

An hourglass-shaped graphic with a globe inside. The top bulb is dark blue, and the bottom bulb is light blue. The globe is a darker shade of blue. The hourglass is centered on the page.

WikiLeaks Document Release

<http://wikileaks.org/wiki/CRS-RL30204>

February 2, 2009

Congressional Research Service

Report RL30204

*APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY2000: VA, HUD, AND
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES*

Dennis W. Snook, Domestic Social Policy Division

Updated December 7, 1999

Abstract. This report is a guide to one of the 13 regular appropriations bills that Congress passes each year. It summarizes the current legislative status of the bill, its scope, major issues, funding levels, and related legislative activity.

WikiLeaks

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Appropriations for FY2000: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies

Updated December 7, 1999

Dennis W. Snook, Coordinator
Specialist in Social Legislation
Domestic Social Policy Division

Appropriations are one part of a complex federal budget process that includes budget resolutions, appropriations (regular, supplemental, and continuing) bills, rescissions, and budget reconciliation bills. The process begins with the President's budget request and is governed by the rules of the House and Senate, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (as amended), the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and current program authorizations.

This report is a guide to one of the 13 regular appropriations bills that Congress considers each year. It is designed to supplement the information provided by the House and Senate Subcommittees on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations. It summarizes the current legislative status of the bill, its scope, major issues, funding levels, and related legislative activity. The report lists the key CRS staff relevant to the issues covered and related CRS products.

This report is updated as soon as possible after major legislative developments, especially following legislative action in the committees and on the floor of the House or Senate.

NOTE: A Web version of this document with active links is available to congressional staff at [<http://www.loc.gov/crs/products/apppage.html>].

Appropriations for FY2000: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies

Summary

P.L. 106-74 (H.R. 2684). On October 20, 1999, the President signed H.R. 2684, FY2000 funding for the Departments of Veterans Affairs (VA) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and several independent agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), National Science Foundation (NSF), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNS). The bill provides \$99.5 billion in FY2000 appropriations for programs covered under the Act, compared to \$99.6 billion requested. As requested, the bill incorporated \$4.2 billion in advance FY2001 funding, and \$2.08 billion in rescissions of funds appropriated in previous years. (Given the discretion granted to agencies, the effect on any particular program of the across-the-board rescission of 0.38% in the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2000 is not yet known.)

P.L. 106-74 added \$1.7 billion to the FY2000 VA medical care request, bringing the total to \$19 billion, plus \$608 million in estimated collections from health plans sharing coverage of veterans (total funding for VA is \$44.3 billion). After including rescissions and advance funding, the net HUD appropriation of \$26 billion is \$2 billion above FY1999, or about \$2 billion less than the Administration requested. Conferees also attached House provisions that seek to improve affordable housing opportunities for seniors. Conferees added funds that brought EPA to \$385 million above the requested level, \$270 million above the Senate funding, and \$284 million above the House amount. Conferees also added funds to approved amounts for NASA (\$1 billion above the House, \$74 million above the Senate), accepted the Administration's request of \$2.5 billion in emergency funding for FEMA (not included in either House's bill), and provided \$354.5 for CNS programs (up \$11 million from the Senate level; the House provided nothing). The final bill dropped a House provision to save \$3 billion by limiting borrowing authority for the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).

Preliminary House and Senate Action. In action leading to final passage, the House had approved \$92 billion, the Senate had approved \$97.8 billion. Most of the differences between the bills were in NASA, CNS, and HUD. The Senate approved \$1 billion more than the House for NASA, funded CNS at \$343.5 million (the House provided no CNS program funding), and incorporated the proposal for HUD to receive \$4.2 billion in advance FY2001 funding, a proposal rejected by the House.

The Administration's FY2000 Budget. The Administration requested \$42.5 billion for VA, including \$17.3 billion for medical care, plus \$608 million from funds mostly collected from health plans with joint coverage of veterans. The Administration proposed consolidating HUD's housing subsidy programs, with FY2000 spending approximating FY1999 levels. Also requested were a 5% reduction to EPA spending; a 7% increase in funds for NSF, and a small reduction to funds for NASA. In spite of continued resistance in Congress to its programs (mostly AmeriCorps), the Administration again proposed expansion of CNS by adding \$110 million to FY1999 levels of \$438.5 million.

Key Policy Staff

Name	Area of Expertise	CRS Division	Tel.
Keith Bea	Emergency Management	G&F	7-8672
Richard Bourdon	Housing	DSP	7-7806
Eugene Boyd	Community Development	G&F	7-8689
Bruce Foote	Housing	DSP	7-7805
Martin Lee	Environmental Policy	RSI	7-7260
Ann Lordeman	National and Community Service	DSP	7-2323
Christine Matthews	National Science Foundation	RSI	7-7055
Bruce Mulock	Consumer Affairs	G&F	7-7775
Pauline Smale	Banking	G&F	7-7832
Dick Rowberg	National Aeronautics and Space Admin.	RSI	7-7040
Dennis Snook	Veterans Affairs	DSP	7-7314
Susan Vanhorenbeck	Housing	DSP	7-7808

Division abbreviations: DSP=Domestic Social Policy; G&F=Government and Finance; RSI=Resources, Science and Industry.

Contents

Most Recent Developments	1
Status	1
Total Appropriations for FY2000 for VA HUD, and Independent Agencies	2
Key Policy Issues	3
Department of Veterans Affairs	3
VA Cash Benefits	3
Veterans Housing Benefits	4
Medical Care	4
VA Construction	6
Program Administration	6
Capital Asset Fund (proposed legislation)	8
Department of Housing and Urban Development	8
Housing Certificate Fund	9
Public Housing Programs	13
Lead-based Paint Reduction	14
Housing for the Elderly and Disabled	14
Homeless Assistance Grants	15
Housing for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)	16
The HOME Investment Partnership Program	16
Native American Block Grants	17
Rural Housing and Economic Development	17
Fair Housing	18
Community Development Block Grant	18
The Federal Housing Administration (FHA)	22
Environmental Protection Agency	23
Federal Emergency Management Agency	26
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27
National Science Foundation	30
Other Independent Agencies	32
American Battle Monuments Commission	32
Cemeterial Expenses, Army	32
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	33
Community Development Financial Institution Fund	33
Consumer Information Center (CIC)	34
Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)	34
Corporation for National and Community Service (CNS)	34
Council on Environmental Quality; Office of Environmental Quality	35
Court of Veterans Appeals	37
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	37
National Credit Union Administration	37
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC)	37
Office of Science and Technology Policy	37
Selective Service System (SSS)	38
Selected World Wide Web Sites	38

List of Tables

Table 1. Status of VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations, FY2000	1
Table 2. Summary of VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations . . .	2
Table 3. Department of Veterans Affairs Appropriations, FY1995 to FY1999 . .	3
Table 4. Appropriations: Department of Veterans Affairs, FY2000	7
Table 5. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, FY1995 to FY1999	9
Table 6. Appropriations: Housing and Urban Development, FY2000	19
Table 7. Environmental Protection Agency Appropriations, FY1995 to FY1999	23
Table 8. Appropriations: Environmental Protection Agency, FY2000	24
Table 9. Appropriations: Federal Emergency Management Agency, FY2000 .	26
Table 10. National Aeronautics and Space Administration Appropriations, FY1995 to FY1999	28
Table 11. Appropriations: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, FY2000	29
Table 12. National Science Foundation Appropriations, FY1995 to FY1999 . .	31
Table 13. Appropriations: National Science Foundation, FY2000	32
Table 14. Appropriations: Other Independent Agencies, FY2000	36

Appropriations for FY2000: VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies

Most Recent Developments

President Signs H.R. 2684. On October 20, 1999, H.R. 2684 became P.L. 106-74, with \$99.453 billion in FY2000 VA-HUD appropriations, including \$4.2 billion in advance FY2001 funding; \$2.08 billion in previous years' funding was rescinded. Conferees reported October 7; the House adopted the conference report (House Rept. 106-379) October 14, and the Senate, October 15.

Continuing Resolution H.J.Res. 68. On September 28, 1999, Congress passed a resolution to continue spending at FY1999 levels, thereby providing 3 additional weeks to complete appropriations actions, including appropriations for VA-HUD.

Previous action on H.R. 2684. The House approved \$91.98 billion (H.Rept. 106-286) September 9. The Senate approved \$97.828 billion on September 24, substituting the language of S. 1596 (S.Rept. 106-161) for the House bill.

Discretionary Spending Allocations. The 1997 balanced-budget law (P.L. 105-33) caps discretionary spending; the latest "302 (b)" allocation for the VA-HUD bill is \$68.632 billion for the House, and \$69.632 billion for the Senate.

Congressional Budget Resolution for FY2000 (H.Con.Res. 68). On April 14, Congress approved its version of an FY2000 budget guideline, assuming \$1.7 billion more in VA medical care funding than the Administration requested.

FY2000 Budget Requests. The President requested \$99.6 billion for FY2000 VA-HUD appropriations, including \$4.2 billion in advance FY2001 appropriations and proposed \$2.08 billion in rescissions of previous years' funding. The request proposed \$21.3 billion in FY2000 appropriations for mandatory spending, and \$72.1 billion in discretionary funds (totals are rounded).

Status

Table 1. Status of VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations, FY2000

Subcommittee markup		House report	Passed House	Senate report	Passed Senate	Conference report	Conference report approval		Public Law
House	Senate						House	Senate	
7/26	9/15	7/30	9/9	9/16	9/24	10/7	10/14	10/15	10/20

Total Appropriations for FY2000 for VA HUD, and Independent Agencies

P.L. 106-74. The appropriations act for VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies (P.L. 106-74) provides \$99.453 billion in FY2000 appropriations for the federal functions funded by the bill (VA, HUD, and NASA comprise 84% of the total). After adjusting for \$4.2 billion in advance FY2001 appropriations, and subtracting \$2.080 billion in rescissions of prior year funding (and \$10 million in other offsets), the net effect on federal taxpayers of P.L. 106-74 during FY2000 is projected to be \$93.163 billion.

Table 2. Summary of VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations
(budget authority in billions of \$)

Program	FY1999	FY2000 Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
Veterans Affairs	42.625	42.538	44.156	44.351	44.335
Housing; Urban Development	24.079	28.048	26.067	27.170	25.951
Environmental Protection Agency	7.590	7.207	7.308	7.322	7.592
Federal Emergency Management Agency	2.870	3.402	0.881	0.855	3.351
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	13.665	13.578	12.654	13.578	13.653
National Science Foundation	3.671	3.921	3.637	3.921	3.912
Other Independent Agencies	0.763	0.909	0.277	0.631	0.673
Tennessee Valley Authority	—	—	-3.000	—	—
Preservation of Affordable Hsg.	—	—	—	—	-0.014
Total Appropriations	95.263	99.603	91.980	97.828	99.453
Scorekeeping adjustments	-3.146	-6.290	-2.090	-6.290	-6.290
<i>Adjustments; rescissions</i>	<i>(-1.070)</i>	<i>(-2.090)</i>	<i>(-2.090)</i>	<i>(-2.090)</i>	<i>(-2.090)</i>
<i>Advance approp. FY2001</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>(-4.200)</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>(-4.200)</i>	<i>(-4.200)</i>
<i>Emergency funding</i>	<i>(-2.076)</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>—</i>
Total, after adjustments:*	92.117	93.313	89.890	91.538	93.163
<i>(Mandatory, adjusted)*</i>	<i>22.313</i>	<i>21.258</i>	<i>21.258</i>	<i>21.307</i>	<i>21.307</i>
<i>(Discretionary)</i>	<i>69.805</i>	<i>72.055</i>	<i>68.632</i>	<i>70.232</i>	<i>71.856</i>

*Adjustments may include various supplementals, rescissions, advance appropriations, accounting changes, and reestimates of program experience. Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: H.Rept. 106-379.

Key Policy Issues

Department of Veterans Affairs

Congress provided \$44.335 billion for programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) during FY2000, an increase of \$1.71 billion above FY1999, and \$1.8 billion above the Administration's request. During action leading to completion of the bill, the House approved appropriations of \$44.156 billion for FY2000, while the Senate approved \$44.351 billion. The Administration's FY2000 budget requested \$42.538 billion. While the number of veterans is declining, VA entitlement spending will rise by \$18 million in FY2000, to \$23.397 billion. Much of this increase results from liberalizations during FY1999 to the Montgomery GI Bill, the primary education program. Also, the enacted bill includes estimated funding for a new homeless program under VA's entitlement authority for veterans' housing assistance. Appropriations for medical care increased by \$1.7 billion.

