Populations activities.

The Committee recommendation does not include new language, requested in the budget, allowing funds provided in this account to remain available for expenditure for 12 years. While the Committee is aware that grants awarded under the section 202 program include 5 years of years of operating expenses, the Committee believes that 7 years to complete construction is unduly long. As a result of this delay, $1,800,000,000 in construction funds provided prior to fiscal year 2002 remains unexpended, including $364,000,000 appropriated prior to fiscal year 1999. At the same time, the demand for units built under the program continues to

rise. While the Committee appreciates the complexities involved in building housing, the Committee believes the current structure of the program should be re-evaluated to ensure that those projects funded under this account are brought on line in a more expeditious fashion. The Committee believes that restructuring the program in a fashion similar to other Federally-funded construction programs whereby grants for planning and design, construction, and operations are provided for separately, based upon the readiness of the project, would result in improvements to the program.

The Committee believes that a transition to this type of structure must be explored. Therefore, the Committee has included $50,000,000 to be competitively awarded for grants to non-profit organizations only to be used to cover the costs of architectural engineering work, site control, and other planning activities related to the development of supportive housing for the elderly under the Section 202 program. It is the Committee's intention that projects which successfully complete the necessary planning and development activities and achieved site control receive priority consideration under future capital grant awards.

Language is also included in the bill directing the Secretary to provide a report to the Committee no later than March 1, 2003 which includes actions taken, or planned to be taken, by the Department to accelerate the completion of projects under this program, and an implementation plan to restructure the program in a fashion which more closely resembles other Federally-funded construction programs.

For the section 811 disabled housing program, the Committee recommends $259,097,000, an increase of $18,232,000 above the fiscal year 2002 level and $8,232,000 above the request. The recommendation includes the following: $220,694,000 for capital grants, PRAC, and voucher activities, $32,157,000 for renewal costs of section 811 tenant-based rental assistance, $5,996,000 for expiring PRAC contracts for up to a one-year term, and no less than $250,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

The Committee continues to support 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. Construction of new housing units is necessary to ensure safe, accessible, affordable housing for persons with disabilities. Therefore, language is included in the bill providing that no more than 25 percent of the funds provided under this program be used for tenant-based rental assistance, thereby allowing 75 percent of the funds to be dedicated to the construction and maintenance of new housing units. In addition, the section 811 supportive housing program plays an important role in increasing the housing options for people with disabilities. However, the Committee is concerned that the application and review process for this program has become increasingly burdensome to the non-profit organizations providing these important services. Therefore, HUD is directed to review the section 811 handbook and modify the program procedures to simplify the application and review process.

Language is not included in the bill to authorize the Secretary to waive any statutory or regulatory requirements related to the section 202 and section 811 programs. While the Committee has

carried this waiver in the past, the Committee believes that any statutory or regulatory problems associated with these programs should be addressed through the appropriate legislative or regulatory processes.

HOUSING COUNSELING

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	[1] 0
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	[1] 0
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	$35,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	[1] 0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	[1] 0

[1] In fiscal year 2002, $20,000,000 was appropriated for housing counseling as a set-aside under the HOME Investments Partnership Program account.

Section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 authorized HUD to provide housing counseling services to homebuyers, homeowners, low and moderate income renters, and the homeless.

The Committee does not recommend the creation of a separate account for housing counseling activities, but instead has provided $25,000,000 for this activity as a set-aside within the HOME Investments Partnership Program account, an increase of $5,000,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2002.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	−$100,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	−100,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 authorized the section 236 Rental Housing Assistance Program to subsidize the monthly mortgage payment of an owner of a rental or cooperative project in order to reduce the rents for lower income tenants.

The Committee recommends a rescission of $100,000,000 from amounts appropriated in prior years which are in excess of amounts required to subsidize mortgages under section 236, as requested.

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 to support affordable housing projects.

The recommendation includes language, modified from the request, to allow surplus funds derived from rental collections which were in excess of allowable rents levels to be returned to project owners only for the purposes of rehabilitating and renovating those properties.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$13,000,000
Offsetting collections	−13,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	13,566,000
Offsetting collections	−13,566,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	13,000,000
Offsetting collections	−13,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−566,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

The National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, as amended by the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000, authorized the Secretary to establish Federal manufactured home construction and safety standards for the construction, design, and performance of manufactured homes. All manufactured homes are required to meet the Federal standards, and fees are charged to producers to cover the costs of administering the Act.

The Committee recommends $13,000,000 to support the manufactured housing standards programs to be derived from fees collected and deposited in the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund established pursuant to the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000. The amount recommended is a decrease of $566,000 below the fiscal year 2002 level.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of direct loans	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$50,000,000	$165,000,000,000	$347,829,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	250,000,000	165,000,000,000	336,700,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	50,000,000	160,000,000,000	347,829,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−200,000,000	0	+11,129,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0	+5,000,000,000	0

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

The Committee recommends the following limitations on loan commitments in the MMI program account as follows: $165,000,000,000 for loan guarantees and $50,000,000 for direct loans. The recommendation also includes $347,829,000 for administrative expenses, of which $343,807,000 is transferred to the Salaries and expenses account, and $4,022,000 is transferred to the Of-

fice of Inspector General. In addition, $85,720,000 is provided for administrative contract expenses, of which no less than $21,360,000 is transferred to the Working Capital Fund for development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under Housing Program or the Federal Housing Administration.

Language is continued, carried in previous years, appropriating additional administrative expenses in certain circumstances.

The Committee encourages the Department to consider the usefulness of automated collateral management systems as a means to detect predatory loans.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of direct loans	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses	Program costs
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$50,000,000	$23,000,000,000	$223,716,400	$15,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	50,000,000	23,000,000,000	216,100,000	15,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request ...	50,000,000	21,000,000,000	223,716,400	15,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0	0	+7,616	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0	+2,000,000,000	0	0

The FHA general and special risk insurance (GI and SRI) program account includes 17 different programs administered by the FHA. The GI fund includes a wide variety insurance programs for special purpose single and multi-family loans, 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, mortgages for experimental housing and for high-risk mortgagors who would not normally be eligible for mortgage insurance without housing counseling.

The Committee recommends the following limitations on loan commitments for the general and special risk insurance program account as requested: $23,000,000,000 for loan guarantees and $50,000,000 for direct loans, the same levels provided in fiscal year 2002.

As requested, the recommendation includes a $15,000,000 direct appropriation for credit subsidy. The Committee also expects that improved FHA management and oversight will enable all programs to operate in a financially sound manner.

The recommendation also includes $223,716,400 for administrative expenses, of which $204,395,400 is transferred to the Salaries and Expenses account and $19,321,000 is transferred to the Office of Inspector General. An additional $93,780,000 is provided for non-overhead administrative expenses, of which no less than $14,240,000 is transferred to the Working Capital Fund for development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve activities under Housing Programs or Federal Housing Administration.

Language is continued, carried in previous years, appropriating additional administrative expenses in certain circumstances.

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 2003 recommendation	$200,000,000,000	$10,343,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	200,000,000,000	9,383,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	200,000,000,000	10,343,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0	+960
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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.

The recommendation includes a $200,000,000,000 limitation on loan commitments for mortgage-backed securities as requested, the same level provided in fiscal year 2002. The Committee also recommends $10,343,000 for administrative expenses to be transferred to the Salaries and Expenses account, as requested, $960,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2002.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$47,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	50,250,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	47,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−3,250,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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 $47,000,000 for research and technology, as requested. Of this amount, $7,000,000 is provided for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) Initiative.

Language is included making funds available for obligation for two years.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$45,899,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	45,899,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	45,899,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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 fair housing statutes. 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 a total of $45,899,000 for this account, as requested. Of this amount, $25,649,000 is for FHAP and $20,250,000 is for FHIP, the same amounts provided in fiscal year 2002.

The Committee expects HUD to continue to provide quarterly reports on obligation and expenditure of these funds, delineated by each program and activity, with the first such report due no later than February 15, 2003.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$126,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	109,758,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	126,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+16,242,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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 $126,000,000 for this account as requested, an increase of $16,242,000 above the fiscal year 2002 level, as follows:

—$96,000,000 is for grants to State and local governments, and Native American tribes, for lead-based paint abatement activities in private low-income housing. This represents a $16,000,000 in-

crease above the fiscal year 2002 level for these activities as requested.

—$10,000,000 is for Operation LEAP (Lead Elimination Action Program), a new initiative requested in the budget to leverage private-sector resources to eliminate lead-based paint hazards in low-income housing. Operation LEAP funds will be allocated competitively to non-profit organizations and the private sector for activities which leverage additional funds for local lead hazard control programs.

—$10,000,000 is for technical assistance and support to State and local agencies and private property owners, a $242,000 increase over fiscal year 2002 as requested.

—$10,000,000 is for the Healthy Homes Initiative as requested. Healthy Homes funds are competitively awarded to State, local or county agencies, non-profit and community-based organizations, landlord organizations, parents' organizations, and environmental contractors, for research, standards development, and education and outreach activities related to housing-related environmental childhood diseases.

The recommendation does not include a separate set-aside for CLEAR Corps. The Committee notes that as part of the Consolidated Planning process, State and local governments are expected to partner with non-profit organizations to develop and implement their lead-based paint abatement plans. The Committee encourages local CLEAR Corps programs to partner with local governments to receive funding support as part of the locality's Consolidated Plan.

The Committee is aware of a proposal put forth by the Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning to create a Community Environmental Health Resource Center (CEHRC) to provide technical support, training, and education and outreach to community-based organizations to evaluate and control housing-related and community-wide health hazards. While the Committee has not included an earmark for this new organization, the Committee encourages HUD to evaluate a proposal from the Alliance and provide a grant if warranted.

Management and Administration
salaries and expenses
(including transfer of funds)

		By transfer						
	Appropriation	FHA funds	GNMA funds	CPD	Title VI	Indian housing	Native Hawaiian housing	Total
FY 2003 recommendation	$530,299,000	$548,202,000	$10,343,000	$1,000,000	$150,000	$200,000	$35,000	$1,090,229,000
FY 2002 appropriation	556,067,000	530,457,000	9,383,000	1,000,000	150,000	200,000	35,000	1,097,292,000
FY 2003 budget request	510,299,000	548,202,000	10,343,000	1,000,000	150,000	200,000	35,000	1,070,229,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−25,768,000	+17,745,000	+960,000	0	0	0	0	−7,063,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+20,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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 total funding of $1,090,229,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Department, a net decrease of $7,063,000 below the fiscal year 2002 appropriation. The recommendation reflects an $85,000,000 reduction due to the transfer of information technology funding previously provided for in this account to a new Working Capital Fund account in fiscal year 2003 as requested in the budget submission. Therefore, the recommendation represents a net increase of $77,937,000 above the comparable fiscal year 2002 level, of which $57,937,000 is for inflationary increases necessary to support 9,100 full-time equivalents, as requested, and $20,000,000 is available to the Chief Financial Officer only for activities to improve financial management and funds control in the Department.

Language is included in the bill setting forth the amounts provided for the various offices funded under this heading as follows:

Office of Housing	$294,154,000
Office of Public and Indian Housing	153,971,000
Office of Community Planning and Development	76,164,000
Office of Policy Development and Research	19,147,000
Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	59,973,000
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control	2,634,000
Government National Mortgage Association	7,233,000
Departmental Management	22,344,000
Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives	2,606,000
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	53,986,000
Office of the General Counsel	64,486,000
Office of Field Policy and Management	77,410,000
Office of Administration	241,761,000
Total, Management and Administration	1,070,299,000

The Department may reallocate funds between the amounts specified above for these offices in accordance with operating plan and/or reprogramming procedures. Amounts provided are consistent with the Department's budget submission, excluding amounts assumed contingent upon enactment of legislative changes to legacy retirement costs, updated to include the effects of the reorganization implemented during fiscal year 2002. Consistent with modifications to the original budget submission, the object classification distribution, which shall also serve as the basis for operating plan and reprogramming changes is as follows:

Personal Services—$860,693,000
Travel and Transportation of Persons—$25,508,000
Transportation of Things—$700,000
Rent, Communications and Utilities—$124,572,000
Printing and Reproduction—$4,644,000
Other Services—$77,807,000
Supplies and Materials—$4,932,000
Furniture and Equipment—$1,180,000
Indemnities—$194,000

Operating Plans/Reprogramming Requirements.—The Committee appreciates the need for management flexibility to allocate management and administrative resources or reorganize offices and programs to address changing requirements at the departments and agencies funded in the bill, including HUD. To provide such flexibility, while ensuring appropriate consultation and oversight, the departments and some agencies are required to submit operating plans and reprogramming letters for Committee approval. Guidance regarding operating plan and reprogramming requirements is described in greater detail at the beginning of this report. The Committee is concerned that HUD has not consistently adhered to these requirements and instead has reallocated resources among programs, projects and activities, reorganized offices and created new offices without prior notification and approval by the Committee. The Committee expects established procedures to be followed so that the Committee is kept informed of, and therefore is better able to respond to, changing requirements at the Department. Therefore, HUD is reminded that operating plans or reprogramming requirements apply to any reallocation of resources totaling more than $500,000 among any program, project or activity; any proposed creation or elimination of any program or office, regardless of the dollar amount involved; and any reorganization, regardless of the dollar amount involved. Object classification changes above $500,000 also are subject to operating plan or reprogramming requirements. Unless otherwise specified in this Act or the accompanying report, the approved level for any program, project, or activity is that amount detailed for that program, project, or activity in the Department's annual detailed budget justification document. These requirements apply to all funds provided to the Department. The Department is expected to make any necessary changes during fiscal year 2003 to its current procedures and systems to ensure that it is able to meet the necessary operating plan and reprogramming requirements applied to other agencies funded in the bill.

Funds Control/Financial Management.—For years, the Committee, the General Accounting Office, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) have raised concerns about the lack of adequate policies and procedures in place at the Department to ensure appropriate funds control and financial management, including its inability to identify and correct deficiencies in a timely manner in accordance with applicable statutes, regulations, and circulars. Every Federal department or agency has a responsibility to obligate and expend its funds in compliance with all statutes, regulations, and OMB circulars, including compliance with the Anti-Deficiency Act (ADA). The Committee expects each department and agency to have vigorous funds control and financial management policies and procedures in place so that it may meet its stewardship responsibilities. Further, the Committee expects each Department or agency to take all necessary corrective actions to expeditiously resolve any violation consistent with the law.

Last year, the Committee became aware that the Department was responsible for three violations of the ADA which occurred between 1998 and 2001, and became increasingly concerned over the Department's failure to make timely formal determination of such ADA violations as required by law. At the same time, OMB con-

cerns over HUD's funds control systems had become so severe that in November 2001, OMB warned the Department it would revoke the Department's authority to hold and distribute its funding unless HUD updated and strengthened its funds control systems. In response to these concerns, the Committee directed its Surveys and Investigations staff to review the Department's established procedures to investigate and enforce the ADA. This review found that the Department lacked adequate funds control policies and procedures with respect to oversight, checks and balances, automated systems, audits, and training.

Based on the findings, the Committee has included bill language and additional funding above the request to assist the Department's efforts to improve funds control and financial management systems. The Committee notes that the authority and responsibility to ensure compliance with the ADA and other appropriations laws and regulations rests with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO). Therefore, the Committee has included $21,000,000 and bill language to ensure that the OCFO has the tools it needs to fulfill this responsibility. Language is also included in the bill which vests the OCFO with the sole authority to investigate, determine, and report compliance with the ADA and all other appropriations laws; establishes an appropriations law division within the OCFO and transfers no less than four appropriations attorneys from the Office of General Counsel (OGC) to the OCFO for this new division; reaffirms well-established appropriations law related to the point of obligation of funds; requires the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) to establish control of and maintain adequate accounting systems as well as policies and procedures to investigate and determine potential and actual violations; requires the CFO to submit a revised departmental funds control handbook to the Committee; and requires the OCFO to determine that any official or employee of the Department designated as an allotment holder of funds has received appropriate training and has in place adequate funds control systems.

To ensure that the OCFO has the necessary resources to fulfill these responsibilities, the Committee recommends $21,000,000 for the OCFO to be used exclusively for funds control improvements including automated financial management systems improvements, additional training of departmental employees, establishment of a division of appropriations law within the OCFO, and ADA compliance audits of all departmental programs. Of this amount, $20,000,000 is provided as an increase above the request for this account, and $1,000,000 has been transferred from the OGC to the OCFO to reflect the personnel transfer included in the bill. To improve audit and compliance at the Department, the Committee directs the OCFO to contract for independent audit services by an entity with adequate ADA and appropriations law training, experience, and resources to conduct rotating ADA compliance audits of all Department programs, with each program audited no less than once every three years. All audit reports shall be directed to the Secretary, the CFO and the Budget Officer.

The Committee believes that funds control and financial management improvements are critical and looks forward to working with the Department toward this goal.

Budget Submission.—While the Committee appreciates the Department's efforts last year to improve the information included in

its annual Budget Justification, the Committee believes that further improvements are required. The Committee reiterates that object classification displays are supplements, not substitutes, for detailed displays which delineate prior year, current year, and requested funding levels for each program, project, or activity within each account. In addition, the Committee directs HUD to submit a detailed budget justification for the Management and Administration account which includes prior year, current year, and requested position, FTE, and funding levels for each program within each office, delineated by headquarters and field office components. The Committee expects HUD, in consultation with the Committee, to further revise its detailed budget justifications to address these concerns as part of its fiscal year 2004 budget submission.

Language is included in the bill, similar to language carried in prior Acts, which: (1) designates amounts provided from various accounts for salaries and expenses; (2) transfers no less than $85,000,000 to the Working Capital Fund; (3) limits the total number of GS–14 and GS–15 positions in the Department; and (4) requires submission of a staffing plan.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$276,300,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	[1] 0
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	$276,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	[1] +276,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

[1] Previously, funds were provided for by transfer from various HUD accounts.

The Working Capital Fund was established pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3535 to provide necessary capital for the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide information technology systems, and for the continuing operation of both Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems.

The Committee recommends $351,400,000 for the Working Capital Fund, a $300,000 increase over the fiscal year 2002 comparable level, of which $276,300,000 is provided as a separate account to support Department-wide information technology systems activities, as requested in the budget submission. An additional $75,100,000 is provided by transfer from the following accounts to support program-specific information technology systems, as requested in the budget submission:

Salaries and expenses—$10,500,000
FHA, Mutual mortgage insurance fund—$21,360,000
FHA, General and special risk insurance fund—$14,240,000
Community development fund—$3,400,000
HOME investment partnerships program—$1,100,000
Homeless assistance—$1,500,000
Public housing capital fund—$18,600,000
Native American Indian block grants—$600,000
Housing certificate fund—$3,000,000
Housing for special populations—$500,000
Office of Inspector General—$300,000

In prior years, all information technology system activities were provided for through transfers from the various accounts within the bill.

The Committee remains committed to improving HUD's information technology capacity. To a large extent, both HUD's and Congress' ability to oversee the effectiveness of HUD's programs is undermined due to the failure of HUD's information systems to provide the information necessary to assess program performance and ensure effective resource management. The Committee understands that information technology systems improvements are organizationally and technically challenging endeavors. Effective development and implementation of such improvements requires strong oversight by the Department, strong program management, early and thorough planning, user input, clearly defined systems objectives and requirements, and appropriate milestones. Absent a clearly defined framework and implementation plan, the Committee is concerned that such endeavors will be vulnerable to uncontrollable cost growth and mission failure. Based on these concerns, for the last two years the Department was directed to provide the Committee with a comprehensive multi-year information technology plan as part of its budget submissions. In addition, the fiscal year 2002 conference report directed HUD not to expend any of the funds on planning and development for a re-competition of its information technology platform and information technology support services platform—the HUD Information Technology Services (HITS) contract—until such a plan was provided. The Department did not deliver the required plan and despite the Committee's direction, the Department moved forward with the re-competition.

The Committee understands that the HITS contract is to be a performance-based, outcome-oriented contract which will provide the entire physical infrastructure and infrastructure support services to satisfy HUD's information processing requirements. The Committee questions how HUD can successfully select and manage a HITS contract that will fully meet the Department's long-term needs in a cost effective fashion when HUD still lacks a comprehensive five year information technology plan identifying the information technology needs to be supported by that contract. Therefore, language is included in the bill prohibiting any funds from being used to award a new HITS contract until 90 days after the Department submits a comprehensive five year information technology plan to the Committee which must include, but is not limited to, the following: (1) an inventory of all current HUD information technology systems and the operational status of each system; (2) a detailed documentation of user systems needs, as identified by the user community; (3) a detailed documentation of systems requirements and systems architecture which addresses the highest priority user needs; (4) a detailed procurement strategy which incorporates appropriate risk management and contract management strategies, including appropriate milestones and deliverables; (5) an evaluation of the ability of separate HUD systems to be integrated to maximize efficiencies; (6) a detailed plan identifying the strategy for integrating existing systems and systems upgrades into the HITS platform, including an identification of contractor responsibilities for systems integration and support; and (6) a complete development and deployment schedule for all planned HUD systems including detailed cost estimates for each system. The Committee directs HUD to consult with the Committee as it develops this plan. Further, the Committee encourages

the Department to use funds provided for the Working Capital Fund to contract with outside information technology experts as necessary to successfully develop this five year plan.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	FHA funds	Public housing	Total
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$73,341,000	$23,343,000	[1] 0	$96,684,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	66,555,000	22,343,000	[1] $5,000,000	93,898,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	74,341,000	[1] 23,343,000	[1] 0	−97,684,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+6,786,000	+1,000,000	[1] −5,000,000	+2,786,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−1,000,000	0	0	−1,000,000

[1] In fiscal year 2002, a transfer was provided to the Office of Inspector General from the Public Operating Subsidies account.

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 $96,684,000 for the Office of Inspector General as requested, an increase of $2,786,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2002. Of this amount, $23,343,000 is derived from transfers from FHA funds.

Language is included in the bill, similar to language carried in prior Acts, which: (1) designates amounts available to the Inspector General from other accounts; and (2) clarifies the authority of the Inspector General with respect to certain personnel issues.

CONSOLIDATED FEE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	−$8,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−6,700,000
FY 2003 budget request	−8,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−1,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

Section 7(j) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act establishes fees and charges from selected programs which are deposited in the fund to offset the costs of audits, inspections and other related expenses that may be incurred by the Department in monitoring these programs. These fees were misclassified as deposit funds in previous years, and have been reclassified as on-budget Federal funds.

The Committee recommends a rescission of $8,000,000 from the Fund, as requested, to partially offset the funding requirements of the Office of the Inspector General.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$30,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	27,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	30,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+3,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

The Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) was established in 1992 to regulate the financial safety and soundness of the two housing government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs)—the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac). The office was authorized in the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, which also provided 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 $30,000,000, an increase of $3,000,000 above fiscal year 2002 level and the same amount included in the budget request.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The bill contains a number of administrative provisions.

Section 201 relates to the division of financing adjustment factors, as requested.

Section 202 prohibits available funds from being used to investigate or prosecute lawful activities under the Fair Housing Act, which was proposed for deletion.

Section 203 continues language to correct an anomaly in the HOPWA formula that results in the loss of funds for certain States, however requested language to make this provision permanent is not included.

Section 204 extends a technical amendment included in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations Act relating to the allocation of HOPWA funds in the Philadelphia metropolitan area, as requested.

Section 205 authorizes the Secretary to waive certain requirements related to an assisted living pilot project, as requested.

Section 206 continues language, carried in previous years in title IV of the Act, requiring funds appropriated to be distributed on a competitive basis in accordance with the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989.

Section 207 continues language, carried in previous years in title IV of the Act, regarding the availability of funds subject to the Government Corporation Control Act and the Housing Act of 1950.

Section 208 continues language, carried in previous years in title IV of the Act, regarding allocation of funds in excess of the budget estimates.

Section 209 continues language, carried in previous years in title IV of the Act, regarding the expenditure of funds for corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

Section 210 continues language, carried in previous years in title IV of the Act, requiring submission of a spending plan for technical

assistance, training and management improvement activities prior to the expenditure of funds.

The Committee does not recommend four new administrative provisions requested in the budget.

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$35,246,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	35,466,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	30,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−220,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+4,846,000

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 $35,246,000 for fiscal year 2003 to administer, operate and maintain the Commission's monuments, cemeteries, and memorials throughout the world. The Committee is aware of the severe operational difficulties experienced by the Commission in France resulting from that country's adoption of a 35 hour work week and has therefore included $846,000 above the budget request for salaries and benefits of up to 20 additional ABMC employees. The Committee expects that these additional employees will be used on either a full or part-time basis to meet the manpower needs of any of the ABMC cemeteries or offices where a manpower shortage has or could potentially cause delays in necessary maintenance and operations.

The Committee has also included an additional $4,000,000 as a second installment towards the cost of planning and construction of a new visitor center at the Normandy American Cemetery in France. The cemetery averages nearly two million visitors per year, and the existing facilities are over 40 years old and inadequate to serve this large number of visitors. The new and expanded visitor center can provide a fuller array of interpretive services to put the D-Day landings and the following battles in Europe in perspective as one of the greatest military achievements of all time, albeit at a staggering price in American and Allied casualties. The battle at Normandy is universally recognized a pivotal moment in World War II and for determining the future course of European and

world history. As ABMC has begun initial planning of this project and may soon move to design and other pre-construction activities, the Committee withdraws its limitation of expenditures for non-construction related costs as noted in the 2002 appropriations legislation.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$6,500,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	7,850,000
Fiscal year 2002 budget request	7,850,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−1,350,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	−1,350,000

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

For fiscal year 2002, the Committee is recommending $6,500,000, a decrease of $1,350,000 from the level for fiscal year 2002.

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 $2,500,000 of the appropriated funds available for two fiscal years.

In the five years since the Board began operations, the Committee has received three independent reports identifying serious deficiencies in the management, control, and direction of the Board's activities. The Committee also finds that despite its past warnings against pursuing outreach and data activities before becoming fully operational, the Board has continued to engage in these activities from limited funds and has pursued these activities at the expense of overextending its technical staff.

Accordingly, the Committee directs that the Office of Prevention, Outreach and Policy proposed in the budget request is to be limited to no more than two positions and that the three additional positions proposed for this Office be transferred to the Office of Investigations and Safety Programs to fill the need for technical investigators. The Committee also expects that the Board vet future reorganizations of offices, programs, and activities with the Committee prior to the planned implementation of such reorganizations, consistent with the language at the front of this report. Additionally, the Committee directs that unobligated funds from fiscal year 2002, which are available through fiscal year 2003, be used first and foremost for hiring and developing technical staff. At the time of this Committee print, close to $1,400,000, or more than seventeen percent of the fiscal year 2002 appropriation, was unobligated and carried over from fiscal year 2002.

Additionally, the Committee directs that of the amounts approved in this appropriation, the Board must limit transfers of funds between object classifications to not more than $50,000 without prior notification of the Committees on Appropriations. Changes from the budget request in excess of $250,000 shall be subject to the normal Committee reprogramming guidelines as outlined at the beginning of this report. No changes may be made to

any expense as reflected in the budget justification, except as approved by the Committees on Appropriations, if it is construed by the Committee to be policy or change in policy. It is the intent of the Committee that all carryover funds for the Board, including recaptures and deobligations, are subject to the normal reprogramming requirements outlined above and at the beginning of this report. The Committee looks forward to working with the new leadership of the Board to correct continued management problems identified by GAO and the Inspector General for the Board.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$80,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	80,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	68,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+12,000,000

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 Fund will also be responsible for implementation of the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000, upon completion of appropriate rules and regulations by the Internal Revenue Service.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $80,000,000 for the program in fiscal year 2003. The recommendation is an increase of $12,000,000 to the budget request and the same as the fiscal year 2002 appropriation. The Committee recommendation includes bill language designating $2,000,000 for financial and technical assistance for Native American, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native communities.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$57,117,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	55,200,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	56,767,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+1,917,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+350,000

The Consumer Product Safety Act established the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), 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 $57,117,000 for fiscal year 2003, an increase of $1,917,000 over the fiscal year 2002 appropriation and $350,000 above the amount included in the budget request. The increase provided is for additional salary costs not provided for in the budget request.

The Committee has not included language requested as a General Provision in this bill to exempt CPSC litigation travel from the requirements of Section 401 of this Act. The Committee finds that there are sufficient opportunities to address changes to litigation travel needs through the Committee's normal reprogramming procedures.

The Committee is concerned that incidents related to hairdryers from a specific manufacturer may have increased since 1994. It is unclear to the Committee how these incidents compare with and what impact these have on national injury statistics. Accordingly, the Committee directs CPSC to provide a report detailing injuries related to specific hairdryers of concern and any actions taken in recalling defective products within this category. To the extent data is available to CPSC, the report shall include injury trend data, by manufacturer, since 1980. The Committee directs CPSC to provide this report by January 2003.

The Committee remains concerned about fire injuries related to children's sleepwear and the limits of data currently available as identified by GAO in its April 1999 report. The Committee emphasizes that it is important that CPSC continue with its efforts to reach out to other interested groups to improve its data collection efforts related to children's sleepwear injuries. The Committee therefore directs that CPSC provide an annual report to the Committee addressing outreach efforts made to interested groups to improve its data collection efforts, enforcement actions taken regarding the current children's sleepwear regulation, and updates on children's sleepwear related injuries, including the number of reported injuries and deaths.

