

Calendar No. 153

111TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
{ 111-69

TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2010

AUGUST 5, 2009.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 3288]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 3288) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, reports the same with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

Amounts of new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 2010

Total of bill as reported to the Senate	\$67,786,573,000
Amount of 2009 appropriations	117,100,120,000
Amount of 2010 budget estimate	108,406,040,000
Amount of 2010 House bill	68,899,275,000
Bill as recommended to Senate compared to—	
2009 appropriations	– 49,313,547,000
2010 budget estimate	– 40,619,467,000
2010 House bill	– 1,112,702,000

CONTENTS

	Page
Program, Project, and Activity	3
Reprogramming Guidelines	3
Congressional Budget Justifications	4
Title I: Department of Transportation:	
Office of the Secretary	8
Federal Aviation Administration	22
Federal Highway Administration	42
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration	56
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	65
Federal Railroad Administration	71
Federal Transit Administration	79
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	92
Maritime Administration	94
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	100
Research and Innovative Technology Administration	103
Bureau of Transportation Statistics	105
Office of Inspector General	106
Surface Transportation Board	107
General Provisions—Department of Transportation	109
Title II: Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
Executive Direction	112
Administration, Operations and Management	113
Personnel Compensation and Benefits	114
Public and Indian Housing	119
Community Planning and Development	131
Housing Programs	152
Federal Housing Administration	159
Government National Mortgage Association	161
Policy Development and Research	161
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	163
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control	164
Management and Administration:	
Working Capital Fund	165
Office of Inspector General	165
Transformation Initiative	166
Administrative Provisions	169
Title III: Independent Agencies:	
Access Board	172
Federal Maritime Commission	173
National Railroad Passenger Corporation	174
National Transportation Safety Board	175
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	177
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	179
Title IV: General Provisions—This Act	
Compliance With Paragraph 7, Rule XVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	182
Compliance With Paragraph 7(c), Rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate	183
Compliance With Paragraph 12, Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate	184
Budgetary Impact of Bill	188
Disclosure of Congressionally Directed Spending Items	188
Comparative Statement of Budget Authority	219

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2010, for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended, with respect to appropriations contained in the accompanying bill, the terms “program, project, and activity” [PPA] shall mean any item for which a dollar amount is contained in appropriations acts (including joint resolutions providing continuing appropriations) or accompanying reports of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, or accompanying conference reports and joint explanatory statements of the committee of conference. This definition shall apply to all programs for which new budget (obligational) authority is provided, as well as to discretionary grants and discretionary grant allocations made through either bill or report language. In addition, the percentage reductions made pursuant to a sequestration order to funds appropriated for facilities and equipment, Federal Aviation Administration, shall be applied equally to each budget item that is listed under said account in the budget justifications submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as modified by subsequent appropriations acts and accompanying committee reports, conference reports, or joint explanatory statements of the committee of conference.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

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

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

shall delineate the appropriation both by object class and by PPA. The report must also identify items of special congressional interest.

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

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS

Budget justifications are the primary tool used by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations to evaluate the resource requirements and fiscal needs of agencies. The Committee is aware that the format and presentation of budget materials is largely left to the agency within presentation objectives set forth by OMB. In fact, OMB Circular A-11, part 6 specifically states that the “agency should consult with your congressional committees beforehand to ensure their awareness of your plans to modify the format of agency budget documents.” The Committee expects that all agencies funded under this act will heed this directive. The Committee expects all the budget justification to provide the data needed to make appropriate and meaningful funding decisions.

While the Committee values the inclusion of performance data and presentations, it is important to ensure that vital budget information that the Committee needs is not lost. Therefore, the Committee directs that justifications submitted with the fiscal year 2011 budget request by agencies funded under this act contain the customary level of detailed data and explanatory statements to support the appropriations requests at the level of detail contained in the funding table included at the end of the report. Among other items, agencies shall provide a detailed discussion of proposed new initiatives, proposed changes in the agency’s financial plan from prior year enactment, and detailed data on all programs and comprehensive information on any office or agency restructurings. At

a minimum, each agency must also provide adequate justification for funding and staffing changes for each individual office and materials that compare programs, projects, and activities that are proposed for fiscal year 2011 to the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.

The Committee is aware that the analytical materials required for review by the Committee are unique to each agency in this act. Therefore, the Committee expects that the each agency will coordinate with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in advance on its planned presentation for its budget justification materials in support of the fiscal year 2011 budget request.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Extension of Transportation Programs and the Solvency of the Highway Trust Fund.—Last year, the Committee noted that it was in the position of recommending funding levels for the highway program without any assurances that sufficient balances would have been available from the Highway Trust Fund to support the program even at the funding level enacted for the previous year. The Committee also noted that it would have been required to cut resources for the Federal-aid highway program by more than one-third unless Congress acted to replenish the balances of the trust fund. To address this issue, last year the Committee included language in its bill that would restore the necessary balances to the Highway Trust Fund. That provision was eventually enacted as a separate piece of legislation.

This year, the Committee developed its recommended funding levels for fiscal year 2010 as many of the programs at the Department of Transportation as well as the Highway Trust Fund are again in a precarious situation. The Committee is now in the position of recommending funding levels for the highway program, transit programs, and highway and motor carrier safety programs without any certainty that the necessary contract authority will be available for the whole of fiscal year 2010. Furthermore, the balances of the Highway Trust Fund must be replenished in less than 1 month.

Congress has begun its work on these important issues, and the Committee has been supporting the development of legislation that would extend transportation programs and bring solvency to the Highway Trust Fund.

The importance of providing stability to the transportation programs and to the trust funds that finance those programs cannot be overstated. State departments of transportation rely on the balances of the Highway Trust Fund for the reimbursement of funds spent out of their own budgets on projects that are eligible for Federal grant dollars. In addition, the funding of most surface transportation programs relies on the availability of contract authority. Enacting legislation to extend these programs and to address the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund is an opportunity to provide stability to the States and local governments as the Congress crafts a full reauthorization package that can address essential questions about how the transportation programs should work, and how they should be financed.

In the meantime, the Committee must fulfill its responsibility to recommend appropriate funding levels for offices and programs at the Department of Transportation. In order to put forward realistic funding recommendations, the Committee is assuming that the

transportation programs will be extended through fiscal year 2010 at the levels authorized for fiscal year 2009. This assumption is based on examples of previous extensions of the transportation programs. This assumption is especially relevant for those programs that rely on contract authority provided in the authorization acts, including the Federal-aid highway program, the formula and bus transit programs, the programs of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and most funding for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Investments in our Nation's Transportation Infrastructure.—The Committee is pleased that the President's budget has included significant investments in our Nation's transportation infrastructure. The President's budget requested \$1,000,000,000 to build intercity and high speed rail and another \$5,000,000,000 to begin a program called the National Infrastructure Bank. This new program would award grants to transportation projects across a wide variety of modes, and base the grant awards on a set of merit-based criteria.

The Committee supports the President's request to fund intercity and high-speed rail, and has recommended a funding level of \$1,200,000,000 for this program. The Committee also recommends \$1,100,000,000 for a grant program that will support significant transportation projects across many modes of transportation.

The Committee also recommends providing increases for ongoing transportation programs that otherwise would not have been funded under the President's budget request or would have been funded with only modest increases to provide adjustments for inflation. The Committee believes that these investments are necessary to improve the condition of our national infrastructure. The recommended funding levels include an additional \$1,400,000,000 above the President's request for highway programs that support infrastructure investments in every State and in communities across the country. It also includes an increase of \$480,000,000 above the President's request for the transit New Starts program, which supports investments in new or expanded transit service. The Committee also recommends \$100,000,000 for a grant program that will help transit agencies reduce their energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, and \$75,000,000 for programs that support improvements to rail safety and railroad infrastructure.

Livable Communities Initiative.—The Committee commends the Secretary of Transportation for collaborating with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on an initiative to improve community livability. With this initiative, the administration recognizes that our communities are not cleanly divided between housing concerns and transportation issues, and so our Government cannot work on housing policy and transportation policy independently of one another.

Although the administration has made a good start with this collaboration, the Committee is concerned that the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development are not coming forward with greater details about their proposals and what they hope to accomplish. The Department of Transportation has promised, for example, to provide an analysis on the barriers in Federal regulations to coordinating housing and

transportation policy at the local level. The Department has also promised to identify areas in Federal law that prevent local governments from coordinating their housing and transportation planning activities. The Committee urges the Department to complete these reviews and provide this information to Congress as promised.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Section 3 of the Department of Transportation Act of October 15, 1966 (Public Law 89–670) provides for establishment of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation [OST]. The Office of the Secretary is comprised of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary immediate and support offices; the Office of the General Counsel; the Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, including the offices of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs and the Assistant Secretary for Transportation for Policy; three Assistant Secretarial offices for Budget and Programs, Governmental Affairs, and Administration; and the Offices of Public Affairs, the Executive Secretariat, Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response, and Chief Information Officer. The Office of the Secretary also includes the Department's Office of Civil Rights and the Department's Working Capital Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009	\$98,248,000
Budget estimate, 2010	103,184,000
House allowance	102,306,000
Committee recommendation	100,975,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of \$100,975,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, including \$60,000 for reception and representation expenses. The recommendation is \$2,209,000 less than the budget request and \$2,727,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The accompanying bill stipulates that none of the funding provided may be used for the position of Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

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

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendation in comparison to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and the budget estimate:

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 enacted	2010 request	
Immediate Office of the Secretary	\$2,400,000	\$2,631,000	\$2,631,000
Office of the Deputy Secretary	759,000	986,000	986,000
Office of the General Counsel	19,838,000	20,359,000	20,359,000
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	10,107,000	11,100,000	10,107,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	10,200,000	10,559,000	10,559,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	2,400,000	2,504,000	2,400,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	26,000,000	25,520,000	26,265,000
Office of Public Affairs	2,020,000	2,123,000	2,123,000
Executive Secretariat	1,595,000	1,711,000	1,711,000
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	1,369,000	1,499,000	1,499,000
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	8,675,000	10,929,000	9,072,000
Office of the Chief Information Officer	12,885,000	13,263,000	13,263,000
Total, Salaries and Expenses	98,248,000	103,184,000	100,975,000

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$2,631,000 for fiscal year 2010 for the Immediate Office of the Secretary. The recommendation is the same as the budget request and \$231,000 greater than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$986,000 for the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary, which is identical to the budget request and \$227,000 greater than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$20,359,000 for expenses of the Office of the General Counsel for fiscal year 2010. The recommended

funding level is the same as the budget request and \$521,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Efforts to Project the Rights of Airline Passengers.—For the past 3 years, the Committee has provided an additional \$2,500,000 in the budget for the Office of General Counsel in order to improve enforcement activities and the protection of air travel consumers. This additional funding has enabled the office to fill eight additional positions, and cover travel expenses so that lawyers and investigators can now conduct on site reviews of airline operations. As a result of these efforts, this month the Department has issued significant consent orders against airlines that violated rules on over-sale procedures and code-sharing disclosure. In addition, the Department is pursuing enforcement action against other airlines based on recent investigative work.

The Committee is pleased to note that the Department has included this increased funding in its budget request for fiscal year 2010. The Committee expects the Office of General Counsel to continue using its resources for activities that will most effectively improve the protection of air travel consumers. In order to allow the office to continue building a strong staff focused on the protection of airline passengers, the Committee directs the Office of General Counsel to use a portion of the \$2,500,000 on an additional 7 FTE, leading to a total of 113 FTE of the Office of General Counsel.

As noted in previous reports, the Committee does not believe that organizing forums to discuss general consumer issues is the most effective means of improving the impact of this office. Therefore, the Committee repeats its direction that none of the funding provided for the Office of General Counsel shall be used for organizing such forums in fiscal year 2010.

ADA Rulemaking.—On February 27, 2006, the Department published a notice of proposed rulemaking [NPRM] to address the issue of whether commuter and intercity rail systems should be required to provide level boarding between rail cars and station platforms in order to fully comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. This NPRM represented a significant proposal by the Department. Setting a standard for level boarding would require extensive investments from rail systems, and it would affect systems regulated by both the Federal Railroad Administration and the Federal Transit Administration.

Since the publication of the NPRM 3 years ago, no final regulations have been issued. The Committee acknowledges that the proposed rule involves a number of complex issues. However, without greater certainty on this matter, the Committee is concerned that Amtrak and other rail systems may hesitate to make necessary investments in ADA compliance. Although the Committee expects all rail systems to fully comply with the requirements of ADA, it urges the Department to reach a resolution on level boarding so that it can publish a final regulation in a timely manner.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR POLICY
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Under Secretary for Policy is the chief policy officer of the Department and is responsible to the Secretary for the analysis, de-

velopment, and review of policies and plans for domestic and international transportation matters. The Office administers the economic regulatory functions regarding the airline industry and is responsible for international aviation programs, the essential air service program, airline fitness licensing, acquisitions, international route awards, computerized reservation systems, and special investigations such as airline delays.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

For fiscal year 2009, the Committee recommends \$10,107,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Policy. The recommended funding level is \$993,000 less than the budget request and equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BUDGET AND PROGRAMS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs is the principal staff advisor to the Secretary on the development, review, presentation, and execution of the Department's budget resource requirements, and on the evaluation and oversight of the Department's programs. The primary responsibilities of this office are to ensure the effective preparation and presentation of sound and adequate budget estimates for the Department, to ensure the consistency of the Department's budget execution with the action and advice of the Congress and the Office of Management and Budget, to evaluate the program proposals for consistency with the Secretary's stated objectives, and to advise the Secretary of program and legislative changes necessary to improve program effectiveness.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$10,559,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs. The recommended level is equal to the budget request and \$359,000 over the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs advises the Secretary on all congressional and intergovernmental activities and on all departmental legislative initiatives and other relationships with Members of Congress. The Assistant Secretary promotes effective communication with other Federal agencies and regional Department officials, and with State and local governments and national organizations for development of departmental programs; and ensures that consumer preferences, awareness, and needs are brought into the decisionmaking process.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of \$2,400,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs. The recommended level is \$104,000 less than the budget request equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$26,265,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration. The recommended funding level is \$745,000 more than the budget request and \$265,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$2,123,000 for the Office of Public Affairs, which is equal to the budget request and \$103,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,711,000 for the Executive Secretariat. The recommendation is identical to the budget request and \$116,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

OFFICE OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization has primary responsibility for providing policy direction for small and disadvantaged business participation in the Department's procurement and grant programs, and effective execution of the functions

and duties under sections 8 and 15 of the Small Business Act, as amended.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$1,499,000, an amount equal to the budget request and \$130,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE, SECURITY, AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Intelligence, Security and Emergency Response keeps the Secretary and his advisors informed on intelligence and security issues pertaining to transportation. The office also provides support to the Secretary for her statutory and administrative responsibilities in the areas of emergency preparedness, response, and recovery functions. Further, the Office ensures that transportation policy and programs support the national objectives of general welfare, economic growth and stability, and the security of the United States.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$9,072,000 for the Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response. The recommendation is \$1,857,000 less than the request and \$397,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$13,263,000, which is equal to request and \$378,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$1,500,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	1,100,000,000

¹The funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009 were provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

The Committee recommendation includes \$1,100,000,000 for grants to State and local governments to make investments in the Nation's surface transportation infrastructure. The Secretary of Transportation must award these grants solely on a competitive basis, and select projects that will make a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area, or a region.

The Committee notes that there has been a tremendous interest in the discretionary grants for surface transportation projects that were provided as a part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 [ARRA]. Although grant applications are not due to the Department until September 15, 2009, the Committee expects that demand for grants will far exceed the amount of available funding. For this reason, the Committee has included additional funding for such significant surface transportation investments in fiscal year 2010.

For the grants funded in the bill, the Committee continues to require the Secretary to award grants so that he ensures an equitable geographic distribution of funds and an appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural communities. The Committee also continues to require the Secretary to give priority to projects that require a contribution of Federal funds in order to complete an overall financing package. In addition, the bill language continues to set minimum and maximum grant size, and to set a limitation on the amount of funding that may be awarded to any individual State.

However, there are important differences between the funding provided in the current bill and the funding that the Committee provided as a part of ARRA. The grants awarded under ARRA are expected to support economic recovery as well as build a legacy of transportation improvements, but the Committee expects that the projects funded under the current bill to be judged solely on their ability to provide important transportation improvements. For this reason, the Committee has not included language requiring the projects to be completed by a specific deadline. In addition, the funding provided under the bill must include a local match to the Federal grant dollars.

Furthermore, the Committee has included language to require the Secretary to spend no less than \$250,000,000 on projects located in rural areas. Because the Committee recognizes that a smaller investment may still constitute a significant improvement for rural communities, the bill language allows the Secretary to provide a waiver for the local match requirement for such projects, and the language lowers the minimum grant size to \$1,000,000.

The bill allows the Secretary to use \$25,000,000 of the funding for administrative and oversight activities, and to transfer portions of this funding to the appropriate modal administrations as needed. The Committee believes that the modal administrations offer valu-

able expertise that has been acquired through years of experience, and the Committee encourages the Secretary to take advantage of this resource within his own Department.

As with all of the funds that may be awarded as grants at the Secretary’s discretion, the Committee expects the Secretary to maintain a grant application process that is transparent, fair, and accessible to all interested parties. The Secretary must publish a set of criteria on which project selections will be based no sooner than 60 days after enactment of the bill. The Committee expects the Secretary to publicize these criteria to all possible grant applicants, and to adhere rigorously and consistently to the published criteria, measuring all applications against those criteria. The Secretary must require applications to be submitted no sooner than 120 days after the criteria are published, and award grants no sooner than September 15, 2010.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CAPITAL

Appropriations, 2009	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	5,000,000
House allowance	2,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is recommending \$5,000,000 to support the Secretary’s Financial Management Capital initiative, which is equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and the budget request.

This new initiative has the potential to improve the financial systems and processes of the Department and provide important benefits to all of the modes. However, the Committee remains concerned that modes will be asked to reimburse OST for additional activities beyond which they have planned and budgeted, and from which they may not benefit. As a result, the Committee reminds the Secretary of language that continues to be included in the bill that limits OST’s ability to approve new assessments or reimbursable agreements appropriated to the modal administrations for new activities, unless a reprogramming of funds is requested and approved by the Committees.