Congress approved \$42.625 billion in appropriations for VA for FY1999, up from \$40.98 billion for FY1998 (after incorporating supplemental appropriations, and various reestimates of mandatory spending for that year). The Administration had requested \$42.15 billion for FY1999.

FY2000 Congressional Budget Resolution. The House approved an amendment to its version of the FY2000 budget resolution that called for an increase of \$1.1 billion over the amount that the Administration requested for medical care; the Senate approved an amendment calling for \$3 billion more for those programs. Final passage of the Budget Resolution contained language calling for \$1.7 billion more in medical care funding.

For additional information on VA programs, see CRS Report RL30099, *Veterans Issues in the 106th Congress*, by Dennis Snook.

**Table 3. Department of Veterans Affairs Appropriations,
FY1995 to FY1999**

(budget authority in billions of current \$)

FY1995	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998	FY1999
\$37.23	\$38.11	\$40.33	\$42.41	\$42.63

Source: Budget levels remain uncertain until all program experience has been recorded, and any supplemental appropriations or rescissions have been taken into consideration; thus, FY1995-98 figures are from budget submissions of subsequent years. Estimates of FY1999 spending are from H.Rept. 106-379, the Conference Report accompanying H.R. 2684 to final passage.

VA Cash Benefits. Spending for VA cash benefit programs is mandatory, and amounts requested by the budget are based on projected caseloads. Definitions of eligibility and benefit levels are in law. For FY2000, CBO projects that \$23.4 billion will be required for these entitlements, mostly service-connected compensation, means-tested pensions, and Montgomery GI-Bill education payments. For the most

part, declining caseloads for pensions and education benefits have been decreasing program obligations from year-to-year. For FY2000, however, this lower trend for education programs will be largely offset because P.L. 105-178 increased Montgomery GI-Bill benefits by 20%. For FY1999, Congress appropriated \$23.4 billion for VA entitlement programs. VA appropriations for FY1998 included \$22.1 billion for VA entitlements.

Veterans Housing Benefits. Historically, the opportunity for veterans to have home loans guaranteed by the federal government was a significant contribution to the national goal of increasing the number of families who owned their own homes. Because of the guarantees, lenders are protected against losses up to the amount of the guarantee, thereby permitting veterans to obtain mortgages with little or no down payment, and with competitive interest rates. These guarantees, and certain direct loans to specific categories of veterans were obligations of the federal government that constituted mandatory spending; administrative expenses are discretionary appropriations transferred from the home loan programs to the General Operating Expenses account.

Guaranteed Transitional Housing Loans for Homeless Veterans Program Account. P.L. 105-368, the Veterans Programs Enhancement Act of 1998 established a pilot project to expand the supply of transitional housing for homeless veterans. The program was authorized to guarantee up to 15 loans with a maximum aggregate value of \$100 million, with no more than 5 loans guaranteed during the first 3 years. These housing plans must enforce sobriety standards, as well as provide various supportive services, such as substance abuse counseling and job readiness skills workshops. Residents would pay a reasonable fee to reside in the project homes. P.L. 106-74 includes an estimate that \$48.25 million for program costs for the program will be required during FY2000, based on the loan limitation of \$100 million.

Medical Care. House and Senate bills both passed their respective chambers after a total of \$1.7 billion was added to the Administration's request of \$17.3 billion for VA medical care for FY2000. (In the Senate, \$600 million of the additional appropriation was deemed to be emergency spending, thereby excluding that amount from "302(b)" spending cap limitations for the bill.) The Administration had requested the same amount as had been appropriated for FY1999, a freeze in part intended to force efficiencies within the VA medical system. In addition, the Administration assumed that \$749 million more medical care funding would be provided in FY2000 from the Medical Care Cost Recovery (MCCF) fund; the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates this amount to be \$608 million. The MCCF collects payments from insurance companies with joint coverage of veterans receiving care in VA facilities, and from veterans obligated for cost-sharing of their VA medical care (CBO estimates MCCF collections for FY1999 to be \$583 million). Congress appropriated \$17.057 billion in funds for VA medical care for FY1998.

Increasing patient load and expanding access. For several years, VA has been expanding access to medical services by transferring medical personnel slots from inpatient settings to more efficient outpatient care venues. As a result, the unique patient count has increased by one-third in 3 fiscal years. Yet, VA estimates that it will eliminate another 7,000 to 8,000 positions in the medical care system during FY2000. The House committee's report (H.Rept. 106-286) expresses concern that

too many additional veterans are being promised services without adequate personnel to serve them, and calls for careful review to determine if it is premature to permit enrollment to all veterans who apply to VA health care plans.

The report recommended passage of a proposal to coordinate VA services with Medicare (Medicare “subvention”) to help alleviate this problem, saying that the “VA has repeatedly demonstrated a capacity to treat patients at a lower cost than most Medicare providers while producing better health outcomes.” The report also called for continuing to expand community-based outpatient access, so that the number of patients that could be served within resource limitations will be maximized, and will occur closer to where veterans live.

The Senate report (S.Rept. 106-161) generally agreed with the House position, and notes that “VA’s budget was not predicated on a detailed assessment of requirements, and no analysis of the specific reductions which would occur were conducted....” The report cited the Administration’s budget estimated reduction of 6,949 personnel slots in FY2000, yet pointed out that VA’s own studies indicate that the reduction would be nearer to 13,000 slots, which the report suggested is an unacceptable level given the tremendous growth in the number of veterans being served in VA outpatient clinics.

In the conference report (H.Rept. 106-379), conferees also addressed one of the issues driving interest in Medicare subvention: access to needed care for veterans in remote areas. While subvention proposals vary in their method for addressing the needs of veterans living substantial distances from VA facilities, many advocates of coordination between VA and Medicare envision a system in which veterans could get needed care from providers nearer to where they live, with the contracted costs paid directly by VA, or indirectly by Medicare when appropriate. VA health plans would determine the circumstances in which such care could be more efficiently and effectively provided by contracting outside VA with local medical services.

The conference report directs VA to study (and report to Congress by February 1, 2000) whether veterans in rural areas experience access and transportation difficulties, and whether such difficulties “serve as a barrier” to their health care. The requested study must examine whether VA’s current resource allocation system contributes to the problem of rural access, as the relatively few rural veterans may be experiencing lower quality care as VA searches to find efficiency savings. The report also requests a proposal for dealing with the problems of rural access.

Response to Hepatitis C (HCV). Evidence suggests that veterans have a substantially higher infection rate for this dangerous communicable disease, and veterans groups and some health care professionals advocate a more aggressive stance by VA to combat the threat. No specific dollar amount is appropriated under H.R. 2684, but the House urged VA to establish “a vigorous program of testing and treatment...broadly available to veterans, and to use all available therapies in the most clinically appropriate and cost effective manner.” The Senate estimated that \$350 million would be needed to treat veterans “suffering from hepatitis C with a new and costly therapy.” Conferees “urge the VA to make testing and treatment for hepatitis C broadly available to all veterans.”

Medical research. The House approved \$326 million for medical and prosthetic research in FY2000, up \$10 million from FY1999. About one-half of the additional funds would be used for the purpose of establishing a public/private partnership to improve diagnosis and treatment of prostate cancer, “one of the most common diseases of American veterans.” The Senate report emphasized the need to “intensify research efforts on the relationship between acid reflux and lower esophageal/upper stomach cancer,” a rise which has the committee concerned. Both reports also encouraged VA to use research funds to further research into the treatment of HCV. The Administration had proposed a freeze on research funds at \$316 million, and the Senate bill endorsed that level. Conferees compromised the differences, providing \$321 million for medical research.

For additional information on VA medical care, see CRS Report 97-786, *Veterans Medical Care: Major Changes Underway*, by Dennis Snook.

VA Construction. Conferees approved \$65 million for major construction, and \$160 million for minor construction (projects with an estimated cost under \$4 million). The House bill had approved \$137 million for major and minor construction projects, comprised of \$35 million for major construction, and \$102 million for minor construction. The Senate bill included \$70 million for major projects, and \$175 million for minor construction, a total of \$245 million. The Administration requested \$235 million for new construction projects, comprised of \$60 million for major construction and \$175 million for minor construction. Many of the minor construction projects will continue VA’s overall strategy of expanding outpatient access.

Most of the larger proposed projects will improve existing facilities: \$13 million recommended by the Administration for a surgical suite to be added to the Kansas City facility was rejected by the House, but endorsed by the Senate, and accepted by conferees; \$17.5 million proposed by the Administration for spinal cord injury treatment and rehabilitation capabilities at the Tampa, Florida hospital was included in both bills. The Senate added \$10 million to facilitate additional planning for the disposition of underutilized hospital space or otherwise superfluous capital assets; conferees accepted the Senate’s proposal.

For FY1999, Congress provided \$317 million in new construction project funding. For FY1998, Congress appropriated \$353 million for new construction, and redirected to outpatient access projects, \$32.1 million that had been previously authorized and appropriated for a new hospital in California.

Program Administration. The House bill had proposed \$886 million to fund the General Operating Expenses (GOE) account for administering VA benefit programs during FY2000, and approved the Administration’s request of \$61 million for administering the medical programs. The Administration requested \$912 million for GOE. After accepting certain minor accounting changes requested by the Administration, the Senate essentially approved the VA request for administrative expenses for medical and benefit programs. Conferees adopted the Senate’s proposed levels for GOE, and trimmed \$1 million from its proposed level for medical administration. Congress provided \$856 million for GOE, and \$63 million for medical

care administration, for FY1999. For FY1998, Congress appropriated \$786 million for GOE, and \$60 million for medical administration.

Table 4. Appropriations: Department of Veterans Affairs, FY2000
(budget authority in billions of \$)

Program	FY1999	FY2000 Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
Comp., pension, burial	21.857	21.568	21.568	21.568	21.568
Insurance/indemnities	0.046	0.029	0.029	0.029	0.029
Housing programs	0.300	0.282	0.282	0.282	0.282
Readjustment benefits	1.175	1.469	1.469	1.469	1.469
Guar. Transitional Hsg. Loans, Homeless Vets.	—	—	—	0.048	0.048
<i>Subtotal: Mandatory (entitlement)</i>	<i>23.379</i>	<i>23.348</i>	<i>23.348</i>	<i>23.397</i>	<i>23.397</i>
Medical care ^a	17.306	17.306	19.006	19.006	19.006
Med.-prosthetic research	0.316	0.316	0.326	0.316	0.321
Construction, major	0.142	0.060	0.035	0.070	0.065
Construction, minor	0.175	0.175	0.102	0.175	0.160
Grants; state facilities	0.090	0.040	0.087	0.090	0.090
State veteran cemeteries	0.010	0.011	0.011	0.025	0.025
Nat'l Cemetery Admin.	0.092	0.097	0.097	0.097	0.097
General operating exp.	0.856	0.912	0.886	0.913	0.913
Admin. expense (hsng.)	0.160	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.158
Inspector General	0.036	0.043	0.039	0.043	0.043
Medical Administration	0.063	0.061	0.061	0.061	0.060
Capital asset fund	—	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000
<i>Subtotal: Discretionary</i>	<i>19.246</i>	<i>19.190</i>	<i>20.808</i>	<i>20.954</i>	<i>20.938</i>
Subtotal: (Veterans Affairs)	42.625	42.538^a	44.156	44.351^a	44.335

Note: Rounding may cause discrepancies in subtotals.

Source: H.Rept. 106-379.

^a Medical Care Collections Fund (MCCF) receipts are added to the Medical Care account; \$583 million in additional funds from this source are estimated for FY1999; \$608 million for FY2000, in the Administration request, and in H.R. 2684 and S. 1596.

VA employment estimates. The Administration projected overall VA employment will average 197,909 in FY2000, down from an estimated average of 205,413 in FY1999, and 207,066 in FY1998. Most of the decline will be in medical staff: VA estimated 176,000 medical care slots for FY2000, down from an estimated 182,000 in FY1999, and 185,000 in FY1998. Medical care staff positions will have declined by 14% from a high of 204,000 at the end of FY1993, if these estimates are matched with experience.