The Committee is also concerned about whether small sample sizes of injuries, particularly burns related specifically to children's sleepwear, make it difficult for the CPSC to achieve the most accurate annual national injury estimates. The Committee therefore directs that CPSC provide a report to the Committee addressing improvements made in data collection since the GAO 1999 report and those still needed for developing the necessary measures to track trends in injuries related to children's sleepwear and to provide more accurate national estimates. The report should also identify the cost estimates for implementing the recommended changes. CPSC is directed to provide both reports to the Committee by April 2003.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$0
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	401,980,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	631,342,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−401,980,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−631,342,000

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 through 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 2003 budget request for program and administrative activities of the Corporation for National and Community Service is $631,342,000, which would have dramatically expanded the program and provided earmarked funds to the Points of Light Foundation and America's Promise. The Committee recommends eliminating Corporation in fiscal year 2003 and has provided authority for prior year funding to be used for the orderly termination of operations.

The Committee directs the Corporation to submit an operating plan within 90 days of enactment of this bill and abide by the reprogramming requirements outlined at the beginning of this report.

The Committee is not providing funds for the proposed Senior Service Initiative. The Corporation should instead propose streamlining and consolidating the already existing senior programs and encourage Americorp opportunities for retirees and young adults alike.

The Committee recommends funding for America's Promise should the Corporation be funded in the future. In addition, the Committee recommends funding for the U.S. Soccer Foundation for the National Soccer Program Development Initiative.

Should the Corporation's programs be reauthorized and funded in the future, the Committee believes that Corporation grants should be a catalyst for service organizations, but not a regular funding stream year after year. The Committee directs the Corporation to add as a part of its application process an element requiring all applicants to outline how the organization will successfully operate in the future without Corporation funding. The Committee directs the Corporation to include in the fiscal year 2003 operating plan the details of how this new requirement was integrated into the application process.

Further, the Committee is encouraged by the Corporation's goal to improve the accountability of its grantees. The Committee directs the Corporation to establish performance measures with each grantee. The Corporation shall require any grantee that does not achieve the established levels of performance on the measures, as determined by the Corporation, to submit to the Corporation for approval a plan of correction. If the grantee fails to achieve the established levels of performance, the Committee directs the Corporation to either reduce some portion or terminate the entire amount of assistance provided to the grantee consistent with established due process requirements.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$5,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	5,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	5,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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 2003, the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2002 funding level.

U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$14,326,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	13,221,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	14,612,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+1,105,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−286,000

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 $14,326,000 for the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $1,105,000 above the current year appropriation and $286,000 below the budget request.

The bill also identifies $1,045,000 of the funds provided to fully fund the pro bono representation program.

The Committee is not recommending funds for purchasing all public spaces in the parking garage of the private building that currently houses the Court. The Committee strongly urges the Court to continue working with the General Services Administration, the building owners, and the other tenants to come to an agreeable solution. If a solution is not agreed to, the Committee recommends the Court look for alternative Federal office space to meet its needs.

Department of Defense—Civil

Cemeterial Expenses, Army

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$32,445,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	22,537,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	24,445,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+9,908,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+8,000,000

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 2001, the remains of 289,494 persons were interred/inured in these cemeteries. There were 3,727 interments and 2,212 inurnments in fiscal year 2001. It is projected that there will be 3,925 interments and 2,700 inurnments in fiscal year 2003. In addition to its principal function as a national cemetery, Arlington is the site of approximately 3,100 nonfuneral ceremonies each year and has approximately 4,000,000 visitors annually.

The Committee recommends $32,445,000 for operations and maintenance of the Cemetery, an increase of $9,908,000 over the fiscal year 2002 funding level and $8,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee has provided an additional $6,000,000 over the budget request for much-needed repairs to the Memorial Amphitheater in fiscal year 2003.

The Committee has also provided an additional $2,000,000 over the budget request to accelerate phase II of the land utilization program for Arlington National Cemetery with respect to the development plan for section 90. There is a growing demand for burial space in Arlington National Cemetery. Funding for this project will accelerate the completion of a boundary wall that will provide space for an additional columbarium in that section.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$84,074,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	70,228,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	[1] 74,471,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+13,846,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+9,603,000

[1] Budget request does not include a proposed transfer of $1,603,000 from the National Cancer Institute.

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 2003 the Committee has recommended a funding level of $84,074,000, an increase of $9,603,000 above the budget request and an increase of $13,846,000 over the fiscal year 2002 level. The Committee's recommendation assumes inclusion of $1,603,000 proposed by the Administration to be transferred from the National Cancer Institute to NIEHS, but not included in the budget documents forwarded to the Congress. The budget request and the Committee's recommendation thus provide $48,936,000 for research and $27,138,000 for the worker training program.

In addition, the Committee has included $8,000,000 previously provided but not requested by the Administration as a contingent emergency in the fiscal 2002 supplemental appropriations legislation. These funds, which include $4,000,000 each for worker training and research programs, are intended to be used to undertake

and continue research and worker training programs related to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$88,688,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	78,235,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	77,388,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+10,453,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+11,300,000

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 2003, the Committee has recommended a funding level of $88,688,000, an increase of $10,453,000 above the fiscal year 2002 funding level and an increase of $11,300,000 above the budget request. The Committee's recommendation provides the budget request as well as an additional $11,300,000 provided by the Congress in the fiscal 2002 supplemental appropriations legislation but not requested as a contingent emergency by the Administration. Of this additional amount, $1,800,000 is to reimburse ATSDR for direct and indirect costs related to the events of September 11, 2001 which were not assumed in the fiscal year 2002 appropriation, and $9,500,000 is to be used to enhance the capacity of the States to respond to chemical terrorism events. As noted in the past, these and similar expenses are expected to be "one time only" costs of the Agency to assist the States and are not to become recurring costs in support of new State personnel.

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.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$8,204,465,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	8,078,813,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	7,620,513,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+125,652,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+583,952,000

The Environmental Protection Agency was created by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, which consolidated nine programs from five different agencies and departments. Major EPA programs include air and water quality, drinking water, hazardous waste, research, pesticides, radiation, toxic substances, enforcement and compliance assurance, pollution prevention, oil spills, Superfund, Brownfields, and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)

program. In addition, EPA provides Federal assistance for wastewater treatment, sewer overflow control, 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. Under existing statutory authority, the Agency may contribute to specific homeland security efforts and, additionally, may participate 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 (CERCLA), as amended.

Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2001 (amending CERCLA).

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 2003, the Committee has recommended a total program and support level of $8,204,532,000, an increase of $125,652,000 above last year's appropriated level and an increase of $583,952,000 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 Com-

mittee 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, as well as be notified, on a monthly basis, of all ongoing litigation, including any negotiations or discussions, planned or ongoing, regarding a consent decree between the Agency and any other entity.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation [1]	$714,578,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	698,089,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	670,008,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+16,489,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+44,570,000

[1] Total does not include transfer of $86,168,000 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 $714,578,000 for Science and Technology for fiscal year 2003, an increase of $16,489,000 above last year's spending level, and an increase of $44,570,000 above the budget request.

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

1. $2,500,000 for EPSCoR.
2. $4,000,000 for Water Environmental Research Foundation.
3. $5,000,000 for the American Water Works Association Research Foundation.
4. $2,500,000 for the National Decentralized Water Resource Capacity Development Project, in coordination with EPA, for continued training and research and development of the program.
5. $5,000,000 for the STAR Fellowship program. The Committee's recommendation restores this program, eliminated in the budget request, to more than 50% of its 2002 funding level.
6. $1,000,000 to the American Water Works Association as a one-time grant to assist AWWA in its drinking water security training activities.
7. $500,000 for the University of South Alabama, Center for Estuarine Research.
8. $500,000 for the city of San Bernardino, California/San Bernardino Valley Metropolitan Water District for the Lakes and Streams project.
9. $750,000 to the University of California, Riverside for continued research of advanced vehicle design, advanced transportation

systems, vehicle emissions, and atmospheric pollution at the CE–CERT facility.

10. $500,000 to the Monterey County, California Water Resources Association for planning activities for the Salinas Valley Water Project.

11. $2,000,000 for the International Center for Water Technology at California State University, Fresno.

12. $1,000,000 for the Central California Air Quality Study conducted by the Central California Air Quality Coalition.

13. $800,000 to Barry University for minority science training.

14. $1,000,000 to the University of Miami in Florida for the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science for continued research into coral reefs.

15. $300,000 to Florida International University to utilize nondestructive techniques to characterize and develop contamination strategies.

16. $250,000 for ongoing research and development of multipurpose sensors for detecting and analyzing environmental contaminants at Boise State University, the University of Idaho and the University of Utah.

17. $500,000 to the Illinois Waste Management and Research Center through the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign for implementation of a program to increase the adoption of innovative pollution prevention technologies by businesses.

18. $200,000 for the Geothermal Heat Pump Consortium.

19. $500,000 for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences in Ann Arbor, Michigan for assisting EPA in meeting the Strategic Goals Program in the metal finishing sector.

20. $500,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute for development and demonstration of environmental cleanup technologies.

21. $500,000 for the Great Lakes Hydrological Center of Excellence at Western Michigan University.

22. $200,000 to Montana State University Bozeman to develop a Water Center Drinking Water Assistance Program for Small Systems.

23. $250,000 to the Desert Research Institute for Clean Water Research of the Western Great Basin Rivers.

24. $7,650,000 for the Environmental Systems Center of Excellence at Syracuse University for research and technology transfer in the fields of indoor environmental quality and urban ecosystems sustainability.

25. $200,000 to the State University of New York, College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry for research and outreach at the Roosevelt Sustainability Center.

26. $500,000 to the Syracuse Research Corporation in Syracuse, New York, a not for profit corporation, for the continuation of environmental research at its Probability Risk Assessment Center.

27. $1,000,000 for the Integrated Petroleum Environmental Consortium.

28. $500,000 for the University of South Carolina for a geologic study for uranium groundwater contamination.

29. $2,000,000 for the Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxics Research Center.

30. $500,000 for the Texas Institute for Applied Environmental Research at Tarleton State University.

31. $500,000 for the Texas Institute for Environmental Assessment and Management at the University of North Texas, Denton, Texas.

32. $970,000 for the Canaan Valley Institute in close coordination with the Regional Vulnerability and Assessment (ReVA) initiative to develop research and educational tools using integrative technologies to predict future environmental risks and support informed, proactive decision-making to be undertaken in conjunction with the Highlands action program.

33. $500,000 for Dauphin Island Sea Lab, Dauphin Island, Alabama, for coastal ecosystem research.

In addition to the funds provided through appropriations directly to this account, the Committee has recommended that $86,168,000 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.

In order to increase the flexibility of the Office of Research and Development in the hiring of necessary and appropriate personnel, the Committee has included bill language which will give EPA the ability to contract for the temporary or intermittent services of students or recent graduates. Identical language was used in Public Law 106–113 to provide such authority to the United States Geological Survey.

The Committee continues to support the partnership between the EPA and the National Technology Transfer Center and directs that the Agency continue the cooperative agreement at the fiscal year 2001 funding level.

The Committee is concerned with the progress of completing IRIS assessments in a timely manner. The Agency is strongly urged to provide adequate resources to the IRIS program. The Agency is also expected to consolidate all IRIS resources to be centrally managed by the Office of Research and Development to accelerate both the development of IRIS values as well as update current ones.

The Committee has long been aware of the environmental concerns in and around the Coeur d'Alene River Basin in northern Idaho resulting from over a century of hard rock mining and decades of ore smelting. This region at one time produced nearly 50% of the nation's silver and about 30% each of the nation's lead and zinc. However, smelting operations ceased in the early 1980's and, since 1983, a 21 square-mile area surrounding the Bunker Hill mining and smelting complex has been on EPA's Superfund National Priority List (NPL). The second largest Superfund site on the NPL, this area has been undergoing remediation activities throughout the 1990's. In 1997, EPA expanded its investigations beyond the Bunker Hill site and, in October 2001, proposed a 20 to 30 year remediation program on an area that would grow from 21 square miles to approximately 1500 square miles. Predictably, this plan to exponentially expand the mandated remediation area has resulted in severe criticism and has brought to question the scientific and technical merits of EPA's assessments and decision making process.

Because of the unique nature of EPA's proposal, the Committee believes it is particularly important to have the benefit of an inde-

pendent, scientific review of the decision. Accordingly, $850,000 is made available from within available funds for the Agency to contract with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) so that the NAS can independently evaluate the Coeur d'Alene Basin Superfund site in its examination of EPA's scientific and technical practices in Superfund site definition, human and ecological assessment, remedial planning, and decision making. NAS is further expected to assess the adequacy and application of EPA's own Superfund guidance in terms of currently available scientific and technical knowledge and best practices, as well as to provide guidance to facilitate scientifically based and timely decision making for the Coeur d'Alene site. While the NAS report may discuss various remedial options, the Committee does not expect the NAS to recommend a specific remedial strategy for this site.

The Agency is directed to execute a contract with the NAS for this study within 120 days of approval of this legislation, and the NAS is expected to complete the study within 24 months of the contract date. In directing this study, it is not the intent of the Committee that ongoing and planned remediation activities with the original 21 square mile NPL site be disrupted or adversely impacted in any way.

The Committee is impressed by very recent technological breakthroughs in the delivery of ultra-high intensity pulsed ultraviolet (PUV) light that may present advances in environmentally safe disinfection of water and wastewater as well as protections and methods for defeating air- and water-borne biological and chemical attacks. The Committee understands that newly commercialized PUV machines deliver light at very high energy levels utilizing advanced technology that eliminates environmental compromises involving the use of toxic chemicals and/or mercury-based lamps. The Committee believes that such technology could present a significant advancement in the areas of water treatment and security, and requests that the Agency prepare and make available to the Committee within 120 days of passage of the bill a report which details the potential impact of such new PUV technology on process safety, plant safety and security, and potential defense of biological terrorism in public water and wastewater treatment applications as well as public and private buildings.

The Committee continues to support the Gulf Coast Hazardous Research Center and directs that the Agency continue funding for the Center at no less than the fiscal year 2002 level.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$2,111,677,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	2,054,511,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	2,047,704,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+57,166,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+63,973,000

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 2003, the Committee has recommended $2,111,677,000 for Environmental Programs and Management, an increase of $63,973,000 above the budget request and an increase of $57,166,000 above the fiscal year 2002 funding level. 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 recommendation includes the following changes to the funding levels included in the budget submission:

1. $21,000,000 for the Chesapeake Bay Program, an increase of $349,000 above the budget request;
2. $15,500,000 for the Great Lakes National Program Office, an increase of $372,000 above the request;
3. $23,521,000 for the National Estuary Program, an increase of $4,275,000 above the budget request;
4. $5,500,000 for the Gulf of Mexico program, an increase of $1,173,000 above the budget request;
5. $2,000,000 for the Long Island Sound Program Office, an increase of $1,523,000 above the budget request;
6. $5,000,000 for Environmental Justice programs, an increase of $921,000 above the budget request;
7. $177,183,000 for the Compliance Assistance, Compliance Monitoring, and Civil Enforcement programs within the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, an increase of $10,407,000 above the budget request;
8. $10,000,000 for Capacity Building, an increase of $489,000 above the fiscal year 2002 funding level;
9. $13,057,000 for Information Integration, an increase of $7,273,000 above last year's level;
10. $42,000,000 for Legal Services, an increase of $216,000 above the fiscal 2002 level;
11. $102,291,000 for Management Services and Stewardship, an increase of $5,956,000 above last year's funding level;
12. $41,000,000 for Planning and Resource Management, an increase of $2,440,000 above the fiscal year 2002 funding level;

13. $14,750,000 for the TRI/Right-to-Know program, and increase of $549,000 above last year;

14. $27,200,000 for the EPM account's portion of the Brownfields program, an increase of $24,381,000 above the level provided in fiscal year 2002.

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

1. $18,000,000 for rural water technical assistance activities and groundwater protection with distribution as follows: $10,000,000 for the NRWA; $4,000,000 for RCAP, to be divided equally between assistance for water programs and assistance for wastewater programs; $1,000,000 for GWPC; $2,000,000 for Small Flows Clearinghouse; and $1,000,000 for the NETC.

2. $1,000,000 for implementation of the National Biosolids Partnership Program.

3. $2,000,000 for source water protection programs.

4. $5,000,000 for a cost-shared grant program to school districts for necessary upgrades of their diesel bus fleets.

5. $3,000,000 to the NRWA to assist small water systems to conduct vulnerability assessments as required in title IV of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness Response Act of 2002.

6. $3,000,000 for EPA's National Computing Center to provide for the remote mirroring of all critical information and related systems to achieve a Continuance of Operations (COOP)/ Disaster Recovery capability.

7. $6,000,000 for grants to interested States to establish a long-term ambient monitoring and assessment framework at relevant geographic scales to support all water quality management objectives.

8. $250,000 to the University of Arkansas to develop bio-engineering solutions to provide state of the art watershed management tools.

9. $500,000 for the San Joaquin River Resource Management Coalition of California.

10. $100,000 to the Tuolumne Utility District in California for the canal optimization study.

11. $250,000 to establish a Santa Ana River Watershed Research and Training Program at the Water Resources Institute of California State University, San Bernardino.

12. $250,000 for the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District for research and design (cost evaluation and environmental studies) of a mitigation project addressing the city's contaminated high groundwater table and dangers presented by liquefaction.

13. $300,000 for the Sacramento River Toxic Pollutant Control Program and Sacramento River Watershed Program.

14. $250,000 to Edward Waters College of Jacksonville, Florida for research education and training with regard to community environmental conditions.

15. $1,500,000 for enhanced environmental education, research and training programs at Florida Gulf Coast University's Institute for Coastal and Watershed Studies.

16. $300,000 to Miami-Dade County, Florida for lead screening, testing, outreach, and education in the Liberty City Neighborhood.

17. $300,000 to Miami-Dade County, Florida to expand the existing environmental education program.

18. $500,000 to the Georgia Environmental Training and Education Authority for a lagoon waste management demonstration project.

19. $1,000,000 to the Columbus Water Works, Columbus, Georgia for an Advanced Biosolids Flow-Through Thermophilic Treatment Process demonstration project.

20. $200,000 to Cerro Gordo County, Iowa for environmental planning related to the Ventura Marsh initiative and overall water quality assessment in connection with the Clear Lake, Iowa Restoration Project.

21. $300,000 to the Friends of the Teton River, Inc. for the Upper Teton Watershed project.

22. $750,000 to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency for the Fox River Watershed Management Program.

23. $500,000 to Purdue University in Indiana for the Contaminant Remediation Optimization Program (CROP).

24. $200,000 for the Equus Beds Water Quality Protection program in Wichita, Kansas.

25. $100,000 for the Metropolitan Area Planning Council for a Comprehensive Water Resources Strategy for the I–495 Corridor of Massachusetts.

26. $300,000 to Caroline County, Maryland for the initial design and engineering of a regional plan for wastewater needs.

27. $175,000 for the Hypoxia Education and Stewardship Project in Kansas City, Missouri.

28. $250,000 for continuation of the Mecklenburg County, North Carolina Surface Water Improvement Management Initiative.

29. $850,000 for continued activities of the North Carolina Central University research initiative.

30. $250,000 for Wake County, North Carolina for planning, environmental analysis and design of a watershed management plan.

31. $250,000 to Rowan University in Glassboro, New Jersey for the Environmental Community Revitalization and Research Initiative.

32. $1,000,000 to continue the sediment decontamination technology demonstration in the New York-New Jersey Harbor.

33. $500,000 to the Tompkins County, New York Soil and Water Conservation District for the Cayuga Lake Watershed Protection Project.

34. $500,000 for the Alfred University Center for Environmental and Energy Research.

35. $150,000 to the Town of North Salem, New York for the Peach Lake pollution study.

36. $750,000 to Columbia University in New York City, New York for education, training and equipment related to ongoing biomedical research on environmentally induced cancers and immunological responses, at the Audubon Biomedical Science and Technology Park.

37. $1,000,000 for the Water Systems Council Wellcare™ Program.

38. $250,000 to the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) for the National Materials Recovery and Recycling Center of Excellence.

39. $1,500,000 for continued work on water management plans for the Central New York watersheds in Onondaga and Cayuga counties.

40. $750,000 to Cortland County, New York for continued work on the aquifer protection plan, of which $150,000 is for continued implementation of the comprehensive water quality management program in the Upper Susquehanna Watershed.

41. $100,000 for a Water Consortium Feasibility Study in Oklahoma with Washington County Water District #3, Rogers County Rural Water District #3, the City of Collinsville, and the City of Owasso.

42. $500,000 to Rural Enterprises of Oklahoma, Inc., a non-profit organization, for demonstration projects which include research, education and training activities related to the development of environmentally beneficial vermicomposting processes.

43. $500,000 for the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania's Department of Health in consultation with the Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth for lead screening, testing, outreach, and education throughout the City.

44. $2,000,000 to the Neighborhood Environmental Action Team of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (N.E.A.T. Philadelphia), in support of N.E.A.T.'s comprehensive neighborhood based, environmental education and awareness project in the West Philadelphia neighborhood.

45. $500,000 for the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station in Tarrant County, Texas for research of water supplies and development of an integrated watershed protection plan.

46. $350,000 to the Brazos River Authority of College Station, Texas for the Brazos/Navasota Watershed Management Project.

47. $500,000 to the Southwest Clean Air Agency for the Columbia River Gorge Phase I Technical Foundation Study.

48. $200,000 to the Tri-State Water Council for the Clark Fork-Pend Oreille Tri-State Water Quality Study.

49. $1,630,000 for on-going activities at the Canaan Valley Institute, including activities relating to community sustainability.

50. $1,700,000 for the Canaan Valley Institute to continue to develop a regional sustainability support center and coordinated information system in the Mid-Atlantic Highlands.

51. $900,000 to the Polymer Alliance Zone's MARCEE initiative.

52. $300,000 to the West Virginia High Technology Consortium Foundation, Inc. (WVHTCF) for research to demonstrate the capture and utilization of CO2 and CH4 at the Meadowfill Landfill near Bridgeport, West Virginia.

53. $450,000 to the Fayette County Commission of West Virginia for a wastewater treatment engineering study to address water quality concerns in the New River Gorge National River.

The Committee has recommended no general reduction for this account.

The Committee has, within available funds, provided $2,000,000 for the eight Environmental Finance Centers, the same as for fiscal year 2002. Also from within available funds, the Agency is provided $350,000 for the maintenance and updating of the Cumulative and Aggregate Risk Evaluation System (CARES) software program, and $250,000 to continue development of BASINS models, GIS mapping, integration with other financial and planning tools, and incorporation of cost-effectiveness considerations into integrated priority ranking systems.

Again this year, the Agency is directed to provide no less than the budget request levels for Pesticide Registration and Re-registration programs and, from within available funds, no less than last year's level of $9,160,000 for the Environmental Education programs. The Agency is directed to distribute funds under the Environmental Education program proportionally in a manner consistent with the provisions of the National Environmental Education Act.

Bill language has been included under Administrative Provisions which authorizes for one year the collection by EPA of $20,000,000 in maintenance fees. The Committee expects that, in the absence of a new tolerance fee, funds requested in the budget submission to support FTEs in the re-registration program may be used to support tolerance reassessment activities. Bill language is also once again included under Administrative Provisions prohibiting the use of funds to promulgate a final regulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance processing fees as proposed at 64 Federal Register 31040, or any similar proposal; and prohibiting the collection of pesticide registration fees if a new maintenance fee has gone into effect.

Bill language has also been included which directs the Administrator to certify two grant amendments regarding the Landis Sewerage Authority in Vineland, New Jersey. The Committee notes that this action is of a technical nature and is required only because the State of New Jersey can no longer certify a grant amendment as required under the former EPA construction grant program.

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee has provided $177,183,000 for the Compliance Assistance, Compliance Monitoring, and Civil Enforcement programs under the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, an increase of $10,407,000 over the budget request and an increase of $5,785,000 over the fiscal 2002 funding level for those programs. In making this recommendation, the Committee has provided sufficient funds to retain the 88 FTEs associated with these three programs which have been proposed for reduction in the fiscal 2003 budget submission. The Committee expects to be kept informed on a regular basis as to the Agency's activities and progress toward maintaining an OECA workforce at the levels provided herein.

In addition to funds provided to the NRWA, RCAP, the GWPC, NETC, and the Small Flows Clearinghouse, the Committee has again provided $2,000,000 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 in-

frastructure and process of an organization now engaged in groundwater and wellhead protection programs.

With regard to Brownfields, the Committee has enthusiastically supported the budget request of slightly more than $170,000,000 for various programs under the State and Tribal Assistance Grant account. In addition, $27,200,000 has been provided in this account for, among other things, the hiring of up to 40 additional FTEs necessary to operate this enhanced program. The total FTE level thus supported through the EPM account should thus not exceed 127.

The Committee has recommended $5,000,000 to begin a new program to provide grants to local school districts to reduce emissions from their buses. Specifically, the Committee intends that these grants are to be used in part for diesel particulate filters, oxidation catalysts, and other similar retrofit technologies that can maximize the removal of the particulate matter and hydrocarbons emissions from school buses. Such grants to school districts should be awarded first based on the age and condition of a district's current bus fleet, then to those areas where large numbers of children ride the bus or where children ride the bus for extended periods, and to those areas where predominantly economically-disadvantaged children live and ride the bus. It is the Committee's intent that in developing this new program the Agency should require, where appropriate, a modest cost-share commitment on the part of the recipient school district.

In a further effort to assist the States in assessing the health of watersheds and to develop plans to address concerns in this regard, the Committee has provided $6,000,000 for grants to States to establish a long-term ambient monitoring and assessment framework at relative geographic scales to support all water quality management objectives. It is the Committee's intent that this framework should include a plan for assessing biological, physical and chemical conditions and should be aimed at all waters of a state, not just a subset. Additionally, the framework should indicate how each participating State plans to link watershed-based ambient monitoring with traditional compliance or source monitoring, and should also outline how the state will incorporate data readily available and of sufficient quality from private and public sources. The Committee expects that the Agency may reserve up to five percent from the total appropriation to administer the program and enable it to provide technical assistance to States in developing and implementing multi-year ambient monitoring and assessment frameworks.

Earlier in the year, the Agency was asked to undertake an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to review the current draft dioxin reassessment. Since that time, another NAS committee assessing the impact of dioxin on the food supply has delved into the scientific methods used by the Agency. In addition, the EPA has determined to send the draft dioxin reassessment to an Interagency Working Group on Dioxin (IWG). The Committee understands that the IWG includes representatives from the Food and Drug Administration, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Centers for Disease Control, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Office of Management and Budget, as well as other government agencies. The Committee further understands, that the IWG review will address many of the toxicological ques-

tions that have been raised concerning the dioxin reassessment, including, but not limited to, the scientific evidence used to classify the carcinogenicity of dioxin to humans, the Agency's use of a linear dose-response model to estimate cancer risk levels, the scientific support for the use of the Toxic Equivalency Factors for dioxins, and the use of body burden as the appropriate dose metric.

The Committee acknowledges that the issues addressed by the Agency's risk assessment for dioxin are highly complex. There are significant limitations in the current knowledge and understanding of dioxin's mechanism of action, and these data gaps affect the Agency's ability to characterize the risks that result from exposure to dioxins. While some at the SAB and elsewhere have suggested that additional research may not bridge many of these important data gaps, the EPA Science Advisory Board has also emphasized the need for the Agency to develop improved risk assessment procedures to better characterize the range of exposures and exposure-response relationships.

The Committee's interest and concerns regarding this important issue are longstanding, and the frustrations surrounding the lack of progress on the part of EPA and others are shared by many. The Agency and the Office of Science and Technology Policy are thus expected to move swiftly with the other participants of the IWG to review the draft dioxin reassessment and make appropriate recommendations as to how this matter should proceed. Should such review not move forward in a progressive manner, the Committee believes that further action on its part may be necessary.

The Committee has provided $900,000 to the Polymer Alliance Zone's MARCEE Initiative with oversight intended to be provided by the Office of Solid Waste. Recycling and remediating e-waste has become an issue of national urgency. The Committee recognizes the Polymer Alliance Zone's (PAZ) important contributions to developing national recycling and reuse solutions for this growing waste stream, including development of: 1) electronics demanufacturing business simulation modeling, 2) national supply chain logistics planning, 3) comprehensive recycling e-commerce platform (Green Online), 4) economics modeling for recovery of e-waste and plastics separation, and 5) alliance with the European Union's Virtual Environmental Recycling Center (VERC) to create a global best practices template for e-waste recovery. The Committee supports PAZ's continued efforts to forge relationships with the leading private sector, public sector, and non-governmental stakeholders to help build a national consensus for efficient and environmentally preferable recovery of e-waste.

The Committee recognizes the potential of the new ambient temperature glass technology to reduce airborne and waterborne chemicals released into the environment, as well as the potential health benefits for indoor air quality and cleanliness in homes, institutions, and hospitals. The Air Quality Planning and Standards Office of the EPA has been provided $200,000 from within available funds to set standards and to increase public and government awareness of the benefits for this technology.