The Committee also continues to direct OST to provide more detailed justifications for this program in its fiscal year 2011 budget request. These detailed justifications should clearly display the amount requested for OST as well as the amount included in the budget request from each modal administration. For clarity, the justifications should list the amount from each modal administration individually and not as a lump sum.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2009	\$9,384,000
Budget estimate, 2010	9,667,000
House allowance	9,667,000
Committee recommendation	9,667,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Civil Rights is responsible for advising the Secretary on civil rights and equal employment opportunity matters, formulating civil rights policies and procedures for the operating administrations, investigating claims that small businesses were denied certification or improperly certified as disadvantaged business enterprises, and overseeing the Department's conduct of its civil rights responsibilities and making final determinations on civil rights complaints. In addition, the Civil Rights Office is responsible for enforcing laws and regulations which prohibit discrimination in federally operated and federally assisted transportation programs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a funding level of \$9,667,000 for the Office of Civil Rights for fiscal year 2010. The recommendation is identical to the budget request and is \$283,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2009	\$18,300,000
Budget estimate, 2010	10,233,000
House allowance	14,733,000
Committee recommendation	10,233,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of the Secretary performs those research activities and studies which can more effectively or appropriately be conducted at the departmental level. This research effort supports the planning, research, and development activities needed to assist the Secretary in the formulation of national transportation policies. The program is carried out primarily through contracts with other Federal agencies, educational institutions, nonprofit research organizations, and private firms.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$10,233,000 for transportation planning, research, and development, which is equal to the budget request and \$8,067,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee directs funding to be allocated to the following projects that are listed below:

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

Project name	Committee recommendation
Vehicle Research Institute—Advanced Materials Transit Vehicle Design, WA	\$750,000
Whatcom Smart Trips, WA	750,000

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Freight Policy Transportation Institute, WA	750,000

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Limitation, 2009	\$128,094,000
Budget estimate, 2010 ¹
House allowance	147,500,000
Committee recommendation	147,500,000

¹ Proposed without limitation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Working Capital Fund [WCF] provides common administrative services to the Department's operating administrations and other Federal entities. The services are centrally performed in the interest of economy and efficiency and are funded through negotiated agreements with Department operating administrations and other Federal customers and are billed on a fee-for-service basis to the maximum extent possible.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$147,500,000 on activities financed through the Working Capital Fund. The budget request proposes to remove the obligation limitation on the Working Capital Fund for services to the operating administrations of the Department. Although the Committee recommendation will allow additional activities to be covered through the Working Capital Fund, the Committee continues to insist that the discipline of an annual limitation is necessary to keep assessments and services of the Working Capital Fund in line with costs. As in past years, the bill specifies that the limitation shall apply only to the Department and not to services provided by other entities. The Committee directs that services shall be provided on a competitive basis to the maximum extent possible.

The Committee notes that the "transparency paper" included in the justifications for fiscal year 2010 provides essential information on total budgetary resources for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and the Office of the Chief Information Officer, including the balance of resources provided through the Working Capital Fund and direct appropriations. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to update this "transparency paper" and include it in the budget justifications for fiscal year 2011.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

	Appropriations	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Appropriations, 2009	\$912,000	\$18,367,000
Budget estimate, 2010	912,000	18,367,000
House allowance	912,000	18,367,000
Committee recommendation	923,000	18,367,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$353,000 to cover the subsidy costs for guaranteed loans and \$570,000 for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program. The recommendation is \$11,000 more than the budget estimate and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee also recommends a limitation on guaranteed loans of \$18,367,000 the same amount as the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

Appropriations, 2009	\$3,056,000
Budget estimate, 2010	3,074,000
House allowance	3,074,000
Committee recommendation	3,074,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides contractual support to assist small, women-owned, Native American, and other disadvantaged business firms in securing contracts and subcontracts arising out of transportation-related projects that involve Federal spending. It also provides support to historically black and Hispanic colleges. Separate funding is requested by the administration since this program provides grants and contract assistance that serves Department-wide goals and not just OST purposes.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$3,074,000 for grants and contractual support provided under this program for fiscal year 2010. The recommendation is the same as the budget request and \$18,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

	Appropriations	Mandatory ¹	Total
Appropriations, 2009	\$86,213,000	\$50,000,000	\$136,213,000
Budget estimate, 2010	125,000,000	50,000,000	175,000,000
House allowance	125,000,000	50,000,000	175,000,000
Committee recommendation	125,000,000	50,000,000	175,000,000

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

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–264) authorized the collection of user fees for services provided by the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] to aircraft that neither take off from, nor land in, the United States. In addition, the act stipulated that the first \$50,000,000 of these so-called “overflight fees” must be used to finance the EAS program. In the event of a shortfall in fees, the law requires FAA to make up the difference from other funds available to the agency. No such shortfall has occurred, however, since fiscal year 2005.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the appropriation of \$125,000,000 for the EAS program. This appropriation would be in addition to \$50,000,000 of overflight fees collected by the Federal Aviation Administration, resulting in a total program level for EAS of \$175,000,000. The recommendation is the same as the budget request, and \$38,787,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Ongoing Challenges to EAS Service.—The Department continues to face significant challenges in delivering air service to all of the communities guaranteed such service under the regulations governing the EAS program. Market forces have resulted in the loss of air service to small- and medium-sized communities that are not eligible for EAS subsidies, and those very same forces have made it difficult to entice air carriers to serve such communities utilizing Federal EAS subsidies. Over the past several years, the major passenger air carriers have effectively abandoned the EAS program, leaving smaller, less-capitalized carriers to serve the subsidized communities. Many of these smaller carriers have struggled to stay afloat.

The program has also been challenged by a growing shortage of aircraft that are the appropriate size to serve EAS communities. These aircraft are either being retired from the fleet, or they are being used for more profitable services elsewhere in the United States or overseas.

Three carriers that have served EAS communities—Air Midwest, Big Sky Airways, and Skyways Airlines—have all shuttered their operations. As a result, 36 eligible communities have temporarily lost their EAS-subsidized service. These communities are expected to be without air service for an estimated cumulative period of at least 246 months as a result of the shutdowns. The Department has secured alternative carriers for all but six of these communities. In addition, the Department has awarded contracts for service to the remaining six communities, although the service itself has not yet begun.

This month, however, Mesaba Airlines filed a 90-day notice of service termination for eight communities that had been receiving unsubsidized service. The Committee expects the Department will soon issue a request for proposals for subsidized service.

In the current fiscal year, the EAS program faced a significant shortfall and did not have adequate resources to meet the program's costs. In order to protect communities dependent on the EAS program for its continued air service, the Committee provided \$13,200,000 in supplemental appropriations in order to fill this shortfall.

The Committee continues to recognize that the EAS program is undergoing a period of unprecedented uncertainty that makes it extremely difficult to predict what the true program costs will be during fiscal year 2010. For this reason, the Committee continues to include bill language that directs the Secretary to transfer to the EAS program such sums as may be necessary to continue service to all eligible EAS points in fiscal year 2010. These funds may come from other funds directly administered by, or appropriated to, the Office of the Secretary.

The following table reflects the points currently receiving service and the annual rates as of June 1, 2009, in the continental United States and Hawaii.

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER

[Data is based on June 1, 2009 rates and CY 2008 passengers]

State	EAS/communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S, M, or L)	Avg. Daily Enplnmts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/08)	Subsidy Rates at June 1, 2009	Subsidy per Passenger	YE Pax Total
AL	Muscle Shoals	60	14.9	\$1,782,928	\$191.75	9,298
AR	El Dorado/Camden	107	2,311,637
AR	Harrison	244	6.0	1,587,067	423.78	3,745
AR	Hot Springs	51	4.1	1,991,307	778.16	2,559
AR	Jonesboro	82	4.0	1,607,385	645.28	2,491
AZ	Page	282	16.7	1,497,556	143.02	10,471
AZ	Show Low	154	16.4	988,181	96.07	10,286
AZ	Kingman	121	4.0	1,275,771	514.01	2,482
AZ	Prescott	102	17.7	1,622,719	146.24	11,096
CA	Crescent City	314	38.9	1,136,896	46.69	24,352
CA	Merced	60	4.4	1,541,365	558.26	2,761
CA	Visalia	47	5.5	1,494,319	430.39	3,472
CA	Del Centro	101	22.7	662,551	46.67	14,198
CO	Pueblo	36	11.2	1,057,128	150.42	7,028
CO	Alamosa	164	22.6	1,853,475	130.76	14,175
CO	Cortez	255	27.1	1,297,562	76.37	16,990
GA	Athens	72	8.2	1,051,386	204.07	5,152
GA	Macon	82	30.6	1,386,306	72.44	19,138
IA	Burlington	74	8.1	943,793	186.15	5,070
IA	Fort Dodge	91	19.2	1,112,607	92.62	12,012
IA	Mason City	131	36.9	1,112,607	48.20	23,082
IL	Marion/Herrin	123	7.7	1,126,810	233.05	4,835
IL	Decatur	126	3.3	1,350,256	661.57	2,041
IL	Quincy	111	6.1	1,532,891	402.97	3,804
KS	Dodge City	150	12.6	1,378,036	174.50	7,897
KS	Garden City	202	32.7	2,373,320	115.82	20,492
KS	Great Bend	114	3.2	749,435	369.73	2,027
KS	Hays	175	26.0	1,757,154	108.03	16,266
KS	Liberal/Guymon	138	11.6	995,284	137.32	7,248
KS	Manhattan	122	37.7	1,198,342	50.82	23,581
KS	Salina	97	11.5	798,895	111.20	7,184
KY	Owensboro	105	1,448,625

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER—Continued

[Data is based on June 1, 2009 rates and CY 2008 passengers]

State	EAS/communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S, M, or L)	Avg. Daily Enplmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/08)	Subsidy Rates at June 1, 2009	Subsidy per Passenger	YE Pax Total
MD	Hagerstown	78	1,570,417
ME	Presque Isle	262	42.3	2,643,588	99.84	26,479
ME	Rockland	81	17.7	1,522,770	137.08	11,109
ME	Augusta/Waterville	67	10.5	2,086,251	318.07	6,559
ME	Bar Harbor	144	31.8	2,086,251	104.81	19,905
MI	Ironwood/Ashland	213	3.8	1,492,865	622.29	2,399
MI	Manistee	110	6.5	1,799,395	445.06	4,043
MI	Escanaba	112	17.3	1,435,118	132.75	10,811
MI	Iron Mountain/Kingsford	105	12.3	1,435,118	186.89	7,679
MN	Chisholm/Hibbing	199	27.4	1,261,841	73.50	17,168
MN	Thief River Falls	305	9.9	1,230,322	198.70	6,192
MO	Cape Girardeau	127	1.2	1,497,542	1,967.86	761
MO	Kirksville	137	2.2	806,169	583.76	1,381
MO	Columbia/Jefferson City	116	34.2	2,186,590	102.27	21,380
MO	Fort Leonard Wood	85	16.7	519,858	49.69	10,463
MO	Joplin	70	15.5	997,680	103.11	9,676
MS	Meridian	88	61.2	686,489	17.91	38,325
MS	Laurel/Hattiesburg	89	38.1	1,191,435	50.00	23,830
MS	Greenville	118	18.8	1,355,693	115.48	11,740
MT	West Yellowstone	332	12.8	431,996	53.80	8,030
MT	Glasgow	285	1.0	928,433	1,499.89	619
MT	Glendive	197	.7	1,056,152	2,526.68	418
MT	Havre	230	.6	1,036,616	2,887.51	359
MT	Lewistown	103	1.8	1,036,616	905.34	1,145
MT	Miles City	145	.8	1,056,152	1,996.51	529
MT	Sidney	272	4.2	2,159,591	820.83	2,631
MT	Wolf Point	293	.8	928,433	1,761.73	527
ND	Devils Lake	402	10.0	1,331,664	212.73	6,260
ND	Jamestown, ND	333	9.0	1,355,011	240.08	5,644
ND	Dickinson	319	28.4	2,274,177	127.86	17,787
NE	McCook	256	5.4	1,583,277	467.73	3,385
NE	Kearney	181	38.0	1,978,386	83.26	23,762
NE	North Platte	255	29.2	1,860,229	101.65	18,300
NE	Scottsbluff	192	30.3	1,535,085	80.95	18,964
NE	Grand Island	138	6.2	2,271,640	583.67	3,892
NE	Alliance	233	5.6	977,609	276.94	3,530
NE	Chadron	290	7.0	977,609	224.07	4,363
NH	Lebanon	72	26.2	2,245,669	136.73	16,424
NM	Alamogordo/Holloman	89	.7	994,623	2,270.83	438
NM	Clovis	102	7.7	1,517,277	315.38	4,811
NM	Silver City/Hurley/Deming	134	8.2	1,442,174	280.96	5,133
NM	Carlsbad	149	5.8	1,046,284	286.26	3,655
NV	Ely	234	.7	1,864,717	4,504.15	414
NY	Plattsburgh	82	1,379,257
NY	Saranac Lake/Lake Placid	132	1,431,875
NY	Massena	138	1,297,613
NY	Ogdensburg	105	1,353,916
NY	Watertown	54	1,228,334
NY	Jamestown, NY	76	12.7	1,350,803	170.41	7,927
OR	Pendleton	185	23.1	1,566,729	108.42	14,451
PA	Lancaster	28	1,831,504
PA	Altoona	112	27.5	1,394,423	81.04	17,206
PA	Johnstown	84	20.9	1,394,423	106.74	13,064
PA	Bradford	77	12.9	1,350,803	166.85	8,096
PA	DuBois	112	9.3	2,020,095	348.41	5,798
PA	Oil City/Franklin	85	3.8	1,226,773	511.58	2,398
PR	Mayaguez	105	14.0	980,980	111.67	8,785
PR	Ponce	77	14.3	740,416	83.00	8,921
SD	Watertown, SD	207	15.4	1,189,606	123.25	9,652
SD	Brookings	58	1,887,110
SD	Huron	121	7.6	1,781,159	374.04	4,762

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE SUBSIDY PER PASSENGER—Continued

[Data is based on June 1, 2009 rates and CY 2008 passengers]

State	EAS/communities	Est. Miles to Nearest Hub (S, M, or L)	Avg. Daily Enplmnts at EAS Point (YE 12/31/08)	Subsidy Rates at June 1, 2009	Subsidy per Passenger	YE Pax Total
TN	Jackson	86	1,598,291
TX	Victoria	93	26.5	610,049	36.83	16,565
UT	Moab	256	9.3	1,607,903	275.70	5,832
UT	Vernal	150	16.8	1,147,786	109.17	10,514
UT	Cedar City	179	23.2	1,242,256	85.46	14,536
VA	Staunton, VA	113	23.9	1,911,466	128.01	14,932
VT	Rutland	69	15.3	839,746	87.50	9,597
WV	Clarksburg	96	19.9	1,058,325	85.14	12,431
WV	Morgantown	75	29.0	1,058,325	58.23	18,174
WV	Parkersburg	110	16.8	2,190,281	208.82	10,489
WV	Beckley	168	10.2	2,092,844	328.03	6,380
WV	Lewisburg	166	20.5	2,330,725	181.86	12,816
WY	Laramie	145	29.9	1,215,603	64.97	18,711
WY	Worland	161	9.6	1,735,814	289.11	6,004

NOTE: No passengers means that the community suffered a service hiatus during CY 2008.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

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

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

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

Section 104 authorizes the Secretary of Transportation or her designee to engage in activities with States and State legislatures to consider proposals related to the reduction of motorcycle fatalities.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Congress streamlined regulatory oversight in 1957 with the creation of two separate agencies, the Federal Aviation Agency and

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The total recommended program level for the FAA for fiscal year 2009 amounts to \$15,991,483,000, including both new budget authority and a limitation on the obligation of contract authority. This funding level is \$40,478,000 more than the budget request and \$779,079,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. However, the level enacted for fiscal year 2009 includes \$1,300,000,000 in emergency spending provided as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Excluding such funding, the Committee recommendation is \$521,421,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations for fiscal year 2009 excluding rescissions and funding provided as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act:

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 enacted	2010 estimate	
Operations	\$9,042,467,000	\$9,335,798,000	\$9,359,131,000
Facilities and equipment	2,742,095,000	2,925,202,000	2,942,352,000
Research, engineering, and development	171,000,000	180,000,000	175,000,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (obligation limitation)	3,514,500,000	3,515,000,000	3,515,000,000
Total	15,470,062,000	15,956,000,000	15,991,483,000

OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2009	\$9,042,467,000
Budget estimate, 2010	9,335,798,000
House allowance	9,347,168,000
Committee recommendation	9,359,131,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation provides funds for the operation, maintenance, communications, and logistical support of the air traffic control and air navigation systems. It also covers administrative and managerial costs for the FAA's regulatory, international, commercial space, medical, engineering and development programs, as well as policy oversight and agency management functions. The operations appropriation includes the following major activities: (1) the air traffic organization which operates, on a 24-hour daily basis, the national air traffic system, including the establishment and

maintenance of a national system of aids to navigation, the development and distribution of aeronautical charts and the administration of acquisition, and research and development programs; (2) the regulation and certification activities including establishment and surveillance of civil air regulations to assure safety and development of standards, rules and regulations governing the physical fitness of airmen as well as the administration of an aviation medical research program; (3) the office of commercial space transportation; and (4) headquarters, administration and other staff and support offices.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of \$9,359,131,000 for FAA operations. This funding level is \$23,333,000 more than the budget request, and \$316,664,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee recommendation derives \$5,277,648,000 of the appropriation from the airport and airway trust fund. The balance of the appropriation will be drawn from the general fund of the Treasury.

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

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

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendation in comparison to the budget estimate and fiscal year 2009 enacted level:

FAA OPERATIONS

	Fiscal year		Committee recommendation
	2009 enacted	2010 estimate	
Air Traffic Organization	\$7,099,019,000	\$7,302,739,000	\$7,305,902,000
Aviation Safety	1,164,597,000	1,216,395,000	1,236,565,000
Commercial Space Transportation	14,094,000	14,737,000	14,737,000
Financial Services	111,004,000	113,681,000	113,681,000
Human Resource Management	96,091,000	100,428,000	100,428,000
Region and Center Operations	331,000,000	341,977,000	341,977,000
Staff Offices	180,859,000	196,063,000	196,063,000
Information Services	46,500,000	49,778,000	49,778,000
Total	9,042,467,000	9,335,798,000	9,359,131,000

AIR TRAFFIC ORGANIZATION

Supporting the Controller Workforce.—The Committee continues to be concerned about the ability of the FAA to maintain a fully staffed and trained controller workforce while record numbers of air traffic controllers reach their eligibility for retirement. For this reason, the Committee recommendation includes \$7,048,000 to increase the air traffic controller workforce by 157 full-time positions in fiscal year 2010. The Committee recommendation is \$2,500,000 more than the increase requested by the administration, and would

accommodate 50 more air traffic controller positions than requested under the President's budget.