Capital Asset Fund (proposed legislation). The Administration included a legislative proposal in its FY2000 budget, for the creation of a 5-year pilot Capital Asset Fund (CAF) that would allow VA to “sell, transfer, or exchange excess and underutilized properties,” collecting the proceeds in this asset fund for use in the disposal or conversion to other uses of superfluous assets, primarily hospital facilities. Ten percent of the CAF proceeds would be transferred to HUD to be used for homeless assistance programs. VA estimated that the CAF would receive \$18 million annually from 2001 through 2004, and requested \$10 million in start-up funds for FY2000. Neither House included the proposed CAF, but conferees did accept the Senate’s proposed \$10 million for capital asset planning as an earmark in the major construction account.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

The Administration requested \$28.05 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in FY2000. This amount is estimated by CBO to be \$3.97 billion more than the appropriation of \$24.08 billion for HUD for FY1999. The House approved \$26.07 billion for HUD in FY2000, approximately a \$2 billion decrease from the FY2000 request, and a \$2 billion increase above the FY1999 appropriation. The Senate approved \$27.2 billion for HUD, using the Administration’s recommendation that \$4.2 billion be advance appropriations for FY2001. Conferees settled on \$28.2 billion in HUD appropriations for FY2000, including \$4.2 in advance FY2001 funding, and offset by \$2.2 billion in rescissions from spending appropriated for previous fiscal years.

The HUD total included in the House-passed bill appeared to signal a substantial increase over the FY1999 appropriations level, but dissenters to the House Appropriations Committee report (H.Rept. 106-286) claimed that “...reductions in HUD programs below the prior year’s level are spread throughout the bill.”¹ The report’s dissenters claimed that the FY1999 fund level was “artificially held down” by rescissions, and that the bill actually recommended \$945 million below “a hard freeze.” Supporters of the House position pointed out that the Administration’s FY2000 HUD budget proposed an advance appropriation of \$4.2 billion (unavailable for expenditure before FY2001), a move the House refused to endorse. In part, the House bill proposed to increase overall funding for the VA-HUD bill by limiting Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) borrowing for an estimated savings of \$3 billion. Such an accounting device may have been used to offset increased HUD spending without exceeding the 302(b) allocations for the entire bill.

¹ H.Rept. 106-286, p. 127.

For FY1999, President Clinton requested \$24.8 billion for HUD; the House approved \$26.1 billion, and the Senate approved \$24.1 billion. The House and Senate differed in amounts appropriated for components of the Housing Certificate Fund, and in their treatment of Federal Housing Authority (FHA) administrative expenses, as well as in various earmarks and program subcategories. In conference, more funding than was approved by either the House or the Senate for the Housing Certificate Fund was adopted, in part because of reforms in federal housing programs contained in Title V of the legislation. For FY1999, \$10.3 billion was provided for the Housing Certificate Fund, reduced by \$2 billion in rescissions (including \$350 million in rescissions enacted as part of the offset to the costs of the supplemental appropriations bill, P.L. 106-31).

For additional information on housing issues, see CRS Report RS20045, *Housing Issues in the 106th Congress*, by Richard Bourdon.

**Table 5. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Appropriations, FY1995 to FY1999**

(budget authority in billions of current \$; net after rescissions)

FY1995	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998	FY1999
\$20.09	\$19.13	\$16.30	\$21.44	\$24.08

Source: Budget levels remain uncertain until all program experience has been recorded, and any supplemental appropriations or rescissions have been taken into consideration; thus, FY1995-98 figures are from budget submissions of subsequent years. Estimates of FY1999 spending are from H.Rept. 106-379, the Conference Report accompanying H.R. 2684 to final passage.

Housing Certificate Fund. The Administration requested \$11.5 billion in new budget authority for the Housing Certificate Fund in FY2000, including \$4.2 billion in advanced appropriations for use beginning in October 2000. With \$2.2 billion in recaptured funds and carryovers from previous years, and \$183 million transferred from the Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing Account, if the Administration's funding request had been granted, \$13.9 billion would have been available for the Housing Certificate Fund in FY2000, of which \$4.2 billion would actually first become available for expenditure in FY2001.

The largest portion of the Administration's request for new funding was for Section 8² contract renewals, \$6.4 billion in FY2000 and \$4.2 billion to be used after October 1, 2000. Of the remainder, \$347 million was to be set aside for incremental vouchers for Section 8 families and the homeless; \$144 million for welfare-to-work vouchers; \$156 million for tenant protection assistance; \$209 million for contract administration; \$6 million for administrative fees, and \$20 million for regional opportunity counseling.

² Section 8 of the Housing Act of 1937 (as amended), provides subsidies for rental housing for low-income families.

The House bill included \$10.54 billion for the Housing Certificate Fund in FY2000. Of this amount, \$25 million could have been used for Section 8 tenant-based rental assistance for disabled families who chose to move from public housing now designated for elderly residents. Language in the House Committee's report also directed HUD to provide relocation vouchers for families being displaced due to the demolition or revitalization of public housing under the HOPE VI program. HUD estimated that this assistance would cost approximately \$30 million, funded through the Housing Certificate Fund. For the most part, however, the House bill and its accompanying report did not specify how money in the HCF would be allocated, or conversely, how various subclassifications dependent on the HCF for funding would be expected to absorb the implied cut-backs.

The Senate bill provided \$11.05 billion for the Housing Certificate Fund. The bill included the Administration's request that an advance appropriation of \$4.2 billion be provided "for the remainder costs of contracts renewed in [FY2000] for the months requiring Section 8 assistance in [FY2001]." The Senate bill also included \$100 million to cover the costs of bringing below market rental contracts up to market. The bill assumed that \$2.05 billion in recaptures would be carried over from FY1999, and become available for Section 8 renewals in FY2000.

Conferees approved \$11.38 billion for the Housing Certificate Fund in FY2000. This appropriation includes \$10.83 billion for the renewal of Section 8 expiring contracts; \$156 million for tenant protection and \$347 million for incremental vouchers as requested by the President; and \$40 million for vouchers for the disabled. The Conferees did not provide appropriations to fund the President's request for welfare-to-work vouchers, regional opportunity counseling, or additional funds for Section 8 contract administration.

Expiring Rental Contracts. The Administration proposed \$10.64 billion for the renewal of all Section 8 contracts due to expire in FY2000. For FY1999, Congress had approved \$9.6 billion for Section 8 contract renewals. HUD identified approximately \$2.4 billion in recaptured and carryover monies from FY1999, including \$183 million transferred from the Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing Account, which it assumed could also be used to renew Section 8 contracts in FY2000, bringing the total available for renewals to \$13 billion. HUD estimated that this amount would be sufficient to renew expiring contracts for 2,383,687 units.³ However, the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-31) rescinded \$350 million of the Section 8 reserve fund. Congress said that it would restore these funds to HUD when needed for the FY2000 Section 8 contract renewals.

HUD expected to continue to renew these contracts through the "mark-to-market" restructuring program established in the VA-HUD 1998 Appropriations Act, and estimates that millions of dollars will be saved that otherwise would be expended on contracts inflated beyond market rates.

Given the aforementioned remark in H.Rept. 106-286, that \$25 million of the recommended \$10.54 billion would be used for tenant-based assistance to the disabled,

³ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Congressional Justifications for 2000 Estimates*. p. P-2.

it appeared that the House bill would have provided \$10.29 billion for Section 8 contract renewals in FY2000. Thus, under the House bill, except for the one recommendation, the various subclassifications administered by HUD through the HCF would have been expected to absorb shortfalls according to a plan developed within HUD, rather than by the Congress through language adopted during the appropriations process.

The Senate bill allocated \$10.855 billion for Section 8 contract renewals, and the Senate report stated “HUD is authorized to provide sticky or enhanced vouchers which permit current residents of such a project to be subsidized based on the market rent for a dwelling unit in the project. Tenants shall remain eligible for sticky vouchers so long as they continue to live in the same projects...” This upgrading of contracts entailed a limit (30% of adjusted gross income) on how much of the new contracts tenants would have to pay. HUD was urged to “make every effort to renew the expiring Section 8 contracts which are attached to this assisted housing, especially those projects located in low vacancy areas, including those in high cost urban areas and rural areas, and especially those projects that serve the elderly and persons with disabilities.”

The Conferees appropriated \$10.83 billion for the renewal of Section 8 contracts in FY2000. In an effort to encourage owners of projects to renew their contracts, Conferees included a provision that permits mark-to-market contract renewals at comparable market rate levels (or higher) for projects meeting certain criteria. (This provision is discussed under the subsection *Housing for the Elderly and Disabled*.)

For more information on expiring contracts and the restructuring program, please see the following: CRS Report 97-264, *The Problem of Section 8 Expiring Contracts*, by Susan Vanhorenbeck, and CRS Report 97-1002, *HUD Multifamily Reform: Section 8 Restructuring*, by Susan Vanhorenbeck.

Section 8 Contract Amendments. The perceived need for Section 8 contract amendments resulted because funding was insufficient to maintain projects that originated during the 1970's and 1980's, and which were built through long-term project-based contracts (usually written for terms up to 40 years). The current practice of providing contracts for a 1-year term could eliminate the need for amendments to these contracts. However, some older contracts remain and in many cases, managers cannot maintain their housing inventory without additional funds provided through amendments to existing contracts.

The Administration did not request any additional funding for Section 8 amendments in FY2000, contending that recaptured Section 8 funds from previous years will be sufficient to fund any necessary amendments to Section 8 contracts in FY2000. Conferees agreed with this assessment and no funds were provided for FY2000. In FY1999, the Administration requested \$1.3 billion in funding for Section 8 amendments. Congress disagreed with the request, and funding was also not provided for amendments to contracts in FY1999.

Section 8 Tenant-Protection Assistance. The Administration assumes that not all owners of Section 8 assisted housing are willing to renew expiring contracts, and the Housing Certificate Fund provides assistance to affected families when a contract renewal does not take place. The Administration requested \$134 million for housing tenants' protection in FY2000, which was to be used to subsidize tenants displaced

through opt-outs, termination of contracts, or property dispositions. The Administration estimated that this amount would aid approximately 27,000 families. Another \$22 million was requested for Multifamily Enforcement, which provides protection for tenants facing additional costs of revised policies in multifamily housing. This funding was to be used for enhanced vouchers, relocation assistance, and similar support, bringing the total FY2000 request for tenant protection in FY2000 to \$156 million. In FY1999, \$434 million was appropriated for this purpose.

The House bill did not provide funding for enhanced vouchers or tenant relocation assistance; however, the House Committee's report stated that \$25 million of the Housing Certificate Fund appropriation could be used to provide relocation vouchers for disabled families who chose to move out of public housing now designated for occupancy by the elderly. The House report also directed HUD to provide relocation vouchers for families displaced by HOPE VI revitalization. The Senate Committee's report specified that \$40 million was to be made available from the HCF for these disabled families, in addition to the \$156 million requested by the Administration for tenant protection assistance.

Conferees agreed with the Senate bill, and provided \$156 million in tenant protection assistance, and \$40 million for vouchers for the disabled.

Section 8 Vouchers. The Administration requested a total of \$491 million to fund 85,000 incremental vouchers in FY2000, including \$243 million for 42,000 Section 8 vouchers to help those renters in "worst case" need (defined as rent equal to more than 50% of tenants' incomes, or conditions determined to be substandard); \$144 million for 25,000 Section 8 vouchers to help families make the transition from welfare-to-work; and \$104 million for 18,000 Section 8 vouchers to help homeless persons making the transition from continuum of care facilities to permanent housing. In FY1999, \$283 million was provided for 50,000 housing vouchers. All of these were used for the welfare-to-work initiative.

Neither version of H.R. 2684 provided funding for incremental vouchers or welfare-to-work vouchers. However, conferees provided \$347 million for approximately 60,000 incremental vouchers, the amount requested by the President.

Contract Administration. The Administration requested \$209 million to contract out duties currently performed by HUD staff, including annual physical inspections of properties, review of management, financial statements, and occupancy, and release of replacement reserves. In recent years, the number of HUD personnel has been declining, and the Administration would like to reserve remaining HUD staff for duties which it believes should only be performed by federal employees.

The Administration also asked for \$6 million for an anticipated administrative fee increase for the Section 8 program. This increase was approved in the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998. Neither version of H.R. 2684 funded this increase or the request for contract administration, and conferees did not provide such funds.

Regional Opportunity Counseling. The President requested \$20 million for the Regional Opportunity Counseling (ROC) program in FY2000. The program, which seeks to expand the housing opportunities of low-income families living in high poverty

neighborhoods, funds special counseling conducted by public housing agencies in partnership with local non-profit agencies. In FY1999, \$10 million was provided for Regional Counseling.

Neither version of H.R. 2684 provided funding for regional opportunity counseling, and there is no funding provision in the final conference agreement.