The Committee expects EPA to establish and implement a Highlands Action Program (HAP) in partnership with Canaan Valley Institute (CVI) to take action on the problems identified in the follow-up Mid-Atlantic Highlands report that Congress directed the EPA

to prepare in the Fiscal Year 2002 House and Conference Reports. The HAP should, among other things, use environmental indicators, strong science, and partnerships to identify the causes of those problems; develop solutions and management actions to resolve the identified problems; and develop a management plan that includes states, non-governmental organizations, local communities and the private sector. The Agency is expected to periodically assess the status of the HAP and report back to Congress on the findings and the successes of the program.

The Committee is fully supportive of the children's health research centers program jointly funded by the EPA and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences at NIH and looks forward to continuation of this constructive partnership.

The Committee is pleased to note that in response to Congressional direction in the 2002 Committee report, EPA plans to send the current version of the Multi-Media, Multi-Pathway, Multi-Receptor, Risk Assessment (3MRA) model and sample results from the model to the Science Advisory Board (SAB) for its review. The Committee again strongly encourages the Agency to spend no resources to use the 3MRA risk model or any portion of the model, for any regulatory or other similar purposes until recommendations of the Science Advisory Board are incorporated into the model.

The Committee is concerned with regulations proposed by EPA that will allocate companies' HCFC production and consumption allowances based on their historic production of HCFCs. It is the Committee's understanding that the proposed rules would permit production allowances to be transferred to foreign countries. A former U.S. manufacturer could use its production and consumption allowances to produce HCFCs in a foreign country and then import HCFCs into the United States. The unintended result of the proposed rules would be to encourage the transfer of U.S. jobs overseas. The Committee strongly urges EPA to ensure that the proposed regulations do not allocate allowances to companies that have stopped producing HCFCs in this country prior to January 1, 2003. The Agency is further encouraged to not promulgate an arbitrary allocation system that promotes market distortion and the movement of jobs outside of the United States.

The Committee expects EPA to continue to work with the Maritime Administration to implement a pilot program to export obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet of the Maritime Administration. This program should ensure the expeditious implementation of a pilot program for export and disposal of obsolete vessels during fiscal year 2003.

The Committee is aware that through a recently issued document the Agency has given guidance on the CERCLA/EPCRA definition of federally permitted releases. In it, EPA clarifies certain issues relating to air releases and states that it supports, and is apparently willing to move forward with, in accordance with law, an administrative exemption from CERCLA and EPCRA reporting for specific NO and NO2 releases. The Committee strongly urges the Agency to utilize appropriate, available funding resources to move expeditiously to complete this process.

The Committee is aware of the recent decision by the Board of Directors of the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) in Orange County, California to move as expeditiously as practicable to

full secondary treatment and to withdraw from the Clean Water Act Sec. 301(h) waiver program. The Committee is also aware that the Clean Water Act has no provision for such an eventuality. Therefore, the Committee strongly urges the Environmental Protection Agency and the State of California to work with OCSD to protect OCSD from lawsuits and administrative penalties while it pursues the difficult challenge of achieving the secondary treatment standard under the terms and conditions of the Clean Water Act and the compliance schedule in the applicable NPDES permit issued by EPA and the State.

The Committee notes that a fundamental goal of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act is the recovery and conservation of energy and materials that would otherwise be discarded. Nonetheless, industrial secondary materials largely remain untapped resources for such recovery. The Committee is aware of EPA's initiative to identify opportunities to further the goal of resource conservation and recovery while remaining true to the mission of ensuring safe and protective waste management practices. The Committee supports the initiative and encourages the use of Agency funding and staff resources to implement the necessary policy changes to further this important statutory goal.

The Committee is aware of the urgent need for certainty with respect to regulations governing the underground injection of treated waste-water in south Florida and Miami-Dade County and thus strongly urges the Agency to issue, no later than March 1, 2003, a final rule for the revision of the federal underground injection control requirements for class 1 municipal wells in Florida that conforms to section 1421(d)(2) of the Public Health Service Act as amended by the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 300h(d)(2)).

The Committee urges EPA to cooperate with the manufactured housing industry, including the Manufactured Housing Research Alliance (MHRA), to facilitate industry participation and research planning for the Energy Star Labeled Homes Program.

The Committee directs the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to report to the Congress, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment, on the pending radon in drinking water regulaions. In developing such report, the Administrator shall (1) consult with the State drinking water, air, and radiation programs; and (2) evaluate options to implement a single drinking water standard for radon.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation [1]	$35,325,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	34,019,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	35,325,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+1,306,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

[1] Total does not include transfer of $12,742,000 from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) provides audit, evaluation, and investigation products and advisory services to improve the performance and integrity of EPA programs and operations. 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 2003, the Committee recommends a total appropriation of $48,067,000 for the Office of Inspector General, an increase of $2,181,000 above last year's funding level and the same as the budget request. Of the amount provided, $12,742,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

Bill language has been included which directs the Inspector General to prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate an audit management plan and the personnel requirements which will enhance the expertise and maximize the efficiencies of the Office.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$42,918,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	25,318,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	42,918,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+17,600,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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

The Committee is recommending $42,918,000, the budget request, for Buildings and Facilities. This funding level represents an increase of $17,600,000 above the fiscal year 2002 funding level. This recommendation provides for necessary maintenance and repair and improvement costs at Agency facilities and the ongoing renovation of EPA's new headquarters.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$1,422,888,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	1,270,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	1,272,888,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+152,888,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+150,000,000

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

The Superfund program is operated by EPA subject to annual appropriations from a dedicated trust fund and from general revenues. Enforcement activities 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, re-

sponsible 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. Due to the site-specific nature of the Agency's Superfund program, site-specific travel is not considered part of the overall travel ceiling set for the Superfund account.

For fiscal year 2003, $1,422,888,000 has been recommended by the Committee, an increase of $150,000,000 above the budget request and an increase of $152,888,000 above last year's funding level. Bill language is included which provides $711,444,000 of the appropriated amount from the Superfund Trust Fund and an identical amount from general revenues of the treasury.

Bill language has been included which transfers $12,742,000 from this account to the Office of Inspector General and $86,168,000 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:

$1,006,952,000 for Superfund remedial, removal and other response/cleanup activities.

$143,600,000 for enforcement activities.

$134,600,000 for management and support.

$12,742,000 to be transferred to the Office of Inspector General. Bill language is included which provides for this transfer.

$86,168,000 to be transferred to Science and Technology for research and development activities. Bill language is included which provides for this transfer.

$28,150,000 for the Department of Justice.

$10,676,000 for other necessary, reimbursable interagency activities, including reimbursements to the Department of the Interior, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the United States Coast Guard.

In providing over $1,000,000,000 for Superfund response actions, the Committee recognizes the importance of cleaning up Superfund hazardous waste sites. In this regard, EPA is encouraged to expedite cleanup efforts, especially those underway. In addition, the Committee encourages EPA to focus particular attention to remediate sites in the states with the largest number of Superfund sites.

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.

For several years, the Committee expressed its concern that any reversal of the long-standing policy of the EPA to defer to the NRC for cleanup of NRC licensed sites was 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—threatened to create legitimate stakeholder concerns regarding the authority and finality of NRC licensing decisions, the duration and costs of site cleanup, and the potential future liability of parties associated with affected sites. The Committee of course recognized that there may exist circumstances at specific NRC licensed sites where the EPA's expertise may be of critical use to the NRC. In the interest of ensuring that sites do not face dual regulations, the Committee had each of the past few years directed both agencies to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which clarifies the circumstances for EPA's involvement at NRC sites when requested by the NRC.

The Committee is aware that the two parties have completed an MOU and it is expected to be signed. While this is certainly a step in the right direction, the Committee is also aware that the proposed MOU does not completely address the intent of the Committee because the threat of dual regulation will remain for certain NRC licensees. The Committee's direction was for the two agencies to enter into an MOU which would clarify the circumstances for EPA's involvement at NRC sites "when requested by the NRC." This direction was not followed.

The Agency is, therefore, directed to enter into an amended Memorandum of Understanding which completely addresses the previous direction of the Committee. In addition, the Agency is directed to provide a report to the Committee no later than the 28th day of each month following approval of this legislation detailing the progress that has been made in following this explicit direction of the Committee.

The Committee notes that the proper selection, design, implementation, enforcement and use of institutional controls are critical to the successful remediation and reuse of redeveloped brownfields, CERCLA, and RCRA sites. The Committee also recognizes that mechanisms must be implemented to ensure that institutional controls are well designed, cost-effective, implemented as planned, operated and maintained over time, and enforced as needed. The Committee therefore expects the Environmental Protection Agency to work closely with state and local governments, communities and site owners to develop administrative mechanisms that will ensure that institutional controls are implemented, maintained, and enforced over time so that the public will have confidence that these tools are an effective and reliable component of remedial action. The Committee also encourages the EPA to fund pilot projects that would evaluate the extent to which insurance products, third-party oversight, and various systems for tracking institutional controls may supplement state and local government and responsible party roles in future maintenance of site institutional controls.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$72,313,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	73,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	72,313,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−687,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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.

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee has provided $72,313,000, a decrease of $687,000 below last year's appropriated level and the same as the budget request.

The Committee is aware of concerns expressed by several states that LUST funds not be used in a disproportionate manner for federal projects instead of state projects as anticipated by the authorizing statutes. The Committee concurs in this position of predominate use in the states and 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

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$15,581,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	15,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	15,581,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+581,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

This appropriation, authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, provides funds to prepare for and prevent releases of oil and other petroleum products in navigable waterways. In addition, EPA is reimbursed for incident specific response costs through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund managed by the United States Coast Guard.

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; and, conducting research of oil clean-up techniques. Funds for this appropriation 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, as amended. Pursuant to law, the Trust Fund is managed by the United States Coast Guard.

The Committee recommends $15,581,000 for fiscal year 2003, the same as the budget request and an increase of $581,000 above the fiscal year 2002 spending level.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$3,789,185,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	3,733,276,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	3,463,776,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+55,909,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+325,409,000

The State and Tribal Assistance Grant account provides grant funds for programs operated primarily by state, local, tribal and other governmental partners. The account provides funding for infrastructure projects through the State Revolving Funds, geographic specific projects in rural Alaska and Alaska Native Villages and on the United States-Mexico Border, and other targeted special projects. In addition, the account funds Brownfields assessment and revitalization grants as well as miscellaneous categorical grant programs.

The largest portion of the STAG account is the State Revolving Funds (SRFs), which provide Federal financial assistance to protect the nation's water resources. The Clean Water State Revolving Funds are 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. This program provides resources for municipal, inter-municipal, state, interstate agencies, and tribal governments to plan, design, and construct wastewater facilities and other projects, including non-point source, estuary, stormwater, and sewer overflow projects. The Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund program finances improvements to community water systems so that they can achieve compliance with the mandates of the Safe Drinking Water Act and continue to protect public health.

This account also funds various categorical grant programs to ensure continued environmental protection nation-wide. Among these are non-point source grants under Section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, Public Water System Supervision grants, Section 106 water quality grants, a new targeted watershed grant, Clean Air Act Section 105 and 103 air grants, a program targeted to environmental information, Brownfields cleanup grants, and other grants utilized by the states, tribes, and others to meet Federal environmental statutory and regulatory requirements.

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommends a total of $3,789,185,000, an increase of $55,909,000 above the current fiscal year spending level, and $325,409,000 above the level proposed in the budget request.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following program level:

$1,300,000,000 for Clean Water State Revolving Funds;

$850,000,000 for Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Funds;

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

$35,000,000 for Alaska rural and Native Villages;

$120,500,000 for Brownfields assessment and revitalization grants;

$8,225,000 for the National Community Decentralized Wastewater Demonstration program;

$1,172,882,000 for state and tribal program/categorical grants; and

$227,578,000 for a program targeting grants to communities for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection.

Bill language has been included which provides specific dollar amounts for each of the above listed programs. In addition, new bill language has been included which stipulates that, consistent with section 603 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $75,000,000 of the $1,300,000,000 proposed for the Clean Water SRF program is to be made available by the States for interest-free loans that increase non-point and non-structural, decentralized alternatives, thus expanding the choices available to communities in their fight for clean water. Finally, bill language has been included which makes a technical clarification to grants made for a specific basin stormwater retention and reuse project, and which makes a technical clarification with respect to a grant made for water infrastructure improvements.

Under the language proposed herein, projects which receive awards must have as their primary purpose the protection, preservation, or enhancement of water quality. Projects must also address sewage or stormwater pollution with one or more approaches which include, but are not limited to, decentralized or distributed stormwater controls, decentralized wastewater treatment, conservation easements, on-site source controls (such as green roofs and rain gardens), stream buffers, low-impact development and urban redevelopment, water conservation and reuse, and wetlands restoration.

From within the Committee's $75,000,000 recommendation for the United States-Mexico Border program, the Agency is expected to provide $2,000,000 for continuation of the Brownsville, Texas area water supply project, and $7,000,000 for continuation of the El Paso, Texas area desalination and water supply project.

For the first time since fiscal year 2000, the Committee is recommending $8,225,000 for continuation of the National Community Decentralized Wastewater Demonstration Project. This program, developed initially by the Committee, has shown tremendous success in meeting its goal of developing and transferring technologies which offer alternatives to centralized wastewater treatment facilities. The six projects proposed for fiscal 2003 include Lowndes County, Alabama ($575,000); Upper Patuxent River Watershed, Maryland ($1,000,000); West Philadelphia and Rodale Institute Farm, Pennsylvania ($1,700,000); Upper Rio Grande Valley Colonias, Texas ($900,000); Chittenden County, Vermont Inte-

grated Water Resource Project ($3,050,000); and Mud River Watershed, Lincoln County, West Virginia ($1,000,000). As in previous years, these projects were determined by non-governmental, independent analysis based upon their unique and diverse geology and geography, their ability to provide the greatest technological diversity using limited financial resources, and the commitment of each community or regional area to find and fund appropriate alternative technologies to resolve their wastewater treatment needs. The Committee expects the Agency to continue the cost share requirements for these six projects as was provided previous projects under this program.

The Committee has provided an increase of $14,606,100 above the budget request for state and tribal program assistance/categorical grants. The Committee's recommendation for each categorical grant follows:

(1) $225,000,000 for air resource assistance to State and local governments under sections 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act, including $10,000,000 for the five State/Regional Haze planning organizations;

(2) $11,044,500 for air resource assistance grants to Tribal governments;

(3) $8,139,900 for radon grants;

(4) $195,000,000 for water pollution control agency resource supplementation under section 106 of FWPCA;

(5) $10,000,000 for beach grants to develop and implement monitoring and information programs for coastal recreation waters pursuant to the Beach Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000;

(6) $5,000,000 for Homeland Security State Counter-terrorism coordinators under PWSS;

(7) $250,000,000 for section 319 of FWPCA non-point source pollution grants, including programs formerly eligible under the section 314 Clean Lakes program;

(8) $14,967,000 for wetlands program development grants;

(9) $18,958,200 for water quality cooperative agreements under section 104(b)(3) of FWPCA;

(10) $93,100,200 for public water system supervision grants;

(11) $10,950,900 for underground injection control grants;

(12) $106,363,600 for RCRA financial assistance grants;

(13) $50,000,000 for Brownfields categorical cleanup grants;

(14) $11,918,400 for underground storage tank grants;

(15) $13,085,500 for pesticides program implementation grants;

(16) $13,682,000 for lead risk reduction grants;

(17) $5,138,800 for toxic substances compliance/enforcement grants;

(18) $19,867,800 for pesticides enforcement grants;

(19) $24,999,900 for the information exchange network program;

(20) $5,986,300 for pollution prevention incentive grants;

(21) $2,209,300 for sector and multimedia enforcement and compliance grants;

(22) $57,469,700 for Indians general assistance grants; and

(23) $20,000,000 for targeted watershed grants.

Section 106 pollution control grants have been provided $195,000,000 an increase of $14,623,100 above the budget request and $2,523,100 above last year's funding level. The Committee believes that an adequately funded section 106 program provides the necessary flexibility for the states to address a wide variety of water related problems, and is particularly important for the states to meet the long-term needs of the TMDL program.

Section 319 non-point source pollution grants would receive $250,000,000, an increase of $11,523,200 above the budget request and $12,523,200 above last year's appropriated level.

The Committee has increased grants to state and local air quality agencies under sections 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act by $3,459,900 over the Administration's request and the fiscal 2002 funding level. Of the total funding amount, $10,000,000 is for the Regional Haze program.

The Committee has not recommended funding for EPA's new Enforcement Grant program which would have made small grants available to States for specific enforcement plans or programs.

For a targeted program making grants to communities for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection, the Committee has provided $227,578,000. As in past years, these grants shall be accompanied by a cost-share requirement whereby 45 percent of a project's cost is to be the responsibility of the community or entity receiving the grant. In those few cases where such cost-share requirement poses a particular burden on the recipient community or entity, the Agency retains its long-standing administrative flexibility to reduce or waive this requirement.

The distribution of funds under this program is as follows:

1. $200,000 to Attalla, Alabama for sewerage system improvements.
2. $200,000 to Powell, Alabama for sewerage system improvements.
3. $100,000 to Lawrence County, Alabama for the Bankhead Forest Water Project.
4. $100,000 to Phil Campbell, Alabama for water system improvements.
5. $1,000,000 to Fort Payne, Alabama for sewerage system improvements.
6. $300,000 to Franklin County, Alabama for water infrastructure improvements.
7. $200,000 to Douglas, Alabama for sewerage system improvements.
8. $200,000 to Marion County, Alabama for water system improvements.
9. $100,000 to the Fayette Water Board, Fayette, Alabama for water security system improvements.
10. $150,000 to the Cullman County Commission, Alabama for the North Cullman County water systems upgrades.
11. $250,000 to the City of Calera, Alabama for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
12. $250,000 to the City of Alabaster, Alabama for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

13. $1,700,000 to South Alabama Utilities of the town of Citronell, Alabama for water infrastructure improvements in western Mobile County.

14. $500,000 to the Southwest Alabama Regional Water Authority for water infrastructure improvements.

15. $750,000 to the City of Huntsville, Alabama for water system improvements.

16. $750,000 to the City of Moulton, Alabama for wastewater system improvements.

17. $125,000 to the Town of Woodville, Alabama for wastewater system improvements.

18. $200,000 to the Limestone County, Alabama Water and Sewer Authority for drinking water improvements.

19. $200,000 to the West Morgan-East Lawrence Water Authority for drinking water improvements.

20. $275,000 to the Town of Littleville, Alabama for wastewater system improvements.

21. $200,000 to the City of Athens, Alabama for wastewater system improvements.

22. $350,000 to the City of Montgomery, Alabama for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

23. $350,000 to the Coosa Valley Water Authority for water infrastructure improvements in St. Clair County, Alabama.

24. $500,000 for the Osage Basin Wastewater District, Arkansas for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

25. $250,000 to the Town of Menifee, Arkansas for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

26. $500,000 to the City of Scottsdale, Arizona for the Scottsdale Arsenic Removal pilot project.

27. $1,000,000 to Huachuca City, Arizona for its effluent recharge project.

28. $250,000 to the City of Goodyear, Arizona for water infrastructure improvements.

29. $500,000 to the Litchfield Park Service Company for construction of the Litchfield Park arsenic treatment facility in Arizona.

30. $750,000 to the Mission Springs Water District in California for groundwater protection and water infrastructure improvements.

31. $750,000 to the City of Murrieta, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

32. $1,000,000 to the City of Newport Beach, California for the Big Canyon Reservoir Cover Project.

33. $700,000 to the Irvine Ranch Water District of Irvine, California for improvement for the San Diego Creek Watershed Natural Treatment System.

34. $700,000 to the City of Laguna Beach, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

35. $1,900,000 to the Olivenhain Municipal Water District in Encinitas, California for water infrastructure improvements.

36. $2,000,000 to the Placer Nevada Wastewater Authority for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Placer County, California.

37. $1,500,000 for water infrastructure improvements for the Cities of Arcadia and Sierra Madre, California.

38. $500,000 to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for the Desalination Research and Innovation Partnership.

39. $600,000 to Ventura County, California for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements related to the completion and implementation of the Calleguas Creek Watershed Management Plan.

40. $500,000 to the United Water Conservation District for groundwater protection in Ventura County, California.

41. $250,000 to the County of Ventura, California for wastewater infrastructure needs for El Rio.

42. $350,000 to the City of El Segundo, California for sanitary sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

43. $500,000 to the City of Redding, California for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Redding Stillwater Industrial Park.

44. $500,000 for stormwater pollution mitigation improvements and infrastructure in Los Angeles County, California.

45. $275,000 for the City of Oceanside, California for infrastructure improvements to the Mission San Luis Rey Waterline.

46. $500,000 to the City of Brisbane, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

47. $100,000 for the Mojave Water Agency for design and construction of a pipeline and facilities to supply supplemental water to the Mojave River Middle Basin Transition Zone.

48. $300,000 for the continuation of water infrastructure improvements in Twentynine Palms, California.

49. $250,000 for the Warren Valley Basin Recharge/Reuse project in Yucca Valley, California.

50. $100,000 for the Lower Owens River Project in Inyo County, California.

51. $100,000 for the continuation of water infrastructure improvements in the Yucaipa Valley Water District in Yucaipa, California.

52. $100,000 for the development of a water master plan to serve the water infrastructure needs of the City of Hesperia, California.

53. $100,000 for planning and design of a sewage treatment and water reclamation facility in Apple Valley, California.

54. $50,000 for Basin Water to conduct a national demonstration project for Highly Efficient/Minimum Waste Ion Exchange Treatment of Potable Water Supplies.

55. $1,000,000 to the City of Sacramento, California for combined sewer system improvements.

56. $250,000 to the City of Compton, California for water infrastructure improvements.

57. $250,000 to the City of Chino Hills, California for stormwater infrastructure improvements for the intersection of Eucalyptus and Peyton Drive.

58. $250,000 to the City of Brea, California for wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvements.

59. $250,000 to the City of Norwalk, California for drinking water infrastructure construction and improvements for the Norwalk Reservoir Project.

60. $1,000,000 to the City and County of San Francisco, California for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard.

61. $500,000 to the City of Ripon, California for water infrastructure improvements to assist in the removal of arsenic from drinking water.

62. $350,000 to Madera County, California Resource Management Agency for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Oakhurst, California.

63. $1,000,000 to the City of Huntington Beach, California for stormwater and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements.

64. $250,000 to the City of Garden Grove, California for stormwater infrastructure improvements.

65. $500,000 to the City of Glendale, California working in conjunction with the Utah State University in Logan, Utah, the University of Colorado in Boulder, and UCLA for a research study and pilot treatment plant focused on the removal of chromium 6 from drinking water.

66. $350,000 to the City of Willits, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements and wetlands mitigation.

67. $250,000 to Sonoma County, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Canon Manor community.

68. $250,000 to Marin County, California wastewater infrastructure improvements for Tomales Bay.

69. $1,000,000 to the City of New Britain, Connecticut for water infrastructure improvements.

70. $500,000 to the City of Southington, Connecticut for water infrastructure improvements.

71. $500,000 for the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission in Massachusetts and the Metropolitan District Commission in Connecticut for wastewater infrastructure and combined sewer overflow improvements on the Connecticut River in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

72. $175,000 to the Town of Wolcott, Connecticut for water infrastructure improvements.

73. $175,000 to the Town of New Fairfield, Connecticut for water infrastructure improvements.

74. $750,000 to the towns of Vernon and Bolton, Connecticut to support the Vernon-Bolton Lake Sewer Project System.

75. $1,000,000 to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority to mitigate combined sewer overflows into the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers.

76. $500,000 to the City of Tarpon Springs, Florida for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

77. $500,000 to the City of Clearwater, Florida for wastewater and reclaimed water infrastructure improvements.

78. $900,000 to the Taylor County, Florida Water and Sewer District for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

79. $500,000 to Orange County, Florida for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

80. $250,000 to the City of Jacksonville, Florida for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

81. $350,000 to the City of Tampa, Florida for the South Tampa Area Reclaimed Project.

82. $1,000,000 to the City of Sweetwater, Florida for wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvements.

83. $1,000,000 to the Solid Waste Authority of Palm Beach County, Florida for pre-construction engineering and design of the Tri-County Biosolids Pelletization Facility.

84. $150,000 to the City of South Miami, Florida for drinking water,wastewater, stormwater and sewer infrastructure improvements.

85. $150,000 to the City of Opa-locka, Florida for drinking water, wastewater, stormwater and sewer infrastructure improvements.

86. $1,000,000 to the Volusian Water Alliance of Volusian County, Florida for the Regional Aquifer Management Project and water infrastructure improvements.

87. $500,000 for the Sarasota County, Florida Phillippi Creek Septic System Replacement Project.

88. $250,000 to the Escambia County, Florida Utility Authority for its Wastewater Treatment Public/Private Partnership project.

89. $500,000 to DeSoto County, Florida for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

90. $250,000 to the Sebring Airport Authority of Florida for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for a light industrial/commercial business park.

91. $500,000 to the City of Boca Raton, Florida for improvements for the Reverse Osmosis Water Treatment Facility.

92. $500,000 for the City of West Palm Beach, Florida for its wetlands-based water project.

93. $250,000 to the City of Lighthouse Point, Florida for stormwater system upgrades and repairs.

94. $500,000 to the City of Umatilla, Florida for stormwater infrastructure improvements.

95. $9,000,000 to the Southwest Florida Water Management District for continuation of the Tampa Bay Reservoir Project.

96. $1,000,000 for Lake Seminole, Pinellas County, Florida for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

97. $1,000,000 to the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

98. $750,000 to the City of Roswell, Georgia for the Big Creek Watershed Demonstration Project.

99. $450,000 to the Liberty County, Georgia Development Authority for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Coastal MegaPark.

100. $750,000 to Gwinnett County, Georgia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

101. $500,000 to continue the Ground Water Chlorination System Replacement and Upgrade Project on Guam.

102. $500,000 to the City of Ottumwa, Iowa for comined sewer overflow system improvements.

103. $1,000,000 to the City of Des Moines, Iowa for stormwater and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

104. $800,000 to the City of Mason City, Iowa for water infrastructure improvements and a radium reduction project.

105. $250,000 to the Bayview Water and Sewer District of Idaho for the Cape Horn Area Clean Water Compliance Project.

106. $500,000 to DuPage County, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements.

107. $500,000 to the Lake County Stormwater Management Commission of Lake County, Illinois for stormwater detention, infrastructure, modeling, design and management activities in the Upper Des Plaines River watershed.

108. $500,000 to the Village of Johnsburg, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

109. $200,000 to the Village of Port Byron, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements.

110. $200,000 to the City of Hamilton, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements.

111. $200,000 to the Dallas Rural Water District, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements in Hancock County, Illinois.

112. $700,000 to the Village of Montgomery, Illinois for removal of lead-based paint from water storage tanks.

113. $260,000 to the Village of Somonauk, Illinois for construction of a water storage tower.

114. $1,000,000 for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Chicago, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

115. $500,000 to the Village of Granville, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements.

116. $500,000 to the Village of Toulon, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

117. $250,000 to the Village of LaGrange, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements.

118. $250,000 to the Village of Justice, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements for the Wesley Fields water system.

119. $500,000 to the City of Galena, Illinois for construction of a wastewater treatment plant.

120. $250,000 to the City of Flora, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements for the Gateway Regional Water System.

121. $400,000 to the City of Breese, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements.

122. $25,000 to the Village of Patoka, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements.

123. $100,000 to the City of Salem, Illinois for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

124. $750,000 to the City of Wilmington, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

125. $750,000 to the City of Carmel, Indiana for water infrastructure improvements.

126. $100,000 to Madison Township, Indiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

127. $165,000 to the Town of Cicero, Indiana for its stormwater infrastructure improvements and pollution prevention project.

128. $250,000 to the Twin Lakes Sewer District in White County, Indiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

129. $350,000 to Tell City, Indiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

130. $750,000 to the City of Hobart, Indiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Green Acres subdivision.

131. $300,000 to the City of Ottawa, Kansas for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

132. $500,000 to Augusta, Kansas for water infrastructure improvements.

133. $500,000 to the Franklin County Fiscal Court of Kentucky for the Choateville Sewer Project.

134. $250,000 to the Spencer County, Kentucky Fiscal Court for water infrastructure improvements.

135. $250,000 to the City of Shepherdsville, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructre improvements.

136. $250,000 to the City of Carrollton/Carrollton Utilities of Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Carroll-Gallatin-Owen Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant.

137. $500,000 to the Louisville/Jefferson County Redevelopment Authority for water infrastructure improvements for a technology park in Louisville, Kentucky.

138. $605,000 to the City of Paintsville, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

139. $400,000 to the City of Morehead, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

140. $1,000,000 to the City of Corbin, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

141. $400,000 to the City of Monticello, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

142. $750,000 to the City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

143. $400,000 to the City of Beattyville, Kentucky for water infrastructure improvements.

144. $200,000 for the City of Clay, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

145. $200,000 to the Marshall County Sanitation District #2 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the City of Draffenville, Kentucky.

146. $200,000 for the City of Bardwell, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

147. $200,000 for the City of Greenville, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

148. $500,000 to the Military Department of Louisiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Gillis W. Long Center.