The Committee continues its direction that the FAA include in its forthcoming controller workforce plan facility-by-facility information on the number of certified controllers, controllers in training, and developmental controllers. The Committee also directs the FAA include in its next workforce plan a goal for each facility for the proportion of certified controllers to controllers in training and developmental controllers, as well as a year by which the agency expects to meet this goal. Last year, the Committee requested a benchmark on the percentage of air traffic controllers who were fully certified at each facility, and the FAA did not comply. The Committee continues to believe in the importance of maintaining adequate experience levels at each FAA facility, and therefore reiterates its interest in having facility-by-facility targets against which actual experience levels can be measured.

Investments in NextGen Staff.—The FAA contracted with the National Academy of Public Administration [NAPA] for a study that would identify the skills and the workforce improvements that will be necessary to develop the next generation air transportation system. This past fall, NAPA published a two-volume report that details its findings. Following the publication of this report, the FAA is requesting an increase of \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2010 in order to increase the staff of the Air Traffic Organization by 104 full-time positions.

The Committee recommendation includes the full \$7,000,000 for NextGen staffing needs, and encourages the FAA to continue taking advantage of the NAPA recommendations.

In addition, the Committee notes that the report published by NAPA addresses a number of concerns that cannot be solved merely by increasing the size of the FAA workforce. For example, NAPA provided recommendations on how the FAA should increase its workforce strategically over time, track and assess its workforce development, hire professionals with the relevant set of skills and competencies, and retain its new employees by providing them with foreseeable career paths.

In order to get an independent assessment of the FAA's first steps in developing a NextGen workforce, the Committee directs the DOT Inspector General to review how the FAA places these first 104 full-time positions in the agency, and to evaluate how well the FAA begins to address each of the recommendations included in the NAPA report. Such an evaluation should include a review of the specific actions that the FAA is taking or is planning to take to implement each recommendation, or a review of the justification that the FAA provides as to why the recommendation would not be in the best interest of the agency. This report shall be submitted no later than one year after the enactment of the bill.

Performance-based Navigation.—The Committee recommends \$35,130,000 for activities related to the development of area navigation [RNAV] and required navigation performance [RNP] procedures. This funding level represents an increase of \$2,830,000 over the budget request.

The Committee remains concerned that another year has passed and the Performance Based Navigation program is tangled in a bu-

reaucracy that allows the competing interests of different offices to muddle the program. The end result is that the effort to develop performance based navigation is left with no clear direction or coherent set of priorities.

This Committee has provided additional funding for the program in previous years, and is sorely disappointed to learn that these funding increases have been used to create procedures that would actually add significantly to travel times and distances into and out of airports. Some of these procedures have not achieved any ascertainable throughput gains, provided environmental benefits, fixed airspace complexity issues, or offered any benefit to end users. Furthermore, the FAA does not conduct thorough pre-development and post-development analyses for each procedure it develops in order to determine if the limited resources of the office are being used appropriately.

The Committee directs the FAA to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by February 15, 2010, that describes in detail every procedure that will be developed with funds appropriated in fiscal year 2010 and quantifiable data comparing the new procedure to the closest applicable existing procedure in terms of reduced flight time, reduced distance flown, and emissions and environmental benefits. In measuring the benefits that the new procedure offers in terms of flight time, distance flown, and environmental impact, the FAA must take into account a realistic estimation of the procedures' use. That is, a new procedure offers no benefits if nobody ever flies along its path. The report should also indicate which office, region, or individual requested the procedure and the anticipated amount of time the procedure will take to develop.

The FAA has informed the Committee that internal efforts to reform the process have been delayed in anticipation of the forthcoming recommendations from the Radio Technical Commission of Aeronautics' [RTCA] Task Force Five. The Committee directs the FAA to report back immediately to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriation upon any change in organizational structure, processes, or priorities within the program after the Task Force's final report.

ATO Finance.—The Committee recommendation includes \$189,623,000 for the offices within the financial services function of the Air Traffic Organization. This funding level is \$2,167,000 less than the budget request and equal to fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Alien Species Action Plan [ASAP].—The Committee recommendation includes \$900,000 to continue the implementation of the Alien Species Action Plan which was adopted by the FAA as part of its record of decision approving certain improvements at Kahului Airport on the Island of Maui. These funds will be used to execute capital projects and continue the operational requirements imposed by the ASAP.

Flight Plans for General Aviation Aircraft.—The Committee is aware that in certain situations pilots of float planes who have filed a return flight plan with the Federal Aviation Administration and informed Customs and Border Patrol using the Electronic Advance Passenger Information System, have had difficulty re-entering the United States when emergencies have resulted in changes

to their filed return time. The difficulties have primarily been attributed to an inability to access the Electronic Advance Passenger Information System from remote locations and therefore inform Customs and Border Patrol of the changes in return times. The committee encourages the Federal Aviation Administration to inform Custom and Border Patrol when an aircraft makes emergency changes to its flight plan and thereby its Electronic Advance Passenger Information System filing, provided that the aircraft operator is unable to refile using the Electronic Advance Passenger Information System, and the aircraft is not equipped to land at a conventional airport for refiling.

Staffing at the Southern California TRACON.—The Committee is concerned that the Department of Transportation Inspector General concluded in a 2009 report that the staffing levels at the Southern California TRACON, the busiest air traffic control facility in the world, are at a critical level. The Inspector General stated: “A significant issue is that SCT (Southern California TRACON) expects to have over 100 controllers in training later this year—which is more than 40 percent of its workforce and could overwhelm SCT’s training capacity.”

The Committee recommends that the Administrator work to staff Southern California TRACON with very experienced controllers. In addition to implementing the recommendations of the Inspector General, the Administrator shall transmit to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, within 60 days of enactment, a clear strategic plan to increase the number of experienced controllers at Southern California TRACON. The plan should include clear interim benchmarks, and it should establish a goal of reducing the number of controllers in training at Southern California TRACON to no more than the national average as soon as possible.

AVIATION SAFETY

Improving the FAA’s One Level of Safety.—This past February, Colgan Air flight 3407 crashed just outside of Buffalo, New York, killing a total of 50 people. In the wake of this tragic accident, many questions were raised regarding the FAA’s safety oversight, including questions about the relationship between regional and legacy airlines, pilot fatigue and certification requirements, airlines’ responsibility to check pilot backgrounds, and the use of check flights.

The Secretary and the FAA Administrator appear to have taken these issues seriously, promising to work aggressively on improving aviation safety. In April, the Department and the FAA gathered representatives from air carriers and other industry groups to participate in a “Call to Action” summit on airline safety. Earlier this month, The FAA held the first of 12 forums across the country aimed at reducing safety risk at regional airlines.

The FAA has also asked the aviation industry and unions to make commitments by July 31 on specific actions that were discussed at the first “Call to Action” session. These commitments would include the expansion of record checks on pilots applying for a job, a review of pilot training programs, and the development of pilot mentoring programs to support a culture of professionalism and safety among pilots.

The FAA has committed itself to two rulemaking actions in order to bolster its safety regulations. The FAA has promised to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking that would reform pilot rest and duty times, taking into account recent scientific findings, by December 31 this year. The agency has also promised to rewrite its rules on pilot training.

The Committee is pleased to see these first intentions of the Department and the FAA to acknowledge weaknesses in their protection of aviation safety, and to take a more active role in improving Federal safety oversight. The FAA, however, has a long history of denying any problems with its safety oversight and program management. The fact that the FAA has now taken a stance that its oversight regime is not infallible only makes it more critical that the agency follow through on its best laid plans. To falter at this point would not only undermine the FAA's credibility, it would also give credence to those who would say that the FAA can never improve.

To support the FAA's aggressive rulemaking plans, the Committee recommendation includes an additional \$300,000 to support three additional staff with the legal expertise necessary to complete the process of drafting Federal regulations.

Supporting the Safety Inspector Workforce.—The President's budget request proposes to increase funding for aviation safety by \$3,084,000 in order to increase the safety inspector workforce by 36 full-time positions. The Committee appreciates the administration's proposal to strengthen the staffing levels for aviation safety, and fully funds the requested full-time positions. In addition, the Committee recommendation includes \$18,500,000 to increase the safety inspector workforce by another 200 full-time positions. With these additional resources, the Committee directs the FAA to increase the flight standards staff by 145 full-time positions, and to increase the aircraft certification staff by 55 full-time positions. With this additional funding, the Committee recommendation includes a total increase for aviation safety inspectors of \$21,583,000 and 236 full-time positions.

The Committee also repeats its direction to the FAA that the next inspector workforce plan shall include a benchmark for the amount of time that aviation inspectors spend in the field directly observing industry operations. In recent years, the FAA has started to use a risk-based oversight regime in order to make the best use of its limited resources. This new approach to safety oversight requires the agency—and its safety inspectors—to monitor many details of industry operations, and to analyze all of the data collected in order to identify areas of risk. Questions have been raised about the role of safety inspectors, and whether they are spending too much time at their desk inputting and analyzing data, and not enough time in the field observing the facts with their own eyes. The Committee believes that the FAA must develop a benchmark for how its safety inspectors use their time, and the Committee expects the agency to monitor the time that safety inspectors spend in the field, and use this information to evaluate inspector workload.

Human Intervention and Motivation Study.—The Human Intervention and Motivation Study is a substance abuse program that

provides help to airline pilots in a way that protects their careers as well as air safety. The HIMS program is an industry-wide effort that involves airlines, pilot unions, and the FAA in the identification of impaired pilots, their treatment, and their return to the cockpit.

Traditional programs to address substance abuse have relied on workplace supervisors. However, airline pilots perform most of their duties among their peers, without direct supervision. The HIMS program works because it uses on peer identification and intervention. The HIMS program provides educational materials, holds seminars, and conducts outreach to the pilot community.

The Committee recognizes the success of the HIMS programs. The Committee also recognizes that flight attendants are safety professionals who, like pilots, perform their duties with little management oversight. With its emphasis on peer identification and intervention, the HIMS program offers an appropriate way to provide help to flight attendants who may be abusing alcohol or drugs.

The Committee recommendation includes \$1,370,000 to continue funding for the HIMS program and to extend the program to flight attendants.

St. Louis University Center for Aviation Safety Research.—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,000,000 for the St. Louis University Center for Aviation Safety Research to continue funding for researchers to conduct comprehensive job task analysis in collaboration with aircraft manufacturers and aviation maintenance organizations in order to build an appropriate curriculum to create a properly trained aerospace technician workforce.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2009	\$2,742,095,000
Budget estimate, 2010	2,925,202,000
House allowance	2,925,202,000
Committee recommendation	2,942,352,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Facilities and Equipment [F&E] appropriation provides funding for modernizing and improving air traffic control and airway facilities, equipment, and systems. The appropriation also finances major capital investments required by other agency programs, experimental research and development facilities, and other improvements to enhance the safety and capacity of the national airspace system [NAS]. The program aims to keep pace with the increasing demands of aeronautical activity and remain in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration’s comprehensive 5-year capital investment plan [CIP].

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,942,352,000 for the Facilities and Equipment account of the Federal Aviation Administration. The Committee recommendation is \$17,150,000 more than the budget estimate and \$200,257,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The bill provides that \$2,472,352,000

shall be available for obligation until September 30, 2012, and \$470,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2010.

Budget Activities Format.—The Committee directs that the fiscal year 2011 budget request for the Facilities and Equipment account conform to the same organizational structure of budget activities as displayed below.

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

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

	Fiscal year 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 estimate	Committee recommendation
Activity 1, Engineering, Development, Test and Evaluation:			
Advanced Technology Development and Prototyping	\$44,900,000	\$41,800,000	\$41,800,000
Traffic Management Advisor [TMA]	3,700,000
NAS Improvement of System Support Laboratory	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
William J. Hughes Technical Center Facilities	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
William J. Hughes Technical Center Infrastructure Sustainment	5,400,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Next Generation Network Enabled Weather [NNEW]	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Data Communications in support of Next Generation Air Transportation System	28,800,000	51,700,000	51,700,000
Next Generation Transportation System Demonstration and Infrastructure Development	28,000,000	33,773,730	33,773,730
Next Generation Transportation System—System Development	41,400,000	66,100,000	66,100,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Trajectory-Based Operations	39,500,000	63,500,000	63,500,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Weather Reduction Impact	14,400,000	35,600,000	35,600,000
Next Generation Transportation System—High Density Arrivals/Departures	18,200,000	51,800,000	51,800,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Collaborative ATM	27,700,000	44,640,770	44,640,770
Next Generation Transportation System—Flexible Terminals and Airports	37,100,000	64,300,000	64,300,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Safety Security and Environment	8,000,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
Next Generation Transportation System—Networked Facilities	15,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
ADS-B Three Nautical Mile Separation	6,765,000
NextGen Integrated Airport	850,000
Total, Activity 1	351,865,000	523,914,500	524,764,500
Activity 2, Air Traffic Control Facilities and Equipment:			
En Route Programs:			
En Route Automation Modernization [eRAM]	203,050,000	171,750,000	171,750,000
En Route Communications Gateway [ECG]	7,400,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
Next Generation Weather Radar [NEXRAD]—Provide	3,000,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
Air Traffic Control System Command Center [ATCSCC]—Relocation	28,600,000	10,300,000	10,300,000
ARTCC Building Improvements/Plant Improvements	56,500,000	51,300,000	50,000,000
Air Traffic Management [ATM]	90,200,000	31,400,000	31,400,000
Air/Ground Communications Infrastructure	7,500,000	8,600,000	8,600,000
ATC Beacon Interrogator [ATCBI]—Replacement	13,000,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
Air Traffic Control En Route Radar Facilities Improvements	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
Voice Switching and Control System [VSCS]	23,300,000	16,700,000	16,700,000
Oceanic Automation System	20,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
Corridor Weather Integrated System [CWIS]	5,900,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
San Juan Radar Approach Control [CERAP]	6,000,000
Next Generation Very High Frequency Air/Ground Communications System [NEXCOM]	46,400,000	70,200,000	70,200,000
System-Wide Information Management	43,042,500	54,600,000	56,600,000
ADS-B NAS Wide Implementation	300,000,000	201,350,000	201,350,000
Wind Hazard Detection Equipment	807,500
Windshear Detection Services	1,000,000	1,000,000
Weather and Radar Processor [WARP]	17,600,000	17,600,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

	Fiscal year 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 estimate	Committee recommendation
Collaborative Air Traffic Management Technologies		18,100,000	18,100,000
Subtotal En Route Programs	860,700,000	683,400,000	684,100,000
Terminal Programs:			
Airport Surface Detection Equipment—Model X [ASDE-X]	33,700,000	17,302,000	25,302,000
Terminal Doppler Weather Radar [TDWR]—Provide	6,100,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System [STARS] (TAMR Phase 1)	28,200,000	28,000,000	28,000,000
Terminal Automation Modernization/Replacement Program (TAMR Phase 3)	3,000,000	3,000,000	23,000,000
Terminal Automation Program	4,300,000	9,600,000	9,600,000
Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities—Replace	136,545,476	176,000,000	179,250,000
ATCT/Terminal Radar Approach Control [TRACON] Facili- ties—Improve	37,900,000	38,900,000	38,900,000
Terminal Voice Switch Replacement [TVSR]	8,400,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
NAS Facilities OSHA and Environmental Standards Compli- ance	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Airport Surveillance Radar [ASR-9]	8,800,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Terminal Digital Radar [ASR-11]	17,100,000	12,600,000	12,600,000
DOD/FAA Facilities Transfer	1,400,000		
Precision Runway Monitors	1,000,000		
Runway Status Lights	26,960,000	117,300,000	117,300,000
National Airspace System Voice Switch [NVS]	10,000,000	26,600,000	26,600,000
Weather System Processor	700,000		
Next Generation Voice Recorder Replacement Program	10,800,000	11,900,000	11,900,000
Houston Area Air Traffic Systems [HAATS]	3,600,000		
Integrated Display System [IDS]	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
ASR-8 Service Life Extension Program	3,000,000		
Integrated Terminal Weather System [ITWS]	4,500,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Remote Maintenance Monitoring		1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Terminal Programs	379,005,476	501,002,000	532,252,000
Flight Service Programs:			
Automated Surface Observing System [ASOS]	8,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Flight Service Station [FSS] Modernization	14,600,000	20,100,000	20,100,000
Weather Camera Program (moved from Safeflight)	2,000,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Subtotal, Flight Service Programs	25,100,000	29,400,000	29,400,000
Landing and Navigational Aids Program:			
VHF Omnidirectional Radio Range [VOR] with Distance Measuring Equipment [DME]	7,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Instrument Landing System [ILS]—Establish	9,050,000	8,600,000	10,100,000
Wide Area Augmentation System [WAAS] for GPS	91,656,000	97,400,000	91,000,000
Runway Visual Range [RVR]	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Approach Lighting System Improvement Program [ALSIP]	13,614,000	8,700,000	9,700,000
Distance Measuring Equipment [DME]	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Visual NAVAIDS—Establish/Expand	1,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
Instrument Flight Procedures Automation [IFPA]	10,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
Navigation and Landing Aids—Service Life Extension Pro- gram [SLEP]	1,000,000	6,000,000	7,000,000
VASI Replacement—Replace with Precision Approach Path Indicator	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,500,000
GPS Civil Requirements	20,700,000	43,400,000	43,400,000
Subtotal, Landing and Navigational Aids Programs	171,120,000	195,700,000	193,300,000
Other ATC Facilities Programs:			
Fuel Storage Tank Replacement and Monitoring	6,100,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
Unstaffed Infrastructure Sustainment	15,300,000	18,200,000	18,200,000
Air Navigational Aids and ATC Facilities (Local Projects)	1,500,000		

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

	Fiscal year 2009 enacted	Fiscal year 2010 estimate	Committee recommendation
Aircraft Related Equipment Program	7,400,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Aircraft Related Equipment Simulator Replacement	400,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Airport Cable Loop Systems—Sustained Support	7,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Alaskan NAS Interfacility Communications System [ANICS] ..	5,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Facilities Decommissioning	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Electrical Power Systems—Sustain/Support	50,000,000	101,000,000	87,750,000
Aircraft Fleet Modernization—International Aircraft	24,900,000
Aircraft Fleet Modernization	3,000,000	5,969,000	5,969,000
Subtotal, Other ATC Facilities Programs	125,600,000	161,369,000	148,119,000
Total, Activity 2	1,561,525,476	1,570,871,000	1,587,171,000
Activity 3, Non-Air Traffic Control Facilities and Equipment:			
Support Equipment:			
Hazardous Materials Management	18,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Aviation Safety Analysis System [ASAS]	18,900,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
Logistics Support System and Facilities [LSSF]	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
National Air Space Recovery Communications [RCOM]	10,000,000	10,230,000	10,230,000
Facility Security Risk Management	15,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Information Security	12,000,000	12,276,000	12,276,000
System Approach for Safety Oversight	14,300,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Aviation Safety Knowledge Management Environment [ASKME]	7,900,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
Subtotal, Support Equipment	105,400,000	108,406,000	108,406,000
Training, Equipment and Facilities:			
Aeronautical Center Infrastructure Modernization	13,500,000	13,810,500	13,810,500
National Airspace System [NAS] Training Facilities	1,400,000
Distance Learning	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
National Airspace System [NAS] Training—Simulator	20,000,000	6,700,000	6,700,000
Subtotal, Training, Equipment, and Facilities	36,400,000	22,010,500	22,010,500
Total, Activity 3	141,800,000	130,416,500	130,416,500
Activity 4, Facilities and Equipment Mission Support:			
System Support and Services:			
System Engineering and Development Support	31,000,000	31,700,000	31,700,000
Program Support Leases	43,504,524	37,500,000	37,500,000
Logistics Support Services [LSS]	7,900,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center Leases	15,800,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
Transition Engineering Support	10,700,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Frequency and Spectrum Engineering	3,500,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
Technical Support Services Contract [TSSC]	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
Resource Tracking Program [RTP]	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Center for Advanced Aviation System Development [CAASD]	78,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000
Aeronautical Information Management Program	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, Activity 4	226,404,524	230,000,000	230,000,000
Activity 5, Personnel and Related Expenses:			
Personnel and Related Expenses—ATO	460,500,000	470,000,000	470,000,000
Total, All Activities	2,742,095,000	2,925,202,000	2,942,352,000

ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Next Generation Transportation System.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of \$358,140,770 for research and

demonstration projects to build new capabilities necessary for the FAA to develop the next generation air transportation system [NextGen]. The recommended funding level for these activities equals the budget request, and it is \$156,840,770 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

These research and demonstration projects are meant to help the FAA move away from an air transportation system that relies on radar technology and a collection of incompatible software systems, and towards a system that takes advantage of satellite technology and network-enabled operations. The FAA has identified six different areas in which it will conduct these projects: system development; trajectory-based operations; weather reduction impact; high density arrivals and departures; collaborative air traffic management; flexible terminals and airports; safety, security, and the environment; and networked facilities.