Public Housing Programs. The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 consolidated all public housing capital programs (except HOPE VI) into one Public Housing Capital Fund. The Act also directs HUD to develop a new formula to allocate resources of the Public Housing Operating Fund for FY2000. In the event that a new formula for that Fund has not been completed in time, FY2000 funds would be distributed using the existing formula. For FY2000, the Administration requested \$3.003 billion for the Public Housing Operating Fund; \$2.55 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund; \$310 million for Drug Elimination Grants; and \$625 million for the HOPE VI program.

Both versions of the bill provided \$2.555 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund. The House bill provided \$2.818 billion for the Public Housing Operating Fund, the Senate provided \$2.9 billion; the House bill provided \$290 million for the Drug Elimination Grant program, the Senate bill funded the requested \$310 million; and the House bill provided \$575 million for the HOPE VI program, the Senate bill \$500 million.

The final bill appropriates \$2.9 billion for the Public Housing Capital Fund and \$3.1 billion for the Public Housing Operating Fund. Both of these amounts exceed the request of the President. The bill also provides \$310 million for Drug Elimination Grants and \$575 million for the HOPE VI program.

The FY1999 appropriations provided \$2.818 billion for the Public Housing Operating Fund; \$3 billion for Public Housing Capital Fund; \$310 million for the Drug Elimination Grant program; and \$625 million for the HOPE VI program.

Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act. During House floor action on the FY1999 VA-HUD appropriations bill, an amendment was adopted that attached the essential language of the Housing Opportunity and Responsibility Act, a sweeping reform of federal housing assistance programs that had passed both chambers but had not been reported from a conference committee. Conferees on the FY1999 VA-HUD appropriations bill deliberated issues in the two versions of the housing reform language, and with participation of the Administration, completed work on this major authorization of federal housing programs.

Under the new law, well-run public housing agencies have more freedom to operate; poorly run agencies can be held more accountable; more working families with higher incomes live in public housing that is now largely occupied by the poorest of the poor; and some residents are required to perform 8 hours a month of community service. In both public housing and Section 8 programs, it is now easier to evict tenants who commit crimes and cause problems. A home rule flexible grant demonstration program allows some local governments (rather than public housing agencies) to receive federal housing funds to develop creative approaches for providing

affordable housing. A new Section 8 housing voucher program is more landlord-friendly and more market-driven. Most provisions in the new law became effective October 1, 1999.

For further information on this significant change in federal housing policy, see CRS Report 98-860, *Housing the Poor: Federal Housing Programs for Low-Income Families*, by Morton J. Schussheim; and CRS Report 98-868, *Public Housing and Section 8 Reforms: The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998*, by Richard Bourdon.

Lead-based Paint Reduction. The Administration requested \$80 million for the Lead-based Paint Reduction program for FY2000, the same amount that was appropriated for the program in FY1999. In FY1997 and 1998, this program was funded as a set-aside of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) fund, and earlier, it was funded under the Annual Contribution for Assisted Housing Account. The FY2000 budget proposal requests that all lead hazard balances from these accounts be transferred to the Lead Hazard Account.

The House version of H.R. 2684 provided \$70 million for lead-based paint reduction in FY2000, a decrease of \$10 million from the FY1999 funding and the Administration's request for FY2000; the Senate version funded the Administration's request. In addition, the House bill would have funded the Healthy Homes Initiative at \$7.5 million, \$2.5 million below the Administration request and the FY1999 level, while the Senate bill approved the requested amount.

The enacted bill included \$80 million for Lead-Based Paint Reduction for FY2000, the same as requested by the Administration.

Housing for the Elderly and Disabled. The President requested \$660 million for housing assistance for the elderly in FY2000. The Administration proposed combining new and existing HUD programs to help subsidize a full range of housing options for the elderly. Of the \$660 million requested for FY2000, \$510 million would be used for the Section 202 Supportive Housing program; \$100 million for a new initiative which would provide capital grants to convert projects to assisted living facilities; and \$50 million to expand the service coordinator program and provide renewal money for congregate housing services. In FY1999, \$660 million was appropriated for housing for the elderly under the Section 202 Supportive Housing program.

The budget also proposed \$87 million in new mandatory spending to be used for 15,000 vouchers for the elderly. These vouchers were to be given to states to subsidize units developed under the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program.⁴

The House bill included \$660 million for the Section 202 program for FY2000, the same level as the FY1999 appropriation. In its report, the House Committee expressed a concern with the future crisis facing housing for the elderly, but it did not

⁴ For further information on low-income housing tax credits, see CRS Report RS20337, *The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit: Current Issues and Proposed Legislation*, by Richard Bourdon.

recommend the funding of assisted living facilities through the Section 202 program. The report endorsed the Continuum of Care approach of providing services to residents of assisted housing to enable low-income and frail elderly to obtain decent housing and the services they require. The Senate version of the bill added \$50 million to the requested amount, approving \$710 million for the elderly under this program.

The Administration also requested \$194 million for housing for the disabled (Section 811) for FY2000, the same amount as provided for FY1999. To assure flexibility and choice in housing for the disabled, no less than 25% (but no more than 50%) of the funding was to be used to provide the disabled with tenant-based vouchers. The House bill included the requested \$194 million for the Section 811 program in FY2000, although its report states concerns about HUD's proposal to expand the percentage of funding directed to tenant-based rental assistance. The report directs HUD to use no more than 25 % of Section 811 funding for tenant-based assistance in FY2000. The Senate approved \$201 million for the disabled, after \$7 million was added by a floor amendment.

The conference report added a new title (Title V) to the VA-HUD appropriations bill which amends housing authorization laws. Title V authorizes funding of \$911 million for housing for the elderly and disabled in FY2000. \$710 million is authorized for Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly, and \$201 million is authorized for Section 811 Supportive Housing for the Disabled. Title V also authorizes \$50 million to repair and convert housing projects for the elderly into assisted living facilities, and \$50 million to renew all grants made in previous years for service coordinators and congregate services in public housing for FY2000. This \$100 million is to be taken from the \$710 million appropriated for the Section 202 program.

Title V does much more than authorize appropriated funds for the elderly and the disabled. It combines provisions of three bills: H.R. 202, H.R. 1336, and H.R. 1624, and is consistent with a number of provisions in the Senate bill, S. 1319. These bills all sought to secure affordable housing for the elderly, disabled, and low-income families in the 21st century. Title V is intended to protect existing residents of federally-assisted housing from being forced to move out of their homes in the face of market rate rent increases; it provides for the development of affordable assisted living facilities from Section 202, public housing and Section 236 projects; and it encourages the preservation of affordable housing by renewing Section 8 contracts at market-rate rent levels when necessary.

For more information on housing for the elderly, see CRS Report RL30247, *Housing for the Elderly: Legislation in the 106th Congress*, by Susan Vanhorenbeck.

Homeless Assistance Grants. The President's budget requested \$1.025 billion for homeless assistance (including \$5 million for a demonstration project). Except for the \$5 million project, these funds would be used for competitive Homeless Assistance Grants and represent an increase of \$45 million or 4.4% over that enacted for FY1999. HUD estimated that with this proposed budget, there would be 150,000 transitional beds funded by the end of 2000 in addition to 80,000 permanent beds, all linked to supportive services.

The final bill provides \$1.02 billion for homeless assistance grants, virtually the same as the Administration's request. This is the same as proposed by the Senate, but \$50 million more than the amount the House had recommended. Conferees require that at least 30% of the appropriations be used for permanent housing, as proposed by the Senate. In addition, a 25% match would be required by grantees for funding for services, as proposed by the Senate. The final bill also accepts the Senate's language that directs HUD to review any previously obligated amounts of assistance that remain unspent, and to deobligate the funds if the contracts are unlikely to be performed.

Under final language in the bill, HUD would merge all of the balances from separate homeless assistance program accounts of past years (including Emergency Shelter Grants, Supportive Housing, Shelter Plus Care, Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Single Room Occupancy, Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless, and Innovative Homeless Initiatives Demonstration accounts) into one Homeless Assistance Grants account to more efficiently utilize recaptured funds and streamline the Department. Up to 1% of appropriated funds could be used for technical assistance to help grantees overcome a variety of problems. As proposed by the Senate, the conferees direct HUD to ensure that state and local jurisdictions pass on at least 50% of all administrative funds to the nonprofit organizations administering the homeless assistance programs.

Housing for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA). The President requested \$240 million for HOPWA in FY2000, \$15 million more than provided for the program in FY1999. HOPWA provides grants to states, localities and nonprofit organizations to meet the housing need of individuals with HIV/AIDS and their families. The Administration contends the funding increase is necessary to support the program in several jurisdictions that become newly eligible in FY2000 for assistance under the program formula. It estimates that \$240 million would support approximately 43,990 housing units.

The House bill provided \$225 million for HOPWA in FY2000; \$15 million below the Administration's request, and level with the FY1999 appropriation. The Senate version provided \$232 million for HOPWA, including \$7 million added by a Senate floor amendment.

The HOME Investment Partnership Program. The HOME program makes funds available to participating jurisdictions to increase the supply of housing and homeownership for low-income families. P.L. 106-74 appropriates \$1.6 billion for the HOME program in FY2000, the same as enacted in FY1999 and the same as approved by the Senate. The President's budget requested a \$10 million increase over the level enacted for FY1999 while the House bill proposed an appropriation of \$1.58 billion.

The appropriation includes \$15 million for housing counseling. The Administration and the Senate had proposed \$20 million for housing counseling, while the House had proposed \$7.5 million. As in the FY1999 conference report, the conferees directed HUD to develop a process for measuring the performance of housing counseling agencies, urging HUD to include performance measurement requirements into future Notices of Funding Availability for the housing counseling program. Absent information on the use of funds and the performance of grantees, the

conferees noted that in future years the program may be subject to further funding reductions.

The appropriation also included \$5 million for management information systems as proposed by the House. The Administration had requested \$7 million and the Senate did not include funding for this category.

The appropriation does include an earmark of \$2 million for the National Housing Development Corporation, to demonstrate innovative methods of preserving affordable housing.

The Administration had requested \$25 million for the creation of the Regional Affordable Housing Initiative as a pilot program to address critical housing needs in targeted regions. This proposal was not funded.

Native American Block Grants. Under the Native American Block Grant, eligible Indian tribes or their Tribally Designated Housing Entities receive funds which can be used for a variety of activities that would increase their supply of affordable housing. The President requested, and both versions of H.R. 2684 approved \$620 million for the Native American Housing Block Grants Program for FY2000, the same as funded for FY1999. The Administration also requested (and both versions of H.R. 2684 approved) \$6 million in credit subsidies to support \$54.6 million in loan guarantees.

For FY2000, the bill directs HUD to contract \$2 million of the funds as technical assistance and capacity building to be used by the National American Indian Housing Council (NAIHC). Prior to receiving the grant, NAIHC is expected to provide a business plan to HUD and to the Committees on Appropriation which explains how NAIHC will expend the funds. An additional \$4 million in funds may be used by HUD for housing inspections, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the management and oversight of Indian housing assistance.

Rural Housing and Economic Development. The FY1999 HUD Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-276) established an Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development within HUD to support housing and economic development in rural areas. For FY2000, P.L. 106-74 appropriates \$25 million for HUD's rural housing and economic development program. This is the same level as enacted in FY1999 and as proposed by the Senate for FY2000. The Administration had requested \$20 million for the program, and the House bill recommended that the program be funded at \$10 million as a set-aside within HUD's Community Development Block Grant account.

The bill directs HUD to use \$3 million of the funds to maintain a clearinghouse of ideas and innovative strategies that promote rural economic development and increases in rural housing. The conference report repeats the FY1999 report's expectation that HUD will cooperate with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), review the requirements of USDA's rural housing and development programs, and incorporate USDA's definitions and requirements into the HUD rural program where appropriate.

For more information on rural housing issues, see CRS Report 98-915, *Rural Housing Programs: FY1999 Appropriations and Amendments*, by Bruce E. Foote.

Fair Housing. Two programs comprise the HUD fair housing function: the Fair Housing Assistance Program, and the Fair Housing Initiatives Program. The Administration requested \$47 million for the two programs, up \$7 million over FY1999. The House bill contained \$37.5 million, the Senate bill \$40 million for the two programs. P.L. 106-74 provides \$44 million for the programs.