149. $1,000,000 the Sewerage and Water Board of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana for continuation of the New Orleans Sanitary Sewer System Inflow Infiltration project.

150. $1,000,000 to the City of Shreveport, Louisiana for installation of backflow preventers within the water distribution system ($500,000), and for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements associated with programs of the Red River Watershed Management Institute ($500,000).

151. $1,000,000 to St. John the Baptist Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

152. $200,000 to the City of New Iberia, Louisiana for joint water and wastewater infrastructure improvements with Iberia Parish.

153. $200,000 to St. Martin Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

154. $250,000 to St. Charles Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements related to the Lake Pontchatrain Basin project.

155. $250,000 to St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

156. $100,000 to St. James Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements coordinated with the Town of Gramercy.

157. $500,000 to the City of Hammond, Louisiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements related to the Lake Pontchatrain Basin project.

158. $250,000 to the City of Slidell, Louisiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements related to the Lake Pontchatrain Basin project.

159. $200,000 to the City of Brockton, Massachusetts for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

160. $150,000 for combined sewer overflow mitigation in Lawrence, Massachusetts.

161. $250,000 to the City of Baltimore, Maryland for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

162. $500,000 to the Town of Elkton, Maryland for biological nutrient removal upgrades.

163. $500,000 to the Town of Federalsburg, Maryland for biological nutrient removal upgrades.

164. $1,045,000 for water supply and distribution infrastructure improvements, sanitary sewer collection system modifications, and wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvements in La Plata, Maryland.

165. $500,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements for Woodlawn Village in Maryland.

166. $1,250,000 to the City of Rockville, Maryland for its Stormwater Management Improvement Project.

167. $500,000 to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission for water infrastructure improvements in Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, Maryland.

168. $300,000 to the City of Bad Axe, Michigan for water infrastructure improvements.

169. $1,000,000 for continuation of the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project.

170. $750,000 to the City of Grand Rapids, Michigan for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

171. $500,000 to the Genesee County Drain Commission for the North-East Relief Sewer and Kearsley Creek Inceptor project.

172. $400,000 to the Detroit Water and Sewer Department, Michigan for water, wastewater and combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

173. $1,500,000 for the Evergreen-Farmington Sanitary Sewer Overflow demonstration project in Oakland County, Michigan.

174. $1,000,000 to Oakland County, Michigan for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements within the George W. Kuhn Drainage District.

175. $1,500,000 to the City of Springfield, Missouri for feasibility studies, design and construction of stormwater infrastructure improvements for the Upper James River.

176. $350,000 to the City of St. Louis, Missouri for water infrastructure improvements for Forest Park.

177. $2,000,000 to the Clean Water Committee of Jefferson County, Missouri for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

178. $350,000 to Caldwell County, Missouri for water infrastructure improvements.

179. $500,000 to the Clarence Cannon Wholesale Water Commission for water infrastructure improvements in Monroe County, Missouri.

180. $500,000 to the City of Lake Saint Louis Duckett Creek Sanitary District, Missouri for wastewater infrastructure improvements and watershed protection projects.

181. $750,000 to the City of Lake, Mississippi for water infrastructure improvements ($72,000), and the City of Louisville, Mississippi for Water Treatment system upgrades ($678,000).

182. $500,000 to the City of Newton, Mississippi for wastewater infrastructure improvements for an industrial park.

183. $300,000 to the City of McComb, Mississippi for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

184. $300,000 to the City of Gulfport, Mississippi for water infrastructure improvements.

185. $550,000 to the City of Corinth, Mississippi for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

186. $500,000 to the City of Tupelo, Mississippi for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

187. $200,000 to the Town of Granite Falls, North Carolina for water infrastructure improvements.

188. $300,000 to the Town of Bakersville, North Carolina for water infrastructure improvements.

189. $200,000 to the Town of Valdee, North Carolina for the Inflow/Infiltration Reduction Sanitary Sewer Project.

190. $100,000 to the Town of Drexel, North Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

191. $200,000 to the Town of Spruce Pine, North Carolina for construction of the Cemetery Hill Water Storage Tank.

192. $500,000 to the City of Henderson, North Carolina for the next phase of the rehabilitation and expansion of the water treatment facilities of the Kerr Lake Regional Water System.

193. $1,000,000 to the City of Concord, North Carolina for the Tri-County Regional Water Project in Cabarrus, Rowan, and Stanly Counties, North Carolina.

194. $250,000 to the County of Granville, North Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

195. $750,000 to Richmond County, North Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

196. $1,000,000 to the Neuse Regional Water and Sewer Authority in Lenoir County, North Carolina for water infrastructure improvements.

197. $1,000,000 for Orange County, North Carolina for wastewater infrastructure needs.

198. $400,000 to the Town of Cary, North Carolina for construction of a biosolids dryer facility.

199. $500,000 to the Town of Highlands, North Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

200. $500,000 to the Buncombe County, North Carolina Solid Waste Management Facility for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

201. $400,000 to the Town of Mooresville, North Carolina for water infrastructure improvements.

202. $600,000 for Wayne State College of Wayne, Nebraska for the Wayne Community Greywater project.

203. $400,000 to Lincoln, Nebraska for the South Salt Creek Sanitary Sewer project.

204. $500,000 to the City of Omaha, Nebraska for a combined sewer overflow project.

205. $1,000,000 to the City of Nashua, New Hampshire to mitigate combined sewer overflows.

206. $600,000 to the City of Portsmouth, New Hampshire for mitigation of combined sewer overflows.

207. $500,000 to the City of Somersworth, New Hampshire for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

208. $435,000 to the Borough of New Providence, New Jersey for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

209. $1,000,000 to the Township of Jefferson, New Jersey for wastewater infrastructure improvements to help protect water quality of Lake Hopatcong, New Jersey.

210. $2,500,000 to the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission for its combined sewage overflow reduction program and the Passaic River/Newark Bay Restoration program.

211. $250,000 for the North Hudson Sewerage Authority for combined sewer overflow improvements.

212. $1,000,000 to the City of Ruidoso, New Mexico for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

213. $500,000 to the City of Los Lunas, New Mexico for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

214. $500,000 to the City of Belen, New Mexico for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

215. $200,000 to the Greater Chimayo Mutual Domestic Water Consumers Association for water infrastructure improvements.

216. $200,000 to the City of Bloomfield, New Mexico for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

217. $350,000 to the Town of Bernalillo, New Mexico for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

218. $350,000 to the Village of Los Lunas, New Mexico for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

219. $700,000 to the Virgin Valley Water District, Nevada for construction of an arsenic treatment facility for the cities of Mequite and Bunkerville, Nevada.

220. $1,000,000 to the City of Little Falls, New York for water infrastructure improvements.

221. $250,000 for the Village of Floyd, New York Water Quality/Quantity Improvement Project.

222. $250,000 to the Village of Whitney Point, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

223. $1,000,000 to the Village of Walden, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

224. $500,000 the the State of New York for the South Shore Estuary Reserve Council of Long Island, New York for stormwater infrastructure improvements.

225. $750,000 to the Town of North Hempstead, New York for stormwater management infrastructure improvements within Manhasset Bay and Hempstead Harbor on the Long Island Sound.

226. $1,000,000 to the City of Niagara Falls, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

227. $500,000 to the City of Rye, New York for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

228. $500,000 for the Lake Neatahwanta Reclamation project in Oswego County, New York.

229. $1,000,000 to the City of Oswego, New York for combined sewer overflow system improvements.

230. $200,000 to the Village of Sloan, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

231. $500,000 to the Town of Hamburg, New York for sanitary sewer overflow improvements.

232. $1,000,000 to the City of Buffalo, New York Water Division for water infrastructure improvements.

233. $1,000,000 to the Monroe County, New York Water Authority for construction of a covered reservoir and security improvements.

234. $1,000,000 to the Saratoga County Water Committee for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

235. $12,000,000 for continued clean water improvements for Onondaga Lake, New York.

236. $2,000,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

237. $500,000 to the Village of Port Byron, New York for construction of a wastewater treatment plant.

238. $6,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure needs in the New York City watershed.

239. $4,000,000 for water quality infrastructure improvements for Long Island Sound, New York.

240. $500,000 to the Cortland County Industrial Development Agency for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements to the Cortland County Business Park.

241. $500,000 to the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority for water infrastructure improvements for the "City West" community.

242. $250,000 to the City of Van Wert, Ohio for expansion of a drinking water reservoir.

243. $375,000 to the City of Napoleon, Ohio for water infrastructure improvements.

244. $800,000 for water infrastructure upgrades for Northern Perry County Water District, Ohio.

245. $750,000 for water infrastructure upgrades for the Village of Crooksville, Ohio.

246. $200,000 for the Village of Amanda, Ohio for water infrastructure improvements.

247. $500,000 for the Village of Spring Valley, Ohio to upgrade its water treatment and distribution system.

248. $400,000 for Greene County, Ohio for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

249. $100,000 for the Pickaway County Sewer District for a regional sewer study in Pickaway County, Ohio.

250. $750,000 to the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District for the Doan Brook Watershed Area in Ohio for continued development of a storm water abatement system in the Doan Brook Watershed Area of Ohio.

251. $1,800,000 for the City of Toledo, Ohio for the development of facilities related to its Methane Biogases Capture and Reuse Initiative.

252. $700,000 to the City of Port Clinton, Ohio for a wastewater infrastructure improvements and mitigation of combined sewer overflows.

253. $500,000 to Perry County, Ohio for water infrastructure improvements.

254. $1,000,000 to the City of Delphos, Ohio for the Tri-County Regional Water System Reservoir Project.

255. $1,000,000 to the City of North Canton, Ohio for a water treatment project.

256. $1,000,000 for the City of Massillon, Ohio for wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvements.

257. $200,000 for the Mahoning County, Ohio for wastewater treatment infrastructure improvements in Springfield Township.

258. $200,000 to the Village of Morristown, Ohio for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

259. $250,000 to the Village of Hartford, Ohio for wastewater and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements.

260. $250,000 to the City of Hulbert, Oklahoma for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Hulbert Community Health Center.

261. $500,000 to the City of Midwest City, Oklahoma for water infrastructure improvements.

262. $500,000 to the City of Altus, Oklahoma for water infrastructure improvements.

263. $500,000 to the City of Portland, Oregon for its wet weather pollution control program.

264. $500,000 to the City of Albany, Oregon for the Albany-Millersburg Joint Water project.

265. $200,000 for Tillamook County, Oregon for construction of a animal waste composting facility.

266. $500,000 to La Pine, Oregon for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

267. $300,000 to the City of North Plains, Oregon for water infrastructure improvements.

268. $2,500,000 for the Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration program in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

269. $540,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the City of Hermitage, Pennsylvania and the Borough or Sharpsville, Pennsylvania.

270. $1,500,000 to Derry Township Municipal Authority in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

271. $500,000 for Pulaski Township, Pennsylvania for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

272. $500,000 to the Wyoming Valley Sanitary Authority of Pennsylvania for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

273. $430,000 to the Nanty Glow Water Authority of Cambria, Pennsylvania for water infrastructure improvements.

274. $500,000 to the Derry Borough Water Authority in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania for water infrastructure improvements.

275. $300,000 to the Borough of Wellsboro, Pennsylvania for combined sewer overflow improvements.

276. $500,000 to the City of Franklin, Pennsylvania for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

277. $500,000 to the City of Lancaster, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

278. $350,000 to the York City Sewer Authority for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

279. $500,000 to Lycoming County, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the Boroughs of Hughesville and Muncy and at Halls Station.

280. $500,000 to the Department of Susquehanna County Economic Development in Montrose, Pennsylvania for water infrastructure improvements.

281. $350,000 to the Chestnut Ridge Area Joint Municipal Authority for wastewater infrastructure improvements for East St. Clair, West St. Clair, King and Napier Townships and in New Paris Borough, Pennsylvania.

282. $500,000 to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Sewer and Water Authority for wastewater infrastructure improvements in the municipality of Arecibo.

283. $500,000 to the City of Woonsocket, Rhode Island for water infrastructure improvements.

284. $250,000 to the Narragansett Bay Commission, Rhode Island, for wastewater and combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

285. $500,000 to Berkeley County, South Carolina for extension of water lines to Cross Community Schools.

286. $500,000 to the City of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina Downtown Redevelopment Corporation for stormwater infrastructure improvements for the Pavilion Area Master Plan.

287. $500,000 to the City of Florence, South Carolina for continued construction of a regional surface water plant.

288. $250,000 to the Town of Eastover, South Carolina for water infrastructure improvements.

289. $190,000 to the Town of Jackson, South Carolina for removal of radium from the water supply.

290. $220,000 to the City of Walhalla, South Carolina for water infrastructure improvements in Oconee County.

291. $500,000 to Charlotte Mecklenburg Utilities, South Carolina for a phosphorous reduction program.

292. $200,000 to Charleston County, South Carolina for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

293. $500,000 to the City of Groton, South Dakota for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

294. $500,000 to the City of Elk Point, South Dakota for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

295. $450,000 to the River Road Utility District for water infrastructure improvements in Cheatham County, Tennessee.

296. $390,000 to the City of Cross Plains, Tennessee for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

297. $1,500,000 to the Athens Utilities Board of Tennessee for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Oostanaula Wastewater Treatment Plant.

298. $500,000 to the City of Lawrenceburg, Tennessee for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

299. $100,000 to the Watauga River Regional Water Authority in Carter County, Tennessee for water infrastructure improvements.

300. $1,200,000 to Polk County, Tennessee for water infrastructure improvement for the Linsdale community.

301. $1,000,000 to the City of Eagle Pass, Texas for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

302. $1,000,000 for West Fort Bend County, Texas for water infrastructure improvements.

303. $500,000 to the City of Meridian, Texas for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Meridian/Bosque Regional Water Supply and Treatment Project.

304. $1,000,000 to the City of Dallas, Texas for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

305. $300,000 to the City of Port Arthur, Texas for water infrastructure improvements in the Sabine area.

306. $500,000 to Park City, Utah for water infrastructure improvements at the Park City Judge Tunnel Water Treatment Plant.

307. $500,000 for Tooele City, Utah for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

308. $250,000 to Sandy City, Utah for water and stormwater infrastructure improvements.

309. $1,000,000 to the Town of Dublin, Virginia for water infrastructure improvements.

310. $350,000 to the Town of Orange, Virginia for construction of a raw water storage basin.

311. $1,000,000 to Dale Service Corporation for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Dale City, Virginia.

312. $950,000 to the Fairfax County Water Authority of Virginia for water system infrastructure and security enhancements.

313. $525,000 to Chesterfield County, Virginia for drainage and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

314. $400,000 for Nelson County, Virginia for water and wastewater system installation and improvements.

315. $150,000 for Camp Virginia Jaycee in Blue Ridge, Virginia for a wastewater treatment project.

316. $400,000 to Fluvanna County, Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

317. $350,000 for St. Paul College in Lawrenceville, Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

318. $400,000 for Pittsylvania County and the Town of Gretna, Virginia for water infrastructure improvements.

319. $300,000 for Franklin County, Virginia for a drinking water infrastructure project.

320. $300,000 for Buckingham County, Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for Buckingham County and the Town of Dillwyn.

321. $200,000 for Cumberland County, Virginia for water infrastructure improvements.

322. $2,000,000 to the City of Richmond, Virginia ($1,000,000) and to the City of Lynchburg, Virginia ($1,000,000) for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

323. $750,000 to the City of Alexandria, Virginia for the sanitary and stormwater sewer reconstruction and extension project to mitigate overflows polluting Four Mile Run Creek.

324. $350,000 to Accomack County, Virginia for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

325. $200,000 to the City of Norfolk, Virginia for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the North Fox Hall and Sewell Garden pump stations.

326. $200,000 to the City of Norfolk, Virginia for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Fairmont Park.

327. $1,000,000 to Loudon County, Virginia Department of Building and Development for the Water Resources Management Program.

328. $500,000 to the Government of the Virgin Islands for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

329. $900,000 to the City of Shelton, Washington for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

330. $110,000 to the Town of South Prairie, Washington for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

331. $500,000 to Parker, Washington for water infrastructure improvements.

332. $500,000 to the City of Roslyn, Washington for wastewater infrastructure improvements.

333. $250,000 to the City of Blaine, Washington for completion of a feasibility study for the Northwest Whatcom County Wastewater Management Plan, Lummis Diviersion, and for related updates of the City's general sewer plan.

334. $375,000 for the Village of Curtiss, Wisconsin for the expansion of their wastewater treatment plant.

335. $925,000 for the Town of Mercer, Wisconsin for the extension of their water infrastructure to the new business park.

336. $1,200,000 for the City of Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin for the extension of sewer and water to the East Side Business Park and the Village of Biron.

337. $300,000 for the Putnam County Commission of West Virginia for the Fishers Ridge water infrastructure project.

338. $265,000 to the Midland Public Service District in Randolph County, West Virginia for the extension of waterlines for Haddix Road.

339. $2,717,000 to the City of Weirton, West Virginia for water treatment plant upgrades.

340. $2,500,000 to the City of Moundsville, West Virginia for construction of a water treatment facility.

341. $2,050,000 to the City of Grafton, West Virginia for upgrades to the Berkeley Run Pump Station, Front Street sewer improvements, Fannie Street sewer improvements, Bluemont Cemetery sewer improvements, and Fetterman's sewer improvements.

342. $2,155,000 to the City of Grafton, West Virginia for wastewater treatment plant upgrades.

343. $506,000 to the City of Sistersville, West Virginia for water treatment plant upgrades.

344. $560,000 to the City of Wellsburg, West Virginia for replacement of the 11th Street Wastewater Lift Station.

345. $635,000 to the Village of Beach Bottom, West Virginia for the extension of water lines, water plant construction and water line replacement.

346. $250,000 to the City of Cudahy, California for wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements.

347. $250,000 to the City of Maywood, California for wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements.

348. $1,000,000 to the City of Manchester, New Hampshire for wastewater infrastructure improvements associated with a combined sewer overflow project.

349. $100,000 for the City of Fulton, Alabama for water system improvements.

350. $650,000 for the City of Jackson, Alabama for water infrastructure.

351. $250,000 for the Mobile County Water, Sewer and Fire Protection Authority, Alabama for water system improvements.

352. $700,000 for the Cities of Daphne, Foley and Fairhope, Alabama for comprehensive water infrastructure assessment.

353. $650,000 for Mobile Area Water and Sewer System and the City of Prichard, Alabama for combined sewer outflow project.

354. $100,000 for Mt. Vernon, Alabama for water system improvements.

355. $100,000 for Summerdale, Alabama for water infrastructure.

356. $400,000 to the Town of Exeter, New Hampshire for planning and design of new wastewater infrastructure facilities.

Recent studies by EPA and others suggest that there has been a substantial deterioration in the nation's wastewater infrastructure, including aging wastewater treatment plants and leaking sewer collection systems. Substantial contributions of wet weather flows and other non-point sources of pollution have also been identified. In addition, the additional expenditures needed to achieve TMDL requirements and groundwater protection in future years are expected to be extensive. Because the federal government funds only a portion of wastewater infrastructure investments, the states

have urged maximum flexibility in their allocation of federal resources, so as to direct investments at the point-source and non-point-source areas of greatest need. However, states also recognize that they must be held accountable to the goals of the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and other wastewater-related federal statutes. The Committee is aware that septic system repair and management projects and other non-point source pollution prevention and control measures, which can produce substantial benefits of water quality protection, are not eligible for SRF funding in most of the states. Further, many recipients of federal wastewater assistance have not instituted user fees to provide for long-term maintenance and repair of the infrastructure, and the results of that lack of maintenance are now evident.

To help address this situation, EPA, at the request of the Committee, established during the Spring of 2002 a working group of representatives from many stakeholder groups in order to address the basic means by which EPA may accord flexibility to the states and yet also assure that federal investments achieve the greatest possible benefits. Specifically, the following questions were addressed by this new working group: (1) are the SRF and other federal financial assistance programs achieving maximum water quality protection in terms of public health and environmental outcomes; (2) are alternatives other than wastewater treatment plants and collection systems eligible for federal assistance, and, if not, why not; (3) do the priority ranking systems which states use to prioritize eligible treatment works projects properly account for environmental outcomes, including indirect impacts from air deposition of treatment plant effluent or stormwater runoff from sewer construction-induced growth; (4) are recipients of federal assistance required to adopt appropriate financial planning methods, which would reduce the cost of capital and guarantee that infrastructure would be maintained; and (5) have sufficient performance measures and information systems been developed to assure the Congress that future federal assistance will be spent wisely by the states?

The Committee has been kept apprised of the developments of this working group and expects that the group's report addressing the aforementioned questions and other related issues be fully utilized by the Agency.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Committee has again this year included an administrative provision giving the Administrator specific authority to, in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, award cooperative agreements to federally recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia so as to properly carry out EPA's environmental programs.

In order to continue providing sufficient and necessary resources for EPA's pesticide re-registration program, the Committee has included bill language which authorizes for one year the collection by EPA of $20,000,000 in maintenance fees. This provision extends to September 30, 2003 the date upon which such authority for collections expires. Bill language is also once again included prohibiting

the use of funds to promulgate a final regulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance processing fees as proposed at 64 Federal Register 31040, or any similar proposal; and prohibiting the collection of pesticide registration fees if a new maintenance fee has gone into effect.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$5,750,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	5,267,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	5,368,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+483,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+382,000

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 $5,750,000 for fiscal year 2003, an increase of $483,000 above the fiscal year 2002 appropriation and $382,000 above the budget request to address unfunded salary needs.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$3,031,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	2,974,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	3,031,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+57,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 budget request	0

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 2003, the Committee has recommended the budget request of $3,031,000 for the CEQ and OEQ, an increase of $57,000 above last year's spending level. The Committee's proposed funding for CEQ will allow full cost of living increases for the current staff of 24 FTEs as well as other necessary expense adjustments. The Committee directs that CEQ's total staffing level not exceed 24 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

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$30,848,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	33,660,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	30,848,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−2,812,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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

The Committee recommendation, the same as the budget request, provides for the transfer of $30,848,000 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 2003.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$3,611,895,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	$10,535,825,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	$6,703,912,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	$−6,923,930,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	$−3,092,017,000

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 2003, the Committee recommends $3,611,895,000 which represents a decrease of $6,923,930,000 from the fiscal year 2002 appropriation and a decrease of $3,092,017,000 from the 2003 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.

The Committee urges the Federal Emergency Management Agency to work with the U.S. Forest Service and state and local officials to develop disaster mitigation measures to avoid potentially catastrophic forest fires in the Angeles, San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests. Extreme drought conditions and insect depredations have killed tens of thousands of trees in these national forests

and on adjacent private property. The Committee urges FEMA to deal with this problem.

The Committee is disturbed that FEMA did nothing during the last fiscal year to implement the minority emergency preparedness demonstration program which was authorized by a general provision of the fiscal year 2002 VA–HUD appropriations bill. In the future, the Agency is cautioned that its personnel must read the entire appropriations bill and follow all direction in the bill and accompanying reports, including the general provisions in title IV. The Committee directs FEMA to report to the Committee by February 3, 2003 on the actions it has taken to implement the minority emergency preparedness demonstration program. At a minimum, FEMA is directed to spend no less than $1,500,000 in fiscal year 2003 to implement the program.

DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$1,820,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	9,171,571,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	1,842,843,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−7,351,571,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−22,843,000

The Federal Emergency Management Agency has responsibility for administering disaster assistance programs and coordinating the Federal response in Presidential disasters declarations. 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 2003, the Committee recommends $1,820,000,000 for disaster relief, a decrease of $22,843,000 from the budget request and a decrease of $7,351,571,000 compared to the fiscal year 2002 level.

The budget request included a proposal to discontinue the section 404 post-disaster mitigation grants program and replace it with a competitive pre-disaster mitigation grant program. The Committee agrees with the objectives of a pre-disaster mitigation program and has addressed this issue in the appropriate place in the report. With regard to the section 404 grant program, the Committee has proposed a change in statute which will reduce the amount of funding for the program, but maintains the program as an effective mechanism to ensure mitigation activities are undertaken when the need is most apparent which is immediately after a disaster strikes. The Committee is concerned that the section 404 program is not being fully utilized in a timely manner, and directs FEMA to take any steps necessary to ensure that mitigation projects are approved quickly and work is accomplished within a reasonable amount of time. At a minimum, FEMA should consider rules or regulations which will recapture any funds not spent within four years.

The Committee is aware of two issues related to repairs undertaken by the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) to Project 184, a 22 megawatt hydropower plant and associated water supply flumes, as a result of landslides and flooding that occurred on January 4, 1997. First, the Committee understands that FEMA has imposed a deadline of October 31, 2002, for EID to complete all of the required repair work. The Committee is concerned that this deadline may be unrealistic given the environmentally sensitive location of the repair work, the complex licensing requirements of the Federal Power Act, and the delays caused by the events of September 11, 2001, related to the importation of equipment critical to the repair from overseas. Therefore, the Committee urges FEMA to extend the deadline for completing the repair for a minimum of 6 months.

Second, the Committee is concerned that FEMA's determination to approve improved project status to the Mill Creek to Bull Creek tunnel portion of the repair work may have been based upon erroneous damage survey reports that may have underestimated the actual costs associated with the repair work. Therefore, the Committee urges FEMA to reexamine the damage survey reports in light of all currently available information.

The Committee recognizes that the citizens and the medical community of Houston, Texas suffer unprecedented losses due to Tropical Storm Allison and that the Texas Medical Center provides important services to its 42 member hospitals and institutions that provide medical care and vital medical research. Therefore, it is the Committee's direction that the Texas Medical Center is to be provided Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigations grants as if it were an eligible applicant under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and has included bill language to that effect. However, specific projects are still subject to Federal and State eligibility criteria and guidelines except that the eligibility of applications submitted due to Tropical Storm Allison shall be considered as of the day of receipt.

The Committee recommendation includes a provision for the transfer of $2,900,000 to "Emergency Management Planning and Assistance" for the consolidated emergency performance grant program which has been carried in prior years' appropriations bills. A new provision included in the bill this year allows for the use of $21,577,000 from the Disaster Relief Fund for activities of the FEMA Inspector General.

NATIONAL PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$250,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	300,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+250,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−50,000,000

The Committee recommends a fiscal year 2003 appropriation of $250,000,000 for the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund, a decrease of $50,000,000 from the budget request. While there was no appropriation for this fund in fiscal year 2002, the Congress did provide an appropriation of $25,000,000 for Project Impact, an initiative to demonstrate the viability of pre-disaster mitigation. The Committee has found that Project Impact achieved its goals and it

is now time to move on to a more robust competitive program to undertake mitigation projects that will significantly reduce damages from and costs of natural disasters. The Committee does not believe this fund should be used for mitigation projects primarily caused by non-natural forces and directs FEMA to issues rules and regulation accordingly. The Committee believes that State and local entities would benefit from a grant program for planning pre-disaster mitigation projects and directs FEMA to provide $250,000 per year to each State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Finally, the Committee notes that in September of 2000 FEMA selected five universities to join the University of California at Berkeley in the pilot phase of the Disaster Resistant University program: University of Alaska/Fairbanks, University of Miami, University of North Carolina/Wilmington, Tulane University, and University of Washington/Seattle. The purpose of the program is to help the nation's colleges and universities facing the threat of natural disasters to assess their vulnerabilities and find ways to protect their research, facilities and the lives of students, faculty and staff. The Committee directs FEMA to continue the Disaster Resistant University Program with grants of $500,000 to each of the six pilot Disaster Resistant Universities and $100,000 each to at least six additional universities, including at least one HBCU, to join the program.

The Committee recognizes the need for continued mitigation research integral to natural disasters, particularly those associated with hurricane and high wind damage. The Committee therefore directs the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to work with the State University System of Florida on comprehensive hurricane mitigation research.

COMMUNITY DISASTER LOAN PROGRAM

The Committee notes that previous direction of the Congress with regard to the Community Disaster Loan Program has restricted the use of the funds solely for loans to municipal governments for emergency education operations assistance where school districts have incurred unanticipated requirements because of displacement of students. The Committee understands that there may have been overwhelming justification for such a restriction in the past, but does not believe the same circumstances exist today. Therefore, FEMA may make loans under this program for any purpose henceforth.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

STATE SHARE LOAN

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	0
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	$405,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−405,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

	Limitation on direct loans	*Administrative expenses*
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	($25,000,000)	$557,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	(25,000,000)	543,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	(25,000,000)	557,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	(0)	+14,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	(0)	0

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

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommends no funding for the cost of State Share Loans, a decrease of $405,000 from the fiscal year 2002 appropriation and the same amount as the President's request. In addition, the Committee has provided $25,000,000 for the limitation on direct loans pursuant to section 319 of the Stafford Act, as well $557,000 for administrative expenses of the program.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$250,690,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	233,801,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	239,690,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+16,889,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+11,000,000

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

The bill includes $250,690,000 for salaries and expenses, an increase of $11,000,000 from the budget request, and an increase of $16,889,000 when compared to the fiscal year 2002 appropriation.

FEMA has experienced significant increases in program growth and responsibility over the past few years and with this budget undertakes two new initiatives that will severely tax its capabilities. The recommendation includes, in addition to the budget request, 64 new full time equivalents for the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Division, 27 for the United States Fire Administration, and 24 for the Financial and Acquisition Management Division. Funding for these positions totals $11,000,000 for fiscal year 2003 and has been added to the budget request.