The FAA intends to use these funds to determine how new approaches to air transportation can be translated into actual technologies, programs, and practices at the FAA. The Committee recognizes that the results of this work will be, by their nature, less predictable than most other projects funded in the Facilities and Equipment account. The FAA may at times determine that some of the ideas tested with this funding may not offer enough benefits to justify further investment.

The Committee, however, expects the FAA to track the following: research and demonstration activities conducted with fiscal year 2010 funding, the contribution of each project to the overall architecture developed for the NextGen program, the results or lessons learned from each project, what these lessons mean for the next step that the FAA must take in moving toward the completion of NextGen, and how those next steps fit into the program's architecture. The Committee directs the FAA to report on each of these topics no later than 18 months after the enactment of this bill.

NextGen Integrated Airport.—The Committee recommends \$850,000 for the NextGen Integrated Airport project at Daytona Beach International Airport. Embry-Riddle and a consortium of private businesses have been working jointly with the Federal Aviation Administration to undertake a technology project that successfully integrates convective weather into the Traffic Management Advisory system using a system-wide information management platform. The funding provided for this project will continue and expand on efforts to demonstrate that current and predictive weather information can be made available to critical air traffic control personnel utilizing systems that are already in place.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

En Route Automation Modernization.—Under the En Route Automation Modernization [ERAM] program, the FAA is replacing the computer network for the air traffic control facilities that manage high-altitude traffic. Modernizing this network is critical to allowing the FAA to continue managing air traffic effectively. It is also an essential component of moving the FAA into the next generation of air traffic control. The Committee recommendation includes \$171,750,000 for the ERAM program. This funding level is equal

to the budget request, and \$31,300,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The FAA established an aggressive schedule for the ERAM program, and until recently, its managers have been able to keep the program on budget and ahead of schedule. This past year, the FAA has had to delay some of the accelerated ERAM milestones. For example, the initial operating capability was delayed from fall of 2008 to early spring this year so that the FAA could address software problems. Because some of these software solutions were complex in nature, the delivery of the software itself was then delayed by 3 weeks. However, the program remains within the budget and schedule that the agency established in the program's formal baseline. The FAA still expects to run the new ERAM software at two key sites—Salt Lake City and Seattle—before the end of this calendar year, and to have the remaining sites to be running on ERAM software before the end of calendar year 2010.

The Committee continues to monitor the ERAM program because of its importance to the ability of the FAA to manage the national airspace safely and efficiently. While pleased that the program remains on time and on budget, the Committee is concerned by reports that the software may not have been functioning as it should have by the time the FAA was ready to test its use. After the initial testing of ERAM at the key sites, there were allegations that the number of software problems and the significance of those problems indicated that ERAM was not ready to be relied on for managing air traffic. The FAA maintained that the program was developing well, but a completely different story was being told by air traffic controllers who worked at the facilities and tested the software.

The Committee is frustrated to hear two completely different stories about ERAM's reliability. The FAA understands that program managers do not regularly meet with air traffic controllers or their representatives during important site visits. Rather, program managers often meet with site managers and rely on those site managers to convey essential information to the air traffic controllers who work at the facility. The Committee questions whether the conflicting stories about ERAM are due, in part, because of this indirect form of communication. The Committee therefore urges program managers at the FAA to provide direct communication with the air traffic controllers and their representatives who will be working with developing software packages.

ARTCC Building Improvements/Plant Improvements.—The Committee recommendation includes \$50,000,000 for improvements to air route traffic control center buildings and plants. This funding level is \$1,300,000 less than the budget request, and \$6,500,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

System-wide Information Management [SWIM].—The FAA has identified the SWIM program as one of the foundations for building the next generation air transportation system. Under this program, the FAA is developing a new architecture that will enable all of the individual FAA systems to communicate and share data efficiently.

The Committee recommendation includes \$56,600,000 for System-wide Information Management, an increase of \$2,000,000 more than the budget request. The Committee directs the FAA to use

these additional funds to continue to test, evaluate, and develop mobile object technology, and to demonstrate the benefits this technology can bring to the SWIM program, Network-enabled Operations [NEO], and a 4D-trajectory National Airspace System.

TERMINAL PROGRAMS

Airport Surface Detection Equipment, Model X.—The Committee recommendation provides \$25,302,000 for the Airport Surface Detection Equipment, Model X [ASDE–X] program, an increase of \$8,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee notes that while the ASDE–X program is ahead of schedule and currently within its revised baseline, no funds were requested in the budget to continue the acceleration of the program.

While the Committee acknowledges that the ASDE–X program has had a troubled past in terms of having a clear, concise set of requirements and a well defined schedule, the program has met its accelerated schedule and is the technological centerpiece for many future safety technologies, such as Runway Status Lights. Given the important nature of the program, it is unclear as to why the program’s request does not include funding to complete the accelerated schedule. The Committee directs the FAA to use the additional resources to keep the program on the accelerated schedule, and directs the FAA to notify the Committee of any unanticipated change in the program’s schedule.

Terminal Automation Modernization/Replacement Program (TAMR Phase 3).—Under the Terminal Automation Modernization/Replacement Program (TAMR Phase 3), the FAA is replacing outdated automation equipment at air traffic control towers and at terminal facilities with more current systems. Automation systems process data and display the information for air traffic controllers. The older equipment is limited in its capacity, and it is not immediately compatible with the Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast [ADS–B] program, an essential part of the FAA’s efforts to modernize the Nation’s air transportation system. The FAA therefore set a goal for upgrading automation equipment at all sites by 2013 in order to continue meeting the milestones set for the ADS–B program.

The FAA’s original estimates on the number of equipment replacements that would be necessary under TAMR Phase 3 by 2013 was based on the assumption that the agency would be reducing the number of its air traffic control facilities through collocations and consolidations. However, the number of sites has not actually been reduced, and the FAA will not be able to meet its goal for 2013 if it continues under its current schedule and budget. In fact, the FAA will need to replace equipment at an additional 107 sites in order to avoid putting the ADS–B schedule and budget at risk.

The Committee is therefore providing additional funding for TAMR Phase 3 in order to accelerate the schedule of replacing the automation technology at these 107 sites. The Committee expects that the additional \$20,000,000 provided for fiscal year 2010 will support replacement of processors and displays at 30 sites. The Committee provides this funding in recognition of the fact that successfully building the next generation air transportation system

will require the FAA to coordinate a great number of technology programs, including the agency's legacy programs.

Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities.—The Committee recommendation includes \$179,000,000 for new and replacement air traffic control towers, and projects that consolidate air traffic control tower with terminal radar approach control facilities. This funding level is \$3,000,000 more than the budget request. The Committee directs the FAA to allocate these additional funds as presented in the following table:

Location	Amount
Palm Springs International Airport, California	\$2,000,000
Nantucket Memorial Airport, Massachusetts	1,000,000

LANDING AND NAVIGATIONAL AIDS PROGRAM

Instrument Landing System [ILS].—Establish.—The Committee recommendation includes \$8,850,000 for the establishment of instrument landing systems, an increase of \$250,000 more than the budget request. The Committee directs the FAA to allocate these additional funds as presented in the following table:

Location	Amount
Piedmont Triad International Airport, North Carolina	\$1,250,000
Rutland-Southern Vermont Regional Airport, Vermont	250,000

Wide Area Augmentation System [WAAS] for GPS.—The Wide Area Augmentation System [WAAS] is a satellite-based technology that supplements the Global Positioning System [GPS] in order to improve the accuracy and integrity of GPS information. WAAS technology allows aircraft to rely on GPS to conduct en route operations as well as precision approach operations to qualifying airports. The Committee recommendation includes \$91,000,000 for the Wide Area Augmentation System. This funding level is \$6,400,000 less than the budget request, and \$656,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Approach Lighting System Improvement Program [ALSIP].—The Committee recommendation includes \$9,700,000 for the procurement and installation of frangible approach lighting equipment. This funding level is \$1,000,000 more than the budget request. The Committee directs the FAA to allocate these additional funds as presented in the following table:

Project	Amount
Juneau International Airport MALS Lighting, Alaska	\$1,000,000

Navigation and Landing Aids—Service Life Extension Program [SLEP].—The Committee notes that Runway End Identifier Lights [REILs] improve airport safety by clearly indicating to pilots the approach end of the runway. The Committee notes that the administration has requested no funds for REILs for fiscal year 2010. The Committee recommendation includes \$7,000,000 for navigation and landing aids. This funding level is an increase of \$1,000,000 more than the budget request, and \$6,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee directs the FAA to use these

additional funds for the procurement and installation of additional REIL systems.

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

The Committee supports bringing FAA equipment into compliance with international standards, and so the Committee recommendation includes \$4,500,000 for the replacement of VASI lighting systems with PAPI lighting systems. This funding level is \$500,000 more than the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee directs the FAA to use the additional funding to procure additional PAPI systems.

OTHER ATC FACILITIES PROGRAMS

Electrical Power Systems—Sustain/Support.—The Committee recommendation includes \$90,000,000 for improvements to the power systems infrastructure of the national airspace system. This funding level is \$11,000,000 less than the budget request, and \$40,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2009	\$171,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	180,000,000
House allowance	195,000,000
Committee recommendation	175,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$175,000,000 for the FAA’s research, engineering, and development activities. The recommended level of funding is \$5,000,000 less than the budget request and \$4,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

A table showing the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, the fiscal year 2010 budget estimate, and the Committee recommendation follows:

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 enacted	2010 estimate	
Improve Aviation Safety:			
Fire Research and Safety	\$6,650	\$7,799	\$7,299
Propulsion and Fuel System	3,669	3,105	3,105
Advance Material/Structural Safety	2,920	2,448	2,448
Atmospheric Hazards/Digital System Safety	4,838	4,482	4,482
Aging Aircraft	14,589	10,944	10,944
Aircraft Catastrophic Failure Prevention Research	436	1,545	1,545
Flightdeck/Maintenance/System Integration Human Factors	7,465	7,128	7,128
Aviation Safety Risk Analysis/System Safety Management	12,488	12,698	12,698
Air Traffic Control/Technical Operations Human Factors	10,469	10,302	10,302
Aeromedical Research	8,395	10,378	9,878
Weather Program	16,968	16,789	15,789
Unmanned Aircraft System	1,876	3,467	3,467
Improve Efficiency:			
Joint Program and Development Office	14,466	14,407	13,407
Wake Turbulence	10,132	10,631	10,631
NextGen—Air-Ground Integration	2,554	5,688	5,688
NextGen—Self Separation	8,025	8,247	8,247
NextGen—Weather Technology	8,049	9,570	9,070
Reduce Environmental Impacts:			
Environment and Energy	15,608	15,522	15,022
NextGen Environmental Research	16,050	19,470	18,470
Mission Support:			
System Planning and Resource Management	1,817	1,766	1,766
William J. Hughes Technical Center Laboratory Facility	3,536	3,614	3,614
RE&D Total	171,000	180,000	175,000

Center for Commercial Space Transportation Safety.—The Committee recommends \$1,000,000 for the creation of a Center for Excellence for Space Transportation dedicated to research and development activities at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Daytona Beach, Florida, that will help to ensure that commercial space flight is a safe and secure enterprise.

Advanced Materials Research.—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 for the National Institute for Aviation Research at Wichita State University in Wichita, Kansas, to enhance ongoing aviation safety research in the areas of metallic and non-metallic structures, crashworthiness, and aging aircraft effects. The funding will be used to purchase new equipment, hire technical personnel, and conduct research in advanced materials.

Nondestructive Inspection Training for Composite Airframe Structures.—The Committee recommendation includes \$250,000 for research that will lead to a systematic approach to providing for the safe use of composite and other advanced materials. The funding will be used for technical personnel, facilities, and equipment for the National Institute of Aviation Research to provide a comprehensive education and training initiative for composite airframe maintenance and airworthiness.

Advance Materials in Transport Aircraft Structures.—The Committee recommendation includes \$500,000 for research and development of composite materials in transport aircraft structures at the Advance Materials in Transport Aircraft Structures Center in Seattle, Washington.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Limitation, 2009	\$3,600,000,000	\$3,514,500,000
Budget estimate, 2010	3,000,000,000	3,515,000,000
House allowance	3,000,000,000	3,515,000,000
Committee recommendation	3,000,000,000	3,515,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of \$3,515,000,000 for grants-in-aid to airports for fiscal year 2010, which is equal to the budget estimate and \$500,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee recommendation is sufficient to continue the important tasks of enhancing airport and airway safety, ensuring that airport standards continue to be met, maintaining existing airport capacity, and developing additional capacity.

In addition, the Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of \$3,000,000,000 for grants-in-aid to airports. The recommended level is equal to the budget estimate and \$600,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. This appropriation is sufficient to cover the liquidation of all obligations incurred pursuant to the limitation on obligations set forward in the bill.

Specifications and Standards for Airfield Pavement Markings.—Retro-reflectivity and pilot visibility of airfield pavement markings is a critical component of runway and airfield safety, especially during operations at night and in inclement weather. The Committee is concerned that information included in the current Federal specification for high-index, retro-reflective glass beads, and thus adopted within airport construction and airport marking standards by the FAA, relies on outdated test data. Product reformulation, color enhancements and industry advancements over the past decade and one-half have improved the performance and durability of high-index, retro-reflective glass beads since this test data referenced in the current Federal specification was compiled. In addition, several technical evaluations of such high-index, retro-reflective glass beads since 2003, including tests conducted by the FAA, reflect conflicting data when compared to tests conducted prior to 1996. The Committee therefore encourages the FAA to serve as the

primary Federal agency to issue a revised specification and update any standards referencing high-index, retro-reflective glass beads by incorporating data and findings of federally funded research conducted in this subject area, including any research completed within fiscal year 2010. Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this act, the Administrator of the FAA shall submit a detailed report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations explaining what actions will be taken to clarify the issue concerning a revised Federal specification and updated standards referencing high-index, retro-reflective glass beads.

Wind Turbines.—The Committee notes that there are sometimes considerable delays in determining if the location of wind turbines will cause difficulties for airports and radar. The Committee directs that the FAA address this issue in order to respond more quickly to determine if particular wind turbines will be a hazard to aviation.

Airport Discretionary Grants.—Of the funds covered by the obligation limitation in this bill, the Committee directs FAA to provide funding, out of available resources, for those projects listed in the table below in the corresponding amounts. The Committee agrees that State apportionment funds may be construed as discretionary funds for the purposes of implementing this provision. To the maximum extent possible, the Administrator should work to ensure that airport sponsors for these projects first use available entitlement funds to finance the projects. However, the FAA should not require sponsors to apply carryover entitlement to discretionary projects funded in the coming year, but only those entitlements applicable to the fiscal year 2010 obligation limitation. The Committee further directs that the specific funding allocated in the table below shall not diminish or prejudice the application of a specific airport or geographic region to receive other AIP discretionary grants or multi-year letters of intent.

AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

State	Airport name	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
AL	Lanett Municipal	For environmental assessments, land acquisition, and runway construction.	\$5,000,000
IL	Southern Illinois	For aircraft rescue firefighting building construction.	800,000
IL	Quad City International	For reconstruction and extension and runway.	500,000
KY	Louisville International	For airfield capacity improvements	750,000
KY	Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International ..	For apron rehabilitation	1,500,000
MI	Oakland County International	For replacement of Oakland County International Airport's obsolete terminal building.	750,000
MO	Lamar Municipal	For construction of a new runway	2,750,000
MO	Sikeston Memorial Municipal	For relocation and construction of a taxiway.	1,700,000
MS	Gulfport-Biloxi International	For design and construction of taxiway	2,500,000
MS	Jackson-Evers International	For airfield improvements	2,000,000
MS	Mid Delta Regional	For various runway improvements	1,000,000
MS	Golden Triangle Regional	For a runway extension	2,000,000
ND	Devils Lake Regional	For runway improvements	500,000
ND	Grand Forks International	For replacement of terminal	2,500,000
NY	Buffalo Niagara International	For construction of a Remain Overnight Apron.	400,000

AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM—Continued

State	Airport name	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
TN	Nashville International	For reconstruction of a portion of 2L–20R runway.	1,500,000
TX	San Marcos Municipal	For apron construction	1,000,000
VT	Burlington International	For taxiway and apron improvements	1,000,000
WI	Sheboygan County Memorial	For reconstruction of Runway 13/31 and Taxiways F1 and F2.	950,000
WI	Eagle River Union	For reconstruction and expansion of ramp ...	850,000

Administrative Expenses.—The Committee recommends \$93,422,000 to cover administrative expenses. This funding level is equal to the budget estimate, and \$5,968,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Airport Cooperative Research.—The Committee recommends \$15,000,000 for the airport cooperative research program. This funding level is equal to the budget estimate and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Airport Technology.—The Committee recommends \$22,472,000 for airport technology research. This funding level is the same as the budget request, and \$3,142,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 level.