The bill approved the Administration's FY2000 request of \$20 million for the Fair Housing Assistance Program, an increase of \$3.5 million over the FY1999 appropriation. The increase will be used to fund a Fair Housing Partnership between state and local government fair housing agencies and private fair housing groups. The Partnership will focus on underserved populations in an effort to ensure full protection of the Fair Housing Act to those who face language, cultural, or other barriers. The House version of H.R. 2684 included almost \$19 million for these Fair Housing programs; the Senate version, \$25 million.

The bill includes \$24 million for the Fair Housing Initiatives Program. The Administration proposed \$27 million in FY2000 for that program, an increase of \$3.5 million over the FY1999 appropriation. The increase was to be paired with the Fair Housing Partnership mentioned above, and used to further homeownership among under-served groups. The House version of H.R. 2684 also included nearly \$19 million for the Initiatives, with a \$2 million set-aside for a nationwide audit to determine the extent of discrimination in the sale and rental of houses. The Senate version provided \$15 million for the initiatives.

Community Development Block Grant. P.L. 106-74 appropriates \$4.8 billion for the CDBG program and its set asides. This is \$25 million more than requested by the Administration and \$50 million more than appropriated in FYY1999.

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is the largest source of federal assistance to state and local governments for housing rehabilitation, economic development, and neighborhood revitalization. P.L. 105-276 appropriated \$4.750 billion in CDBG assistance for FY1999. For FY2000, the Administration requested \$4.775 billion for CDBG, including \$425 million for set-aside activities, \$101 million less than the \$526 million appropriated for FY1999. These proposed set-asides were to provide funding for Indian tribes, empowerment zone related technical assistance, Economic Development Initiative projects, homeownership zones, and the Youthbuild program. The Administration's budget request for FY2000 also included \$350 million in CDBG-related assistance, including funding for urban and regional empowerment zones, brownfield development, the redevelopment of abandoned buildings, and support of so-called "smart growth" initiatives under the Administration's Regional Connections proposal.

P.L. 106-74 does not include funding for any of the Administration's new community development initiatives. It continues to fund a number of set asides under the CDBG program. These include:

- \$67 million for Indian tribes;

- \$3 million for the Housing Assistance Council;
- \$2.2 million for National American Indian Housing Council;
- \$41.5 million for special project grants, including \$2 million for Alaskan Native and native Hawaiian serving institutions;
- \$20 million for the Self Help Housing Opportunity Program;
- \$23 million for capacity building activities, including an earmark of \$20 million for Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing to be carried out by the Local Initiative Support Corporation and (LISC) and the Enterprise Foundation, including \$4 million for rural areas and, \$3.75 million for Habitat for Humanity International;
- \$55 million for supportive services;
- \$60 million for neighborhood initiatives for distressed and blighted communities with \$23 million earmarked for specific projects;
- \$42.5 million for Youthbuild activities, including \$2.5 million for capacity building activities; and
- \$275 million for Economic Development Initiative grants, including \$240 million for specific earmarked projects identified in the conference report accompanying H.R. 2684.

Increasingly, entitlement communities and states have complained about the proliferation of narrowly targeted categorical programs funded as set-asides under the block grant program.

Table 6. Appropriations: Housing and Urban Development, FY2000
(budget authority in billions of \$)

Program	FY1999	Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
Housing certificate fund	10.327	11.522	10.540	11.051	11.377
<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>10.327</i>	<i>7.322</i>	<i>10.540</i>	<i>6.851</i>	<i>7.177</i>
<i>(By transfer)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>(0.183)</i>	<i>(0.183)</i>	<i>(0.183)</i>	<i>(0.183)</i>
<i>Advance approp. FY2001</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>4.200</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>4.200</i>	<i>4.200</i>
<i>Housing set-asides:</i>					
<i>Expiring Section 8 contracts</i>	<i>(9.600)</i>	<i>(10.640)</i>	<i>(10.540)^b</i>	<i>(10.855)</i>	<i>(10.834)</i>
<i>Sect. 8 tenant protection</i>	<i>(0.434)</i>	<i>(0.156)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>(0.156)</i>	<i>(0.156)</i>
<i>Region. opportunity counsel.</i>	<i>(0.010)</i>	<i>(0.020)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Welfare-to-work hsng. vouch.</i>	<i>(0.283)</i>	<i>(0.144)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Contract administration</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>(0.209)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Incremental vouchers</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>(0.347)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>—</i>	<i>(0.347)</i>
<i>Administrative fee change</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>(0.006)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>—</i>	
<i>Voucher for disabled</i>	<i>(0.040)</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>(0.040)</i>	<i>(0.040)</i>
<i>Subtotal: HCF set-asides</i>	<i>10.327</i>	<i>11.522^a</i>	<i>10.540^b</i>	<i>11.051^a</i>	<i>11.377^a</i>
Section 8 recapture (rescission)	-2.000	0	0	0	-1.300
Section 8 carryover (rescission)	0	0	0	0	-0.943
Public housing capital fund	3.000	2.555	2.555	2.555	2.900
Pub. housing operating fund	2.818	3.003	2.818	2.900	3.138
Drug elimination grants	0.310	0.310	0.290	0.310	0.310

Program	FY1999	Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
Distressed pub. hous. (HOPE)	0.625	0.625	0.575	0.500	0.575
Indian hsng. block grants	0.620	0.620	0.620	0.620	0.620
Indian hsng. loan guar.	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006
Rural Hsng.; Econ. Develop.	0.025	0.020	0	0.025	0.025
Housing, persons with AIDS	0.225 ^c	0.240	0.225	0.232	0.232
Community Devel. Blk. Grant	4.750	4.775	4.500	4.800	4.800
(CDBG emergency funding)	0.020	0	0	0	0
Homeless Assistance Grants	0.975	1.025 ^d	0.970	1.020	1.020
HOME Invest. Partnerships	1.600	1.610	1.580	1.600	1.600
Brownfields Initiative	0.025	0.050	0.020	0.025	0.025
Regional connections	0	0.050	0	0	0
Urban Empowerment Zones	0.045	0	0	0	0.055
Rural Empowerment Zones	0	0	0	0	0.015
Regional emp'ment zones	0	0.050	0	0	0
Sec.108 loan guar.; subsidy	0.030	0.030	0.026	0.030	0.030
America priv. invest.; subsidy	0	0.037	0	0	0.020
Redevelopment of aband. bldg.	0	0.050	0	0	0
Office of lead hazard control	0.080	0.080	0.070	0.080	0.080
Housing, elderly and disabled	0.854	0.854	0.854	0.911	0.911
Federal Housing Admin. (net) ^f	-0.033	0.635	0.318	0.635	0.635
Research and technology	0.048	0.050	0.043	0.035	0.045
GNMA (net) ^f	-0.361	-0.407	-0.413	-0.407	-0.413
Fair housing activities	0.040	0.047	0.038	0.040	0.044
Inspector General	0.050	0.038	0.040	0.064	0.051
Salaries and expenses	0.456	0.502	0.457	0.457	0.477
Y2K convers'n (emerg. funds)	0.012	0	0	0	0
Admin. provisions (net) ^e	-0.468	-0.329	-0.064	-0.319	-0.383
Subtotal (HUD) (rounded, may not add)	24.079	28.048	26.067	27.170	25.951

Source: H.Rept. 106-379.

^a Includes \$4.2 billion funded and expected to be spent in FY2001.

^b H.R. 2684 does not identify set-asides, except H.Rept. 106-286 indicates that \$25 million of the HCF appropriation is to be provided for section 8 tenant-based rental assistance for disabled families moving from public housing designated for the elderly.

^c Includes additional \$10 million provided by P.L. 105-277.

^d Includes \$5 million for homeless assistance demonstration project.

^e Net, interagency transfers and offsetting receipts against appropriations of the current year.

Regional Connections. This was a new initiative of the Clinton Administration designed to promote comprehensive and coordinated regional development strategies. The Administration requested \$50 million in Regional Connections grants to be awarded to state and local governments. The Administration unsuccessfully sought \$100 million in funding for this proposal in its FY1999 budget submission. The proposal also failed to win approval during consideration of HUD's FY2000 appropriations.

Brownfield Redevelopment. For FY2000, the Administration sought an appropriation of \$50 million in support of brownfield redevelopment, an increase of \$25 million over FY1999. These are environmentally contaminated sites in urban and rural communities that the Administration sought to return to useful economic life through a process of environmental remediation and reuse. Funds were to be used to support Section 108 loan guarantees to help pay for cleanup activities and to assist in financing job-generating economic development projects.

P.L. 106-74 appropriates \$25 million in support of brownfield redevelopment projects consistent with the Senate version of H.R. 2684. This is significantly less than the \$50 million requested. The House version of H.R. 2684 included \$20 million for brownfield redevelopment projects.

Regional Empowerment Zones. This was a new Administration proposal and part of its "New Markets Initiative" intended to promote economic activities in distressed urban and rural communities. The Regional Empowerment Zone proposal sought to increase youth employment opportunities by linking urban empowerment zone strategies to broader metropolitan area employment opportunities. The Administration requested \$50 million for this proposal. The final version of H.R. 2684 did not include funding for this initiative.

Urban and Rural Empowerment Zones. Empowerment zones provide tax credits to eligible private businesses and to state and local governments to be used to encourage economic activity in selected communities. Estimates accompanying P.L. 106-74 show that for FY1999, funding for urban empowerment zones will total \$45 million. This assistance was provided under an omnibus appropriation measure, P.L. 105-277. The Administration's FY2000 budget request for HUD did not include funding for empowerment zones and enterprise communities. P.L. 106-74 appropriates \$55 million for urban empowerment zones, including \$3.666 million for each zone designated in Round II. The Act also includes \$15 million for Round II rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities. For additional information on empowerment zones see CRS Report RS20380 *Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Communities Program: Information on Round II*, by Bruce K. Mulock, and CRS Report 97-257 *Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities Program: Implementation and Developments*, by Bruce K. Mulock.

America's Private Investment Companies. Another component of the Administration's "New Markets Initiative," the America's Private Investment Companies (APIC) proposal is intended to increase the flow of private equity capital investment into distressed urban and rural communities. The Administration estimates that this credit subsidy could leverage \$1 billion in private capital. The Administration requested \$37 million in APIC subsidy for FY2000.

P.L. 106-74, appropriated \$20 million for APIC activities contingent upon the the enactment of authorizing legislation before June 30, 2000.

Redevelopment of Abandoned Buildings. This is a component of the Administration's "New Markets Initiative" designed to increase economic activity in distressed urban and rural areas. The Administration requested \$50 million to assist communities raze abandoned blighted buildings and redevelop the sites for commercial or residential use. P.,L. 106-74 does not include funds for this initiative.

Section 108 Loan Guarantee Subsidy. The Administration requested \$30 million in subsidies to support a loan guarantee commitment of \$1.3 billion for FY2000. CDBG Section 108 loan guarantees allow selected local and state governments to borrow up to five times their annual CDBG allocation to finance large scale economic development projects. For FY1999, \$30 million in subsidies were authorized to support \$1.3 billion in loan guarantee commitments. The House version of H.R. 2684 recommended a subsidy of \$26 million to support \$1.087 billion in loan guarantees for FY2000, the Senate version provided \$30 million. P.L. 106-74 provides \$29 million in support of \$1.261 billion in loan guarantee commitments.

Youthbuild. The Youthbuild program, which provides supervised education and job training to teenaged residents in public housing, was funded as a \$42.5 million CDBG set-aside program in FY1999. This includes \$2.5 million for capacity building activities. For FY2000, the Administration requested \$75 million in CDBG funds be set-aside for Youthbuild activities. P.L. 106-74 includes \$42.5 million for Youthbuild activities for FY2000, as a CDBG set-aside (see previous page). This includes \$2.5 million for capacity building activities.

The Federal Housing Administration (FHA). P.L. 106-74 includes a House proposal that limits insurance commitments for the FHA Mutual Mortgage Insurance fund to \$140 billion, a \$30 billion increase over the FY1999 level. The Administration and the Senate proposed a \$120 billion level. A higher level of FHA loan activity is expected because of the increase in the FHA loan limit enacted in the FY1999 HUD Appropriations Act. The increased commitment limit is intended to avoid the need for supplemental appropriations if the demand for FHA insurance exceeds the projected level.

As proposed by the Senate, obligations for direct loans are limited to \$100 million during FY2000. The Administration and the House proposed a direct loan limitation of \$50 million, a 50% decrease from the FY1999 appropriation.