FEMA is directed to provide $1,750,000 to the Administrative and Resource Planning Directorate for its efforts to archive key agency documents by digitization to optical disks, including related activities.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$11,549,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	10,303,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	11,549,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+1,246,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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. The FEMA Inspector General has the added responsibility to act in that capacity for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,549,000 for the Office of Inspector General, an increase of $1,246,000 above the fiscal year 2002 appropriation and the same as the President's budget request.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation [1]	$367,040,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	[2] 850,023,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	3,747,214,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−482,983,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−3,380,174,000

[1] Does not include funding for Fire Fighters Assistance grants.
[2] Includes $360,000,000 in Fire Fighters Assistance grants.

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

The Committee recommends a fiscal year 2003 appropriation of $367,040,000, a decrease of $482,983,000 to the fiscal year 2002 level and a decrease of $3,380,174,000 to the fiscal year 2003 budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends a transfer of $2,900,000 from the Disaster Relief account for the consolidated emergency performance grants program. This account has in the past included funding for Fire Fighter Assistance grants. With this bill, the fire fighter grant program is given its own account.

Of the amount provided, no more than $30,000,000 is provided for the Citizen Corps program, up to $30,000,000 is provided for all-hazard planning activities, and $78,000,000 is provided for communications interoperability.

The Committee expects that comprehensive State strategies will address immediate State and local responder needs to effectively respond to all types of terrorist or weapons of mass destruction attacks. These plans should include the equipment, training, exercise, technical assistance, and planning needs for all types of State and local first responders including law enforcement, fire, emer-

gency, medical service, and hazardous material response. In the development and implementation of their plans, States are expected to consult with local governments regarding the scope, design, and allocation of resources so that State and local strategies are consistent."

The September 11th attacks taught Federal, State, and local first responders the importance of having communications equipment and plans that allow all types of responder from multiple jurisdictions to maintain communications lines during an emergency. This interoperability program shall provide State and local agencies with grants to develop multi-jurisdiction emergency communications plans, procure emergency communications equipment, and procure equipment allowing existing communications systems to be interoperable. The Committee remains concerned about the inefficient use of appropriated funds. The Committee notes that, historically, efforts to address public safety wireless issues have been fragmented resulting in duplication and wasted resources. The Wireless Public Safety Interoperable Communications Program, known as Project SAFECOM was established to promote a more efficient and coordinated effort to achieve critical network interoperability. The Committee endorses Project SAFECOM as the means to accomplish this purpose. FEMA, through Project SAFECOM, is directed to develop requirements, goals, and timeframes and report back to the Committee by March 31, 2003 on its efforts.

The Committee directs FEMA, within 90 days of enactment of this legislation, to update its guidance on outdoor warning and mass notification systems, CPG 1–17, and immediately upon its publication to disseminate the guidance to units of government at the federal, state and local level to aid them in the purchase of this equipment. The committee recognizes that many of the basic principles outlined in the guidance document continue to apply to these systems, but the guidance document must be updated to reflect some of the technological advances that have taken place since originally published in 1980. The updated guidance shall reflect the benefits of using voice technology to address all natural and man-made hazards, including acts of terrorism, and shall require that all warning systems be operable in the absence of AC power supply. Further, the Committee urges FEMA to consult with other relevant agencies and use the updated CPG 1–17 as the baseline for formulating a national standard for outdoor warning and mass notification that reflects the latest state-of-the art technology.

FEMA is directed to continue its partnership with the National Technology Transfer Center at the fiscal year 2000 level to bring technology applications to the local, state, and Federal levels of the emergency management community for the purpose of responding to both natural disasters and terrorist attacks and reducing their impact.

FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$450,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	[1] 360,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	[1] +90,000,000
Comparison with budget request	+450,000,000

[1] Funding for this activity was included under Emergency Management Planning and Assistance.

This account supports a grant program of assistance to local fire fighting departments for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the public and fire fighting personnel, including volunteers and emergency medical service personnel, against fire and fire-related hazards.

The Committee recommends funding of $450,000,000 in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $90,000,000 when compared to fiscal year 2002 appropriations and an increase of $450,000,000 when compared to the budget request. A provision is included in the bill which transfers a portion of these funds to Salaries and Expenses to necessary administrative costs.

The Committee urges FEMA to work in a collaborative and inclusive manner in the planning, training and equipping of all front line responders, including but not limited to all components of EMS, fire, police, and other parties a locality may employ. Additionally, the Committee believes that FEMA should give priority to applicants proposing entry-level physicals or immunizations under the Health and Wellness grant category.

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 2003.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$153,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	140,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	153,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+13,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	+308,000

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 McKinney-Vento 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 $153,000,000 for the Emergency Food and Shelter Program, an increase of $13,000,000 when compared to the fiscal year 2002 appropriation and the same as the budget request. The budget had proposed that this program be transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban Development in an effort to consolidate "homeless" programs. The Committee recommends that the program remain at FEMA where it has a proven track record of providing assistance to those most in need at the lowest possible cost.

Once again this year, bill language is included which limits administrative costs to 3.5% for fiscal year 2002.

FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$200,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	300,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+200,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	−100,000,000

The budget request included $300,000,000 for the Flood Map Modernization Fund in recognition of the overwhelming need to update maps which are on average close to 14 years old. Maps this old do not always reflect the current state of development and hydrology and in many cases are of little use in determining the true risk to homes or buildings. The Committee noted last year that floods are the nation's most costly and frequent natural disasters and at that time proposed funding of over $150,000,000 to begin a robust flood map modernization program. Unfortunately, the Conference on this bill last year was not able to endorse the House position due to a lack of funding. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2003 includes $200,000,000 for the Flood Map Modernization Fund.

The Committee wants to emphasize that modernization of flood maps should not sacrifice quality for quantity and program performance goals should not emphasize short-term quantity over product quality. At a minimum, the Committee directs FEMA to use no less than $75,000,000 for "basin-wide" analyses and up to $45,000,000 shall be dedicated to working with State and local communities to build on local knowledge and capabilities through Cooperating Technical Partnership agreements.

The Committee commends FEMA for its development of Cooperating Technical Partnerships with local and state governments and regional entities. Such involvement of state, local, and regional government bodies is encouraged since such engagement improves the quality of the new maps and fosters heightened local risk awareness. Voluntary contributions, either monetary or in-kind, are expected so that the investment of federal dollars is leveraged. Recognizing that some communities can commit significantly more resources than others and that accurately mapping risk serves the national interest and assists in reducing natural disaster costs to the nation, cost shares will vary on a case by case basis but a goal of 20% is to be sought. FEMA is directed to make $2,000,000 available to the New York Department of Environmental Conservation for the New York Flood Plain Mapping Program, and use $2,000,000 to continue the Louisiana pilot project to provide two-foot contour interval mapping of ground elevations.

FEMA is directed to make $250,000 available to the Canaan Valley Institute to develop flood plane maps of West Virginia for areas that are currently unmapped and/or update existing flood plain maps.

The Committee has been made aware that the state of Alabama is in the process of developing a statewide Geographic Information System (GIS) clearinghouse responsible for collecting and distributing GIS data to the various federal, state, local and private users. The Committee is encouraged by this GIS initiative and believes it is consistent with the overarching goals of FEMA's Flood Map Modernization Program. Therefore, the Committee urges FEMA to partner with the Alabama Department of Revenue and

the state of Alabama in order to further develop the Alabama statewide GIS initiative.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER 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 $32,393,000, and for mitigation activities, not to exceed $77,666,000. 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 all of fiscal year 2003 does not currently exist. The Committee has included bill language which extends this authority through December 31 of 2004 to ensure the seamless operation of the program.

NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$20,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	20,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	20,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriations	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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 2003, to be derived by transfer from the National Flood Insurance Program.

ADMINISTRATION PROVISION

The Committee has included an administrative provision which specifies that a hospital meeting the standard for occupancy under regulations established by the California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) shall also have satisfied FEMA's criteria for "Immediate occupancy." The Committee has taken this action because FEMA has been unable to resolve a dispute with regard to Valley Presbyterian Hospital in California as directed in the report accompanying the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill.

The Committee has included an administrative provision which gives FEMA authority to provide funds to the City of New York and the State of New York for costs unreimbursed under the Stafford Act. These funds are to be derived from appropriations for the Disaster Relief account made available under Public Law 107–117. It is the understanding of the Committee that the categories of costs will include, but not be limited to, salaries for uniformed and other personnel, capital expenses necessary to protect public safety and health, and fire department costs. It is not the intent of the Committee that any of these funds shall be used for the non-Federal share of any cost share programs. Prior to receipt of these funds, the City of New York and the State of New York shall provide FEMA and the Committee with a detailed spending plan with full cost justifications. These plans must include a certification that the items paid for with these funds have not been reimbursed under the Stafford Act.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CITIZEN INFORMATION CENTER FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$11,541,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	7,276,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	12,541,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+4,265,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	−1,000,000

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.

The Federal Information Center (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, contractual services are used to respond to public inquiries via a nationwide toll-free telephone call center.

On January 28, 2000, the Consumer Information Center assumed responsibility for the operations of the FIC program with the resulting organization being officially named the Federal Consumer Information Center. The 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.

During fiscal year 2002, the Federal Consumer Information Center became part of GSA's newly established Office of Citizen Services and Communications and was renamed the Federal Citizen Information Center (FCIC). The new Office serves as a central federal gateway for citizens, businesses, other governments, and the media to obtain information and services from the government. FCIC assumed operational control of the FirstGov.gov website and in fiscal year 2003 plans to begin accepting e-mail and fax inquiries from the public.

Public Law 98–63, enacted July 30, 1983, established a revolving fund for the CIC. Under this fund, FCIC activities are financed from the following: annual appropriations from the general funds 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 bill includes a limitation of $18,000,000 on the availability of the revolving fund. Any revenues accruing to this fund during fiscal year 2003 in excess of this amount shall remain in the fund and are not available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriation Acts.

For fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommends $11,541,000, an increase of $4,265,000 over the level for fiscal year 2002 and a decrease of $1,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee recognizes the importance and is supportive of the Administration's interest in expanding FCIC services to the public. To this end, the Committee has increased funding for FCIC by almost sixty percent over the level provided in fiscal year 2002.

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 2003 will total approximately $15,946,000.

The Committee is supportive of the expansion of the Federal Citizen Information Center to include management of the FirstGov portal. This is in keeping with the FCIC mission to be a one-stop, multi-channel provider of Federal information to the public through print, the media, and online. Further, the Committee is strongly opposed to any weakening in staffing of the consumer mission of the program and firmly believes that moving the consumer media staff outside of FCIC would seriously diminish FCIC's ability to inform and educate the public about vital consumer issues. Additionally, the Committee is convinced that removing the Comptroller of the FCIC Fund out of the FCIC organization would fragment the fiduciary accountability of this appropriation.

Because of the Committee's commitment to protect and strengthen both the FCIC program as a whole and its financial integrity, and to avoid any conflict of Committee jurisdiction, the Committee directs that the FCIC organization and management structure as presented in the fiscal year 2003 Congressional Justification be retained, notwithstanding the changes that have already been implemented to incorporate the management and staffing of the FirstGov portal.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$15,300,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	14,901,700,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	15,000,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+398,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+300,000,000

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 $15,300,000,000 in fiscal year 2003, which is an increase of $300,000,000 from the budget request and an increase of $398,300,000 when compared to the fiscal year 2002 enacted appropriation.

The Committee strongly believes that NASA's goal of significantly improving the agency's financial management process, as a primary goal, is noteworthy. The Committee is convinced that this increased emphasis on financial management, and the improved cost visibility that will result from these efforts, will yield substantially improved decision making in the future.

Integrated Financial Management Program. The Committee is aware that there have been two previous NASA attempts at fielding a new financial management system, neither of which was successful. The Committee concurs with recent revisions to the program, which, in order to reduce risk, has focused on fielding the core financial programs initially, and on reducing overlap with follow-on modules. However, the Committee is concerned about the current estimated overall cost of the IFMP at $644,300,000. The Committee directs that NASA undertake a comprehensive review of all elements of IFMP and follow-on IFMP modules in order to reduce the overall cost; this review should include consideration by NASA of other financial applications already operating within the government. NASA is directed to submit the results of this review not later than February 15, 2003.

Working Capital Fund. In support of efforts to improve cost visibility, the Committee has authorized the establishment of a working capital fund. The Committee recommends that information technology (IT) be adopted as the first area for inclusion in the fund since Agency reports indicate that IT funding has not been sufficiently managed in the past, and this lack of control has threatened the performance of numerous Agency-wide systems, not the least of which has been information financial management. The Committee cautions the Agency that the working capital fund should not be used as a means to circumvent the normal appropriations process.

Full Cost Accounting/Reports. The Committee also notes that the Agency plans to submit the fiscal year 2004 budget under a full cost model. It should be noted, however, that there are numerous recurring reports and cost limitations that may be affected as a result of this change, not the least of which is the limitation on expenditures for the International Space Station. NASA is directed to submit, in conjunction with the fiscal year 2004 budget, rec-

ommended changes to existing law, if necessary, to the "cost caps" to reflect full cost methodology.

Title IV of the bill includes four general provisions which directly affect NASA operations. Section 419 provides for the establishment of a working capital fund. Section 420 provides NASA with enhanced lease authority. Section 421 provides NASA with authority to privatize certain utility systems. This authority is similar to that provided to the Department of Defense. The Committee has taken this action in anticipation of NASA getting more reliable and cost efficient utility service in selected locations. Included in the legislation is direction requiring NASA to present to the Congress a detailed economic analysis prior to entering into any agreement to convey utilities to a private party. Finally, Section 422 extends NASA's authority to offer buy-out incentives to employees for three additional years.

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$6,130,900,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	6,912,400,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	6,130,900,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	−781,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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. Starting with the fiscal year 2002 appropriation, this account also includes funding for activities previously carried in the Mission Support appropriations account.

The Committee recommends a total of $6,130,900,000 for the human space flight account in fiscal year 2003.

In the past this Committee and the Congress have been staunch supporters of NASA's efforts to upgrade its shuttle fleet in the areas of safety and reliability. It is with deep regret that the Committee notes that once again, major safety upgrades funded in prior years' budgets have been cancelled due to technological obstacles or cost constraints. The Committee is frustrated that NASA cannot seem to accurately evaluate the risks of its proposed upgrade program components and the cost of those components. The Committee directs NASA to undertake a serious evaluation of the process by which safety upgrades are proposed and approved, only to be cancelled or deferred less than one year later. NASA is directed to report to the Committee on Appropriations within 60 days on the steps being taken to correct deficiencies in the process.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$9,144,500,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	7,889,600,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	8,844,500,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+1,287,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+300,000,000

This appropriation provides for the research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These activities include: space science, life and microgravity science, earth sciences, 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. Starting in fiscal year 2002, this account also includes funding for activities previously carried in the Mission Support appropriations account.

The Committee recommends $9,144,500,000 for Science, Aeronautics and Technology in fiscal year 2003. The amount recommended is an increase of $300,000,000 to the budget request, and $1,287,400,000 more than the fiscal year 2002 appropriation.

SPACE SCIENCE

Within the Space Science portion of this account, the Committee recommends $3,556,200,000, a net increase of $141,900,000 to the budget request.

The Committee is supportive of the New Frontiers Program as a competitive process to undertake missions to the outer planets. The Committee is concerned that the New Frontiers Program as proposed by NASA may be unduly constrained by a uniform cap on mission costs of $650 million. Since the purpose of the program is to undertake scientifically valuable missions, the cap should not limit the mission options being considered. The Committee supports New Frontiers with a flexible cap for each new opportunity ($500 million to $1 billion in fiscal year 2002 dollars) prior to open competition, giving due consideration to specified scientific objectives.

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

1. An increase of $2,500,000 for the Center for Space Sciences at Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas.

2. An increase of $105,000,000 for the Kuiper Belt/Pluto mission.

3. An increase of $40,000,000 for the Europa mission. In light of the high priority by the National Academy decadal study for a Europa Orbiter Mission and the public support for Europa exploration as indicated by the recent survey of the Planetary Society, the Committee directs NASA to conduct a focused technology program and begin Phase A activities to ensure that this mission is ready at the earliest possible opportunity and that NASA preserves its core capabilities to implement and manage such a mission at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000 for this activity and an additional $10,000,000 for instrument technology. The Committee is aware that JPL has an relationships with research universities on its outer planetary

programs and anticipates that a majority of the $10,000,000 million will be expended solidifying those relationships.

4. An increase of $500,000 for Morehead State University, Kentucky, for upgrades to its ADAS satellite tracking facility.

5. An increase of $2,000,000 for propulsion testing facilities at the University of Alabama, Huntsville.

6. An increase of $500,000 for the Ultra-lightweight Electroformed Segmented Large Aperture Optics program at Alabama A&M University.

7. An increase of $900,000 for High-Energy Photonics Instrumentation at the University of Alabama, Huntsville.

8. An increase of $7,500,000 for development of a lightweight carrier pallet to support the Hubble Space Telescope program. The recent success of the Hubble servicing mission has underscored the continued importance of the Hubble Space Telescope. NASA's plan for HST has been to discontinue servicing missions after 2004 in order to create a funding wedge for the next generation space telescope (NGST), the community's highest priority, and to return HST to earth in 2010. Although this scenario creates an important funding wedge, it also leads to a significant probability that HST will degrade over the intervening six-year period and become inoperable well before 2010. This gap may be so long that HST archival data alone may not sustain a productive scientific community. The Committee directs that NASA carry out an in-depth study of possible alternatives to the 2010 return mission that would increase the probability of operating HST until NGST becomes available. This study should address the possibility of an additional servicing mission, SM5, and as an alternative, a final servicing mission in 2007 in lieu of the 2010 mission that would include a means of disposing of HST other than by Shuttle return. This study should address the relative costs of such scenarios, the potential scientific benefits, and the mission constraints that will need to be considered for the 2010 return mission.

9. An increase of $19,900,000 to the Mars program to cover recent cost increases. This funding is derived through a decrease in funding for the flight projects building, a cancelled project at the Jet Propulsion Lab.

10. A decrease of $10,000,000 from the Nuclear Electric Propulsion program and a decrease of $7,000,000 from the Nuclear Power System program.

BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL RESEARCH

Within the Biological and Physical Research portion of this account, the Committee recommends $854,200,000, a net increase of $11,900,000 to the budget request.

Within the amount provided, the Committee directs NASA to establish a floor of funding support for the National Space Biomedical Research Institute at $30,000,000 in fiscal year 2003.

The Committee remains committed to a healthy and productive Materials Science research program. This program has undergone multiple reviews by the National Research Council. It has also produced a backlog of well-respected investigators whose experiments have undergone multiple peer reviews, certifying that they will provide useful scientific returns that can only be obtained in the microgravity environment of space.

The Committee is concerned that recent changes to the Materials Science program have jeopardized the ability of the International Space Station to support a robust materials science research program. Therefore, the Committee expects NASA to maintain its commitment to a healthy materials research program, which at a minimum includes the timely completion of the Materials Science Research Rack—1, its experiment modules and module inserts, and the planned, peer-reviewed materials investigations that were to utilize this facility.

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

1. An increase of $4,000,000 for the Space Radiation program at Loma Linda University Hospital.
2. An increase of $1,000,000 for Canisius College for multi-user scientific equipment in life sciences.
3. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Institute for Proteomic and Nanobiotechnology at Northwestern University.
4. An increase of $400,000 for the Center for Research and Training in gravitational biology at North Carolina State University.
5. An increase of $5,000,000 for the National Center of Excellence in Bioinformatics in Buffalo, New York.
6. An increase of $8,000,000 for procurement of animal and plant habitats for the international space station.
7. A decrease of $11,200,000 from the Generations program. The Committee recognizes the value of the research being proposed through the Generations program, but finds the program to unaffordable at this time given shortages in funding for equipment for the International Space Station.
8. The Committee notes that NASA's 15 Commercial Space Centers are all under the management of the Office of Biological and Physical Research and directs NASA to support Centers at a funding level of $18,500,000, an increase of $3,700,000 to the budget request.

EARTH SCIENCES

Within the Earth Sciences portion of this account, the Committee recommends $1,675,000,000, a net increase of $46,600,000 to the budget request.

The Committee commends the work of the New Jersey NASA Specialized Center of Research and Training and its application not only to long duration space missions but its impact on the agricultural and environmental business sectors. The Committee encourages NASA to continue funding these vital efforts and recommends the agency create a technology development and demonstration center focusing on life support issues in closed environments in New Jersey.

The fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill and accompanying reports gave NASA Congressional direction to establish an implementation plan for Earth science applications partnerships. NASA completed the report on its implementation plan in June of 2002 and forwarded the report to the Committee for its review. The Committee has reviewed the report and finds that it offers a good basis on which to build a credible program utilizing remote sensing data from the Earth Observing System. Accordingly, the Committee recommendations do not include any funding for new remote

sensing applications centers, but urges NASA to follow through with its implementation plan which calls for a widely competed program.

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

1. An increase of $650,000 for the NASA Center for Marine Remote Sensing at the University of New England.
2. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Advanced Tropical Remote Sensing Center of the National Center for Tropical Remote Sensing Applications and resources at the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science.
3. An increase of $500,000 for continuation of emerging research that applies remote sensing technologies to forest management practices at the State University of New York, College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry.
4. An increase of $2,500,000 for NASA's Regional Application Center for the Northeast.
5. An increase of $15,000,000 for the Institute of Software Research for development and construction of research facilities.
6. An increase of $1,750,000 for on-going activities at the Goddard Institute for Systems, Software, and Technology Research, including UAV and remote sensing technology research.
7. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Clustering and Advanced Visual Environments initiative.
8. An increase of $6,000,000 for data storage back-up and recovery managed services that supports the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) programs, providing heterogeneous support to existing information systems and scalability to serve future requirements.
9. An increase of $10,000,000 to be transferred to the Air Force Research Laboratory (PE 602204F Aerospace Sensors) to develop dual-use lightweight space radar technology.
10. An increase of $1,500,000 for the United States portion of a joint U.S./Italian satellite development program to remotely observe forest fires.
11. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Little River Canyon field school.

AERO-SPACE TECHNOLOGY

Within the Aero-Space Technology portion of this account, the Committee recommends $2,883,850,000 a net increase of $68,050,000 to the budget request.

The Committee has grown increasingly concerned that today's airspace modernization efforts fall short of addressing existing and emerging needs. Growing numbers of flight delays and cancellations over the past few years can be attributed to fundamental limitations in aviation system capacity. Congestion, delays and inefficient routing have serious economic and environmental consequences. The events of September 11, 2001 not only highlighted the importance of aviation to our entire economy, but also demonstrated the need to enhance aviation system security to reduce the risk that future threats result in the shutdown of our national airspace system.

The Committee strongly urges the NASA Administrator, in consultation with the FAA Administrator to participate in a national initiative with the objective of defining and developing an air traffic

management system designed to meet national long-term aviation security, safety, capacity and efficiency needs. Such an initiative would result in a multi-agency blueprint for acquisition and implementation of an air traffic management system that would build upon current air traffic management and infrastructure initiatives. The initiative should take a system of systems approach toward integrating the requirements, resources, and capabilities of all key agencies or department and utilize stakeholder based system performance requirements to determine an optimal operational concept and system architecture. New modeling, simulation, and analysis tools should be used to validate system performance and benefits. The national initiative should also develop a transition plan for successful implementation into the National Airspace System (NAS).

The Committee recognizes that any significant improvement in the National Airspace System will depend upon a robust technology development program. Given the thirty-year involvement of Glenn Research Center in developing innovative communications research and technology for NASA, the Center should play a significant role in achieving the development of this technology.

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

1. An increase of $19,000,000 for Intelligent Propulsion for Next Generation Aircraft to build on and leverage the Ultra Efficient Engine Technology and Quiet Aircraft Technology programs.
2. An increase of $2,500,000 for the NASA-Illinois Technology Commercialization Center at DuPage County Research Park.
3. An increase of $300,000 for the Rural Technology Transfer and Commercialization Center of Durant, Oklahoma.
4. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Tulane Institute for Macromolecular Engineering and Science for polymer research.
5. An increase of $1,500,000 for the Glennan Microsystem Initiative.
6. An increase of $500,000 to be used for continued development of an electric/diesel hybrid engine at Bowling Green State University in conjunction with the University of Toledo.
7. An increase of $6,000,000 for the HITS multilateration sensor and surveillance server for Airport Surface Detection and Management System.
8. An increase of $5,000,000 to develop in partnership with the Air Force Research Laboratory-Information Directorate, the JVIEW modeling and simulation system for satellite coverage analysis, ground radars and air traffic over the United States.
9. An increase of $5,000,000 for Project SOCRATES.
10. An increase of $7,000,000 for continuation of the Space Alliance Technology Outreach Program, including $3,000,000 for business incubators, in Florida and New York.
11. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Advanced Interactive Discovery Environment engineering research program at Syracuse University.
12. An increase of $5,000,000 for the National Center of Excellence in Infotonics in Rochester, New York.
13. An increase of $1,500,000 for the Virtual Collaboration Center at the North Carolina GigaPop.

14. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Garrett Morgan Commercialization Initiative in Ohio.

15. An increase of $1,000,000 for on-going activities in support of NASA Dryden Flight Research Center's Intelligent Flight Control System (IFCS) research project.

16. An increase of $1,250,000 for ongoing research at Marshall Space Flight Center in the area of advanced and breakthrough solutions for propulsion.

17. An increase of $9,000,000 for hydrogen research being conducted by the Florida State University System.

18. An increase of $5,000,000 to develop in partnership with the Air Force Research Laboratory-Information Directorate, the JVIEW modeling and simulation system for satellite coverage analysis, ground radars and air traffic over the United States.

19. An increase of $500,000 for aerospace projects being accomplished by the Montana Aerospace Development Authority.

20. An increase of $800,000 for Middle Tennessee State University for the SATS Aerospace Flight Education Research Initiative.

21. An increase of $3,000,000 for the Advanced Power Systems project.

22. An increase of $5,000,000 for the DP–2 vectored thrust program.

23. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Energy Momentum Wheel project at Goddard Space Flight Center.

24. An increase of $1,000,000 for COM simulation architecture program.

25. An increase of $4,000,000 for NASA's Independent Verification and Validation Facility

26. An increase of $2,000,000 for equipment for the Computer Forensics Technology Center at Utica College of Syracuse University.

27. An increases of $7,000,000 for the Small Aircraft Transportation System. The Committee is concerned that NASA has not requested sufficient funding to enable the Small Aircraft Transportation System (SATS) program to demonstrate the practical application of the SATS Program concept, which offers the promise of extending reliable point-to-point air service to smaller communities and has provided this increase. The additional funding is to be invested through the governance process of the National Consortium for Aviation Mobility (NCAM), exclusively for acceleration of regional service demonstrations that apply those SATS and related technologies ready for implementation, and for automotive technology transfer. The Committee expects NCAM to use these additional funds to accelerate the planning and conduct of SATS regional service demonstrations in states with strong state, community, and transportation service provider participation in the NCAM partnership. This funding for NCAM is in addition to the $11,750,000 proposed by NASA for fiscal year 2003. Further, the Committee expects the SATS service demonstrations to provide the participating communities and their representative organizations with an opportunity to participate in SATS transportation service demonstrations, an analysis of economic impacts and related implications of improved air access to smaller communities, and an explanation of the technologies behind the concept.

The Committee expects the SATS program to engage NCAM partners in efforts to enhance the affordability of SATS to end-users through an inter-modal transportation technology transfer effort in coordination with relevant industrial automotive technology development efforts.

The Committee expects the SATS service demonstrations to be done in collaboration with the FAA and, as appropriate, in cooperation with the FAA's Safe Flight 21 Program. The SATS project will address issues raised by the FAA regarding operational procedures and safety criteria for the SATS technologies and their deployment. A primary objective of the FAA–NASA collaboration in the SATS program is for the output of the 2005 demonstration activities to be sufficient to define the implementation actions required for deployment of SATS transportation services.

NASA is directed to provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate on the status of program progress and results on March 31 of each year. Finally, the Committee directs that future budget requests for SATS shall identify sufficient funding to enable NCAM to fully carry out the service demonstrations and the automotive technology transfer, including adequate funding to support full collaboration between SATS and the FAA.

28. A decrease of $31,000,000, without prejudice, from the Space Launch Initiative program. The Committee recommendation includes the full request for of $62,700,000 for Alternative Access to Station. Because NASA's Research Maximization and Prioritization Task Force has called for additional "upmass" to improve ISS research productivity, the Committee directs that these funds be used to demonstrate a near-term commercial ISS re-supply service.

29. An increase of $500,000 for the Advanced Space Propulsion Materials Research and Technology Center at Alabama A&M University.

30. An increase of $1,000,000 for high temperature nanotechnology research to be conducted at Glenn Research Center.

31. An increase of $1,000,000 for the computing, information, and communications technology program only for the development, demonstration and assessment of a mobile, wireless, broadband internet capability.

The Committee supports the mission of Wallops Flight Facility and that facility's fully capable test range for low-cost, aerospace-based, science and technology research through small to medium-sized missions. However, the Committee does not support the alteration of existing roles and responsibilities of NASA's flight centers.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Within the Academic Programs portion of this account, the Committee recommends $178,950,000 an increase of $35,250,000 to the budget request.