Small Community Air Service Development Program [SCASDP].—The Committee recommends \$8,000,000 for the Small Community Air Service Development Program. This funding level is equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The administration requested no funds for this program for fiscal year 2010.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Rescission, 2009	– \$80,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allocation	
Committee recommendation	– 393,000,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a rescission of contract authorization of \$393,000,000 of unobligated balances of contract authority.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Section 110 limits the number of technical staff years at the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development to no more than 600 in fiscal year 2009.

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

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

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

Section 114 prohibits funds limited in this act for the Airport Improvement Program to be provided to an airport that refuses a request from the Secretary of Transportation to use public space at the airport for the purpose of conducting outreach on air passenger rights.

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

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

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

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Under the Committee recommendations, a total program level of \$43,411,000,000 would be provided for the activities of the Federal Highway Administration in fiscal year 2010. The recommendation is \$1,565,000,000 more than the budget request. The recommendation is also \$25,704,527,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, including funding provided as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act [ARRA], and it is \$1,795,473,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, excluding such funding. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations (excluding rescissions and funding provided as part of ARRA):

	Fiscal year		Committee recommendation
	2009 enacted	2010 estimate	
Federal-aid highway program obligation limitation	\$40,700,000,000	\$5,000,000,000	\$41,107,000,000
Federal-aid highway program budget authority	36,107,000,000
Additional investments in highway infrastructure	1,400,000,000
Surface transportation priorities	161,327,000	165,000,000
Emergency relief program	739,000,000	739,000,000	739,000,000
Appalachian development highway system	9,500,000
Denali access system program	5,700,000
Total	41,615,527,000	41,846,000,000	43,411,000,000

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 2009	\$390,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	415,396,000
House allowance	413,533,000
Committee recommendation	415,396,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of \$415,396,000 for administrative expenses of the agency. This limitation is equal to the budget request and \$25,396,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The bill includes language to make \$3,809,000 of the limitation on administrative expenses available to the Office of Inspector General to conduct audits and investigations related to the FHWA.

In addition, \$3,124,000 in contract authority above this limitation is made available for the administrative expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission in accordance with section 104 of title 23, United States Code.

Ensuring the Success of Mass Evacuations.—The Committee recognizes that the success of all-hazards mass evacuations from major metropolitan areas is dependent on safe and high-capacity highways and bridges. The Committee directs the Department of Transportation [DOT], in cooperation with the Department of Homeland Security [DHS], to assess the mass evacuation plans for the country's most high-threat, high-density areas and identify and prioritize current deficiencies on the recommended evacuation routes that could impede evacuations if not addressed. Further, for the National Capital Region [NCR], the Committee directs the DOT, in cooperation with DHS including the Office of the National Capital Region Coordination, to conduct an analysis of how national highway system projects currently under construction to the west of the NCR could increase the NCR's evacuation capacity and provide a detailed plan to accelerate such highway projects. The Department shall submit its report to the Committee on Appropriations no later than 120 days after the enactment of this act.

Improving Bridge Safety.—Almost 2 years ago, the tragic collapse of the Interstate 35W bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota, called attention to the deteriorating condition of our Nation's bridges. There are almost 600,000 bridges across the country. Although the likelihood of another collapse is low, the consequences of such an event would again be a catastrophe. In addition, bringing our bridges into good condition would mean that travelers and freight would be able to move across them efficiently and without unnecessary delay.

In the wake of the Minneapolis bridge collapse, the Federal Highway Administration promised to improve the Federal oversight of bridge maintenance. The Federal Highway Administration started to make revisions to its Bridge Program Manual in order

to provide better guidance to its division offices. Following a recommendation by the Inspector General, the Federal Highway Administration began implementing a more data-driven, risk-based method of overseeing bridge safety so that the agencies limited resources could be targeted to the areas of the greatest need. The agency also required its division offices to conduct comprehensive reviews of States' compliance with Federal standards and to assess bridge load rating and posting practices.

While the Federal Highway Administration has taken a step in the right direction, the Committee is disappointed in the amount of progress that the agency has been able to accomplish over the past couple of years. Too much time has passed without enough progress to show for it.

The Committee notes that the final bridge manual still has not been published. The manual was under review 1 year ago, and it is still under review at the current time. The Committee acknowledges that some of the issues that the agency must address in revising its manual are complex in nature, but the Committee remains unconvinced that the Federal Highway Administration is taking an aggressive enough approach in completing its work.

Earlier this year, the Inspector General issued a report evaluating the Federal Highway Administration's implementation of its new data-driven, risk-based oversight. The Inspector General found significant holes in the new oversight regime. When the Federal Highway Administration conducted its compliance reviews and assessments, the Inspector General found that the division offices made limited use of the agency's data and conducted their work inconsistently from office to office. The Inspector General attributed these shortcomings to the fact that managers at Federal Highway Administration headquarters provided no minimum requirements for the division offices to follow. The Inspector General also found that headquarters staff themselves did not routinely use data in order to focus agency resources on the highest risk areas. Finally, the Inspector General reported that the Federal Highway Administration does not take an active approach in helping States to improve the quality of data collected on bridges, a shortcoming that could undermine any effort to base agency efforts on high risk areas based on the results of data analysis.

The Inspector General acknowledged that the efforts of the Federal Highway Administration are limited in part by a lack of resources. The agency lacks the manpower at the division offices and at headquarters to devote significantly more resources on bridge oversight. However, most of the shortcomings identified by the Inspector General do not rely solely on the presence of additional staff. The Federal Highway Administration must take on the responsibility of setting clear standards for its division offices.

The Committee expects the Federal Highway Administration to make more significant progress in improving its oversight of bridge conditions and safety over the course of fiscal year 2010. In order to ensure that the agency has the staff necessary to conduct more rigorous oversight of bridges, the Committee directs the Federal Highway Administration to use \$6,000,000 of the funds for hiring additional personnel at the agency headquarters and in each of the division offices.

In addition, the Committee directs the Inspector General to evaluate the Federal Highway Administration’s progress in fulfilling each of the recommendations given in his report on the national bridge inspection program (Report Number MH–2009–013), and to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with his findings no later than April 30, 2010.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

	Obligation limitation (trust fund)	Budget authority (general fund)
Limitation, 2009	\$40,700,000,000	¹ \$27,500,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	5,000,000,000	36,107,000,000
House allowance	41,107,000,000
Committee recommendation	41,107,000,000

¹The budget authority provided for this program for fiscal year 2009 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111–5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends limiting fiscal year 2010 Federal-aid highways obligations to \$41,107,000,000, which is equal to the total level of funding requested by the President, and \$407,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level for the Federal-aid highway program, excluding funding provided as a part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Within the overall limitation on fiscal year 2010 Federal-aid highway obligations, the Committee recommends limiting fiscal year 2010 obligations on transportation research to \$429,800,000. The recommendation for transportation research is equal to the budget request. This specific limitation controls spending for the transportation research and technology programs of the FHWA, and it includes the intelligent transportation systems; surface transportation research; technology deployment, training and education; university transportation research; and the Bureau of Transportation Statistics.

In addition, the bill includes a provision that allows the FHWA to collect and spend fees in order to pay for the services of expert firms in the field of municipal and project finance to assist the agency in the provision of TIFIA credit instruments.

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

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM OBLIGATION LIMITATION

[Fiscal year 2009 and President's request and Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2010]

	Fiscal year 2009	Fiscal year budget request 2010	Committee recommendation
Formula Programs			
ALABAMA	\$664,181,764	\$687,313,588	\$687,313,588
ALASKA	290,717,063	306,492,208	306,492,208
ARIZONA	672,374,585	694,554,043	694,554,043
ARKANSAS	410,847,021	426,183,825	426,183,825
CALIFORNIA	3,002,777,749	3,106,055,097	3,106,055,097
COLORADO	451,065,359	467,363,776	467,363,776
CONNECTICUT	422,828,746	439,265,057	439,265,057
DELAWARE	129,898,054	135,165,109	135,165,109
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	126,772,019	131,310,650	131,310,650
FLORIDA	1,690,108,775	1,748,776,951	1,748,776,951
GEORGIA	1,143,842,745	1,183,320,551	1,183,320,551
HAWAII	136,011,037	141,936,283	141,936,283
IDAHO	244,839,686	253,924,652	253,924,652
ILLINOIS	1,121,712,771	1,162,573,951	1,162,573,951
INDIANA	852,499,523	881,834,801	881,834,801
IOWA	384,432,661	398,755,189	398,755,189
KANSAS	327,579,516	340,408,612	340,408,612
KENTUCKY	568,095,523	588,546,800	588,546,800
LOUISIANA	555,575,744	575,403,159	575,403,159
MAINE	141,822,084	141,076,962	141,076,962
MARYLAND	518,543,985	537,202,618	537,202,618
MASSACHUSETTS	531,894,794	552,271,464	552,271,464
MICHIGAN	926,977,662	961,766,642	961,766,642
MINNESOTA	523,448,534	542,902,295	542,902,295
MISSISSIPPI	389,213,117	403,718,563	403,718,563
MISSOURI	762,024,021	789,274,386	789,274,386
MONTANA	315,817,904	327,444,124	327,444,124
NEBRASKA	244,575,447	253,657,642	253,657,642
NEVADA	256,097,971	266,309,073	266,309,073
NEW HAMPSHIRE	146,151,389	151,802,205	151,802,205
NEW JERSEY	859,742,154	889,849,589	889,849,589
NEW MEXICO	310,184,441	321,314,740	321,314,740
NEW YORK	1,450,156,103	1,506,611,094	1,506,611,094
NORTH CAROLINA	930,622,868	962,552,246	962,552,246
NORTH DAKOTA	207,347,401	214,979,405	214,979,405
OHIO	1,147,361,001	1,187,464,703	1,187,464,703
OKLAHOMA	504,786,983	522,428,172	522,428,172
OREGON	372,563,076	387,051,148	387,051,148
PENNSYLVANIA	1,443,922,086	1,498,371,512	1,498,371,512
RHODE ISLAND	163,809,919	158,723,923	158,723,923
SOUTH CAROLINA	548,969,028	568,254,257	568,254,257
SOUTH DAKOTA	217,374,734	225,943,186	225,943,186
TENNESSEE	704,208,483	729,516,981	729,516,981
TEXAS	2,868,608,137	2,965,284,870	2,965,284,870
UTAH	259,427,213	269,661,219	269,661,219
VERMONT	134,115,890	139,559,125	139,559,125
VIRGINIA	859,531,139	888,826,389	888,826,389
WASHINGTON	556,453,022	576,047,950	576,047,950
WEST VIRGINIA	350,067,330	363,159,189	363,159,189
WISCONSIN	642,654,090	665,698,229	665,698,229
WYOMING	215,495,030	223,076,582	223,076,582
SUBTOTAL	32,700,127,377	33,860,984,785	33,860,984,785
Non-Formula Programs	7,999,872,623	7,246,015,215	7,246,015,215
TOTAL	40,700,000,000	41,107,000,000	41,107,000,000

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS PROGRAMS

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

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA-LU], the highway, highway safety, and transit authorization through fiscal year 2009, made Federal-aid highways funds available in various categories of spending.

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

Interstate Maintenance [IM].—The 46,876-mile Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways retains a separate identity within the NHS. The IM program finances projects to rehabilitate, restore, resurface and reconstruct the interstate system. Reconstruction that increases capacity, other than HOV lanes, is not eligible for IM funds. The Federal share for the IM program is 90 percent, subject to the sliding-scale adjustment, and funds are available for 4 years.

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

INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE

Project name	Committee recommendation
24th Street/I-15 Interchange, UT	\$2,000,000
24th Street/I-15 Interchange, UT	2,000,000
I-10 Interchange at Pecue Lane, LA	1,100,000
I-12 Interchange at LA-16, Denham Springs, LA	650,000
I-15 Corridor of the Future, NV	1,000,000
I-15 Custer Avenue Interchange, MT	3,000,000
I-235/US 54 and Central Avenue Interchange, KS	100,000
I-29 Fargo North to Sheyenne River, ND	1,000,000
I-5 Columbia River Crossing, WA	2,000,000
I-70 Viaduct Realignment, KS	500,000
I-75 at South Dixie Drive/Central Avenue Interchange, OH	500,000
I-85 Widening in Davidson and Rowan Counties, NC	1,700,000
I-90 Belgrade East Interchange, MT	1,500,000
I-95 Interchange with SR 202 (Butler Boulevard), FL	1,000,000
I-95 Pawtucket River Bridge Replacement, RI	1,800,000
IH-35W Congestion Relief, Fort Worth, TX	1,000,000

INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Interstate 280: Interchange Improvements, Harrison, NJ	2,000,000
Interstate 29: Reconstruction and Utility Relocation Project, IA	1,000,000
Interstate 40: New Conway South Interchange, AR	800,000
Interstate 430/630: Interchange Modification, AR	3,000,000
Interstate 540: Fayetteville-North, AR	3,000,000
Interstate 81: Exit 3 Interchange Improvements, PA	1,000,000
Interstate 95/Fairfax County Parkway Interchange at Newington Road, VA	1,000,000
Kapolei Interchange Complex, HI	3,000,000
Marion Road Interchange, SD	1,000,000
Meadowood Interchange, NV	1,000,000
Southern Nevada Beltway Interchanges, NV	1,000,000
Starr Road Interchange, NV	3,000,000
Turnpike Improvement Project: SR-1 and I-95	1,500,000

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

Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation.—The bridge program enables States to improve the condition of their bridges through replacement, rehabilitation, and systematic preventive maintenance. The funds are available for use on all bridges, including those on roads functionally classified as rural minor collectors and as local. Bridge program funds have a 4-year period of availability with a Federal share for all projects, except those on the interstate system, of 80 percent, subject to the sliding scale adjustment. For those bridges on the interstate system, the Federal share is 90 percent, subject to the sliding-scale adjustment.

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

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

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

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

FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS

Project name	Committee recommendation
Repairs to Waterville Road, TN	\$200,000
Navajo Route 42, Oljeto Road Resurfacing Project, UT	1,000,000
Choctaw Lake-Bluff Lake Route, MS	1,500,000
SR-160 Blue Diamond Highway, NV	1,000,000
Pyramid Highway, Sparks, NV	500,000
South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge, Doyle Drive, City and County of San Francisco, CA	2,750,000
CR 97, Nicolls Road Highway Improvements, NY	400,000
Federal Lands Improvement Project, HI	4,000,000
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Community Streets Project, Bear Soldier South, SD	600,000
Hoover Dam Bypass Bridge, AZ	4,250,000
BRAC-Related Improvements, Anne Arundel County, MD	2,300,000
BRAC-Related Improvements, Harford County, MD	2,300,000
BRAC-Related Improvements, Montgomery County, MD	2,300,000
BRAC-Related Improvements, Prince George's County, MD	2,300,000
Kalispel Tribe Road Development from Sprague Avenue to US 2, WA	1,300,000
Pyramid Highway Corridor, NV	1,100,000
Boulder City Bypass, NV	1,000,000
FH-24, Banks to Lowman, ID	2,000,000
Southern Nevada Beltway Interchanges, NV	2,250,000
SR-160 Nevada Expansion, NV	2,250,000
West River Trail Bridge, VT	170,000
Flight 93 National Memorial, PA	1,400,000
SD Highway 63 Resurfacing, SD	3,000,000
Forest Road Upgrade, MS	500,000
Reconstruction of BIA Route 7 on the Turtle Mountain Reservation, ND	1,200,000

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

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

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

and user satisfaction by inviting innovation, new technologies, and new practices to be used in highway construction and operations.

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

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

FERRY BOATS AND FERRY TERMINAL FACILITIES

Project name	Committee recommendation
New Vessel Program—Propulsion System Acquisition, WA	\$3,000,000

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

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

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

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY AND SYSTEM PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Project name	Committee recommendation
5th and 6th Street Reconstruction, OR	\$800,000
7th Street Gateway Streetscape Enhancement Project, OR	500,000
Access Road to Melbourne International Airport, FL	800,000
Autumn Street Parkway, San Jose, CA	1,000,000
Beaudry Road Crossing and Pathway Project, WA	600,000
Bossier Parish Congestion Relief, LA	400,000
Camden Waterfront Neighborhood Development Initiative, NJ	500,000
Completion of Future I-99, US Route 15 in Steuben County, NY	1,000,000
Downtown Development Authority Streetscape, Dahlonega, GA	392,000
El Camino East/West Corridor, AL	1,500,000
Fish Lake Trail Completion, WA	2,000,000
Freeways and Arterial System of Transportation [FAST], NV	700,000
Hamilton Street Overpass Safety Project, WA	1,000,000
I-84, Broadway Avenue to Gowen Road Widening, ID	400,000
I-84, Caldwell to Nampa Widening, ID	1,000,000
Interchange Design and Construction, Kansas Highway 10 and Lone Elm Interchange, Lenexa, KS	500,000
Interstate 579 "Cap"—Urban Green Space & Park Plaza, Pittsburgh, PA	1,000,000
Iowa Technology Corridor West Grand Avenue Extension, IA	600,000
Loop 82 Railroad Overpass, TX	700,000
Midtown Transportation Infrastructure, NY	1,400,000
Monongalia Health Systems Access Road, WV	1,000,000
New Hanover Greenway System, NC	250,000
New Orleans City Park Infrastructure Improvements, New Orleans, LA	2,000,000

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY AND SYSTEM PRESERVATION PROGRAM—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Ninth Street Island Bridge Project, MT	625,000
Pedestrian Safety Improvement Project, NY	300,000
Riggin Road at the Walnut Street Intersection, IN	1,000,000
Salters Road Expansion Along I-85, Greenville, SC	300,000
Scoping Study on Audubon and Natcher Parkways in Western Kentucky, KY	375,000
South Lawrence Trafficway, KS	1,250,000
State Road 133 from Albany to Moultrie, GA	800,000
Town of Lexington Unified Traffic Plan—Phase I, SC	1,000,000
Union Crossing, MA	400,000
US 113 Improvements in Worcester County, MD	400,000
US 41/Cobb Parkway Expansion and Bridge Replacement, GA	500,000
US 78 Upgrade to Interstate Standards, MS	1,000,000
US Highway 169 Widening Project, OK	500,000
US-95, Thorncreek to Moscow, ID	400,000
Wetzel Street Bridge Replacement, WV	500,000
Widen Hwy 99W between SPRR Overpass and NW Circle Boulevard, OR	300,000

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

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

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

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

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

Delta Region Transportation Development Program.—This program encourages multistate transportation planning and supports the development of transportation infrastructure in the eight States that comprise the region of the Mississippi Delta: Alabama,

Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.