The FY2000 Budget and both versions of H.R. 2684 requested \$18.1 billion in loan commitments for FHA's General and Special Risk Insurance funds, the same level as enacted in FY1999. These funds support specialized mortgage finance needs such as hospitals, assisted living and nursing homes, apartment buildings, and home rehabilitation.

For more information on FHA mortgage limits, see CRS Report 98-421, *Raising the FHA Mortgage Limit: Issues and Options*, by Bruce E. Foote.

Environmental Protection Agency

The President's FY2000 request for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was \$7.2 billion in spending authority or 5% less than the \$7.6 billion appropriated for FY1999. The FY1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act, P.L. 105-277, added \$30 million to the EPA budget for FY1999; the FY1999 Emergency Supplemental, P.L. 106-31, decreased EPA's FY1999 funds by \$10 million. Both versions of H.R. 2684 included \$7.3 billion for EPA (the Senate was approximately \$15 million higher). The conferees added funds, bringing the enacted total to \$7.6 billion in P.L. 106-74.

Three prime issues were the adequacy of funds to capitalize wastewater and drinking water needs; increased funding and EPA's authority to conduct climate change activities; and the Agency's progress in cleaning up toxic waste sites under the Superfund program.

The Administration's proposed FY2000 levels in the State and Tribal Assistance Grants would have provided one-third less for capitalizing state and local wastewater needs, thereby prompting considerable controversy during hearings before EPA's appropriators this year. Two factors drove this interest: the program's widespread popularity among all states and many localities, and major remaining capital needs. EPA estimates these remaining needs to be in the \$100 billion to \$200 billion range; the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies judges the needs to be roughly \$300 billion.

The controversy did not extend to the other major activity, capitalizing state drinking water funds, which would have increased under the proposal from \$775 million to \$825 million. Funding for special Mexican Border water quality and drinking water projects would have doubled to \$100 million, and grants for state administration of environmental programs would rise 6% to \$825 million, under the proposal. The budget also proposed a new \$200 million Clean Air Partnership program to fund innovative state and local activities aimed at reducing air pollutants.

**Table 7. Environmental Protection Agency Appropriations,
FY1995 to FY1999**

(budget authority in billions of current \$)

FY1995	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998	FY1999
\$6.7	\$6.5	\$6.8	\$7.4	\$7.6

Source: Budget levels remain uncertain until all program experience has been recorded, and any supplemental appropriations or rescissions have been taken into consideration; thus, FY1995-98 figures are from budget submissions of subsequent years. Estimates of FY1999 spending are from H.Rept. 106-379, the Conference Report accompanying H.R. 2684 to final passage.

The House added \$325 million to the President's request for waste water needs for a total of \$1.175 billion, and approved \$775 million for state drinking water funds, \$50 million less than requested. The House approved the entire \$885 million requested for state programs, and \$41.4 million of the \$200 million requested for the Clean Air Partnership. The Senate bill and the conference agreement restored waste water state

revolving funds to the FY1999 level of \$1.35 billion, and as did the House, funded state programs at the \$885 million requested. The final appropriation for drinking water funds was \$820 million, \$5 million less than requested. Conferees included \$332 million for special purpose water grants, \$304 million more than requested by the Administration. Unlike the House, the Senate and the conferees did not include funding for the Clean Air Partnership. In addition, the Senate included an amendment restoring \$12 million for the Montreal Protocol Fund; conferees funded the change by an across-the-board reduction equal to the \$12 million.

EPA's climate change activities continue to be controversial. The Administration supports the yet-to-be ratified Kyoto Protocol to reduce greenhouse gases as an international response to global warming. Congress approved no additional research funds for FY1999, denied most of the requested increase of roughly \$80 million for climate change activities, and included bill language prohibiting EPA from spending funds on activities that would implement the Protocol. In action near the end of the 105th Congress, the Omnibus Appropriations Act (P.L. 105-277), added \$10 million to the existing appropriation for global climate activities; early in the 106th Congress, the FY1999 Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 106-31) rescinded \$10 million from that same account.

Table 8. Appropriations: Environmental Protection Agency, FY2000
(budget authority in billions of \$)

Program	FY1999	Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
Science and Technology (including transfers from Superfund)	0.700 ^a	0.680	0.680	0.680	0.683
Environmental programs, compliance (management)	1.848	2.047	1.850	1.897	1.900
Office of Inspector General	0.043	0.040	0.036	0.043	0.043
Buildings and facilities	0.057	0.063	0.063	0.026	0.063
Superfund (net, after transfers)	1.448	1.452	1.404	1.351	1.351
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund	0.073	0.072	0.060	0.072	0.070
Oil spill response	0.015	0.016	0.015	0.015	0.015
State and tribal assistance grants	3.407 ^b	2.838	3.200	3.250	3.467
Across-the-board reduction: Offset for Montreal Protocol	—	—	—	-0.012	0
Subtotal (EPA) (rounded, may not add)	7.590	7.208	7.308	7.334	7.592

Source: H.Rept. 106-286; S.Rept. 106-161.

^a Also includes \$10 million added for FY1999 by P.L. 105-277.

^b Also includes \$20 million added for FY1999 by P.L. 105-277.

Climate change programs are funded through the Science and Technology, and the Environmental Compliance accounts. The Administration's FY2000 request of \$239 million for EPA's climate change activities would have been a 90% increase if it had been adopted. About 30% of this amount was to have been for science and technology activities, and the remaining 70% for activities to encourage voluntary reduction of greenhouse gases. Some Members assert that EPA does not have legal authority to act to reduce carbon emissions, a primary cause of such gases. CRS' *Climate Change Briefing Book* [<http://www.congress.gov/brbk/html/ebgcc1.html>] discusses many aspects of the climate change issue.

The House approved \$115 million for the Climate Change Technology Initiative, \$111 million less than requested. It funded Climate Change Research at \$18 million, \$1 million more than the amount provided for FY1999. The House bill also included language restricting funds for preparing, publishing, or issuing an assessment required under Section 106 of the Global Climate Change Research Act, unless these assessments were developed according to specifications spelled out in the bill. Also denying most of the proposed increase for climate change funding, the Senate bill included report language requesting justification for EPA's climate change programs.

Conferees approved \$115 million for Climate Change Technology Initiative, denying almost all of the proposed increase. It funded Climate Change Research at \$20.8 million, \$2 million less than requested. Conferees included report language restricting FY2000 funds from preparing, publishing or issuing an assessment required under the Global Climate Change Research Act, and other report language prohibiting EPA from using FY2000 funds for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol.

The Superfund for cleaning up toxic waste sites, remains an issue. Unlike the last three fiscal years, the FY2000 budget did not seek a major increase in the program; the \$1.5 billion requested was the same as appropriated in FY1999. In addition to that appropriation, P.L. 105-276 authorized an additional \$650 million if the fund had been reauthorized by August 1, 1999, which did not occur. The House bill included \$1.45 billion for Superfund, \$50 million less than requested; the Senate bill and the conference committee provided \$100 million less than requested for an FY2000 appropriation of \$1.35 billion. Both bills and the final enactment included nearly all of the \$92 million requested for the popular Brownfield program designed to remedy low level contaminated sites which have economic development potential.

Committee oversight of the Superfund focuses on improving the efficiency of the program's administration and the progress EPA is making in cleaning up all major hazardous waste sites. The General Accounting Office (GAO) continues to place this program on its list of troubled federal programs and there are ongoing efforts in both the House and Senate to legislatively reform this program.

For more detailed information on the Superfund, see: CRS Issue Brief IB10011, *Superfund Reauthorization Issues in the 106th Congress*, by Mark Reisch. For information on wastewater treatment issues, see CRS Report 98-323, *Wastewater Treatment: Overview and Background*, by Claudia Copeland; for clean air issues, see CRS Issue Brief IB10004, *Clean Air Act Issues in the 106th Congress*, by James McCarthy. For additional detail on clean air issues, see: CRS Report 97-8, *Air Quality: EPA's Proposed New Ozone and Particulate Matter Standards*, by John

Blodgett and James McCarthy. For more detailed information on EPA and its budget, see: CRS Issue Brief IB10038, *Environmental Protection Agency: Analysis of Key FY2000 Budget Issues*, by Martin Lee.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) helps states and localities prepare for and cope with catastrophic disasters. FEMA administers policies related to emergency management and planning, disaster relief, fire prevention, earthquake hazard reduction, emergency broadcasting services, flood insurance, mitigation programs, and dam safety. Citations to and summary information on basic authorities from FEMA can be found in: CRS Report RS20272, *FEMA's Mission: Policy Directives for the Federal Emergency Management Agency*, by Keith Bea.

Table 9. Appropriations: Federal Emergency Management Agency, FY2000
(budget authority in billions of \$)

Program	FY1999	FY2000 Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
Disaster relief	0.308	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300
Emergency funding	2.036	2.480	0	0	2.480
Pre-disaster mitigation	0	0.030	0	0	0
Disaster loan subsidy	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Salaries and expenses	0.171	0.190	0.178	0.180	0.180
Inspector General	0.005	0.008	0.007	0.008	0.008
Emergency management, planning assistance	0.241	0.251	0.281 ^a	0.256 ^a	0.267 ^a
Emergency food, shelter	0.100	0.125	0.110	0.110	0.110
Flood map modernize.	0	0.005	0.005	0	0.005
Flood mitigation fund	0	0.012	0	0	0
Radiological emerg. preparedness (net)	0	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
Y2K conversion	0.007	0	0	0	0
Subtotal (FEMA) (rounded, may not add)	2.870	3.402	0.881	0.855	3.351

Source: H.Rept. 106-379.

^a The House and Senate approved \$25 million for pre-disaster mitigation in the emergency management planning and assistance account.

Disaster relief is authorized by the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. The Act authorizes the President to declare major disasters or emergencies (the latter provide considerably less federal assistance than the former), sets out eligibility criteria, and specifies types of assistance that may be authorized. Funding varies from year-to-year by the severity and frequency of declared catastrophes. In recent years, billions have been appropriated to help communities recover from tornados, hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, and other incidents. For further budgetary information on FEMA, see: CRS Report RS20094, *FEMA Funding Overview: Current and Historical Data for the Federal Emergency Management Agency*, by Keith Bea.

To reduce future losses from disasters, FEMA has sought increased funding for mitigation activities. Members of Congress have voiced general support for the Administration's emphasis on disaster mitigation, but disagree on specifics. For example, instead of agreeing to the request for separate funding for the Project Impact mitigation efforts, for FY1999, Congress set aside roughly half the amount requested in the existing account that funds state and local emergency preparedness activities ("emergency management, planning and assistance," or EMPA).

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) receives appropriations within 4 broad program categories: the International Space Station (ISS); human space flight; science, aeronautics and technology; and, mission support. The ISS includes construction of the station and cooperative activities with Russian space programs. The space shuttle includes shuttle operations, maintenance, performance, and safety upgrades. Science, aeronautics and technology programs include research and development contracts and academic activities within space science; life and microgravity science; earth sciences; advanced concepts in aeronautics and technology; and launch services. The fourth category, mission support, includes salaries and expenses for operations of NASA. Within each of the 4 broad categories are appropriation earmarks for specific program functions. There is also a separate appropriation line for the Office of Inspector General.

For FY2000, the Administration requested \$13.578 billion for NASA, compared to an appropriation of \$13.665 billion for FY1999.

NASA projects eight Space Shuttle flights in FY2000 including seven for the ISS. The reliability of Russian commitments to the ISS is a critical issue for FY2000, as it could affect ISS construction costs. Assuming successful launch of the Russian Service Module before the end of 1999, NASA expects 10 ISS missions in FY2000, to continue construction and outfitting of the ISS, and to install the first ISS crew. Continued consolidation of Space Shuttle contract operations under the Space Flight Operations Contract is also expected in FY2000.

For FY2000, NASA requested \$2.986 billion for Space Shuttle operations, compared to \$3.028 billion approved in FY1999. The House reduced the requested amount for shuttle operations by \$150 million. The Senate approved the full request for space shuttle operations. The final appropriations bill provides an increase of \$25 million above the request. The additional funds are for safety upgrades of the shuttle.

The Administration's request for the ISS was \$2.483 billion compared to \$2.270 billion appropriated in FY1999. The House reduced the ISS request by \$100 million; the Senate approved the full request. The final appropriation bill provides \$2.331 billion, \$152 million below the request.