The Committee has provided $82,100,000 for NASA's minority university research and education activities, the same as the budget request. The Committee directs that the Minority University Research and Education Program be retained as a discrete budget line in future budgets and that the Minority University Research

and Education Division be continued within the Office of Equal Opportunity Programs.

The Committee has serious concerns that too few students are pursuing advanced degree in aerospace science and engineering, with a result that the Nation's future in the utilization and exploration of space will be compromised. The Committee recognizes that for advanced education to be effective, it must be pursued in universities with active research programs. NASA, with its longstanding support of university-based research, is in a unique position to ensure that the university research base, and the educational opportunities that accompany it, are sufficient to the Nation's needs. Accordingly, NASA is directed, in cooperation with the Nation's leading research universities, to develop a comprehensive plan and implementation strategy that will result in an increase in the number of students pursuing advanced degrees in the presence of vibrant university research efforts. The plan should include means to increase the number of university research and educational groups, to increase the number of new, young faculty; to build cooperative relationships between universities and NASA centers; and means for attracting and supporting students. The plan should be submitted to the Committee by March 15, 2003 and will serve as the basis for consideration of the fiscal year 2004 NASA budget.

The Committee encourages NASA to develop closer working relationships with universities in regions adjacent to national laboratories. National laboratories have assets and capabilities that are important to graduate student support and collaborations with regional universities.

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

1. An increase of $250,000 for Niagara University for science, engineering and math programs.
2. An increase of $1,200,000 for the NASA Educator Resource Center at South East Missouri State University.
3. An increase of $1,050,000 for the Carl Sagan Discovery Science Center at the Children's Hospital at Montefiore Medical Center to implement the educational programming for this science learning project.
4. An increase of $2,500,000 for the JASON Foundation.
5. An increase of $4,000,000 for continuation of programs at the American Museum of Natural History.
6. An increase of $1,000,000 to the U.S. Space and Rocket Center for an Educational Training Center.
7. An increase of $1,000,000 for academic and infrastructure needs at St. Thomas University in Miami, Florida.
8. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Ohio View Consortium.
9. An increase of $3,000,000 for the Alabama Math, Science, and Technology initiative.
10. An increase of $2,500,000 to the Educational Advancement Alliance to support the Alliance's math, science, and technology enrichment program.
11. An increase of $5,000,000 for the National Space Grant College and Fellowship program. The funding level recommended by the Committee is $24,100,000, the same as the fiscal year 2002 appropriation. By this action, the Committee has funded the core pro-

grams of the 52 consortia, including some modest upgrades. NASA is encouraged to use these consortia to continue workforce development initiative to attract and retain educated, skilled diverse employees for ANSA and aerospace industries. It is imperative that NASA encourage additional young people to pursue careers in science and engineering and these consortia are on the front lines for this effort.

12. An increase of $500,000 for Science, Engineering, Math and Aerospace Academy programs at Central Arizona College.

13. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Center for Science and Math at the University of Redlands.

14. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Chabot Space and Science Center for math and science education.

15. An increase of $2,000,000 for the City College of New York to establish a community-based science and technology education facility.

16. An increase of $500,000 for Science, Engineering, Math and Aerospace Academy programs at Livingstone College.

17. An increase of $550,000 for the Patriots Technology Training Center in Seat Pleasant, Maryland.

18. An increase of $5,400,000 for the EPSCoR program for a total funding level of $10,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2002.

19. An increase of $800,000 for Science, Engineering, Math, and Aeronautics Academy in Miami, Florida.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$24,600,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	23,700,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	24,600,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	0

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

The Committee recommends $24,600,000 for the Office of the Inspector General in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $900,000 to the amount provided in fiscal year 2002 and the same as the budget request for fiscal year 2002.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The bill includes four administrative provisions as carried in prior appropriations acts, three of which were proposed in the budget.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	($1,500,000,000)	($309,000)
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	(1,500,000,000)	(309,000)
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	(1,500,000,000)	(0)
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	(0)	(0)
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	(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.

The Committee recommends a limitation of $1,500,000,000 on CLF lending activity to member credit unions from borrowed funds. This limitation represents the same level as fiscal year 2002 and the same as the budget request. The Committee expects to be kept apprised of CLF lending activity.

The Committee recommends the budget request of not more than $309,000 for administrative expenses.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$1,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	1,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	1,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	0

The Community Development Revolving Loan Fund Program (CDRLF) was established in 1979 to assist officially designated "low-income" credit unions in providing basic financial services to low-income communities. Low-interest loans and deposits are made available to assist these credit unions. Loans or deposits are normally repaid in five years, although shorter repayment periods may be considered. Technical assistance grants are also available to low-income credit unions. Until fiscal year 2001, only earnings generated from the CDRLF were available to fund technical assistance grants. Grants are available for improving operations as well as addressing safety and soundness issues.

The Committee recommends $1,000,000 be provided to the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund for loans to community development credit unions, the same level as requested in the budget request. Within this amount, $700,000 is available until expended for loans to community development credit unions and $300,000 is available for fiscal year 2003 for additional technical assistance grants to low-income and community development credit unions.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$5,422,942,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	4,808,540,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	5,028,210,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+614,402,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+394,732,000

Established in 1950 and receiving its first appropriation of $225,000 in 1951, the National Science Foundation celebrates its 51st anniversary as an important, highly regarded federal agency during fiscal year 2002. The primary purpose behind its creation was to develop a national policy on science, and support and pro-

mote 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 2002 is a multi-billion dollar agency.

The Committee recommends a total of $5,422,942,000 for fiscal year 2003. This recommendation is an increase of $614,402,000, or 13 percent, above last year's appropriation and an increase of $394,732,000 above the President's budget request.

The Committee is strongly supportive of the National Science Foundation and committed to its mission of providing national leadership and federal financial support of research as the basis for scientific and social advancement for the nation and for the entire world. This commitment is reflected in the substantial 13 percent increase provided in this bill for the NSF for FY 2003.

As Congress, the executive branch and the American people begin to consider a multi-year build-up of financial support for the NSF, however, the Committee also believes that a review of the agency's organizational, programmatic and personnel structures is appropriate and can provide assurance to the public that the agency is positioned to maximize the opportunities which increased funding can create. The Committee has allocated $1,000,000 within the agency "Salaries and Expenses" appropriation for a contract with the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) to conduct such a study. The Committee expects this contract to be awarded no later than December 31, 2002.

Without prejudicing the outcome of this NAPA review, the Committee is concerned about the following issues:

Organizational and program structure. Over the last decade the NSF has evolved into a very complex and multi-layered system of directorates, sub-directorates and programs each with its own leadership and budget. This organizational structure is then managed and evaluated against a system of goals which were established under the Government Performance and Results Act as well as a set of six cross-cutting priority areas which change from year to year. All programs are required to justify themselves according to how they serve both the goals and the priorities. Assets flow and personnel are evaluated based on such evaluations even though not every program clearly is designed to serve every goal and every priority. There is concern that this system, each aspect of which may have been created with the best of intentions, may have become overly bureaucratic. Some observers have characterized this current structure as both Byzantine and balkanized. This reflects a concern that the system is broken up into large numbers of parts which may channel significant portions of research funding into narrow areas making it difficult for researchers to follow broader interdisciplinary projects or innovative research areas not yet reflected in NSF's view of scientific opportunity. Because recent NSF budget requests have heavily favored the agency's own priority areas at the expense of research in core disciplines, investigators often feel compelled to apply for support in certain areas because of a sense that proposals which do not fit into NSF's priorities are significantly disadvantaged. The Committee believes that a thoughtful review should ask whether the current NSF organization and management structure and its goal and priority systems should be simplified or changed.

The balance between field driven and NSF driven science priority setting. Second, but clearly related, the Committee believes that this review should consider whether the NSF's approach to its stewardship mission creates the proper balance between necessary and appropriate levels of agency leadership of NSF sponsored science and the need to ensure that this research remains principally investigator initiated work. A corollary question is whether the structure of NSF and management control of its priority setting methodologies have negatively influenced the balance between NSF initiatives and appropriate resource allocations for core science investments.

The underlying principal around which NSF was founded and which the Committee believes is still the pedestal upon which the success of America's taxpayer supported research rests is that both the choice of research priorities and the choice of individual projects should flow principally from practicing scientists in the field as expressed through organized systems of advice and through external peer review. The Committee believes that it is appropriate to review whether the balance of power in setting research priorities is the appropriate one or whether NSF has become too directive in managing its research portfolios.

Role of the National Science Board. The NSF is unique in entrusting both advisory and executive authority for the agency in an "independent" board appointed by the president. Recent Congressional action has highlighted, however, the concerns about the relationship between the Board and the agency and its Director and in particular the issue as to how independent the Board is able to operate given its dependence on the Agency for financial support and personnel. The Committee has not adopted the proposals made by its Senate counterpart to provide for a separate budget for the Board but instead would request that the organizational review of NSF here directed include an analysis of the extent to which the Board has fulfilled its original purpose and a review of the role and the structure of the Board in the future.

Personnel policies. The NSF has chosen over the years to rely significantly on contractual and on temporary personnel assigned to the agency under the IPA system to manage its science programs including its grant selection processes. Almost one-tenth of the approximately 1500 staff of the agency are university based researchers detailed to NSF under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (so-called IPA's) and over 200 are contractors. The assignment of non-permanent personnel to management positions now includes the heads of its science directorates. The advantage of this system is a continuous flow of individuals from the field who are current in their science. The disadvantage, however, is a cadre of agency personnel, including some of its most senior staff, who have less experience and could have split loyalties between their federal roles and their past or future employment base. The Committee believes a thoughtful review of the agency's structure should include an evaluation of the use of temporary staff and term appointments, especially to the extent this involves the heads of the science directorates.

In laying out these particular concerns, the Committee does not mean this to be an exclusive list. The review by NAPA should be carried out by very senior and thoughtful persons who should feel

free to analyze any other factors which the group believes are central to the question of determining what organizational, programmatic and personnel systems will facilitate the most effective partnership between the National Science Foundation and the scientific community for the benefit of the nation.

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 2003 recommendation	$4,150,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	3,598,340,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	3,783,200,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+551,660,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+366,800,000

The appropriation for Research and Related Activities covers all programs in the Foundation except Education and Human Resources, Salaries and Expenses, Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction, 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 $4,150,000,000 for Research and Related Activities in fiscal year 2003, an increase of $551,660,000 above last year's funding level and an increase of $366,800,000 above the budget request. This represents a 15.3 percent increase over the fiscal year 2002 appropriated level for this entire account, and provides an increase of at least 15 percent over the fiscal 2002 funding level for seven of the nine Research and Related Activities' directorates. The Committee's recommendation includes the following program levels: (1) Biological Sciences, $584,670,000; (2) Computer and Information Science and Engineering, $592,110,000; (3) Engineering, $543,160,000; (4) Geosciences, $700,890,000; (5) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, $1,058,510,000; (6) Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences, $195,610,000; (7) U.S. Polar Research Programs, $254,000,000; (8) U.S. Antarctic Logistical Support Activities, $70,440,000; and (9) Integrative Activities, $150,610,000.

Except as specifically noted herein, in allocating the increases provided by the Committee, the Foundation should give the highest priority to increasing research opportunities for investigator initiated research in the core scientific disciplines. 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.

Of the amounts made available for Biological Sciences, the Committee has recommended $75,000,000, the budget request, to continue research on the genomics of plants of major economic importance. In addition, the Committee's recommendation provides $26,000,000 for Biocomplexity in the Environment research, an increase of 53% over the fiscal year 2002 funding level of $16,900,000.

It is the Committee's intent that not to exceed $12,500,000 of the additional funds made available for Computer and Information Science and Engineering, may be used by NSF for ongoing operational support of the two funded terascale computing systems. The remaining additional resources over the budget request should, to the greatest extent practicable, be focused on information technology research and cyber-security research.

From within the Engineering Directorate, the Committee is concerned that researchers are reaching the physical limits of current complementary metal oxide semiconductor (CMOS) process technology and that this will have significant implications for continued productivity growth in the information economy. The Committee encourages NSF to examine the challenges and timelines outlined in the most recent International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors and, where feasible, increase research support in this area accordingly.

Under the Geosciences Directorate, the Committee has not recommended approval of the budget request to transfer to the NSF the Environmental Education program, currently operated by the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Sea Grant Program, operated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or the Hydrology of Toxic Substances program, operated by the United States Geological Survey. Each of these programs works well within its current framework and the Committee has not been convinced that such transfer as proposed in the budget submission will either enhance the individual programs or benefit the ongoing programs of the Foundation.

Within the additional funds made available for the Mathematical and Physical Sciences directorate, the Committee expects the Foundation to allocate funds on a basis which provides a high priority for astronomy, including individual investigator grants, and sufficient resources to begin development of important new projects recommended in a recent National Academy of Sciences 10-year plan for astronomical science activities. In addition, the Committee's recommendation for the Astronomical Sciences activity includes $5,000,000 above the budget request for the National Radio Astronomy Observatory (NRAO) program, $4,300,000 above the budget request for the National Optical Astronomy Observatories (NOAO), $2,000,000 above the budget request for the National Astronomy and Ionosphere Center (NAIC), and no less than the budget request of $4,000,000 for the Telescope Systems Instrumentation Program (TSIP). The Foundation is expected to aggressively continue its program, begun in fiscal 2001, of upgrading on a priority basis its astronomical facilities and equipment.

Also within Mathematical and Physical Sciences, the Committee's recommendation includes the budget request of $181,870,000 for Mathematical Sciences and not less than $225,000,000, a 15% increase over the fiscal year 2002 funding level, for Physics programs.

With regard to the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate (SBE), the Committee recognizes that investment in basic, multidisciplinary research on learning is crucial to both successful educational reform and effective workforce development. In this regard, the Committee's recommendation includes support for the NSF Science of Learning Centers. This program is intended to build collaborative research communities of scientists, educators, community groups, and industry capable of addressing fundamental questions in learning and then integrating these results into ongoing federal education reform initiatives.

Also within the SBE directorate, the Committee has included $6,000,000 for the Children's Research Initiative (CRI). This level of funding, an increase of $1,000,000 above that provided for fiscal years 2001 and 2002, will allow NSF to emphasize ongoing research related to enhancing literacy and improving math and science skills.

For the Office of Polar Programs (OPP), an increase of $18,260,000 above the budget request has been provided to enhance the ongoing research effort as well as to provide additional necessary resources for operations, research support and logistics, and science and research grant support. In addition, the Committee is aware of the pressing need to provide both upgraded living facilities and adequate, indoor storage facilities at NSF's McMurdo Station in Antarctica. In this regard, the Committee requests that the OPP prepare and deliver to the Committee at the earliest date possible a report outlining the work that needs to be performed to upgrade these facilities as well as the estimated short- and long-term costs involved with such upgrades. The report should detail whether such facilities would be new construction or retrofits or upgrades to existing facilities. Upon completion and delivery of such report, OPP may utilize available resources provided herein to begin planning, design, pre-construction and/or construction activities related to such necessary upgrades.

Finally, from within these additional funds, OPP may begin to execute contractual arrangements and make necessary advance expenditures in preparation of its plans to provide mechanical traverse capability between McMurdo Station and Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station. Because all supplies and materials going to the South Pole must currently be configured so as to fit in a C–130 aircraft, delivery of such is entirely dependent on the availability of aircraft and subject to severe weather fluctuations. Once fully implemented, this traverse capability thus offers the opportunity to safely and in a timely manner provide both increased supply volumes and construction supplies and equipment requiring less retrofit at a greatly reduced cost.

Within the Integrative Activities Directorate, an additional $40,000,000 over the budget request has been included for Major Research Instrumentation.

MAJOR RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$159,510,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	138,800,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	126,280,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+20,710,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+33,230,000

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 $159,510,000 for the major research construction and equipment account for fiscal year 2003, an increase of $33,230,000 over the budget request and $20,710,000 over the fiscal 2002 funding level.

The Committee's recommendation includes the budget requests of $9,720,000 for the Large Hadron Collider, $13,560,000 for the George E. Brown Jr. Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation, $30,000,000 for construction funding of the Atacama Large Millimeter Array (ALMA) aperture-synthesis radio telescope, and $6,000,000 for additional construction requirements necessary to meet enhanced capacity needs at the new South Pole Station.

In addition the Committee is recommending $25,530,000 as the final installment necessary to complete development of the High-performance Instrumented Airborne Platform for Environmental Research (HIAPER), and $24,700,000 for continued research and development of the IceCube Neutrino Detector Observatory in Antarctica. This project, building on the successful AMANDA demonstration, is designed to more fully develop knowledge of the origins of the universe as well as the fundamental nature of physical matter using its unique polar telescope. This device will allow scientists to measure, quantify and analyze neutrino particles and their role in these basic questions of science. The amount provided for fiscal 2003 will support continued development, acquisition, preconstruction, testing and logistics support necessary to facilitate IceCube's large-scale construction and deployment.

Finally, the Committee has provided $40,000,000 for first year funding for the new EarthScope project instead of $35,000,000 as requested in the budget submission, and $10,000,000 for support of the Terascale Computing System and the Distributed Terascale Facility (also known as "Teragrid"), instead of $20,000,000 as proposed in the budget request.

With regard to EarthScope, the five-year budget projections of this important project initially called for lesser funding requirements in the first, fourth, and fifth years of the project and dramatically increased funding in years two and three. In an attempt to provide a relatively level funding profile for the life of the project, the project's sponsors have developed an alternative request which provides $40,000,000 in year one, $42,000,000 in year two, $40,000,000 in year three, $39,000,000 in year four, and $37,000,000 in year five. In addition to the obvious benefits such level funding will bring to the annual appropriations process, the sponsors have suggested this new approach brings the added benefits of achieving significant cost savings over the long-term operation and maintenance of the facility, and providing higher quality data through the acquisition of instrumentation with uniform technical characteristics.

With regard to support of the two new terascale facilities, it is the Committee's understanding that the original fiscal 2002 request of $55,000,000 for this project was intended to be spent over a three-year period, with $35,000,000 being necessary in year one and $10,000,000 necessary in each of years two and three. The Congress last year provided the first year's $35,000,000 requirement, and the Committee intends to continue this pattern by providing $10,000,000 in fiscal 2003 and $10,000,000 in fiscal year 2004.

The Committee's recommendation does not include funding for the new National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON) project as requested in the budget submission. This decision, made without prejudice to the NEON project, allows the Committee to use its limited MREFC resources to fully fund ongoing projects as well as begin funding for one new research effort, the EarthScope project.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$910,580,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	875,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	908,080,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+35,580,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+2,500,000

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 2003, the Committee recommends $910,580,000, an increase of $35,580,000 above last year's appropriated level and $2,500,000 above the budget request. The Committee's recommendation includes the following program levels: Math and Science Partnership, $160,000,000; Educational System Reform, $40,250,000; EPSCoR, $86,000,000; Elementary, Secondary and Informal Education, $177,440,000; Undergraduate Education, $155,600,000; Graduate Education, $128,380,000; Human Resource Development, $95,710,000; and Research, Evaluation and Communication, $67,200,000.

In addition to the $86,000,000 recommended for the EPSCoR program under the Education and Human Resources account, the Committee has concurred in the budget request of $5,000,000 for EPSCoR from within the Integrated Activities directorate in the Research and Related Activities account, bringing the total EPSCoR program level for fiscal 2003 to $91,000,000.

Within the Committee's recommendation for the Elementary, Secondary and Informal Education activity is an additional $6,000,000 for Informal Science, bringing the total program level to $61,000,000.

Within the Undergraduate Education activity, increases above the budget request have been provided for the Advanced Technological Education (ATE) program (+$4,000,000), the STEM Talent Expansion Program (STEP) (+$13,000,000), and the Robert Noyce

Scholarship Program (+$3,000,000). The total funding level for each of these three programs is $42,160,000, $15,000,000, and $7,000,000, respectively.

Finally, within the Human Resource Development Activity, an additional $2,000,000 above the budget request has been added to the Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation (LSAMP) program for a total funding level of $28,530,000, and $3,500,000 above the budget request has been added to Historically Black Colleges and Universities Undergraduate Program (HBCU–UP) for a total 2003 program level of $17,470,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$193,852,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	170,040,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	202,950,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+23,812,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	−9,098,000

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 $193,852,000 for salaries and expenses, a decrease of $9,098,000 below the President's budget request and an increase of $23,812,000 above last year's appropriated level.

The Committee shares the belief that the increased activities, responsibilities, and financial resources of the Foundation make it necessary to provide increased personnel resources as well. The Committee's recommendation therefore includes $128,662,000 for Personnel Compensation and Benefits, an increase of $8,812,000 above the fiscal year 2002 funding level. This funding level is sufficient to provide comparability and locality pay increases for existing staff, within-grade increases, career promotions and appropriate bonuses, and will allow the employment of up to 25 additional FTEs, bringing the total workforce to 1175 for fiscal year 2003.

In addition, the Committee's recommendation includes an additional $15,000,000 above the fiscal 2002 funding level for General Operating Expenses, including increases for space rental, travel and transportation, training, supplies and other necessary operating expenses, as well as for the Foundation's ongoing Information Infrastructure program.

As the Committee has not approved the transfer of programs from the EPA, NOAA, and the U.S. Geological Survey as proposed in the budget submission, the Committee's recommendation for Salaries and Expenses does not include the 17 FTEs that would have transferred with these programs.

The Foundation is expected to use up to $1,000,000 from within the Salaries and Expenses account to contract with the National Academy of Public Administration for an extensive organizational study as outlined earlier in this Report.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$9,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	6,760,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	7,700,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+2,240,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request	+1,300,000

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 2003, the Committee has recommended $9,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General. This amount is $2,240,000 above last year's funding level and is $1,300,000 above the budget request.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$105,000,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	105,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	105,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 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 a funding level of $105,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, the same amount as the budget request and the fiscal year 2002 appropriation.

A set-aside of $10,000,000, as proposed in the budget, is included for continuation of 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 to attain the goal of homeownership.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation	$26,480,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation	25,003,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request	26,480,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation	+1,477,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 budget request	0

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 Serv-

ice 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 2003, the bill includes the budget request of $26,480,000 for the Selective Service System, $1,477,000 above the fiscal year 2002 funding level.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends inclusion of twenty-two general provisions, fifteen of which were carried in the fiscal year 2002 Appropriations Act (Public Law 107–73). The Committee has included new provisions which (1) prohibits the expenditure of funds to any department or agency created after enactment of this Act, (2) changes the formula for hazard mitigation grant funding, (3) modifies the Consumer Product Safety Act to clarify that CPSC has jurisdictional authority regarding the regulation of low-speed electric personal assistive mobility devices, (4) provides new authorities to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as described in the NASA section of this report, and (5) provides for a reduction in the State cost share for construction of emergency operations centers from 50 percent to 25 percent.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives states: "Each report of a committee on 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.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is a statement of general performance goals and objectives for which this measure authorizes funding:

The Committee on Appropriations considers program performance, including a program's success in developing and attaining outcome-related goals and objectives, in developing funding recommendations.

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 $17,138,000 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 ($168,207,000), the education loan fund program account ($70,000), the vocational rehabilitation loans program account ($289,000) and the Native American veteran housing loan program account ($558,000). 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 under the Department of Veterans Affairs which would transfer funds from the medical care collections fund to medical care.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Veterans Affairs which would transfer $5,000,000 from medical and prosthetic research to medical care.

The Committee recommends providing authority under administrative provisions for the Department of Veterans Affairs for any funds appropriated in 2003 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 2002 and all collections made during fiscal year 2003 to the flexible subsidy fund.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring the following amounts to the salaries and expenses account for administrative expenses: FHA mutual mortgage insurance and general and special risk insurance program accounts ($548,202,400); GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account ($10,343,000); community development loan guarantees program account ($1,000,000); Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account ($200,000); native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund ($35,000); and Native American housing block grants account ($150,000).

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring $13,000,000 from the manufactured housing fees trust fund to the manufactured housing standards program.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring no less than the following amounts to the working capital fund under the salaries and expenses account for development and management of information technology systems: housing certificate fund ($3,000,000); public housing capital fund ($18,600,000); community development fund ($3,400,000); home investment partnership program account ($1,100,000); homeless assistance grants account ($1,500,000); housing for special populations account ($500,000); FHA mutual mortgage insurance program account ($21,360,000); FHA general and special risk insurance program account ($14,240,000); Office of Inspector General ($300,000); and native American housing block grants account ($600,000).

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring $23,343,000 from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration to the Office of Inspector General.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring $30,000,000 from the federal housing enterprise oversight fund to the office of federal housing enterprise oversight account.

The Committee has included language under the Environmental Protection Agency transferring funds from the hazardous substance superfund trust fund ($12,742,000) to the Office of Inspector General. In addition, $86,168,000 is transferred from the hazardous substance superfund trust fund to the science and technology account.

The Committee has included language under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation transferring up to $30,848,000 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 $2,900,000 from the disaster relief account to the emergency management planning and assistance account and $21,577,000 to the Office of Inspector General.

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 which provides for the transfer of up to five percent of firefighter assistance grants funding to salaries and expenses.

The Committee has included general transfer language under National Aeronautics and Space Administration, human space flight account and the science aeronautic and technology account. This language will allow for the transfer of funds among these two accounts, as necessary, to reflect full cost accounting recently scheduled for implementation.

RESCISSIONS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Certificate Fund	−1,300,000,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development, Rental Housing Assistance	−100,000,000

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):

TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * * * *

PART II—GENERAL BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 17—HOSPITAL, NURSING HOME, DOMICILIARY, AND MEDICAL CARE

Subchapter I—General

Sec.
1701. Definitions.

* * * * * * *

Subchapter III—Miscellaneous Provisions Relating to Hospital and Nursing Home Care and Medical Treatment of Veterans

1721. Power to make rules and regulations.

* * * * * * *

[1729B. Health Services Improvement Fund.]

* * * * * * *

Subchapter III—Miscellaneous Provisions Relating to Hospital and Nursing Home Care and Medical Treatment of Veterans

* * * * * * *

§ 1722A. Copayment for medications

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Amounts collected [under subsection (a)] *under this section* shall be deposited in the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund. [Amounts collected through use of the authority under subsection (b) shall be deposited in the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Improvement Fund.]

[(d) The provisions of subsection (a) expire on September 30, 2002.]

* * * * * * *

§ 1729A. Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund

(a) * * *

(b) Amounts recovered or collected after June 30, 1997, under any of the following provisions of law shall be deposited in the fund:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(8) Section 8165(a) of this title.

(9) Section 113 of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (Public Law 106–117; 38 U.S.C. 8111 note).

[(8)] *(10)* Public Law 87–693, popularly known as the "Federal Medical Care Recovery Act" (42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq.), to the extent that a recovery or collection under that law is based on medical care or services furnished under this chapter.

* * * * * * *

[§ 1729B. Health Services Improvement Fund

[(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Improvement Fund.

[(b) Amounts received or collected after the date of the enactment of this section under any of the following provisions of law shall be deposited in the fund:

[(1) Section 1713A of this title.

[(2) Section 1722A(b) of this title.

[(3) Section 8165(a) of this title.

[(4) Section 113 of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act.

[(c) Amounts in the fund are hereby available, without fiscal year limitation, to the Secretary for the purposes stated in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1729A(c)(1) of this title.

[(d) The Secretary shall allocate amounts in the fund in the same manner as applies under subsection (d) of section 1729A of this title with respect to amounts made available from the fund under that section.]

* * * * * * *

PART VI—ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 81—ACQUISITION AND OPERATION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES; PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY; ENHANCED-USE LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

* * * * * * *

Subchapter V—Enhanced-Use Leases of Real Property

§ 8165. Use of proceeds

(a)(1) Funds received by the Department under an enhanced-use lease and remaining after any deduction from those funds under subsection (b) shall be deposited in the [Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Improvement Fund established under section 1729B of this title] *Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund established under section 1729A of this title.*

* * * * * * *

SECTION 113 OF THE VETERANS MILLENNIUM HEALTH CARE AND BENEFITS ACT

SEC. 113. ACCESS TO CARE FOR TRICARE-ELIGIBLE MILITARY RETIREES.

(a) * * *

(b) DEPOSITING OF REIMBURSEMENTS.—Amounts received by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the agreement under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the [Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Improvement Fund established under section 1729B of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 202] *Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections fund established under section 1729A of title 38, United States Code.*

* * * * * * *

SECTION 225 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

HOPWA TECHNICAL

SEC. 225. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount allocated for fiscal [year 2000, and the amounts that would otherwise be allocated for fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002] *years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003,* to the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on behalf of the Philadelphia, PA–NJ Primary Metropolitan Area (hereafter "metropolitan area"), under section 854(c) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall adjust such amounts by allocating to the State of New Jersey the proportion of the metropolitan area's amount that is based on the number of cases of AIDS reported in the portion of the metropolitan area that in located in New Jersey.

* * * * * * *

FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT

* * * * * * *

SEC. 136a–1 (i) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) MAINTENANCE FEE.—

(A) Subject to * * *

(B) In the case of * * *

(C)(i) The amount of each fee prescribed under subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted by the Administrator to a level that will result in the collection under this paragraph of, to the extent practicable, an aggregate amount of [$17,000,000] *$20,000,000* in [each] fiscal year 2003.