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

DELTA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Project name	Committee recommendation
Poplar Bluff Industrial Park Bypass, MO	\$2,000,000
Interstate 55 Interchange, MO	1,000,000
Capitol Street Renaissance Project—Transportation Improvements, MS	1,150,000
Statesman Boulevard and Trail, MS	1,500,000
Jonestown Bypass, MS	1,250,000
Interstate 55 Interchange Lighting, MS	600,000
Route 34, MO	1,150,000

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

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

ELIMINATION OF RAIL-HIGHWAY GRADE CROSSING HAZARDS IN HIGH-SPEED RAIL CORRIDORS

Project name	Committee recommendation
55th Street East Grade Separation, ND	\$1,900,000
Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations, CA	2,000,000
Livingston Railroad Grade Separation Undercrossing, MT	600,000
Railway-Highway Grade Crossing Mitigation, Northeastern Illinois	2,000,000

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2009	\$41,439,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	33,000,000,000
House allowance	41,846,000,000
Committee recommendation	41,846,000,000

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of \$41,846,000,000. The recommended level is \$8,846,000,000 more than the budget request and is necessary to pay outstanding obligations from various highway accounts pursuant to this and prior appropriations acts.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

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

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

Section 122 appropriates funds for the projects, programs, and activities specified as follows:

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES

Project name	Committee recommendation
10th Avenue South Corridor Extension, Waverly, IA	\$500,000
4th Street Improvement Project, City of Moro, OR	126,076
53rd Avenue Bridge and Roadway Extension Project, OR	300,000
70th Avenue and Valley Avenue East Corridor Project, WA	1,500,000
ADHS Corridor, H, WV	4,500,000
Airport Road Replacement, TN	1,000,000
Anchor Lake Interchange and Service Road, MS	500,000
Arterial Road and Bridge Improvements, Matanuska-Susitna Borough, AK	1,000,000
Artesia Road Bypass, MS	1,000,000
Bergen County Specialized Bus Transit, NJ	1,000,000
Blair Bypass—South Corridor, NE	1,000,000
Bonneville Clark Couplet, NV	500,000
Bossier Parish Congestion Relief Plan, Bossier Parish, LA	850,000
Brett Way Extension, OR	300,000
Broad Street Parkway/Nashua River Bridge Enhancements, NH	500,000
Broadway Bridge Replacement Project, WA	3,200,000
Brush Creek-Troost Avenue Streetscape Improvements, MO	1,000,000
Byram-Clinton/Norrell Parkway, MS	1,500,000
Cannon AFB BRAC County Road Improvements, NM	1,000,000
Cape Girardeau Riverwalk Trail, MO	1,600,000
Carson City Freeway—Phase II, NV	800,000
Central City, Trinity River Vision, Fort Worth, TX	500,000
Church Street Marketplace and Side Streets Improvements, VT	1,000,000
City of Hines Street Rehabilitation Project, OR	300,000
City of Providence Street Paving, RI	800,000
City of Tuscaloosa Streetscape, AL	2,000,000
Coalfields Expressway, WV	2,000,000
Collins Road Improvements, Cedar Rapids, IA	1,000,000
Construction of Four Lane Highway on US 69 in Crawford, Bourbon, and Cherokee Counties, KS	1,500,000
Countywide Regional Loop Trail, Mount Clemens, MI	2,000,000
Defense Access Road, MS	1,000,000
Denali Commission Transportation Program, AK	1,000,000
East Chester Street Improvement, TN	785,000
East Loop, Brownsville, TX	500,000
East Metropolitan Corridor, MS	2,000,000
Emergency Access Ramp to Interstate 84, NY	1,000,000
Fairfax County Parkway Interchange Improvements at Fair Lakes Boulevard and Monument Drive, VA	600,000
FNSB Road and Bridge Improvements, AK	1,000,000
Gluckstadt Road and Interchange, MS	1,500,000
Golden Gate Bridge Seismic Retrofit Construction Project, CA	2,000,000
Greensboro Greenway, NC	500,000
Hardy County Complex Access Road, WV	1,500,000
Hastings Bridge/Highway 61 Right-of-Way and Construction, MN	1,000,000
Hattiesburg Longleaf Trace Rails to Trails, MS	500,000
Henry Avenue Bridge Reconstruction, WI	1,000,000
High Bridge Renovation, MT	300,000
Highway 167: Louisiana State Line to Sheridan, AR	1,400,000
Highway 226: Highway 67 to Highway 49, AR	1,000,000
Highway 63: Interchange Improvements, AR	2,000,000
Hogan Road Traffic Improvements, ME	550,000
Holly Springs Road, MS	1,500,000
Hutchins Street Reconstruction, Berlin, NH	800,000
Hybrid Composite-Concrete Bridges, ME	2,000,000
I-40 Boulevard Construction, OK	1,000,000
I-44 Range Line Road Interchange, MO	1,000,000
I-69, TX	500,000
Improvement of the South Connector Street, SD	1,250,000
Improvements to 159th Street, KS	2,000,000
Indian River Inlet Bridge, DE	800,000
Infrastructure Improvement at Height of Land, ME	2,900,000
International Railway Station/Intermodal Transportation Center, NY	800,000
Interstate 69/Great River Bridge: Highway 65—MS Highway 1, AR	2,000,000
Iowa Highway 14—57 Complete Streets Corridor Improvements in Parkersburg, IA	2,000,000

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Jenny Barker Rd./K-156/Mary St Reconfiguration, KS	500,000
Kettering Gateway Project, Flint, MI	1,200,000
King Coal Highway, WV	2,000,000
Kittitas Highway Safety Improvements, WA	2,000,000
Knoxville Road Reconstruction, Mercer County, IL	500,000
LA 1 Goldenmeadow to Port Fourchon, Lafourche Parish, LA	1,000,000
Lafayette Interchange, MO	1,000,000
Lake Harbour Drive, MS	1,500,000
Lake Merritt Improvement Project, CA	850,000
Lesner Bridge Replacement, VA	500,000
Lewis and Clark Legacy Trail, ND	700,000
Longfellow Bridge Approach and Gateway, MA	1,000,000
Lower Main Street Infrastructure Project, Claremont, NH	500,000
Lowry Avenue Bridge Replacement, MN	600,000
Mahoning Road Infrastructure and Economic Development Project, OH	1,000,000
MD 404 Improvements in Caroline, Talbot, and Queen Anne's Counties, MD	400,000
Missouri River Freight Corridor Development Study, MO	900,000
MLK-Lincoln Avenue Railroad Grade Separation, WA	2,000,000
MO-13 and MO-82 Interchange, MO	1,000,000
Naugatuck River Greenway, CT	1,000,000
Nevada Pacific Parkway, NV	550,000
New York State Route 12, NY	500,000
Newberg-Dundee Transportation Improvement Project, OR	400,000
Newport Cliff Walk Restoration, RI	500,000
North Broad Street Redevelopment Project, NJ	500,000
Northern Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation, MA	1,300,000
Northwest 66th Avenue Reconstruction, IA	600,000
Ohio Hub Plan, OH	700,000
Oktibbeha County Southern Bypass, MS	500,000
Old Taylor Road Roundabouts, MS	500,000
Ontario Oregon Railroad Underpass Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, OR	300,000
Park Road Bridge Replacement and Dubuque Street Elevation Project, Iowa City, IA	1,500,000
Pioneer Street Rail Overpass Safety Improvement Project, WA	1,000,000
Pony Express Boulevard Extension, Herriman, UT	1,000,000
Port of Everett Infrastructure Improvement Project, WA	1,200,000
R-170 Landslide Road Replacement, WA	2,000,000
Reconstruction and Upgrade of 2300 West between 1900 South and the Interstate 15 West Frontage Road in Lehi, UT	1,500,000
Regional East-West Trail and Bikeway, Albuquerque, NM	1,000,000
Remediation and Reuse of Reclaimed Port Land, DE	750,000
Replacement and Rehabilitation of Municipal Bridges and Trestles, City of Ketchikan, AK	500,000
Reunion Interchange, MS	1,500,000
Rickenbacker Intermodal East-West Connector, OH	2,000,000
Road Improvements from 57th Street North to 1,000ft South of 26th Street, Sioux Falls, SD	1,500,000
Route 1/Route 123 Interchange Improvements, VA	600,000
Route 160 and Route 60 Interchange Improvements, MO	1,000,000
Route 27 Renaissance 2000 Project, NJ	1,000,000
Route 60/422 Interchange, PA	500,000
Rutland Center Street Marketplace Improvements, VT	1,000,000
San Bernardo Avenue Restoration, Laredo, TX	500,000
San Jose Boulevard Improvements (Carlsbad), NM	750,000
Sellwood Bridge Replacement Project, OR	1,300,000
Sitka Waterfront Development, AK	500,000
South Street Reconstruction and Streetscape Improvements, NY	1,000,000
Southeast Connector, IA	2,000,000
Southwest Arterial Project, IA	400,000
St. John's Heritage Parkway Interchanges, Cities of Melbourne and Palm Bay, Brevard County, FL	2,000,000
State Route 24/48, MS	1,900,000
Sue Ann Big Crow and Oglala Trail and Bike Path Enhancement, Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, SD	500,000
Thetford Village Pedestrian Improvements, VT	450,000
Tupelo Thoroughfare Northern Loop, MS	1,500,000
University of Kentucky Academy for Community Transportation Innovation, KY	1,000,000
Urban Collector Road, MS	2,000,000

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
US 16B Improvements near US 16 to near SD 79, SD	500,000
US 195 Safety Improvements—Cheney-Spokane Road Interchange, WA	2,000,000
US 395 from Moana to Stead, NV	700,000
US 63, MO	1,000,000
US 70 Bridge Repairs, TN	1,500,000
US 93 Corridor and Kalispell Bypass, MT	3,000,000
US Highway 97 and J Street Intersection Project, OR	700,000
US Route 17/Dominion Boulevard, VA	500,000
US Route 35, WV	2,000,000
US Route 422 Westbound Off-Ramp Improvements at the Oaks Interchange, PA	1,300,000
Vidalia Port Access Road, Vidalia, LA	1,500,000
Wadhams Road Bridge over Black River, St. Clair, MI	3,000,000
Waterfront Redevelopment Access Project, WA	2,000,000
West County Line Road, MS	1,500,000
West Haven Rail Passenger Station, CT	1,000,000
West Virginia Route 10, WV	2,000,000

Section 123 appropriates an additional \$1,400,000,000 for highway infrastructure. Of this total additional funding, \$500,000,000 is provided for the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act [TIFIA] program, which offers credit assistance for significant transportation projects. This total additional investment also includes \$900,000,000 for a portion of the Federal-Aid Highway program called the Surface Transportation Program [STP]. Funding provided for STP would be distributed to the States in the same proportion as the fiscal year 2010 obligation limitation in order to increase the investment in essential transportation infrastructure throughout the States. These targeted funding increases will make possible the large-scale transportation projects that address the bottlenecks, congestion, and deterioration that riddle our transportation system, and it will also fund transportation projects on a smaller scale to help maintain the infrastructure that support our communities.

Section 124 provides requirements for any waiver of Buy American requirements.

Section 125 continues a provision prohibiting tolling in Texas, with exceptions.

Section 126 clarifies funding for a previously funded project in Rhode Island.

Section 127 clarifies funding for a previously funded project in Florida.

Section 128 clarifies funding for a previously funded project in California.

Section 129 clarifies funding for a previously funded project in Kansas.

Section 130 clarifies funding for a previously funded project in Alabama.

Section 131 clarifies funding for a previously funded project in Nevada.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a level of \$549,898,000 for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. The language provides the authority to obligate and liquidate \$548,570,000 from the Highway Trust Fund, as well as an appropriation of \$1,328,000 from the General Fund. The Committee is assuming an extension of SAFETEA–LU at the currently authorized levels. As such it was necessary to provide budget authority in addition to the contract authority made available under an extension to meet the President's request for these safety programs. This level is \$8,898,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration [FMCSA] is responsible for developing, implementing, and enforcing regulations for the motor carrier industry that result in qualified drivers and safe vehicles operating on our Nation's highways. By effectively carrying out its responsibilities, the agency provides the motor carrier industry with appropriate guidance and sufficient oversight to

ensure both the efficient movement of goods and people and the safety of the Nation's driving public.

In fiscal year 2009, this Committee voiced its disappointment and frustration with the FMCSA's poor performance in carrying out its mission. In particular, the Committee cited inadequate regulations that had been struck down by the courts, as well as weak oversight of the industry. The Committee noted that the result of these actions, or inaction, made it difficult for the industry to manage operations in a compliant manner, and may in some instances have actually undermined safety.

The Committee is pleased that since last year, some progress has been made in improving motor carrier safety. The most recent data from the Fatality Analysis Reporting System show a 12 percent reduction in the number of large truck fatalities, from 4,822 in 2007 to 4,229 in 2008. The Committee hopes that this is an indication that the agency's programs are having a positive impact on motor carrier safety. However, while these data point to improvements, the Committee remains concerned other indicators, such as out of service rates—the rate at which driver or vehicle violations are so severe as to require a vehicle to be taken off the road—remain unchanged at nearly 24 percent. The Committee is also troubled by the number of safety recommendations that require action by the agency.

The recommendations that the FMCSA must address come from audits and investigations conducted by the Department of Transportation's Office of Inspector General [OIG], the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB], and the Government Accountability Office [GAO]. For example, the OIG has made a series of recommendations on the commercial driver's license [CDL] program dating back to 2002, seven of which remain open. FMCSA hopes to address these recommendations in a new rule that will revise knowledge and skills testing standards, implement fraud prevention efforts, and establish new minimum standards for States to issue commercial drivers permits. However, despite a legislative requirement that this rule be issued by April 2008, the rule has yet to be issued.

In addition, in 2001, following an accident investigation, the NTSB made several recommendations to the FMCSA in order to prevent medically unqualified drivers from operating commercial vehicles. This item was placed on the NTSB's Most Wanted List in 2003, and FMCSA's response remains "open unacceptable." In updating its Most Wanted list in October 2008, the NTSB noted, ". . . nearly a decade after the New Orleans, Louisiana, accident that precipitated the issuance of these recommendations, many issues in this area remain unaddressed, and the overall system of driver medical certification is no more effective this year than last."

Finally, the GAO has done a series of assessments of the FMCSA's programs, and one of their investigations recently uncovered major flaws with the drug testing facilities used by the agency. An important recommendation that the GAO made to the FMCSA was to create a national drug testing database. The FMCSA indicated that it was moving forward with the creation of this database, however, the report requested by the Committee

which would detail a timeline for establishing this database has not yet been submitted.

All of these recommendations speak to the serious and necessary actions that the agency must take to improve and strengthen its oversight of the industry. Importantly, the agency must move with more urgency to address long-standing recommendations that will result in fatality reductions. The FMCSA will soon have the opportunity to request the additional tools and authorities necessary to strengthen and enhance its regulatory and oversight responsibilities during the reauthorization of the bill that governs the FMCSA's funding and programs. The current authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 2009. As the administration considers its reauthorization proposals for the FMCSA, the Committee expects the administration to carefully consider the many serious recommendations by the DOT OIG, the NTSB, and the GAO. These recommendations provide the administration with a clear outline of the weaknesses of the agency and the opportunities to have a greater impact on safety.

However, while the reauthorization bill provides an opportunity for the FMCSA to gain new authorities, the Committee notes that the agency and the administration must not wait for the passage of this new law. This administration must address some outstanding issues left by the previous administration. Several rules, including the CDL rule, need to be issued. In addition, the administration also has the opportunity to revisit existing rules, such as the controversial hours-of-service regulations and the use of electronic on-board recorders.

It is clear that there is a lot of work to be done to strengthen the FMCSA and its oversight. However, the Committee does note that the agency has taken some steps to address improve its programs and policies. In particular, the agency is undergoing an organization and systems overhaul as part of the Comprehensive Safety Analysis [CSA] 2010. A pilot being conducted as part of this initiative has shown some promise and has provided some assurance to the NTSB that the agency is taking steps to improve the safety of motor carrier operations. Moreover, the agency's own Motor Carrier Safety Advisory Committee has provided numerous recommendations for how the agency can address the recommendations made by the OIG, the NTSB, and the GAO. The Committee believes that the FMCSA has the opportunity to generate further reductions in large truck fatalities this year by addressing its many outstanding recommendations, and expects the agency to seize this opportunity.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Limitation, 2009	\$234,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 (limitation)	239,828,000
House allowance	239,828,000
Committee recommendation	239,828,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of \$238,500,000 for FMCSA's Operations and Programs. The Committee has also provided the authority to liquidate an equal amount of contract authorization. The Committee has also appropriated \$1,328,000 from the General Fund. The recommendation is \$5,828,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

OPERATING EXPENSES

The Committee recommends \$183,051,000 for operating expenses. This level is \$5,551,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

Comprehensive Safety Analysis [CSA] 2010.—Over the past 5 years, the FMCSA has been undertaking comprehensive evaluation and overhaul of its systems and operations. The Comprehensive Safety Analysis [CSA] 2010 initiative is designed to improve the effectiveness of the agency's compliance and enforcement programs. The Committee strongly supports the agency's efforts to improve its programs, and remains focused on ensuring that CSA 2010 delivers the promised results.

The accompanying chart identifies the major milestones associated with the development and implementation of CSA 2010. The FMCSA has shown good progress in meeting the milestones for implementing this new system. The Committee also appreciates that the agency has taken steps to communicate to its partners and stakeholders the changes that CSA 2010 will bring. Since the FMCSA relies on its partners in the field to assist them in fulfilling its mission, continued communication with and training of its partners in the field will be critical to the success of this initiative.

The Committee notes that the FMCSA missed its target date for issuing its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking related to the safety fitness determination rating system. This rulemaking will be subject to great scrutiny, which is likely to require a significant amount of time, so delays in the rulemaking will delay the potential safety benefits of this new system. The Committee expects the FMCSA to meet its new target date of October 2009.