**Table 10. National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Appropriations, FY1995 to FY1999**
(budget authority in billions of current \$)

FY1995	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998	FY1999
\$14.00	\$13.88	\$13.71	\$13.65	\$13.67

Source: Budget levels remain uncertain until all program experience has been recorded, and any supplemental appropriations or rescissions have been taken into consideration; thus, FY1995-98 figures are from budget submissions of subsequent years. Estimates of FY1999 spending are from H.Rept. 106-379, the Conference Report accompanying H.R. 2684 to final passage.

The request for additional ISS funding during FY2000 assumes some of the additional costs would be offset by savings in the Aero-Space Technology programs. The Office of Aero-Space Technology plans to terminate two major aeronautics research programs in FY2000, high speed research and advanced subsonic engine technology. In addition, with the end of NASA's share of contract costs, funding for the X-33 project, a joint effort with Lockheed Martin to develop technology for a reusable launch vehicle, will decline. NASA requested \$1.006 billion for the Office of Aero-Space Technology, 24.8% below the FY1999 appropriation. The House reduced that request by \$43.5 million while the Senate increased the request by \$100 million. The latter would be applied to advanced space transportation research. The final appropriations provides \$1.159 billion, \$152.3 million above the request. The additional funds are for Ultra Efficient Engine technology and aircraft noise reduction research and the Space Liner 100 project.

The Office of Space Science intends to develop small Mars exploration missions, including the use of robotic aircraft. Two major missions and an upgrade of the Hubble Space Telescope are also expected in FY2000, along with four launches in the Explorer program. The next two satellites in Earth Science's Earth Observing System (EOS) program are scheduled to be launched in FY2000, assuming successful launch of the Terra (formerly the EOS AM-1) mission in FY1999. For FY2000 the Administration requested \$2.197 billion for Space Science and \$1.459 billion for Earth Science. The House appropriated \$1.956 billion for Space Science and \$1.174 billion for Earth Science. The reductions approved by the House include cancellation of the Contour, TRIANA, LightSAR, and Earth System Science Pathfinder missions, and substantial reductions in the Space Science supporting research and technology and the EOS programs. The Senate included an appropriation of \$2.077 billion for Space Science and the full request for Earth Science. No specific recommendations were made for the reduction in the Space Science request. The final appropriations provides \$2.198 billion for Space Science and \$1.455 billion for Earth Science. Within those totals, Congress reduced funding for some programs and increased those of others from the requested amounts.

The Administration requested \$2.495 billion for the mission support programs for FY2000, down \$16 million from the appropriation for FY1999 (\$2.511 billion). The House approved \$2.269 billion for FY2000, while the Senate endorsed the full request. The final appropriation provides \$2.515 billion for these activities.

In the report accompanying its appropriation, the House noted NASA's progress in assembling the ISS. It expressed concern, however, about the growing costs of the ISS and NASA's apparent lack of progress in expanding commercial participation in the ISS program. The House also stated that additional funding for shuttle upgrades was not available at this time. The House stated that while the reduction from the request for Space and Earth Science activities was substantial it was less significant than might appear. The House argued that most of the reduction was being taken from projects that were in the early stages of development or were from future planning or technology development activities. The House noted that the latter budgets had grown substantially in recent years.

The report accompanying the Senate bill expresses concern about the continuing cost escalation of the ISS and the reliability of Russia in meeting its commitments. The report acknowledges the termination of the high-speed research and advanced subsonic technology programs, but directs NASA to ensure that knowledge gained from that research to date would not be lost. The report also directs the Office of Science and Technology Policy to determine whether NASA is making effective use of the data collected by the Space and Earth Science programs. The bill would add funds to the advanced space transportation program and the report directs NASA to accelerate development of technology to enable lower cost access to space.

Table 11. Appropriations: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, FY2000
(budget authority in billions of \$)

Program	FY1999	FY2000 Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
Human space flight	5.480	5.638	5.388	5.639	5.511
Science, aeronaut., tech.	5.654	5.425	4.976	5.425	5.607
Mission support	2.511	2.495	2.269	2.495	2.515
Inspector General	0.020	0.021	0.021	0.020	0.020
Subtotal (NASA) (rounded, may not add)	13.665	13.579	12.654	13.578	13.653

Source: H.Rept.106-379.

In the conference report, NASA was directed to accelerate commercialization efforts on the ISS. A provision was added to the bill that would establish demonstration programs for commercial ventures on the station in order to evaluate ways of using the ISS for economic development of low-earth orbit. The conference report also directed NASA to report quarterly on the status of station assembly. Congress directed NASA to contract with the National Research Council to study the

“availability and usefulness” of data collected from NASA Space and Earth Science missions. Reports on the status of all Earth and Space Science missions are to be reported quarterly to Congress. Congress directed NASA to examine the possibility of extending CSOC to those telecommunications and mission operations not now covered by the contract.

The House has approved a NASA authorization bill (H.R. 1654) that would authorize \$13.626 billion for FY2000, specifying \$2.482 billion for the ISS, \$3.173 billion for Launch Vehicles and Payload Operations, \$5.453 billion for Science, Aeronautics, and Technology, and \$2.495 billion for Mission Support. The Senate Commerce Committee approved a NASA authorization bill (S. 342) that would authorize \$13.378 billion for FY2000, specifying \$2.283 billion for the ISS, \$3.155 billion for Launch Vehicles and Payload Operations, \$5.425 billion for Science, Aeronautics, and Technology, and \$2.495 billion for Mission Support.

For a more detailed discussion of NASA and its FY2000 request, see: CRS Report RL30154, *The National Aeronautics and Space Administration's FY2000 Budget: Description and Analysis*, by Richard Rowberg. For more discussion on the ISS, see: CRS Issue Brief IB93017, *Space Stations*, by Marcia S. Smith.

National Science Foundation

The FY2000 appropriation for the National Science Foundation (NSF) is \$3.9 billion, a 6.6% (\$241 million) increase over the FY1999 estimate of \$3.7 billion. The FY2000 appropriation is part of the Administration's commitment to basic research, as outlined in the “21st Century Research Fund.” The support provides significant investments in several priority areas, including biocomplexity in the environment (\$50 million) and in new and comprehensive approaches to education and workforce development (\$475 million). At the suggestion of the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee, the NSF has been designated as the lead agency for an initiative on information technology that involves six federal agencies. NSF's FY2000 appropriation provides \$126 million for Information Technology Research (ITR). (ITR supersedes the Information for the Twenty-First Century Initiative, IT²). The investment will support research in areas such as software systems, high-end computing, and terascale computing systems.

Included in the FY2000 appropriation is \$2.97 billion for Research and Related Activities (R&RA), a 7.1% increase (\$196 million) above the FY1999 level of \$2.77 billion. R&RA funds research projects, research facilities, and education and training activities. NSF has placed increased emphasis on funding rates for new investigators and on efforts to address grant size and duration. The R&RA includes support for Integrative Activities (IA), created in FY1999. The IA, funded at \$129 million in FY2000, provides support for major research instrumentation, intellectual infrastructure, cross-disciplinary research, and the Science and Technology Policy Institute (STPI). The STPI, formerly the Critical Technologies Institute, is funded at the requested level of \$4 million. The Opportunity Fund within the IA did not receive funding. Conferees included language in the report that limits NSF support for internet domain registration which is consistent with the established policy of the National Science Board.

The Major Research Equipment (MRE) account is funded at \$95 million in FY2000, a 5.6% increase (\$5 million) over the FY1999 level. The MRE supports the construction of major research facilities that are at the “cutting edge of science and engineering.” All projects are funded at the levels requested by the Administration, and include terascale computing systems (\$36 million), construction funds for the Large Hadron Collider (\$15.9 million), completion of the design and development phase of the Millimeter Array (\$8 million), initial investments in the Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation (\$7.7 million), modernization of the South Pole Station (\$5.4 million), and funding for the reconfiguration of the Polar Support Aircraft (\$12 million). Funding of \$10 million above the MRE request is directed at the acquisition of a high altitude research aircraft, the High-Performance Instrumented Airborne Platform for Environmental Research (HIAPER). When completed, the HIAPER will be available to support atmospheric science research opportunities for the next 30 years.

The FY2000 appropriation for the Education and Human Resources Directorate (EHR) is \$697 million, 5.2% increase (\$35 million) above the FY1999 estimate. Support at the precollege level includes investments in two new activities, the National Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Education Digital Library (NSDL) and the NSF Graduate Teaching Fellows in K-12 Education. The NSDL is intended improve the quality, quantity, and comprehensiveness of internet-based educational resources. The Teaching Fellows program will support graduate and undergraduate science and mathematics majors as content resources for teachers in K-12 classrooms. The EHR includes support (\$55 million) for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) and a new Office of Innovation Partnerships (\$10 million). Conference language directs that support for these two activities be combined into a single program office.

**Table 12. National Science Foundation Appropriations,
FY1995 to FY1999**

(budget authority in billions of current \$)

FY1995	FY1996	FY1997	FY1998	FY1999
\$3.23	\$3.22	\$3.27	\$3.43	\$3.67

Source: Budget levels remain uncertain until all program experience has been recorded, and any supplemental appropriations or rescissions have been taken into consideration; thus, FY1995-98 figures are from budget submissions of subsequent years. Estimates of FY1999 spending are from H.Rept. 106-379, the Conference Report accompanying H.R. 2684 to final passage.

In addition, the new office is directed to assist non-EPSCoR institutions receiving the least federal research support in their efforts to expand their research infrastructure and competitiveness. The conference agreement also provides \$10 million for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) through the underrepresented population undergraduate reform initiative. The EHR will provide \$8 million for the HBCUs, and the R&RA will provide the additional \$2 million in support. Informal Science Education (ISE), funded at the requested level of \$46 million, will continue its involvement in the professional development of science teachers. ISE will also expand its efforts to bring learning opportunities to inner cities and rural areas that have had limited exposure to science and technology.

For additional information on NSF, see: CRS Report 95-307, *U.S. National Science Foundation: An Overview*, both by Christine M. Matthews.

Table 13. Appropriations: National Science Foundation, FY2000
(budget authority in billions of \$)

Program	FY1999	FY2000 Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
Research, related activities	2.770	3.004	2.769	3.007	2.966
Education, human resources	0.662	0.678	0.660	0.689	0.697
Major research equipment	0.090	0.085	0.057	0.070	0.095
Salaries and expenses	0.144	0.149	0.147	0.150	0.149
Office of Inspector General	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.006	0.005
Subtotal (NSF) (rounded, may not add)	3.671	3.921	3.637	3.921	3.912

Source: H.Rept. 106-379.

Other Independent Agencies

In addition to funding for VA, HUD, EPA, FEMA, NASA and NSF, several other smaller “sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices” will receive their funding through the bill providing appropriations for VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1999.

American Battle Monuments Commission. This Commission is responsible for the construction and maintenance of memorials honoring Armed Forces battle achievements since 1917. Included among the Commission’s functions are the maintenance of 24 American military cemeteries and 31 memorializations in 15 foreign countries. The Administration requested \$26 million for FY2000, an amount only a few thousand dollars above the amounts appropriated for FY1999.

The House bill adds \$2 million to the requested amounts, as “the third increment provided the Commission to reduce the maintenance backlog” noted during the FY1998 appropriations process. The Senate bill accepted the Administration request; conferees accepted the Senate amount.

Cemeterial Expenses, Army. Arlington National Cemetery and the Soldiers’ and Airmen’s Home National Cemetery are under the administration of the U.S. Army. At the close of FY1998, 272,195 persons were interred/inurned in these cemeteries.

In addition to almost 6,000 interments and inurnments each year, Arlington is the site of approximately 2,700 other ceremonies, and 4 million visitors, annually.

For FY2000, conferees (as did both versions of the bill) provided \$12.473 million, as the Administration requested, up from the appropriation of \$11.666 million in FY1999 (rounded to the nearest \$1 million shows both the FY1999 appropriation and the recommendations for FY2000 to be \$12 million).

Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board. The Administration requested \$7.5 million for the Board for FY2000, which originated in the FY1998 bill, with \$4 million appropriated to meet start-up operations costs. The Board, which was authorized by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, investigates hazardous substance spills or releases. Congress appropriated \$6.5 million for FY1999.

The House bill includes \$7 million for the Board, or \$.5 million less than the Administration requested. The Senate bill freezes the appropriation at the FY1999 level of \$6.5 million. The Senate report suggests that the Board is focusing too much of its resources on internal activities, when it should be conducting the investigations for which it was established. Conferees agreed with the Senate assessment. Nevertheless, the conference approved \$8 million for the Board, but limited the number of Senior Executive Service positions to 3, and directed the Board to submit a business plan to Congress by December 31, 1999.