(D) The maximum * * *

(E)(i) For a small * * *

(F) The Administrator shall * * *

(G) If any fee * * *

(H) The authority provided under this paragraph shall terminate on September 30, [2002] *2003.*

(6) OTHER FEES.—During the period beginning on October 25, 1988, and ending on September 30, [2002] *2003*, the Administrator shall * * *

* * * * * * *

(k) * * *

(3) EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF SIMILAR APPLICATIONS.—

(A) The Administrator shall use for each of the fiscal years 1997 through [2002] *2003*, not more than 1/10 of the maintenance fee collected * * *

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968

TITLE XIII—NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1301. This title may be cited as the "National Flood Insurance Act of 1968".

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER I—THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

* * * * * * *

FINANCING

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 December 31, [2002] *2004,* 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.

* * * * * * *

PROGRAM EXPIRATION

SEC. 1319. No new contract for flood insurance under this title shall be entered into after December 31, [2002] *2004.*

* * * * * * *

PART A—INDUSTRY PROGRAM WITH FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

* * * * * * *

EMERGENCY IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 1336. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, for the purpose of providing flood insurance coverage at the earliest possible time, the Director shall carry out the flood insurance program authorized under chapter I during the period ending December 31, [2002] *2004,* in accordance with the provisions of this part and the other provisions of this title insofar as they relate to this part but subject to the modifications made by or under subsection (b).

(b) In carrying out the flood insurance program pursuant to subsection (a), the Director—

(1) shall provide insurance coverage without regard to any estimated risk premium rates which would otherwise be determined under section 1307; and

(2) shall utilize the provisions and procedures contained in or prescribed by this part (other than section 1334) and sections 1345 and 1346 to such extent and in such manner as he may consider necessary or appropriate to carry out the purpose of this section.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER IV—APPROPRIATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 1376. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary through December 31, [2002] *2004,* for studies under this title.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 404 OF THE ROBERT T. STAFFORD DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT

SEC. 404. HAZARD MITIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may contribute up to 75 percent of the cost of hazard mitigation measures which the President has determined are cost-effective and which substantially reduce the risk of future damage, hardship, loss, or suffering in any area affected by a major disaster. Such measures shall be identified following the evaluation of natural hazards under section 322 and shall be subject to approval by the President. Subject to section 322, the total of contributions under this section for a major disaster shall not exceed **[**15**]** *7.5* percent of the estimated aggregate amount of grants to be made (less any associated administrative costs) under this Act with respect to the major disaster.

* * * * * * *

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT

SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Consumer Product Safety Act".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

* * * * * * *

Sec. 38. Low-speed electric personal assistive mobility devices.

* * * * * * *

LOW-SPEED ELECTRIC PERSONAL ASSISTIVE MOBILITY DEVICES

SEC. 38. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, low-speed electric personal assistive mobility devices, other than those excluded by 15 USC 2052(a)(1)(A), are consumer products within the meaning of section 3(a)(1) of this Act.

(b) For the purpose of this section, the term "low-speed electric personal assistive mobility device" means a self-balancing two non tandem wheeled device with an electric propulsion system whose maximum speed on a paved level surface, when powered solely by such a propulsion system while ridden by an operator who weighs 170 pounds, is less than 20 mph; provided, however, that this term shall exclude devices that are subject to jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration pursuant to Section 321 (h) of the Title 21, United States Code.

(c) To further protect the safety of consumers who ride low-speed electric personal assistive mobility devices, the Commission may promulgate new or amended requirements applicable to such devices as necessary and appropriate.

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

* * * * * * *

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

* * * * * * *

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

SEC. 314. There is hereby established in the United States Treasury a National Aeronautics and Space Administration working capital fund. Amounts in the fund are available for financing activities, services, equipment, information, and facilities as authorized by law to be provided within the Administration; to other agencies or instrumentalities of the United States; to any State, Territory, or possession or political subdivision thereof; to other public or private agencies; or to any person, firm, association, corporation, or educational institution on a reimbursable basis. The fund shall also be available for the purpose of funding capital repairs, renovations, rehabilitation, sustainment, demolition, or replacement of NASA real property, on a reimbursable basis within the Administration. Amounts in the fund are available without regard to fiscal year limitation. The capital of the fund consists of amounts appropriated to the fund; the reasonable value of stocks of supplies, equipment, and other assets and inventories on order that the Administrator transfers to the fund, less the related liabilities and unpaid obligations; amounts received from the sale or exchange of property; and payments received for loss or damage to property of the fund. The fund shall be reimbursed, in advance, for supplies and services at rates that will approximate the expenses of operation, such as the accrual of annual leave, depreciation of plant, property and equipment, and overhead.

ENHANCED-USE LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY

SEC. 315. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administration may enter into a lease under this section with any person or entity (including another department or agency of the Federal Government or an entity of a State or local government) with regard to any real property under the jurisdiction of the Administration.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) A person or entity entering into a lease under this section shall provide consideration for the lease at fair market value as determined by the Administrator, except that in the case of a lease to another department or agency of the Federal Government, that department or agency shall provide consideration for the lease equal to the full costs of the Administration in connection with the lease.

(2) Consideration under this subsection may take one or a combination of the following forms:

(A) the payment of cash;

(B) the maintenance, construction, modification or improvement of facilities on real property under the jurisdiction of the Administration;

(C) the provision of services to the Administration, including launch services and payload processing services; or

(D) use by the Administration of facilities on the property.

(3)(A) The Administrator may utilize amounts of cash consideration received under this subsection for a lease entered into under this section to cover the full costs of the Administration in connection with the lease. These funds shall remain available to the Administration until expended.

(B) Any amounts of cash consideration received under this subsection that are not utilized in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall be deposited in a capital asset account to be established by the Administrator, shall be available for maintenance, capital revitalization, and improvements of the real property assets of the Administration, and shall remain available to the Administration until expended.

(c) LEASE TERM.—The term of any lease entered into under this section shall not exceed 75 years.

(d) SCORING.—For the sole purpose of scoring leaseback agreements for purposes of the Federal budget, if the non-Federal entity shall exercise management control of the business of the public-private entity and holds a majority interest in ownership in the public-private venture, then the project shall not be considered to be constructed on Government-owned land for the purposes of the application of scoring rules.

(e) AUTHORITY FOR DISPOSITION OF LEASED PROPERTY.—If, during the term of a lease entered into under this section, or within 90 days after the end of the term of the lease, the Administrator determines that the leased property is no longer needed by the Administration, the Administrator may initiate action for the transfer to the lessee of all right, title, and interest of the United States in the property by:

(1) requesting the Administrator of General Services Administration to dispose of the property for such consideration as the NASA Administrator and the Administrator of General Services jointly determine is in the best interests of the United States and upon such other terms and conditions as the Administrators consider appropriate; or

(2) taking such other disposal action authorized by statute for the transfer of property under the jurisdiction of the Administration.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator may require such terms and conditions in connection with a lease under this section as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LEASE AUTHORITY.—The authority under this section to lease property of the Administration is in addition to any other authority to lease property of the Administration under law.

CONVEYANCE OF UTILITY SYSTEMS

SEC. 316. (a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may convey a utility system or part of a utility system under the jurisdiction of the Administrator to a municipal, private, regional, district, or cooperative utility company or other qualified entity. The conveyance may consist of all right, title, and interest of the United States in the utility system or such lesser estate as the Administrator considers appropriate to serve the interests of the United States.

(b) SELECTION OF CONVEYEE.—The Administrator shall carry out the conveyance through the use of competitive procedures if more than one of the entities and utilities referred to in subsection (a)—

(1) are eligible to operate and maintain the conveyed utility system under applicable law regulating utilities; and

(2) notify the Administrator of an interest in the conveyance under subsection (a).

(c) CONSIDERATION.—The Administrator shall require as consideration for a conveyance under subsection (a) an amount equal to the fair market value (as determined by the Administrator) of the right, title, or interest of the United States conveyed. The consideration may take the form of—

(1) a lump-sum payment; or

(2) a reduction in charges for utility services provided by the utility or entity concerned to the facility at which the utility system is located for a period of time that is sufficient to amortize the value of the utility system (including any real property or interest in real property) conveyed.

(d) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Subject to appropriations, a lump-sum payment received under subsection (c) shall be merged with and made available for the same purposes as amounts available for construction of facilities in the "Human space flight" and the "Science, aeronautics, and technology" accounts.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under subsection (a) as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) UTILITY SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this section, the term "utility system" means any of the following:

(1) a system for the generation or distribution of electric power;

(2) a system for the treatment or supply of water;

(3) a system for the collection or treatment of wastewater;

(4) a system for the generation or supply of steam, hot water, or chilled water;

(5) a system for the supply of natural gas;

(6) a system for the transmission of telecommunications; or

(7) any other utility system that the Administrator considers to be appropriate.

* * * * * * *

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

(Public Law 104–204)

SEC. 432. TO PROMOTE AND SUPPORT MANAGEMENT REORGANIZATION OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.—(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) * * *

(2) No voluntary separation incentive under this section may be paid based on the separation of an employee after September 30, [2002] *2005*.

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 415 of title IV of the bill, all of which are carried in the fiscal year 2001 Appropriations Act, are general provisions which place limitations or restrictions on the use of funds in the bill and which might, under certain circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law.

The bill 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, 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 the 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 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, administrative provisions, permitting transfers between mandatory accounts, limiting and providing for the use of certain funds, funding administrative expenses associated with VA life insurance programs from excess program revenues, extending authority to operate the Franchise Fund, allowing reimbursement from enhanced-use leases, and allowing for reimbursement for certain services. Eleven provisions have been carried in previous Appropriations Acts. Six new provisions have been added.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions limiting medical services for non-service connected veterans to those who have provided insurance and income information.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions delaying the implementation of geographic means test for one year.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions requiring new funds to be appropriated for adjudication of disability claims arising from any new concurrent receipt legislation.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions merging the Health Services Improvement Fund with the Medical Care Collections Fund and extending the Department's authority to collect receipts.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions providing $19,900,000 for information technology initiatives at the Department.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions prohibiting funds in this Act from being used to implement provisions of H.R. 3253 as passed by the House on September 18, 2002.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions limiting funds in Medical Care and the Medical Care Collections Fund for security training and equipment to $11,000,000.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, which designates funds for various programs, activities, and purposes, and specifies the uses of such funds.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, housing certificate fund, which specifies the allocation of certain funds; establishes a reserve fund for certain purposes; sets forth certain reporting requirements; places a limitation on certain fees and fee balances; and requires certain data to be submitted.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, public housing capital fund, which specifies the allocation of certain funds; limits the delegation of certain waiver authorities; waives certain penalties related to withholding of funds; requires reallocation of certain funds; prohibits funds from being used for certain activities; and requires final regulations to be issued by a date certain.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, public housing operating fund, which designates certain funds to be distributed by the Attorney General through a re-

imbursable agreement; and prohibits funds from being used for certain activities.

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 specifies the allocation of certain funds.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, home investment partnerships program, which specifies the allocation of certain funds.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, homeless assistance grants, which establishes certain minimum funding and matching requirements; and requires grantees to integrate homeless programs with other social service providers.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, housing for special populations, which allows funds to be used to renew certain contracts; and specifies the allocation of certain funds.

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, manufactured housing fees trust fund, which permits fees to be modified.

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, management and administration, which specifies the allocation of funds; designates the use of certain funds; sets forth certain authorities of, and requirements on, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; requires the transfer of certain personnel; places limitations on personnel; and requires submission of a staffing plan.

Language is included under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, working capital fund, which places restrictions on the use of funds.

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; prohibits funds to investigate or prosecute certain lawful activities; revises allocations for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS grant recipients; waives certain section 8 rental payment limits for a demonstration program; relates to the expenditures for certain corporations and agencies; relates to allocations of funds in excess of budget estimates; and requires submission of a spending plan.

Language is included under Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, salaries and expenses, which limits certain personnel employed by the Board.

Language is included under Department of the Treasury, Community Development Financial Institutions, community develop-

ment financial institution program account, which sets aside funds for various purposes.

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 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 requires the certification of grant amendments.

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, administrative provisions, which permits the Administrator to award cooperative agreements to Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia under certain circumstances, prohibits the use of funds for implementation of a specific new pesticide tolerance fee, and which authorizes for one year a pesticide maintenance fee.

Language is included under Environmental Protection Agency, state and tribal assistance grants, making technical changes in grants provided in previous appropriations acts.

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

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

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

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

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

Language is included under the General Services Administration, Federal Citizen 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 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 loans from borrowed funds 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.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the agencies in the accompanying bill which contain appropriations that are not authorized by law:

Agency/Program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriation in last year of authorization	Appropriation this bill
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS				
Construction, Major:				
Seismic Corrections for Palo Alto, CA, Building 2				$14,013,000
Seismic Corrections for Palo Alto, CA, Building 4				21,750,000
Seismic Corrections for San Francisco, CA, Building 203				31,000,000
Seismic Corrections for West Los Angeles, CA, Building 500				27,200,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT				
Housing Certificate Fund:				
Section 8 contract renewals and administrative expenses	1994	$8,446,173	$5,458,106	16,071,162
Section 441 contracts	1994	109,410	150,000	16,808
Section 23 leased housing conversions	1994	13,303		500
Section 8 preservation, protection, and family unification	1994	759,259	541,000	259,517
Incremental Vouchers	1994	2,060,725		40,000
Contract Administrators				196,000
Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)	2002	Such sums	573,735	574,000
Native American Housing Block Grant	2001	Such sums	636,000	649,000
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS	1994	156,300	156,000	292,000
Rural Housing and Economics Development				25,000
Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities				30,000
Community Development Fund:				
Community Development Block Grants	1994	4,168,000	4,380,000	4,577,000
Housing Assistance Council				3,300
Native American Indian Housing Council				2,200
National Housing Development Corporation				5,000
National Council on La Raza HOPE Fund				5,000
Self-Help Housing Opportunity Program	2000	Such sums	20,000	28,500
Capacity Building	1994	25,000	20,000	29,500
Economic Development Initiatives				144,600
Neighborhood Initiatives				23,400
YouthBuild	1994	41,680	28,000	65,000
HOME Investment Partnerships	1994	2,173,612	1,275,000	2,221,040
Homeless Assistance Grants	1994	465,774	599,000	1,250,000
FHA General and Special Risk Program Account:				
Limitation on guaranteed loans	1995	Such sums	(20,885,072)	(23,000,000)
Limitation on direct loans	1995	Such sums	(220,000)	(50,000)
Credit Subsidy	1995	Such sums	188,395	15,000
Administrative Expenses	1995		197,470	93,780

Agency/Program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriation in last year of authorization	Appropriation this bill
GNMA Mortgage-Backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account:				
Limitation on guaranteed loans	1996	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(200,000,000)
Administrative Expenses	1996	Such sums	9,101	10,343
Policy Development and Research	1994	36,470	35,000	47,000
Fair Housing Activities, Fair Housing Initiatives Program	1994	26,000	20,481	20,250
Lead Hazards Reduction Program	1994	276,000	185,000	126,000
Salaries and Expenses	1994	1,029,496	916,963	1,090,299
Community Development Financial Institutions Fund	1998	111,000	80,000	80,000
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	1994	30,714	32,000	105,000
Consumer Product Safety Commission	1992	45,000	40,200	54,000
Federal Citizen Information Center Fund:				
Federal Information Center	1980	7,000	4,492	3,447
Consumer Information Center Fund	1970	Not applicable	0	3,829
National Credit Union Administration, loan fund	1979	0	0	1,000
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY				
Categorical Grants:				
Clean Air Act	FY 1997	Such sums	167,230	
Radon Abatement Act	FY 1991	10,000	9,000	
Clean Water Act (FWPCA)	FY 1990–91			
BEACH Act	FY 2005	30,000		
Safe Drinking Water Act	FY 2003	115,000		
Solid Waste Disposal Act (RCRA)	FY 1988	70,000	71,391	
Toxic Substances Control Act	FY 1983	1,500	5,100	
Pollution Prevention Act	FY 1993	8,000	6,800	
Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act	FY 1998	Such sums	38,585	
Clean Water SRF	FY 1992	1,800,000	2,400,000	
Sewer Overflows	FY 2003	750,000		
Drinking Water SRF	FY 2003	1,000,000		
Alaskan Native Village	FY 1979	2,000	Not available	
Hazardous Substance Superfund	FY 1994	5,100,000	1,480,853	
LUST Trust Fund	FY 1988	10,000	14,400	
Oil Spills (FWPCA)	No expiration	35,000	15,000	
Science and Technology:				
Clean Air Act	FY 1997	Such sums	177,150	
Clean Water Act	FY 1990	159,520	27,028	
FIFRA	FY 1991	95,000 (part)	11,890	
Safe Drinking Water Act	FY 2003	Such sums	51,501	

ERDDA	FY 1981	1,115,591	217,828
Office of Inspector General	No expiration	Such sums	34,019

The statutory authority for appropriations in all eight of EPA's accounts is provided to the Agency through a wide variety of primarily media-specific statutes as shown in the following chart:

Section title	Statute section	Terms of authorization	Expiration
Federal Water Pollution Control Act			
Res., Invest., Train., Tech. Asst., Info. Activ	104(U)(1)	$22.77m, FY86–90	33,146.
Train. Progs. for Treat. Works Personnel	104(U)(2)	$3m, FY86–90	33,146.
Forecasting Manpower	104(U)(3)	$1.5m, FY86–90	33,146.
Agricul. Research	104(U)(4)	$10m, FY73–75	27,575.
Fresh Water Aquatic Ecosystems Res. Grants	104(U)(5)	$15m, FY73–75	27,575.
Thermal Discharge Cont	104(U)(6)	$10m, FY73–75	27,575.
Res., Dev., Demo. Grants Storm Water Poll. Cont	105(H)	$75m, FY73–75, 10% for 105(E)	27,575.
Grants for Pollution Control and Enforce	106(A)	$75m, FY86–90	33,146.
Mine Wtr. Poll. Control	107(E)	$30m, until expend	When expended.
Great Lakes Pollution Control Demo. Projects	108(C)	$20m, until expend	When expended.
Lake Erie Corp. of Eng. Deno. Project	108(E)	$5m, until expend	When expended.
Train, Grts., Cont., Schol	112(C)	$7m, FY86–90	33,146.
Alaska Vill. Deno. Proj	113(D)	$2m	29,128.
In-Place Toxic Poll. Removal From Ports	115	$15m	When expended.
Hudson Say PCB Reclamation Demo. Proj	116(D)	$20m	Indefinite.
Chesapeake-Bay Program	117(D)	$3m, FY87–90	33,146.
		$10m for grants, FY87–90	33,146.
Great Lakes Program	118(g)	$11m, FY87–91 (30% to NOAA)	9/30/91.
Assur. for Every State	205(E)	$75m, FY79–90	9/30/90.
Reserve % for Admin. Specific Sections	205(G)	Limit subject to formula	No exp. date.
Set-Aside for Altern. Conv. Sewage Treat. Wrks	205(H)	Limit subject to formula	No exp. date.
Altern. and Innovative Technologies-Fed. Share	205(I)	Limit subject to formula	9/30/90.
Reserve Con. Grants for WQ Mgt. Planning	205(J)	Limit subject to formula	No exp. date.
Nonpoint Source Resrv	205(J)(5)	Limit subject to formula	No exp. date.
Sewage Covey. Cost NYC-NTWTON Treatment Plant	205(K)	Limit subject to formula	9/30/82.
Reim. for Treat. Works	206(E)	$2600m for 206(a)	When expended.
		$750m for 206(b)	When expended.
Grants for Construct. of Treatment Works	207	$1200m, FY89–90	9/30/90.
Grants to Areawide Waste Mgt. Agencies	208(F)(3)	Such sums FY 83–90	9/30/90.
Corps of Eng. Program of Tech Asst	208(H)(2)	$50m, FY73–74	6/30/74.
DOI.Natl. Wetlands Inv	208(i)(2)	$6m	12/31/81.
Agri Contracts-Control Non-Point Source Poll	208(J)(9)	Such sums FY83–90	9/30/90.
Water Resources Council Basin Planning	209(C)	$200m	When expended.
IAG Transf. to Supp. WQ	304(K)(3)	$100m, FY79–83	9/30/90.
		Such sums FY84–90	9/30/90.
Rev. Fund for Remov. of Oil or Haz. Sub. Progs	311(K)	$35m	No exp. date.
Clean Lakes Grants	314(C)(2)	$30m, FY86–90 until expend	9/30/90.

Section title	Statute section	Terms of authorization	Expiration
Clean Lakes Demo. Proj	314(D)(4)	$40m	When expended.
Natl. Study Commission	315(H)	$17.25m	When expended.
Non-Point Source Mgt. Prog. Grants to States	319(J)	$130m, FY–91 until expend	9/30/91.
Sewage Sludge Studies	405(G)(2)	$5m, FY87	No exp. date.
Con. Grants—San Diego	510(J)	$600m, FY94	No exp. date.
Oakwood Beach/Red Hood	512(B)	$7m, FY87 and beyond	No exp. date.
Boston Harbor & Adj. Wtrs	513(D)	$100m, FY87	When expended.
San Diego Wastewater Reclamation Demo	514(C)	$2m, FY87 and beyond	No exp. date.
Des Moines Sewage Plnt	515(B)	$50m, FY87 and beyond	No exp. date.
General Authorization	517	$135m, FY86–90	9/30/90.
Studies of Wtr. Poll. Probs. in Aquifers	520(C)	$7m, FY87 and beyond	No exp. date.
Great Lakes Consumptv. Use Study	521(D)	$750k, FY87 and beyond	No exp. date.
Sulfide Corrosn. Study	522(D)	$1m, FY87 and beyond	No exp. date.
State Water Poll. Cont. Revolving Fund Auth	607	$1.8b, FY92	9/30/94.
Marine Prot. Rsrch. & Sanct. Act			
Ocean Dumping Ban Act			
For Title I	111	$14m, FY94–97	When expended.
Clean Air Act			
General Authorization	327(A)	Such sums FY90–97	9/30/97.
Local Impl. Revisn. Grants	327(A)(1)	$50m, FY91	9/30/91.
FIFRA—Food Quality Protection Act			
Gen. Authorization/Res	31	$95m, FY91	9/30/91.
Asbestos School Hazards Abatement Act			
Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act			
General Authorization	512	$100m, FY85–90	9/30/90.
Estab. Trust Fund for Collect. Loan Repayments	4(A)/5(E)	$25m, FY87–90	No date spec.
Resource Conserv. & Recov. Act			
Solid Waste Disposal Act			
Tire Shredding Grants	2004	$750K, FY78–79	9/30/79.
General Authorization	2007(A)	$80m, FY88	9/30/88.
Criminal Investigators	2007(E)	$2.529m, FY88	9/30/88.
Undrgrnd. Storg. Tank Reg	2007(F)(1)	$10m, FY85–88	9/30/88.
St. Asst.-UST Prog. Dev	2007(F)(2)	$25m, FY85–88	9/30/88.
St. Haz. Wst. Prog. Grants	3011(A)	$60m, FY88	9/30/88.

Grants to States for Invntory Haz. Wst. Sites	3012	$25m, FY85–88	9/30/88.
Solid Wst. Prog. St. Grts	4008(A)(1)	$10m, FY85–88	9/30/88.
Grants for Studies & Market Analysis	4008(A)(2)(D)	$10m, FY85–88	9/30/88.
St. Asst. for Provisns. Relt. to Recycled Oil	4008(A)(3)(A)	$4m, FY82–86	9/30/86.
Spec. Communities Disposal Site Grants	4008(E)(2)	$500K, FY85–88	9/30/88.
Municip. Asst. for Enrgy. Conserv. & Recov. Plang	4008(F)(2)	$8m, FY82–86	9/30/86.
St. Asst. for Recycled Oil Programs	4008(G)(4)	$5m, FY85–88	9/30/88.
Rural Community Grants	4009(D)	$15m, FY81–82	9/30/82.
Dept. of Commerce Funct	5006	$1.5m, FY85–88	9/30/88.
Resource Conserv. Comm	8002(J)(5)	$2m	When expended.
Drilling Fluids. Study	8002(M)	$1m	When expended.
Special Studies	8002(Q)	$8m, FY78–79	7/30/91
Res., Training & Info	8007	$35m, FY78	9/30/79.
Medical Waste Tracking. Demo. Program	11012	Such sums FY89–91	9/30/78.
Natl. Ground Water Comm	04(I) Title VII	$7m, FY85–87	1/11/87.
Safe Drinking Water Act			
Health Risk Red. & Cost Analysis in Regulation Dev	1412(b)(3)(C)(iv)	$35m, FY96–03	9/30/03.
Arsenic and Sulfate Studies	1412(b)(12)(A)(vi)	$2.5m, FY97–00	9/30/00.
Small Systems Operator Certification Grants	1419(d)(3)	$30m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Small PWS Technology Assistance Centers Grants	1420(f)(6)	$2m, FY97–99	9/30/99.
		$5m, FY00–03	9/30/03.
Environmental Finance Centers	1420(g)(4)	$1.5m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Sole Source Aquifer Demonstration Program	1427(m)	$15m, FY92–03	9/30/03.
State Programs to Establish Wellhead Prot. Areas	1428(k)	$30m, FY92–03	9/30/03.
State Ground Water Protection Grants	1429(f)	$15m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Tech. Assist. for Small Systems Circuit Rider	1442(e)	$15m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Emergency Assistance to States (1442(a)(2)(B))	1442(d)	$8,050k, FY91	9/30/91.
Research, Tech. Assist., Info., Trng of Personnel	1442(d)	$38,020k, FY91	9/30/91.
Grants for State Public Water	1443(a)(7)	$100m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Underground Injection Control Grants	1443(b)(5)	$15m, FY92–03	9/30/03.
New York Watershed Protection Program	1443(d)(4)	$15m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Special Study and Demonstration Grants	1444(c)	$10m	6/30/77.
Grants to Public Sector Agencies for Dev. & Demo. Proj	42 U.S.C. (300j–3a(c)1)	$25m	9/30/78.
Monitoring Program for Unregulated Contaminants	1445(a)(2)(H)	$10m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Capitalization of Drinking Water SRFs	1452(m)	$1b, FY95–03	9/30/03.
Grants to Sppt State Source WQ Prot. Partnership Prog	1454(e)	$5m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Drinking Water Assistance to Colonias	1456(e)	$25m, FY97–99	9/30/99.
Studies on Harmful Substances in Drinking Water	1458(c)(3)	$12.5m, FY97–03	9/30/03.
Waterborne Disease Occurrence Study	1458(d)(3)	$3m, FY97–01 (with limitations)	9/30/01.
Grants to States for Remedying School Drinking Water	1465(c)	$30m, FY91	9/30/91.

Section title	Statute section	Terms of authorization	Expiration
General Drinking Water Research Authorization	201	Such sums (not to exc. $26.593m)	9/30/03.
Grants to Alaska to Improve Sanitation	303(e)	$15m, FY97–00	9/30/00.
Wastewater Assistance to Colonias	307(e)	$25m, FY97–99	9/30/99.
Grants for Water Supply Sys. & Source WQ Prot. Progs.	401(d)	$25m, FY97–03 uncondit. auth $25m, FY97–03 condit. auth.	9/30/03.
Pollution Prevention Act			
EPA Activities—Source Reduct	6610	$8m, FY91–93	9/30/93.
State Grants for Tech. Assist	6610	$8m, FY91–93	9/30/93.
Noise Control Act			
Res., Dev.—Low Noise Prod	15(G)	$2.42m, FY77	9/30/77.
General Authorization	19	$15m, FY79	9/30/79.
Envir. Research., Development., & Demo Act			
EPA Environ. Reserach & Dev. Activities	2		9/30/81.
Health and Ecological Effects program	2 CAA	$45.2m, FY81	
Industrial Processes program		$4.1m, FY81	
Monitoring and Technical Support		$20.8m, FY81	
Health and Ecological Effects	2 CWA	$23.8m, FY81	
Industrial Processes		$13.7m, FY81	
Public Sector Activities		$14.3m, FY81	
Monitoring and Technical Support		$12.1m, FY81	
Health and Ecological Effects	2 SDWA	$12.36m, FY81	
Public Sector Activities		$14.08m FY81	
Monitoring and Technical Support		$1.008m FY81	
	2 SWDA	$26.446m FY81	
Health and Ecological Effects	2 PHSA	$2.99m FY81	
Monitoring and Technical Support		$191m FY81	
Health and Ecological Effects	2 IA	$5.232m FY81	
Monitoring and Technical Support		$2.868m FY81	
Anticipatory Research		$14.745m FY81	
Health and Ecological Effects	2 FIFRA	$5.97m FY81	
Industrial Processes		$2.9m FY81	
Monitoring and Technical Support		$565k FY81	
Health and Ecological Effects	2 TSCA	$31.87m FY81	
Industrial Process		$1.77m FY81	
Monitoring and Technical Support		$3.247m FY81	
Health and Ecological Effects	2 EA	$50.096m FY81	

Energy Control		$57.503m FY81	
Program Management	2 EPA	$4.666m FY81	
Inspector General Act			
OIG Approp. Accounts	108	Amounts as appropriated	No exp. date.
Toxic Substances Control Act			
Radon Abatement Act			
TSCA Research & Dev	10		9/30/81.
State Programs	28(D)	$1.5m, FY82–83	9/30/83.
General Authorization	29(D)	$58.646m FY82, $62m, FY–83	9/30/83.
Radon Profic. Rating	305(E)	$1.5m	When expended.
Citizen Guide, Model Constr. Stds., Tech. Asst	305(F)	$3m, FY89–91	9/30/91.
Radon St. Prog. Grants	306(J)	$10m, FY89–91	9/30/91.
Radon Diag./Remedial in High-Risk Schools	307(B)	$1m & 500k (diag. & remed.)	When expended.
Region. Radon Trng. Ctrs	308(F)	$1m, FY89–91	9/30/91.
Comp. Env. Response, Compensation & Liability Act			
Superfund Amend. & Reauth. Act			
Emergency Plan. & Community Right to Know Act			
Limit. on Sec. 515/516	111(A)	$5.1b, FY91–94	9/30/94.
Pilot Proj. for Removal of Lead Contam. Soil	111(A)(6)	$15b	No exp. date.
Worker Train. & Ed. Grts	111(C)(12)	$20m, FY87–94	9/30/94.
Agency—Tox. Sub. Disease	111(M)	$60m, FY90–94	9/30/94.
Limit. on Rad. Demo. Prog	111(N)(1)	$20m, FY87–94	9/30/94.
Limit. on Maz. Sub. R&D, Demo, and Training Activ	111(N)(2)	$35m, FY91–94	9/30/94.
Gulf Coast Haz. Sub. R&D, and Demo. Center	118(i)(4)	$5m, FY87 and thereafter	No exp. date.
Pacific Northwest Haz. Sub. R&D and Demo. Centr	118(O)(5)	$5m, FY87 and thereafter	No exp. date.
Emer. Trng. & Review of Emer. Systems—St. & Locl	305(A)(2)	$5m, FY87–90	9/30/90.
Gen. Auth. T–111 Emer. Plan. Comm. Right to Knw	330	Such sums beginning FY87	No exp. date.