In the agency's report to the Committee, the FMCSA noted that the preliminary results of the test model for CSA 2010 have been encouraging. The test is slated to conclude in June 2010, with full

deployment at the end of 2010. As such, the Committee directs the FMCSA to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by March 15, 2010 regarding the results of phase I of the pilot and any preliminary results of phase II. The report should also include an update to the spend plan required in fiscal year 2009. In addition, the Committee requests that the GAO continue to monitor the implementation of CSA 2010. The GAO's review should include an assessment of the pilot being conducted as part of the initiative, as well as a review of FMCSA's ability to meet the milestones and cost estimates included in its spend plan.

CSA MILESTONES, 2008–2011

2008	2009	2010	2011
<p>August: Final report on measurement methodology (in review) SFD Final report (in review)</p> <p>September: Establish protocols for program evaluation data collection (in process) Define interventions for BASICS of: Driver Fitness Controlled Substances and Alcohol Improper Loading/Cargo Securement Crash History (in process) Develop policy, guidance and aids for interventions, Phase II (in process) Document intervention selection guidance for Phase II BASICS (in process) Deliver refined concept of operations for Phase II (incomplete) Deliver training for Phase II (in process) Initiate Phase II of operational model test (scheduled)</p> <p>November: Deliver final rulemaking support paper (complete)</p> <p>December: Annual public listening session/report-out (ongoing) Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (incomplete)</p>	<p>October: Coordinate with FMCSA Reauthorization Working Group (ongoing). Deliver final report of findings from analyses and evaluation (incomplete)¹.</p> <p>December: Annual public listening session/report-out (ongoing). Final rule (incomplete)</p>	<p>March: Deliver refined concept of operations for broader implementation (incomplete).</p> <p>June: Complete measurement system evaluation (incomplete). Modify Field Operations Training Manual (incomplete). Identify and summarize requirements for broader implementation (ongoing). Develop training materials for broader implementation (incomplete). Begin implementing CSA (approximate deadline, incomplete). Complete operational model test (approximate deadline, incomplete).</p> <p>December: Improve core program elements for operational model test (ongoing).</p>	<p>July: Complete quantitative analyses for program evaluation (incomplete)</p>

¹ Original completion date scheduled for November 2008.

High-risk Carriers.—In fiscal years 2008 and 2009, the Committee directed additional resources toward FMCSA’s effort to meet the requirement to conduct compliance reviews on all motor carriers that are identified as high risk. In addition, the Committee required quarterly reports on the agency’s ability to meet this requirement. Since the agency first began reporting to the Committee, the agency’s performance in meeting this requirement has increased significantly, from 69 percent to 86 percent. While the Committee is pleased with this progress, the Committee expects the agency to continue to make strides in order to fulfill this requirement.

Since the President’s budget is essentially baseline funding, the Committee has not redirected additional resources for this activity. However, the Committee expects that the additional \$500,000 requested for travel will fund additional compliance reviews on high-risk carriers. The Committee also directs the agency to continue to provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with quarterly reports on its ability to meet its requirement to evaluate high risk carriers.

ADA Compliance.—For several years, this Committee has pushed the FMCSA to enforce DOT’s own Americans with Disability Act [ADA] regulations for over-the-road curbside operators. It took the passage of a law by Congress to compel the agency to accept its responsibility to deny or revoke operating authority based on an operator’s inability or unwillingness to meeting DOT’s ADA regulations. However, to date the FMCSA has not taken any enforcement actions related to ADA noncompliance. The Committee once again directs the FMCSA to include information in its budget for fiscal year 2011 on enforcement actions the agency has taken, including the number of denials or revocations based on noncompliance with ADA regulations. The Committee expects the information to demonstrate that the FMCSA takes its responsibility to enforce DOT’s ADA regulations seriously.

PROGRAM EXPENSES

The Committee recommends \$56,777,000 for FMCSA’s program expenses. Funding is provided for the programs as follows:

	2009 enacted	2010 estimate	Committee recommendation
Research and Technology	\$8,500,000	\$8,543,000	\$8,500,000
Information Management	34,445,000	34,617,000	34,722,000
Regulatory Development	9,686,000	9,728,000	9,680,000
Outreach and Education	2,875,000	2,889,000	2,875,000
CMV Operations Grants	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

COMPASS.—The Creating Opportunities, Methods and Practices to Secure Safety [COMPASS] program was undertaken by the FMCSA to integrate the agency’s information technologies with its business practices and create a single source of safety data. In the agency’s report to the Committee, the FMCSA detailed the functionalities delivered by the system as well as the legacy systems that will be retired as the system becomes more robust.

The Committee believes that continued progress in this area is critical to the agency’s efforts to improve its systems and better

target the riskiest carriers. As such, the Committee directs the agency to submit an updated spend plan for the COMPASS by May 1, 2010.

Research and Technology Education.—In May 2009, the FMCSA submitted a plan to the Committee detailing its planned research and technology funding, as well as the safety benefits of that research. The Committee is pleased that the agency's efforts are aimed at safety technologies that promise to reduce fatalities and improve safety. However, it is unclear how quickly these technologies will be deployed by the industry. The Committee believes that, at a minimum, the FMCSA should be more aggressively sharing the safety benefits with the motor carrier industry and promoting these safety technologies. Therefore the Committee directs that the FMCSA use at least \$100,000 of the education and outreach budget to educate motor carrier operators on available safety technologies and promote those most likely to result in meaningful safety benefits.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2009	\$307,000,000	\$307,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	289,000,000	310,070,000
House allowance	310,070,000	310,070,000
Committee recommendation	310,070,000	310,070,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of \$310,070,000 for motor carrier safety grants. The recommended limitation is consistent with the budget estimate. The Committee has also provided the authority to liquidate an equal amount of contract authorization.

The Committee recommendation is \$3,070,000 more than the fiscal year 2008 enacted level. The Committee recommends a separate

limitation on obligations for each grant program funded under this account with the following funding allocations:

	Amount
Motor carrier safety assistance program [MCSAP]	\$212,070,000
Commercial driver's license and driver improvement program	25,000,000
Border enforcement grants	32,000,000
Performance and registration information system management [PRISM] grants	5,000,000
Commercial vehicle information systems and networks [CVISN] grants	25,000,000
Safety Data Improvement	3,000,000
CDLIS	8,000,000

PRISM.—In fiscal year 2008, the Committee directed the Government Accountability Office [GAO] to evaluate the extent to which the PRISM program has assisted States and the FMCSA in identifying and taking effective enforcement action against unsafe motor carriers. In addition, the Committee wanted the GAO to examine steps that could assist in fully implementing PRISM nationally. The GAO found that in the States where PRISM is being used to deny, revoke or suspend operating authority, the program has shown safety benefits. However, GAO also noted that the impact of its program is hard to measure, in part, because the program is not implemented nationally. The Committee recommendation includes funding for grants to implement PRISM. However, the Committee encourages the FMCSA to examine strategies that the agency can employ in order to ensure full implementation of PRISM nationally, including potential administrative or legislative changes.

The bill also rescinds \$1,530,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations acts.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

The bill rescinds \$3,400,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations acts.

NATIONAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY PROGRAM

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

The bill rescinds \$400,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations acts.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY
ADMINISTRATION

Section 135 subjects the funds in this act to section 350 of Public Law 107–87 in order to ensure the safety of all cross-border long haul operations conducted by Mexican-domiciled commercial carriers.

The Committee notes that the Congress acted earlier this year to suspend the Mexican trucking pilot program because of serious

and legitimate safety concerns, and expects that the administration will not commence another Mexican trucking pilot program until those concerns have been addressed and resolved. The Committee urges the administration to work expeditiously with the Mexican Government to establish a proposal to implement a cross-border trucking program that maintains the safety of our roads and highways and enhances the efficient movement of commerce.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

NHTSA's current programs are authorized in five major laws: (1) the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code); (2) the Highway Safety Act (chapter

4 of title 23, United States Code); (3) the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act [MVICSA] (part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code); (4) the National Driver Register Act of 1982; and (5) the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA-LU].

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

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$868,153,000 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA]. This total funding level includes both budget authority and limitations on the obligation of contract authority. This funding is \$925,000 more than the President's request and \$12,153,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations excluding rescissions:

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2009 enacted	2010 estimate	
Operations and Research	\$232,500,000	\$237,103,000	\$241,303,000
National Driver Register	4,000,000	4,078,000	7,350,000
Highway Traffic Safety Grants	619,500,000	626,047,000	619,500,000
Total	856,000,000	867,228,000	868,153,000

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2009	\$232,500,000
Budget estimate, 2010	237,103,000
House allowance	240,628,000
Committee recommendation	241,303,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

These programs support traffic safety programs and related research, demonstrations, technical assistance, and national leadership for highway safety programs conducted by State and local government, the private sector, universities, research units, and various safety associations and organizations. These highway safety programs emphasize alcohol and drug countermeasures, vehicle oc-

cupant protection, traffic law enforcement, emergency medical and trauma care systems, traffic records and licensing, State and community traffic safety evaluations, motorcycle riders, pedestrian and bicycle safety, pupil transportation, distracted and drowsy driving, young and older driver safety programs, and development of improved accident investigation procedures.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has provided \$241,303,000 for Operations and Research. This level is \$4,200,000 more than the budget request and \$8,803,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Of the total amount recommended for Operations and Research, \$135,803,000 is derived from the General Fund and \$105,500,000 is derived from the Highway Trust Fund.

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

In 2008, NHTSA partnered with leading automobile manufacturers in the Automotive Coalition for Traffic Safety [ACTS] to develop alcohol detection technologies that could be installed in a vehicle to prevent drunk driving. These technologies need to be non-intrusive in order to achieve greater acceptance by the general public. The development of advanced alcohol detection technologies is one of the key components of the Campaign to Eliminate Drunk Driving, which has brought together Mothers Against Drunk Driving [MADD], major leading auto manufacturers, law enforcement, and other stakeholders with the goal of eliminating drunk driving. To date, NHTSA and ACTS have developed preliminary device specifications, performed a rigorous technical review of candidate technologies, and initiated proof-of-concept research to investigate those technologies that hold the most promise.

The Committee recommends \$1,500,000 to support this work. This funding level is \$500,000 more than the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Of the total recommended funding, \$500,000 is for research by ACTS on public acceptability of advanced detection technologies. Because the success of the effort depends on its acceptance by the general public, this issue must be addressed as soon as possible.

National Emergency Medical Services [EMS] Information System.—Although there are national databases to support police and fire services, there has been no similar national repository for data on emergency medical services [EMS]. EMS systems vary in their ability to collect and use data in order to improve emergency medical response and patient care. The National Emergency Medical Services Information System [NEMSIS] is designed to reduce post-crash death and disability by developing a better understanding of current EMS response and performance so that scarce resources can be efficiently allocated to critical training, equipment, planning and other needs that best improve patient outcomes.

The Committee recommends a funding level of \$2,250,000 for the full implementation of a National Emergency Medical Services Information System. The recommended funding level is \$1,500,000 more than the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Alternative Fuels Research.—The recommended funding level includes \$10,000,000 for research into the safety of vehicles that use alternative fuels. This funding level is \$9,000,000 more than the budget request and \$9,850,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. This research is an important step in ensuring that vehicles powered by alternative sources of energy do not compromise our safety.

The funding provided for alternative fuels research shall be used to initiate development of full-scale vehicle crash test procedures and selection of suitable performance criteria to quantify potential failures and resulting unsafe conditions; to initiate research on the safety of emerging battery technologies, particularly lithium ion, used in hybridized fuel cell, ICE, and plug-in electric vehicles; to continue research on vehicle fuel system performance, including determination of appropriate leakage limits based on fire safety research, and develop test procedures to monitor post-crash electrical isolation of the high-voltage propulsion system; and to analyze the results from the fuel system storage component testing and evaluate the safe storage of hydrogen through cumulative life-cycle durability, crash, and fire exposure testing.

Motorcycle Fatalities.—The Committee continues to believe that States have the right to decide their own laws, but that the Nation's chief transportation official must have the authority to advocate on behalf of the enactment of safety laws by those States. For this reason, the Committee continues to recommend bill language that removes, for fiscal year 2010, the restriction on the Secretary's ability to go to States and advocate on behalf of motorcycle helmet laws.

Teen Drivers.—The Committee strongly believes that NHTSA must continue to vigorously pursue strategies to reduce impaired and dangerous driving among age groups that represent the highest risks. According to NHTSA, motor vehicle crashes are the leading cause of death for 15- to 20-year olds; they are involved in three times as many fatal crashes as all other drivers. Recognizing that teenage and young adult drivers are at enhanced risk of being involved in an alcohol-related fatal crash, the Committee applauds NHTSA's ongoing collaboration with Students Against Destructive Decisions [SADD] and other national organizations focused on reducing underage drinking and promoting positive decision-making among young people. The Committee encourages NHTSA to continue to seek ways to enlist youth in addressing the behaviors that place youth at risk in motor vehicles. NHTSA is also encouraged to support research and create programs to directly address and improve teen driving safety.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2009	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	4,078,000	4,078,000
House allowance	4,000,000	4,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,000,000	4,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The Committee recommends a liquidation of contract authorization of \$4,000,000 for payment on obligations incurred in carryout provisions of the National Driver Register Act. The recommended liquidating cash appropriation is \$78,000 less than the budget estimate and equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of \$4,000,000 for the National Driver Register. The recommended limitation is \$78,000 less than the budget request and equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER MODERNIZATION

Appropriations, 2009
Budget estimate, 2010
House allowance	\$3,350,000
Committee recommendation	3,350,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,350,000 for the modernization of the National Driver Register. The administration requested no appropriation for this activity for fiscal year 2010, and no funds were provided for this activity in fiscal year 2009. However, the cost of the modernization will exceed the original cost estimated by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and an additional appropriation is necessary for fiscal year 2010 in order to allow the agency to modernize the system while continuing to operate the existing database.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

	Liquidation of contract authorization	Limitation on obligations
Appropriations, 2009	\$619,500,000	\$619,500,000
Budget estimate, 2010	626,047,000	626,047,000
House allowance	619,500,000	619,500,000
Committee recommendation	619,500,000	619,500,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on obligations of \$619,500,000 for the highway traffic safety grant programs funded under this heading. The recommended limitation is \$6,547,000 less than the budget estimate and equal to fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee has also provided the authority to liquidate an equal amount of contract authorization.

The Committee continues to recommend prohibiting the use of section 402 funds for construction, rehabilitation or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local, or private buildings or structures.

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

	Amount
Highway Safety Programs (section 402)	\$235,000,000
Occupant Protection Incentive Grants (section 405)	25,000,000
Safety Belt Performance Grants (section 406)	124,500,000
State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements Grants (section 408)	34,500,000
Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grants (section 410)	139,000,000
Motorcyclist Safety Grants (section 2010)	7,000,000
Child Safety and Child Booster Seat Safety Incentive Grants (section 2011)	7,000,000
High Visibility Enforcement Program (section 2009)	29,000,000
Administrative Expenses	18,500,000

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

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

Section 141 exempts obligation authority made available in previous Public Laws for multiple years from limitations on obligations for the current year.

Section 142 rescinds \$2,299,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under the heading “Operations and Research” in prior appropriations acts.

Section 143 rescinds \$14,004,000 in unobligated balances from amounts made available under the heading “Highway Traffic Safety Grants” in prior appropriations acts.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

The Federal Railroad Administration [FRA] became an operating administration within the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967. It incorporated the Bureau of Railroad Safety from the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation from the Department of Commerce, and the Alaska Railroad from the Department of the Interior. The Federal Railroad Administration is responsible for planning, developing, and administering programs to achieve safe operating and mechanical prac-

tices in the railroad industry. Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) and other financial assistance programs to rehabilitate and improve the railroad industry's physical infrastructure are also administered by the Federal Railroad Administration.

SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2009	\$159,445,000
Budget estimate, 2010	168,770,000
House allowance	172,533,000
Committee recommendation	171,770,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$171,770,000 for Safety and Operations for fiscal year 2009, which is \$3,000,000 more than the budget request and \$12,325,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Of this amount the bill specifies that, \$12,300,000 remains available until expended.

Next Generation Corridor Equipment Pool Committee.—The Committee recommendation includes \$3,000,000 for grants to Amtrak and States for participation in the Next Generation Corridor Equipment Pool Committee that was authorized under section 305 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act. In addition to supporting an alternative mode of transportation, the investments being made in intercity and high-speed rail have the potential to support a domestic industry for manufacturing rail equipment. The Next Generation Corridor Equipment Pool Committee is a mechanism by which projects and corridors being developed across the country can coordinate on rail equipment standards and orders so that a domestic industry will be able to respond.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2009	\$33,950,000
Budget estimate, 2010	34,145,000
House allowance	37,145,000
Committee recommendation	34,145,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$34,145,000 for railroad research and development, which is equal to the budget request and \$195,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Within the amount provided, the Committee recommends:

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Project name	Committee recommendation
Caltrain—Positive Train Control, CA	\$500,000
Constructed Facilities Center, West Virginia University, WV	250,000
Metrolink—Positive Train Control, CA	500,000
PEERS Rail Grade Crossing Safety, Statewide, IL	500,000

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING PROGRAM

The Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing [RRIF] program was established by Public Law 109–178 to provide direct loans and loan guarantees to State and local governments, Government-sponsored entities, or railroads. Credit assistance under the program may be used for rehabilitating or developing rail equipment and facilities. No Federal appropriation is required to implement the program because a non-Federal partner may contribute the subsidy amount required by the Credit Reform Act of 1990 in the form of a credit risk premium.

The Committee continues bill language specifying that no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments may be made using Federal funds for the payment of any credit premium amount during fiscal year 2010.

RAIL LINE RELOCATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009	\$25,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	40,000,000
Committee recommendation	25,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under the Rail Line Relocation and Improvement program, the Federal Railroad Administration provides grants to States to fund the relocation and improvement of railroad lines. In awarding these grants, the FRA takes into consideration the effect that the proposed railroad project will have on freight and passenger operations, as well as the effect it will have on motor vehicle and pedestrian traffic and safety, community quality of life, and area commerce.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$25,000,000 for the Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program, which is equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The administration requested no appropriation for this program for fiscal year 2010.