Community Development Financial Institution Fund. The Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFI) was created by P.L. 103-325. The CDFI is an Administration initiative to provide credit and investment capital to distressed urban and rural areas. The program also provides training and technical assistance to qualifying financial institutions. The program has survived despite attempts to eliminate it.

P.L. 104-19 modified the original Act by giving the Department of the Treasury the authority to manage the CDFI program, although the CDFI continues to be funded through the VA/HUD bill. After attempts to end funds for the CDFI were defeated, Congress appropriated \$80 million for FY1998, but included a requirement that GAO audit the CDFI to “review” its effectiveness.

The Administration’s FY2000 budget requested \$125 million for CDFI, the same amount requested by the Administration’s last 2 budgets. Congress appropriated \$80 million in the FY1999 VA-HUD bill (P.L. 105-276) for CDFI, and added \$15 million more in the Transportation appropriations act (P.L. 105-277).

Although its report remarks that the “Committee is very pleased with the CDFI Strategic Plan, and the goals, objectives, and strategies it contains,” the House bill recommends an appropriation for FY2000 of \$70 million, which is \$55 million less than requested, and \$25 million less than the current fiscal year. The Senate approved \$80 million, and its report expresses concern that CDFI “does not provide capital in low-population states....” The report “directs the CDFI Fund to improve its efforts in making funding available to entities in states with populations of less than 2 million people.”

Conferees provided \$95 million for CDFI, and recommended that the agency develop a “Small and Emerging CDFI Access Program” to facilitate a balance between established and emerging CDFIs.

For further information on CDFI, see: CRS Report 97-819, *Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund*, by Pauline Smale.

Consumer Information Center (CIC). Conferees funded the CIC equal to the Administration’s FY2000 request of \$2.622 million, as both versions of the bill recommended. The Center, administered through the General Services Administration (GSA), helps federal agencies distribute consumer information and promotes public awareness of existing federal publications. Congress appropriated \$2.619 million for the Center for FY1999; \$300,000 of which was for functions of the Office of Consumer Affairs, an entity previously administered through the Department of Health and Human Services. That federal entity received no appropriations for FY1999.

Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). This Commission is an independent regulatory agency charged with protecting the public from unreasonable product risk and to research and develop uniform safety standards for consumer products. The Administration requested \$51 million for FY2000, up \$3.5 million over FY1999 appropriations. Congress included language in its FY1999 appropriation for CPSC, that requires the Commission to contract with the National Academy of Sciences for a study of the potential toxicologic risks of fire-retardant chemicals that the Commission has proposed be required in residential upholstered furniture, and in children’s sleepwear.

The House Appropriations Committee expressed a concern (H.Rept. 106-286) that according to the Commission’s own Annual Report (a finding validated by two GAO reports), data on deaths and injuries are not adequate to properly evaluate risks of consumer products, especially those concerned with children’s sleepwear. The House bill would fund the CPSC in FY2000 at the same level (\$47 million) as for FY1999, rejecting the Administration’s recommendation that the Commission establish a new research program. The Senate bill approved \$49.5 million, and left it to “the agency’s discretion, subject to normal reprogramming guidelines” to determine how the reduction below the request is distributed. Conferees approved \$49 million.

Corporation for National and Community Service (CNS). The Corporation administers programs authorized under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (NCSA) and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (DVSA). Appropriations for the NCSA programs, the largest of which is AmeriCorps, are included in the VA-HUD bill.

The key issue concerning the Corporation and the NCSA programs, which are strongly supported by President Clinton, has been budgetary survival. Some Members have expressed concerns about partisan activities, program costs, financial management, and federally funding a “paid volunteer” program. (The DVSA programs, — e.g., Foster Grandparents Program and Senior Companion Program — are funded under the Labor/HHS Appropriation bill and have been non-controversial.) Authorization for CNS, and programs and activities authorized by NCSA, expired at

the end of FY1996. Since then, continued program authority has occurred through the appropriations process.

The Administration's FY2000 budget requested \$545.5 million for the NCSA programs (plus a \$3 million request for the CNS Office of the Inspector General (OIG). For FY1999, Congress provided \$425.5 million (plus \$3 million for the OIG) for these programs. It then added \$10 million for AmeriCorps in the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Appropriations Act, 1999 (P.L. 105-277). Total funding for AmeriCorps for FY1999 was \$237 million; the President requested \$302 million for FY2000.

For FY2000, the House bill recommended no appropriations for national and community service programs. The bill did contain the \$3 million recommended for activities of the OIG. The Senate approved \$423.5 million in funds for the Corporation, specifying that \$70 million was for educational awards in the National Service Trust account; \$224.5 million for AmeriCorps; \$7.5 million for Points of Light Foundation; \$18 million for the Civilian Community Corps; \$43 million for learning programs; \$28.5 million for "quality and innovation activities"; \$27 million for administration; and \$5 million for audits and evaluations. The bill also included \$5 million for the OIG.

Conferees provided appropriations of \$434.5 million for the Corporation, specifying \$70 million for educational awards; \$234 million for AmeriCorps grants; \$7.5 million for Points of Light Foundation; \$18 million for the Civilian Community Corps; \$43 million for learning programs; \$28.5 million for "quality and innovation activities"; \$28.5 million for administration; and \$5 million for audits and evaluations. The final bill also includes \$4 million for the OIG.

The Senate report had expressed concern about the Corporation's "inability to operate its activities with adequate responsibility and accountability," especially with regard to \$31 million in expenditures that neither the Corporation nor its auditors could explain. Furthermore, the OIG had identified a surplus of \$100 million in the National Service Trust account. Bill language was included in the Senate bill which rescinded \$80 million from that account, and scored the savings as an offset to FY2000 appropriations for the Corporation, making the net Senate CNS appropriation \$348.5 million (including \$5 million for the OIG). Conferees accepted the proposed rescission, but added \$11 million for CNS programs, thereby making net appropriations for CNS (including \$4 million for the OIG) \$358.5 million.

For further information on the Corporation and its programs see: CRS Report RL30186, *Community Service: A Description of AmeriCorps, Foster Grandparents, and Other Federally Funded Programs*, by Ann Lordeman and Alice D. Butler.

Council on Environmental Quality; Office of Environmental Quality.

These two entities are within the Executive Office of the President. The Council oversees and coordinates interagency decisions in matters affecting the environment; the Office provides the professional and administrative staff for the Council. Congress appropriated \$2.675 million for these functions in FY1999; the President has requested \$3.02 million for FY2000. The House bill approves \$2.827 million for FY2000; the

Senate bill freezes the appropriation at FY1999 levels. Conferees accepted the higher amount recommended by the House.

Table 14. Appropriations: Other Independent Agencies, FY2000
(budget authority in billions of \$)

Program	FY1999	FY2000 Admin. Request	FY2000 House	FY2000 Senate	FY2000 Confer.
American Battle Monuments Commission	0.026	0.026	0.028	0.026	0.028
Chem. Safety and Hazard Investigations Board	0.007	0.008	0.007	0.007	0.008
Cemetery Exp., Army	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
Community Development Financial Institutions	0.095 ^a	0.125	0.070	0.080	0.095
Consumer Inform. Center	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Consumer Product Safety Commission	0.047	0.051	0.047	0.050	0.049
Corporation for National and Community Service ^b	0.439	0.549	0.003	0.349	0.359
Council on Environ. Quality; Office of Environ. Quality	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Court of Veterans Appeals	0.010	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011
<i>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (transfer)</i>	<i>(0.035)</i>	<i>(0.034)</i>	<i>(0.034)</i>	<i>(0.035)</i>	<i>(0.034)</i>
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	0.090	0.090	0.080	0.060	0.075
National Credit Union Administration	0.002	0.000	0.001	0	0.001
Office, Science &Tech.	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005
Selective Service System	0.024	0.025	0.007	0.025	0.024
Subtotal: (rounded, may not add)	0.798	0.909	0.277	0.631	0.673

Source: H.Rept. 106-379.

^a Includes \$15 million in additional funds provided by P.L. 105-277

^b Includes \$10 million in additional funds provided by P.L. 105-277 for FY1999; also includes funds for CNS Office of the Inspector General (\$3 million for FY1999, and for the request and the House bill; the Senate bill included \$5 million, and the enacted bill included \$4 million.

Court of Veterans Appeals. The Court of Veterans Appeals has exclusive jurisdiction to review decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and has the authority to decide relevant conflicts in the interpretation of law by VA and the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and its decisions constitute precedent to guide subsequent decisions by that Board. Congress provided \$10.2 million for operations for the Court in FY1999; the President has requested \$11.45 million for FY2000. Both versions of H.R. 2684 concur with the President's request, and the conferees approved the requested level.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The FDIC's Office of the Inspector General is funded from deposit insurance funds, and has no direct support from federal taxpayers. Before FY1998, the amount was approved by the FDIC Board of Directors; the amount is now directly appropriated to ensure the independence of the IG office. For FY2000, the amount requested was \$33.7 million; Congress approved \$34.7 million for FY1999. The House bill concurred with the Administration request; the Senate version matched the FY1999 level; conferees approved the lower level approved by the House.

National Credit Union Administration. The purpose of this administrative office, created under the National Credit Union Central Liquidity Facility Act (P.L. 95-630), is to improve the general financial stability of credit unions. Subscribing credit unions may borrow from the agency to meet short-term requirements. The Administration proposed a limitation on administrative expenses, which are financed from the revolving fund, of \$257,000 for FY2000. For FY1999, the Administration proposed a limitation of \$176,000 for the agency's functions; Congress accepted that amount, and approved a House proposal for a revolving loan program for credit union risk pooling, with a subsidy of \$2 million. The Administration did not request appropriations for the pooling fund for FY2000, and the Senate bill does not provide such funds; the House bill provides \$1 million for the risk pool; conferees accepted the House funding level.

Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC). The NRC leverages funds for reinvestment in older neighborhoods through community-based organizations called NeighborWorks. Among projects supported by the financing activities of the NRC are lending activities for home ownership of low-income families. Nationwide, there are 184 of these organizations, serving 825 communities in 45 states, with 70% of the people served living in very low and low-income brackets. The President requested \$90 million for FY2000, the same amount as Congress provided for FY1999. Although H.Rept. 106-286 notes that the Corporation "consistently...performs beyond its goals and the Committee's expectations," the House bill approves \$80 million for FY2000, a reduction of \$10 million. The Senate bill provides \$60 million, and its report remarks that the appropriation "...matches the Corporation's fiscal year 1998 level prior to the initiation of two demonstration programs that were to be completed by the end of fiscal year 1999." The conference approved \$75 million for the NRC.

Office of Science and Technology Policy. The Office of Science and Technology Policy coordinates science and technology policy for the White House. The Office provides scientific and technological information, analysis and advice to the President and executive branch, and reviews and participates in formulation of national

policies affecting those areas. The President requested \$5.2 million for FY2000; Congress appropriated \$5.03 million for FY1999. The House bill approved \$5.108 million for FY2000; the Senate bill approved the requested amount; conferees accepted the House proposed level.

Selective Service System (SSS). The SSS was created to supply manpower to the U.S. Armed Forces during time of national emergency. Although since 1973, the Armed Forces have been on voluntary recruitment and incentives, the SSS remains the primary vehicle for conscription should it become necessary. In 1987, the SSS was given the task of developing a postmobilization health care system that would assist with providing the Armed Forces with health care personnel in time of emergency. Congress appropriated \$24.4 million for this office for FY1999; the President requested \$25.3 million for FY2000.

The House bill proposed that the activities of the SSS be terminated in FY2000, and provided \$7 million for that purpose, and no funds were provided for continuing registration for a potential draft. The Senate bill matched the requested increase over FY1999 funding, and its report comments favorably on the Selective Service's accomplishment of an automated system "capable of handling mass registration and inductions..." should the need arise, as well as the development of a "postmobilization health care personnel delivery system capable of providing the necessary critically skilled health care personnel to the Armed Forces in time of emergency." Conferees approved \$24 million for the Selective Service.

Selected World Wide Web Sites

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Summary and Justification of Budget.
[<http://www.epa.gov/ocfopage>]

Corporation for National and Community Service
[<http://www.cns.gov/>]

Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
[<http://www.hud.gov>]

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
[<http://www.fema.gov>]

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).
[<http://www.hq.nasa.gov>]

National Science Foundation (NSF).
[<http://www.nsf.gov>]

Office of Management and Budget (OMB).
[<http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/EOP/OMB/html/ombhome.html>]

Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).
[<http://www.va.gov>]