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	90,993	97,580	91,020	96,978
Mandatory	28,850	29,093	28,850	29,093

Note.—The Committee will reallocate to eliminate the breach in the budget authority allocation prior to the bill's consideration by the House.

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.	
Outlays:	
2003	71,703
2004	19,478
2005	8,804
2006	4,834
2007	4,765

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 in bill	33,080
Fiscal year outlays resulting therefrom	7,579

BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT

During fiscal year 2003 for purposes 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 2003 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 2003 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 2003 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.

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS					
Veterans Benefits Administration					
Compensation and pensions	24,944,288	28,949,000	28,949,000	+4,004,712	---
2002 Supplemental (P.L. 107-206)	1,100,000	---	---	-1,100,000	---
Readjustment benefits	2,135,000	2,264,808	2,264,808	+129,808	---
Veterans insurance and indemnities	26,200	27,530	27,530	+1,330	---
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite)	203,278	437,522	437,522	+234,244	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(300)	---	(300)	---	(+300)
Credit subsidy	---	-98,000	-98,000	-98,000	---
Administrative expenses	164,497	168,207	168,207	+3,710	---
Education loan fund program account	1	1	1	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(3)	(3)	(3)	---	---
Administrative expenses	64	70	70	+6	---
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account	72	55	55	-17	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(3,301)	(3,626)	(3,626)	(+325)	---
Administrative expenses	274	289	289	+15	---
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account	544	558	558	+14	---
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration	28,574,218	31,750,040	31,750,040	+3,175,822	---
Veterans Health Administration					
Medical care	20,656,164	22,243,761	23,639,304	+2,983,140	+1,395,543
2002 Supplemental (P.L. 107-206)	142,000	---	---	-142,000	---
Delayed equipment obligation	675,000	500,000	250,000	-425,000	-250,000
Total	21,473,164	22,743,761	23,889,304	+2,416,140	+1,145,543

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Medical care cost recovery collections:					
Offsetting receipts	-691,000	-752,000	-1,386,000	-695,000	-634,000
Appropriations (indefinite)	691,000	752,000	1,386,000	+695,000	+634,000
Total available (excludes offsetting receipts)	22,164,164	23,495,761	25,275,304	+3,111,140	+1,779,543
Medical and prosthetic research	371,000	394,373	405,000	+34,000	+10,627
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	66,731	69,716	74,716	+7,985	+5,000
Total, Veterans Health Administration	21,910,895	23,207,850	24,369,020	+2,458,125	+1,161,170
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses	1,195,728	1,256,418	1,251,418	+55,690	-5,000
Emergency supplemental	2,000	---	---	-2,000	---
National Cemetery Administration	121,169	133,149	133,149	+11,980	---
Office of Inspector General	52,308	55,000	61,000	+8,692	+6,000
Construction, major projects	183,180	193,740	193,740	+10,560	---
Construction, minor projects	210,900	210,700	240,700	+29,800	+30,000
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities	100,000	100,000	100,000	---	---
Parking Revolving Fund	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries	25,000	32,000	32,000	+7,000	---
Total, Departmental Administration	1,894,285	1,981,007	2,012,007	+117,722	+31,000
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs	52,379,398	56,938,897	58,131,067	+5,751,669	+1,192,170
(Limitation on direct loans)	(3,604)	(3,629)	(3,929)	(+325)	(+300)
Consisting of:					
Mandatory	(28,408,766)	(31,580,860)	(31,580,860)	(+3,172,094)	---
Discretionary	(23,970,632)	(25,358,037)	(26,550,207)	(+2,579,575)	(+1,192,170)
TITLE II					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Housing Certificate Fund:					
Direct appropriation	11,440,975	13,326,559	12,386,987	+946,012	-939,572
Advance appropriations provided in previous acts	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	---	---
Subtotal, discretionary	15,640,975	17,526,559	16,586,987	+946,012	-939,572
(Advance appropriation)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
Rescission of unobligated balances:					
Rescission of unobligated balances	-1,200,000	-1,100,000	-1,300,000	-100,000	-200,000
Rescission (P.L. 107-206)	-388,500	---	---	+388,500	---
Public housing capital fund	2,843,400	2,425,900	2,843,400	---	+417,500

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Public housing operating fund	3,494,868	3,530,000	3,600,000	+105,132	+70,000
Operation Safe Home (rescission)	-11,000	---	---	+11,000	---
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing	573,735	574,000	574,000	+265	---
Native American housing block grants	648,570	646,594	649,000	+430	+2,406
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	5,987	5,200	5,300	-687	+100
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(234,283)	(197,243)	(197,243)	(-37,040)	---
Native Hawiian housing block grant	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund	1,000	1,035	1,035	+35	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(40,000)	(39,712)	(39,712)	(-288)	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing	22,008,535	23,619,288	22,959,722	+951,187	-659,566
Community Planning and Development					
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	277,432	292,000	292,000	+14,568	---
Rural housing and economic development	25,000	---	25,000	---	+25,000
Empowerment zones / enterprise communities	45,000	---	30,000	-15,000	+30,000
Community development fund	5,000,000	4,715,500	5,000,000	---	+284,500
Community development fund (emergency supplemental)	2,000,000	---	---	-2,000,000	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 107-206)	783,000	---	---	-783,000	---
Section 108 loan guarantees:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(608,696)	(275,000)	(275,000)	(-333,696)	---
Credit subsidy	14,000	6,325	6,325	-7,675	---
Administrative expenses	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
Brownfields redevelopment	25,000	25,000	25,000	---	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
HOME investment partnerships program	1,846,040	2,084,100	2,221,040	+375,000	+136,940
Rescission (P.L. 107-206)	-50,000	---	---	+50,000	---
Homeless assistance grants	1,122,525	1,129,500	1,250,000	+127,475	+120,500
Total, Community planning and development	8,355,997	8,253,425	8,850,365	+494,368	+596,940
Housing Programs					
Housing for special populations	1,024,151	1,024,151	1,100,000	+75,849	+75,849
Housing for the elderly	(783,286)	(773,636)	(840,903)	(+57,617)	(+67,267)
Housing for the disabled	(240,865)	(250,515)	(259,097)	(+18,232)	(+8,582)
Housing counseling assistance	---	35,000	---	---	-35,000
Rental Housing assistance	---	---	---	---	---
Rescission	---	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000	---
Rescission (P.L. 107-206)	-300,000	---	---	+300,000	---
Manufactured housing fees trust fund	13,566	13,000	13,000	-566	---
Offsetting collections	-13,566	-13,000	-13,000	+566	---
Savings from canceling S.1029	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(165,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(250,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(-200,000)	---
Administrative expenses	336,700	347,829	347,829	+11,129	---
Negative subsidy 1/	-2,323,000	-2,753,000	-2,753,000	-430,000	---
Administrative contract expenses	160,000	85,720	85,720	-74,280	---
Additional contract expenses	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(+2,000,000)	(+2,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	216,100	223,716	223,716	+7,616	---
Negative subsidy	-225,000	-225,000	-225,000	---	---
Subsidy	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---
Non-overhead administrative expenses	144,000	93,780	93,780	-50,220	---
Additional contract expenses	4,000	4,000	4,000	---	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-1,671,200	-2,206,955	-2,206,955	-535,755	---
Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)					
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	10,343	10,343	+960	---
Offsetting receipts	-382,000	-358,000	-358,000	+24,000	---
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology	50,250	47,000	47,000	-3,250	---
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities	45,899	45,899	45,899	---	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction	109,758	126,000	126,000	+16,242	---
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses	556,067	510,299	530,299	-25,768	+20,000
Transfer from:					
Limitation on FHA corporate funds	(530,457)	(548,202)	(548,202)	(+17,745)	---
GNMA	(9,383)	(10,343)	(10,343)	(+960)	---
Community Development Loan Guarantees Program	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
Native American Housing Block Grants	(150)	(150)	(150)	---	---
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program	(200)	(200)	(200)	---	---
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantees	(35)	(35)	(35)	---	---
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,097,292)	(1,070,229)	(1,090,229)	(-7,063)	(+20,000)
Working capital fund	---	276,300	276,300	+276,300	---
Office of Inspector General	66,555	74,341	73,341	+6,786	-1,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(22,343)	(23,343)	(23,343)	(+1,000)	---
(By transfer from Public Housing Oper Subsidy)	(5,000)	---	---	(-5,000)	---
Total, Office of Inspector General	(93,898)	(97,684)	(96,684)	(+2,786)	(-1,000)
Emergency supplemental	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Consolidated fee fund (rescission)	-6,700	-8,000	-8,000	-1,300	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.....	27,000	30,000	30,000	+3,000	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-27,000	-30,000	-30,000	-3,000	---
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	30,147,695	31,349,091	31,346,314	+1,198,619	-2,777
2002 Emergency Supplementals and Recissions.....	2,045,500	---	---	-2,045,500	---
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development (net).....	32,193,195	31,349,091	31,346,314	-846,881	-2,777
Appropriations.....	(27,165,395)	(28,357,091)	(28,554,314)	(+1,388,919)	(+197,223)
Rescissions.....	(-1,956,200)	(-1,208,000)	(-1,408,000)	(+548,200)	(-200,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(2,784,000)	---	---	(-2,784,000)	---
Advance provided in previous acts.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(300,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-200,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(381,882,979)	(381,511,955)	(388,511,955)	(+6,628,976)	(+7,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(563,568)	(583,273)	(583,273)	(+19,705)	---
TITLE III					
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
American Battle Monuments Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	35,466	30,400	35,246	-220	+4,846
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board					
Salaries and expenses.....	7,850	7,850	6,500	-1,350	-1,350

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Department of the Treasury					
Community Development Financial Institutions					
Community development financial institutions fund program account	80,000	68,000	80,000	---	+12,000
Consumer Product Safety Commission					
Salaries and expenses	55,200	56,767	57,117	+1,917	+350
Corporation for National and Community Service					
National and community service programs operating expenses	401,980	631,342	---	-401,980	-631,342
Office of Inspector General	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---
Total	406,980	636,342	5,000	-401,980	-631,342
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims					
Salaries and expenses	13,221	14,994	14,326	+1,105	-668
Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army					
Salaries and expenses	22,537	24,445	32,445	+9,908	+8,000

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Department of Health and Human Services					
National Institute of Health					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	70,228	74,471	84,074	+13,846	+9,603
Emergency supplemental.....	10,500	---	---	-10,500	---
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention					
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry					
Toxic substances and environmental public health.....	78,235	77,388	88,688	+10,453	+11,300
Total, Department of Health and Human Services..	158,963	151,859	172,762	+13,799	+20,903
Environmental Protection Agency					
Science and Technology.....	698,089	670,008	714,578	+16,489	+44,570
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	36,891	111,168	86,168	+49,277	-25,000
Subtotal, Science and Technology.....	734,980	781,176	800,746	+65,766	+19,570
Emergency supplemental.....	90,308	---	---	-90,308	---
Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,054,511	2,047,704	2,111,677	+57,166	+63,973
Emergency supplemental.....	39,000	---	---	-39,000	---
Office of Inspector General.....	34,019	35,325	35,325	+1,306	---
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	11,867	12,742	12,742	+875	---
Subtotal, OIG.....	45,886	48,067	48,067	+2,181	---
Buildings and facilities.....	25,318	42,918	42,918	+17,600	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,170,000	1,272,888	1,422,888	+252,888	+150,000
Delay of obligation	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
Transfer to Office of Inspector General	-11,867	-12,742	-12,742	-875	---
Transfer to Science and Technology	-36,891	-111,168	-86,168	-49,277	+25,000
Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,221,242	1,148,978	1,323,978	+102,736	+175,000
Emergency supplemental	41,292	---	---	-41,292	---
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program	73,000	72,313	72,313	-687	---
Oil spill response	15,000	15,581	15,581	+581	---
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	2,658,900	2,305,500	2,616,303	-42,597	+310,803
Categorical grants	1,074,376	1,158,276	1,172,882	+98,506	+14,606
Subtotal, STAG	3,733,276	3,463,776	3,789,185	+55,909	+325,409
Emergency supplemental	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
Total, EPA	8,078,813	7,620,513	8,204,465	+125,652	+583,952
Executive Office of the President					
Office of Science and Technology Policy	5,267	5,368	5,750	+483	+382
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,974	3,031	3,031	+57	---
Total	8,241	8,399	8,781	+540	+382

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation					
Office of Inspector General (transfer)	(33,660)	(31,388)	(30,848)	(-2,812)	(-540)
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Disaster relief	664,000	1,842,843	1,820,000	+1,156,000	-22,843
(Transfer to EMPA)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	---	---
(Transfer to OIG)	---	(-21,577)	(-21,577)	(-21,577)	---
Contingent emergency appropriations	1,500,000	---	---	-1,500,000	---
Emergency supplemental	4,356,871	---	---	-4,356,871	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 107-206)	2,650,700	---	---	-2,650,700	---
Subtotal	9,171,571	1,842,843	1,820,000	-7,351,571	-22,843
National pre-disaster mitigation fund	---	300,000	250,000	+250,000	-50,000
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:					
State share loan	405	---	---	-405	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	543	557	557	+14	---
Salaries and expenses	203,801	209,163	219,690	+15,889	+10,527
Defense function	30,000	30,527	31,000	+1,000	+473
Subtotal	233,801	239,690	250,690	+16,889	+11,000
Emergency supplemental	25,000	---	---	-25,000	---
Office of Inspector General	10,303	11,549	11,549	+1,246	---
(Transfer from Disaster relief)	---	(21,577)	(21,577)	(+21,577)	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Emergency management planning and assistance	384,623	3,727,914	348,040	-36,583	-3,379,874
Defense function	20,000	19,300	19,000	-1,000	-300
Fire Act	---	---	450,000	+450,000	+450,000
Subtotal	404,623	3,747,214	817,040	+412,417	-2,930,174
(Transfer from Disaster relief)	(2,900)	(2,900)	(2,900)	---	---
Emergency supplemental	220,000	---	---	-220,000	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 107-206)	225,400	---	---	-225,400	---
Radiological emergency preparedness fund	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	---	---
Emergency food and shelter program	140,000	153,000	153,000	+13,000	---
Flood map modernization fund	---	300,000	200,000	+200,000	-100,000
National Flood Insurance Fund:					
(Limitation on administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses	28,798	32,393	32,393	+3,595	---
Flood mitigation	76,381	77,666	77,666	+1,285	---
(Transfer out)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	---	---
National Flood Migration Fund (by transfer)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	---	---
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	10,535,825	6,703,912	3,611,895	-6,923,930	-3,092,017
Appropriations	(1,557,854)	(6,703,912)	(3,611,895)	(+2,054,041)	(-3,092,017)
(By transfer)	(22,900)	(44,477)	(44,477)	(+21,577)	---
Emergency appropriations	(8,977,971)	---	---	(-8,977,971)	---
General Services Administration					
Federal Citizen Information Center Fund	7,276	12,541	11,541	+4,265	-1,000

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Human space flight	6,912,400	6,130,900	6,130,900	-781,500	---
Emergency supplemental	76,000	---	---	-76,000	---
Science, aeronautics and technology	7,857,100	8,844,500	9,144,500	+1,287,400	+300,000
Emergency supplemental	32,500	---	---	-32,500	---
Office of Inspector General	23,700	24,600	24,600	+900	---
Total, NASA	14,901,700	15,000,000	15,300,000	+398,300	+300,000
National Credit Union Administration					
Central liquidity facility:					
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)	(309)	(309)	(309)	---	---
Community Development Revolving Loan Fund	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities	3,530,270	3,715,200	4,082,000	+551,730	+366,800
Defense function	68,070	68,000	68,000	-70	---
Subtotal	3,598,340	3,783,200	4,150,000	+551,660	+366,800
Emergency supplemental	300	---	---	-300	---
Major research equipment and facilities construction	138,800	126,280	159,510	+20,710	+33,230
Education and human resources	875,000	908,080	910,580	+35,580	+2,500
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 107-206)	19,300	---	---	-19,300	---
Salaries and expenses	170,040	202,950	193,852	+23,812	-9,098
National Science Board	---	---	---	---	---
Office of Inspector General	6,760	7,700	9,000	+2,240	+1,300

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, NSF	4,808,540	5,028,210	5,422,942	+614,402	+394,732
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation					
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	105,000	105,000	105,000	---	---
Selective Service System					
Salaries and expenses	25,003	26,480	26,480	+1,477	---
Total, title III, Independent agencies	39,251,615	35,496,712	33,095,500	-6,156,115	-2,401,212
Appropriations	(29,959,444)	(35,496,712)	(33,095,500)	(+3,136,056)	(-2,401,212)
Rescissions	---	---	---	---	---
(Transfer out)	(-22,900)	(-44,477)	(-44,477)	(-21,577)	---
(By transfer)	(56,560)	(75,865)	(75,325)	(+18,765)	(-540)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,525,000)	(1,525,000)	(1,525,000)	---	---
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(309)	(309)	(309)	---	---
Grand total (net)	123,824,208	123,784,700	122,572,881	-1,251,327	-1,211,819
Appropriations	(109,502,237)	(120,792,700)	(119,780,881)	(+10,278,644)	(-1,011,819)
Rescissions	(-1,956,200)	(-1,208,000)	(-1,408,000)	(+548,200)	(-200,000)
Emergency appropriations	(12,078,171)	---	---	(-12,078,171)	---
Advance provided in previous acts	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
(By transfer)	(61,560)	(75,865)	(75,325)	(+13,765)	(-540)
(Transfer out)	(-22,900)	(-44,477)	(-44,477)	(-21,577)	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,828,604)	(1,628,629)	(1,628,929)	(-199,675)	(+300)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(381,882,979)	(381,511,955)	(388,511,955)	(+6,628,976)	(+7,000,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(563,877)	(583,582)	(583,582)	(+19,705)	---

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
FSLIC resolution fund (mandatory)	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	---	---
Use of misc. receipts in NASA WCF Sec. 419	---	---	3,000	+3,000	+3,000
NASA enhanced-use lease Sec. 420	---	---	20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Extension of NASA early buyout provision	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
OMB retirement accurals	---	1,199,000	---	---	-1,199,000
Total, adjustments	-4,000	1,195,000	24,000	+28,000	-1,171,000
Total (including adjustments)	123,820,208	124,979,700	122,596,881	-1,223,327	-2,382,819
Amounts in this bill	(123,824,208)	(123,784,700)	(122,572,881)	(-1,251,327)	(-1,211,819)
Scorekeeping adjustments	(-4,000)	(1,195,000)	(24,000)	(+28,000)	(-1,171,000)
Total mandatory and discretionary	123,820,208	124,979,700	122,596,881	-1,223,327	-2,382,819
Mandatory	28,404,766	31,576,860	31,576,860	+3,172,094	---
Discretionary	95,415,442	93,402,840	91,020,021	-4,395,421	-2,382,819

BUDGET AUTHORITY FOR 2002 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2003
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAP BY FUNCTION					
Mandatory	28,404,766	31,576,860	31,576,860	+3,172,094	---
Discretionary:					
General purpose discretionary:					
Defense discretionary	143,073	144,307	144,480	+1,407	+173
Nondefense discretionary	95,272,369	93,258,533	90,875,541	-4,396,828	-2,382,992
Total, Discretionary	95,415,442	93,402,840	91,020,021	-4,395,421	-2,382,819
Grand total, Mandatory and Discretionary	95,415,442	93,402,840	91,020,021	-4,395,421	-2,382,819

MINORITY VIEWS OF HON. ALAN MOLLOHAN AND HON. DAVID OBEY

The appropriations bill for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies reported by the Committee corrects many of the worst flaws in the President's budget. In particular, it adds critically needed funds for veterans medical care and services, restores many of the cuts in housing programs, provides important increases for several environmental programs, and significantly increases funds for basic science at the National Science Foundation. The bill does much good within it's budget allocation and the Chairman has worked cooperatively with Committee Members on both sides of the aisle to balance priorities based on need, program performance, and the interests of Members of the House.

Unfortunately, however, the Subcommittee's budget allocation does not permit it to adequately address the many needs and opportunities within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee. The bill remains below the levels necessary to fully meet the needs of veterans and low-income individuals and underfunds critical infrastructure needs of this nation. Specific examples of these shortfalls abound: thousands of veterans languish on long waiting lists for needed medical care; waiting times for public housing are measured in years rather than months; and the EPA has released a new report showing a shortfall in funding to provide for clean and safe water in the hundreds of billions of dollars. In addition to failing to address critical needs, the low allocation has forced the Majority to rely on highly questionable budget assumptions and practices to stay within the Subcommittee's budget ceiling. These include a "temporary" recommendation to eliminate funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service; very conservative projections of the cost of maintaining the section 8 public housing voucher program; and, most troubling, the decision to provide only $800 million of the $3.5 billion which the President requested for "first responder" activities on the assumption that the Commerce-Justice-State bill will fund the remainder of the President's first responder program. This latter assumption is highly suspect since the Commerce-Justice Subcommittee's budget allocation is already approximately $2 billion below the level likely necessary to pass that bill in the House, making it impossible for them to absorb another $2.7 billion to meet the President's request for the "first responders" program.

These funding problems are not primarily the result of programmatic disagreements between the Majority and the Minority on the Committee. Rather, they are the artifacts of the President and House Majority Leadership's insistence on an overall budget ceiling which is arbitrary and entirely inadequate. The Minority believes that within the existing budget limitations, this bill's at-

tributes outweigh its shortfalls, but we believe strongly that additional amounts will need to be made available to the Subcommittee before the bill is sent to the President.

Veterans

Veterans programs are an example of an area where constrained resources have meant that the Chairman was unable to address critical needs. He is to be praised for his recommendation to add $1.1 billion to the President's request for veterans' medical care and for rejecting the Administration's proposal to establish a deductible of $1,500 for many veterans. The Chairman has also allocated a much needed increase of $31 million for medical and prosthetic research. Unfortunately these increased levels are still inadequate. At the levels recommended by the Committee, waiting times for medical appointments will continue to increase. Currently 280,000 veterans wait for an appointment for VA health care.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

The Committee bill restores many of the reductions in the President's request for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. For instance, the $417 million cut by the Administration to the Public Housing Capital Fund was fully restored. The Chairman has also provided substantial increases for the HOME program and for homeless assistance grants, including $10 million for a demonstration program to develop new and innovative solutions to solving the problem of homeless Americans.

By far, the most critical aspect of the Committee bill related to public housing is the change in the treatment of section 8 renewals. While the bill continues a basic budget policy of funding the renewal of all section 8 vouchers, this year the Committee's recommended funding level is based on the actual number of units leased, as reported by the public housing authorities. This approach is intended to avoid replicating the situation that has occurred in recent years where amounts appropriated are in excess of actual units leased and the excess funds are then "recaptured" in the following year. These funds are then reallocated to other programs, sometimes for housing, but often for other purposes. The Committee has chosen to use these funds up front for other fiscal year 2003 housing needs. It is not the intent of the Committee to reduce the number of families and individuals served by these vouchers. Nor does the Committee intend to limit the ability of public housing authorities to reach full utilization of authorized vouchers. The intent is to prevent unused funds in this account from being spent on programs that do not provide or improve housing. These changes to the Housing Certificate Fund, specifically to the renewal of tenant-based section 8 vouchers, are of concern to many people. The Minority will continue to work with the Majority to address these concerns as this bill moves forward.

Environmental Protection Agency

This bill provides a substantial increase of $560 million above the President's request for the Environmental Protection Agency. The $8,204 million recommended by the Committee supports core activities to protect this nation's water and air, to clean-up haz-

ardous wastes and to enforce various laws to protect the environment. It also provides resources for three important initiatives: approval of the President's proposal to double funding for the Brownfields program to clean-up abandoned industrial sites from $100 million to $200 million; a $150 million increase over the President's budget for the Superfund program to escalate clean-up of toxic waste sites; and a new $21 million program to support the clean-up of critical watersheds.

Notwithstanding these increases, there are a number of areas where funding remains inadequate. Principal among these is funding for repair of this nation's clean water and wastewater infrastructure. On September 30th the Administrator of EPA released results of the most recent survey of the gap between the need for infrastructure improvements and available funds. This study, conducted by EPA, shows a twenty-year shortfall totaling $388 billion for clean water facilities and $274 billion for safe drinking water facilities. Given this need, the Minority does not understand why the Majority has proposed a reduction of $50 million to $1,300 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

Science

Despite constrained resources for the bill, the Chairman has made scientific research a priority and has provided a generous allocation for the science agencies, especially the $5,423 million in the bill for the National Science Foundation. The President's budget requested a meager 3 percent real increase for the NSF. The Committee has wisely added $395 million to the President's request bringing the 2003 increase to slightly over 13 percent, an amount which will allow the agency to significantly expand research in basic physics, chemistry, mathematics and engineering as well as take advantage of new opportunities which would have not been possible under the Bush budget. In approving this increase as a first step to a potentially substantial multi-year increase for NSF, the Committee has also directed a major review of the Foundation's organizational, programmatic and personnel policies to assure the Congress and the public that the NSF is optimally organized to take advantage of the new opportunities that increased resources can provide.

Although the increases recommended by the Chairman and approved by the Committee for NASA is appreciated, they are not sufficient to provide for a robust space program. The bill as reported does include $15.3 billion for NASA, an increase of $300 million above the President's request but a mere three percent over last year.

The space station program was, and is, a concern of the Minority. The International Space Station has encountered serious cost overruns throughout its history. This Committee and Congress continue to await a revised cost estimate in the wake of revelations last year of another $5 billion in cost growth. Although details of the new cost estimates were expected last month, new detailed figures are not now expected before the end of October. NASA has not yet provided details of how it plans to complete construction of the station while ensuring that it will be the "world class" research facility NASA promised, meet U.S. commitments to its international part-

ners, and stay within proposed budget guidelines. We are concerned by the reports of the Research Maximization and Prioritization (ReMaP) task force and the National Research Council that outline the reduction in scientific research capability that would result should only the "core complete" configuration be built. The potential of the space station to serve as a premier research laboratory must not be jeopardized. In addition, the NASA Management and Cost Estimating task force last year criticized the agency's focus on meeting annual budgets without dealing with the larger challenge of total program costs. The Minority feels that NASA must demonstrate not only that it has improved its management and cost estimating processes, but also that it will cease taking a year-by-year approach to budgeting without considering the impact on total program costs.

There are four general provisions affecting NASA in this bill. Two of these provisions are of concern to the Minority: a proviso allowing for the "enhanced-use lease" of real property and a provision concerning the privatization of utilities. As we move through the legislative process, these issues need to be reviewed and vetted by all parties impacted by these provisions.

Corporation for National and Community Service

Members should note that the Committee has again declined to include funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service. The Minority remains committed to working with the Majority to ensure that adequate funding is made available for this important purpose.

Conclusion

In summary, the Minority is pleased by the Chairman and the Committee's efforts in many areas, especially the funds added to the President's request for veterans medical care, ongoing housing programs, environmental initiatives, and the National Science Foundation. However, shortfalls in other areas represent ongoing concerns, which we will work to address during House and Conference consideration prior to sending the bill to the President.

ALAN B. MOLLOHAN.
DAVE OBEY.

○