Within the total funding available to the program for fiscal year 2010, funds are to be made available to the following projects and activities:

RAIL LINE RELOCATION

Project name	Committee recommendation
Grade Crossing Mitigation, Galesburg, IL	\$3,000,000
Port of Alexandria Rail Spur, City of Alexandria, LA	500,000

RAIL LINE RELOCATION—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Shelby Intermodal Hub, MT	1,000,000
Southern Rail Corridor, MN	600,000
Waterfront Rail Reconstruction Project: Kawasaki SWIMO, NY	800,000
West Freight Access Project, WA	3,000,000

RAILROAD SAFETY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009	\$25,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the appropriation of \$50,000,000 for the Railroad Safety Technology Program for fiscal year 2010. This program was not funded for fiscal year 2009, and the administration requested no funding for this program for fiscal year 2010.

This past fall, two trains collided in Chatsworth, California, killing 25 people and injuring another 135 people. The accident turned the Nation's attention to rail safety and the possibility that new technologies, such as positive train control, could help prevent such accidents in the future. By providing grants to railroads, railroad suppliers, and State and local governments, the Railroad Safety Technology Program will support the deployment of such rail safety technology.

The bill includes language that would allow applicants to be eligible for funding provided under the Rail Safety Technology Program even if they have not yet completed all of the planning documents required under the Rail Safety Improvement Act. The Committee is providing this waiver for this first year of funding for the program, but the Committee directs the FRA to provide priority

consideration to those entities that have completed all of its reporting requirements.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK)

The National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) operates intercity passenger rail services in 46 States and the District of Columbia, in addition to serving as a contractor in various capacities for several commuter rail agencies. Congress created Amtrak in the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–518) in response to private carriers’ inability to profitably operate intercity passenger rail service. Thereafter, Amtrak assumed the common carrier obligations of the private railroads in exchange for the right to priority access of their tracks for incremental cost.

OPERATING GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2009	\$550,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	572,348,000
House allowance	553,348,000
Committee recommendation	553,348,000

The Committee provides \$553,348,000 for operating grants for Amtrak. The operating grant provides a subsidy to account for the difference between Amtrak’s self-generated operating revenues and its total operating costs. The amount provided is \$19,000,000 less than the President’s request and \$3,348,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Both the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2010 and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level included funding for the Amtrak Office of Inspector General within the funding provided for operating grants to Amtrak. This year, however, the Committee has provided funding for the Amtrak Office of Inspector General separately. After taking into account this change in accounting, the Committee recommendation is equal to the funding that would be provided to Amtrak for operating expenses under President’s budget request, and it is \$21,848,000 more than the funding that was provided to Amtrak for operating expenses under the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

Supporting the Amtrak Office of Inspector General.—The Committee is appalled by the failure of Amtrak and its Inspector General to maintain even the semblance of a working, professional relationship. Amtrak’s former Inspector General has recently retired from his position, and details about his retirement, as well as the conduct of Amtrak and its legal department are currently the subject of investigation. In the meantime, Amtrak has appointed an interim Inspector General while it looks for a permanent replacement.

The Committee understands that Amtrak and its interim Inspector General will be working together to develop a set of policies and procedures that will act as the foundation for a more productive relationship going forward. The Amtrak Board of Directors passed a resolution to support this effort, and included in its resolution some flexibility so that future Inspectors General at Amtrak can make changes to the policies and procedures.

While these actions may be necessary steps to take, the Committee cannot feel confident that they will result in a fully independent and effective Amtrak Inspector General unless an outside observer can monitor the developments. For this reason, the bill includes language that requires two separate analyses by a member of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency [CIGIE]. This council consists of Inspectors General from across the Federal Government, and its mission is to address issues of integrity, economy and effectiveness that transcend individual Government agencies and to increase the professionalism and effectiveness of the Inspector General workforce.

First, the bill requires a member of CIGIE to review the policies and practices that Amtrak and its interim Inspector General develop as the basis for its ongoing relationship. In order for Amtrak to receive its operating grants for the third and second quarter of fiscal year 2010, the member of CIGIE must determine that these policies and procedures are consistent with the letter and the spirit of the Inspector General Act of 1978.

One year later, another member of CIGIE must evaluate the operational independence of the Amtrak Inspector General. This second review is necessary to ensure that the new policies and procedures have resulted in an actual change in the relationship between Amtrak and its Inspector General. The new policies and procedures will be meaningless and without any value if the Amtrak Inspector General cannot act effectively and independently from Amtrak.

The bill requires Amtrak to reimburse CIGIE members for all costs associated with the conduct of their work. The Committee expects that the Amtrak Board of Directors, President, and all of its offices will fully cooperate with these two reviews, and that any unreasonable impairments or untimely responses from Amtrak employees or management will be considered as evidence of impairments to the ability of an Inspector General to attain operational independence from Amtrak.

Finally, the Committee notes that Amtrak has had a policy of inviting the Department of Transportation Inspector General and his representatives to the meetings of its Board of Directors. The Committee expects Amtrak to continue allowing the DOT Inspector General and his employees to attend these meetings and to continue making board materials available to them. The Committee places great value on the work of the DOT Inspector General, and expects Amtrak to maintain a professional relationship with him and his office.

Reporting Requirements.—Last year, the Committee had included report language that required Amtrak to submit budget justifications in similar format and substance to the justifications submitted by Government agencies. Amtrak has still not submitted a budget justification, and so the Committee has included bill language that requires Amtrak to submit the budget justifications concurrent with the submission of the President's budget request.

The bill also continues to include language requiring Amtrak to submit a business and long-term financial plan 60 days after the enactment of the bill. This requirement is consistent with the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act, but includes instruc-

tions to provide a separate accounting of ridership, revenues, and expenses of the Northeast Corridor, commuter service, long-distance service, State-supported service, each intercity train route, and commercial activities. In addition, the bill includes language requiring Amtrak to submit a plan for achieving operational savings, and requiring the DOT Inspector General to report on actual savings achieved through these efforts.

Improved Customer Service.—In an effort to reduce Amtrak’s operating costs, the Committee provides \$5,000,000 and directs Amtrak to deploy and study the use of human emulation technology to improve customer service over the telephone and online, and to provide consumers with feedback using voice, text, and page navigation. Such technology shall only be derived on a competitive basis from domestic sources. Within 24 months, Amtrak shall provide a comprehensive report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations an evaluation of the impact of the utilization of such technology in achieving cost savings, and improving customer service and overall utilization.

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD
PASSENGER CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2009	\$940,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	929,625,000
House allowance	929,625,000
Committee recommendation	1,001,625,000

The Committee recommends \$1,001,625,000 for capital and debt service grants for Amtrak. Of this amount, not more than \$264,000,000 shall be available for debt service payments. The amount provided is \$72,000,000 more than the budget request and \$61,625,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The bill language includes a requirement that Amtrak submit a comprehensive fleet plan. The fleet plan must be submitted at the same time Amtrak submits its comprehensive business plan, which is required by current law to be submitted to the Committee no later than 60 days following enactment of the annual appropriations act.

Compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act.—The Committee believes that compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] is essential to ensuring that all people have equal access to transportation services. For this reason, the Committee has included bill language that requires Amtrak to invest \$144,000,000 in capital projects that will bring the facilities of the railroad into compliance with the ADA. This investment level for ADA compliance is consistent with the needs identified by Amtrak for fiscal year 2010. The Committee, however, does not grant Amtrak’s request to include bill language that would provide Amtrak with an extension on the deadline to comply with ADA.

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

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$8,090,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	1,000,000,000
House allowance	4,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,200,000,000

¹Of the funding provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$8,000,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the appropriation of \$1,200,000,000 for grants to support intercity rail service and high speed rail corridors. The recommended funding level is \$200,000,000 more than the budget request. It is also \$6,890,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level including the funding provided as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, but \$1,110,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level excluding such funding.

This Committee provided \$120,000,000 over the fiscal year 2008–2009 period to support capital investments in passenger rail service. This effort saw a significant boost with the enactment of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which included the appropriation of \$8,000,000,000 for continued support of intercity passenger rail and for new investments in the building of high speed rail in the United States. The funding recommended by the Committee will build on these investments in order to continue supporting individual projects that improve intercity passenger rail across the country, as well to create a new system of high speed rail corridors.

FRA's Strategy for High-speed Rail.—The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act included language that required FRA to complete a strategic plan describing how the agency would invest the funds provided in the act to improve and deploy high-speed passenger rail systems. In response to this requirement, the Department published “A Vision for High Speed Rail in America” in April of this year. However, the report lacked detail, and few details have been offered since that time either in program guidance or in the budget justifications for fiscal year 2010.

The Committee continues to be concerned that investments in intercity and high-speed rail will not be put to their best use unless FRA can articulate a more developed strategy for railroad investments. For this reason, the Committee has included language in the bill which prohibits FRA from awarding grants until the agency has completed a national rail plan as required under the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act. The Committee also directs

FRA to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report which describes how the investments made with funding provided in the bill will contribute to furthering the national rail plan. This report shall include a discussion of what actions FRA is taking to establish standards for high-speed rail corridors and how the agency will prioritize funding for corridors across the country. These standards shall address such issues as expected ridership, project cost, public benefits (including benefits to nonriders resulting from reductions in congestion), trip time, frequency of service, reliability, and safety. FRA shall submit this report no later than 180 days after enactment of the act.

High-speed Rail Research.—The bill includes a provision that allows the FRA to retain \$50,000,000 of the intercity and high-speed rail funding for research and demonstration activities that will support the development of high-speed rail, including the engineering and development of high-speed rail locomotives.

High-speed Rail and Rail Car Accessibility.—The Committee believes that the pursuit of high speed rail in the United States will require the FRA and its partners to think about the contribution that rapid passenger boarding and alighting makes to keeping trains on schedule. In order to create a system around efficiency and speed, all people—regardless of ability, age, or size—must be able to safely and quickly enter and exit the rail cars. The smooth flow of passengers reduces dwell time at stations, improving overall travel times. The Committee encourages the FRA to coordinate with the Access Board, and to take advantage of the expertise at the Board, in order to develop an approach for working with grantees of intercity and high-speed rail funding on issues of accessibility.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

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

Section 152 permanently prohibits funds for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation from being available if the Corporation contracts for services at or from any location outside of the United States which were, as of July 1, 2006, performed by a full-time or part-time Amtrak employee within the United States.

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

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

Section 155 clarifies funding made available for a previously funded project.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

The Federal Transit Administration was established as a component of the Department of Transportation by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, effective July 1, 1968, which transferred most of the functions and programs under the Federal Transit Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 302; 49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The missions of the Fed-

eral Transit Administration are: to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods; to encourage the planning and establishment of urban and rural transportation services needed for economical and desirable development; to provide mobility for transit dependents in both metropolitan and rural areas; to maximize the productivity and efficiency of transportation systems; and to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such services and systems.

The most recent authorization for transit programs was contained in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users [SAFETEA-LU]. Although these programs are currently set to expire before the beginning of fiscal year 2010, the Committee must forward its recommendations with the assumption that the programs will be extended under their current structure until the enactment of a full reauthorization package.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations compared to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and the administration's request, excluding rescissions and funding provided through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act:

Program	Fiscal year		Committee recommendation
	2009 enacted	2010 estimate	
Administrative Expenses	\$94,413,000	\$97,478,000	\$97,478,000
Formula and bus grants (trust fund)	8,260,565,000	5,000,000,000	8,343,171,000
Formula and bus grants (general fund)		3,343,171,000	
Research and University Research Centers	67,000,000	67,670,000	67,670,000
Capital investment grants	1,809,250,000	1,827,343,000	2,307,343,000
Grants for energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reductions			100,000,000
Grants to WMATA			150,000,000
Total	10,231,228,000	10,335,662,000	11,065,662,000

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009	\$94,413,000
Budget estimate, 2010	97,478,000
House allowance	97,478,000
Committee recommendation	97,478,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total of \$97,478,000 for the agency's salaries and administrative expenses. The recommended level of funding is equal to the budget request and \$3,065,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The bill limits travel expenses to \$1,809,000.

The Committee recommendation includes language authorizing the Administrator to transfer funding between offices. Any transfers totaling more than 5 percent of the initial appropriation from

this account must be approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations through the usual reprogramming process. The bill also includes a provision requiring FTA to provide \$75,000 to the DOT Office of Inspector General on a reimbursable basis for costs associated with audits of FTA's financial statements.

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

Full Funding Grant Agreements [FFGAs].—SAFETEA-LU, as amended, requires that FTA notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, as well as the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Senate Committee on Banking, 60 days before executing a full funding grant agreement. In its notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Committee directs FTA to submit the following information: (1) a copy of the proposed full funding grant agreement; (2) the total and annual Federal appropriations required for the project; (3) the yearly and total Federal appropriations that can be planned or anticipated for future FFGAs for each fiscal year through 2012; (4) a detailed analysis of annual commitments for current and anticipated FFGAs against the program authorization, by individual project; (5) an evaluation of whether the alternatives analysis made by the applicant fully assessed all the viable alternatives; (6) a financial analysis of the project's cost and sponsor's ability to finance the project, which shall be conducted by an independent examiner and which shall include an assessment of the capital cost estimate and finance plan; (7) the source and security of all public and private sector financing; (8) the project's operating plan, which enumerates the project's future revenue and ridership forecasts; and (9) a listing of all planned contingencies and possible risks associated with the project.

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

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

FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

	Obligation limitation (trust fund)	Budget authority (general fund)
Appropriations, 2009	\$8,260,565,000	¹ \$7,550,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	5,000,000,000	3,343,171,000
House allowance	8,343,171,000
Committee recommendation	8,343,171,000

¹The budget authority provided for this program for fiscal year 2009 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends limiting obligations in the transit formula and bus grants account in fiscal year 2010 to \$8,343,171,000. The recommendation is equal to the total level of funding requested by the President, including both obligation limitation and budget authority. The recommendation is also \$82,606,000 more than the obligation limitation enacted for fiscal year 2009, but \$7,467,394,000 less than the total level of funding enacted for fiscal year 2009, including both obligation limitation and budget authority provided as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

The Committee recommends \$9,400,000,000 in authority to liquidate contract authorizations. This amount is sufficient to cover outstanding obligations from this account.

The following table displays the distribution of obligation limitation among the program categories of formula and bus grants:

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

Program category	Amount
Clean Fuels Program	\$61,500,000
Over-the-Road Bus Accessibility Program	10,800,000
Urban Area Formula Grants	4,757,130,662
Bus and Bus Facilities	584,000,000
Fixed Guideway Modernization	1,756,134,569
Planning Programs	113,500,000

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

Program category	Amount
Elderly and Persons with Disabilities	140,680,447
Nonurbanized Area Formula	607,025,922
Job Access and Reverse Commute	164,500,000
New Freedom	92,500,000
National Transit Database	3,500,000
Alternatives Analysis	25,000,000
Alternative Transportation in Parks and Park Lands	26,900,000

The following table displays the State-by-State distribution of funds for several of the major program categories in the formula and bus grants account:

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION ESTIMATED FISCAL YEAR 2010 APPORTIONMENTS FOR FORMULA GRANTS PROGRAMS BY STATE

State name	Section 5307 and 5340 urbanized area	Section 5311 and 5340 nonurbanized area	Section 5309 fixed guideway modernization	Section 5310 special needs for elderly and individuals with disabilities	Section 5316 job access and reverse commute	Section 5317 new freedom	Section 5303 and 5304 metropolitan and State planning	State total
Alabama	\$20,213,562	\$13,394,488.00		\$2,339,837	\$3,090,329	\$1,120,324	\$900,701	\$41,059,241
Alaska	24,879,026	6,108,165.00	\$19,022,282	300,165	318,768	51,391	475,957	51,155,754
American Samoa		228,964.00		65,326	199,894	9,015		503,199
Arizona	65,287,784	9,567,312.00	3,864,024	2,446,061	3,480,888	1,697,035	2,262,406	88,605,510
Arkansas	10,124,395	10,214,755.00		1,499,654	1,950,951	919,691	475,957	25,185,403
California	745,701,826	22,912,737.00	235,408,217	14,350,398	22,035,585	11,834,136	17,727,252	1,069,970,151
Colorado	70,589,820	8,421,190.00	8,506,099	1,697,357	1,788,947	517,736	1,722,703	93,243,852
Connecticut	81,538,411	2,726,657.00	48,138,102	1,649,708	1,110,772	1,266,165	1,321,732	137,751,547
Delaware	12,004,430	1,274,371.00	335,004	471,361	337,635	249,118	475,957	15,147,876
District of Columbia	84,901,052	110,761,784	110,761,784	404,591	461,149	284,210	475,957	197,288,743
Florida	223,007,054	28,640,963	28,640,963	9,148,699	9,107,977	6,382,258	7,460,040	297,477,971
Georgia	84,378,259	17,327,132.00	37,257,533	3,422,569	4,787,617	2,845,572	2,913,287	152,931,969
Guam		618,879.00		173,959	200,162	26,300		1,019,300
Hawaii	31,322,153	1,979,881.00	2,158,724	658,453	624,490	348,365	475,957	37,568,023
Idaho	7,479,772	5,892,091.00		627,494	692,492	381,374	475,957	15,549,180
Illinois	268,074,939	14,293,876.00	178,230,666	5,292,091	6,117,369	4,181,489	6,167,927	482,358,357
Indiana	46,212,928	13,712,175.00	1,164,584	2,778,259	2,650,633	1,909,101	1,749,168	70,176,848
Iowa	17,391,413	10,222,636.00		1,425,202	1,244,420	787,995	517,252	31,588,918
Kansas	12,804,508	9,476,687.00		1,276,005	1,379,494	690,659	595,605	26,222,958
Kentucky	23,668,773	12,959,093.00		2,155,887	3,148,759	1,223,164	749,060	43,904,736
Louisiana	37,288,639	10,301,019.00	3,707,416	2,146,338	3,585,259	1,602,438	1,178,685	59,809,794
Maine	4,594,781	5,469,706.00		744,950	641,078	376,757	475,957	12,303,229
Maryland	117,500,479	5,012,969.00	38,676,624	2,282,950	1,999,401	1,816,135	2,527,808	169,816,366
Massachusetts	189,474,873	3,522,665.00	94,340,035	3,036,361	2,645,268	2,262,272	3,320,154	298,601,628
Michigan	83,949,361	17,397,135.00	854,599	4,399,718	4,695,728	3,342,246	3,736,057	118,374,844
Minnesota	57,082,751	12,836,943.00	12,549,519	2,010,302	2,009,700	1,144,663	1,585,200	89,219,078
Mississippi	6,263,948	11,639,943.00		1,503,983	2,801,452	820,334	475,957	23,505,617
Missouri	48,606,808	13,965,008.00	8,920,316	2,652,610	3,347,618	1,628,870	1,694,134	80,815,364
Montana	3,297,981	7,590,831.00		519,202	578,848	257,565	475,957	12,720,384
N. Mariana Islands	814,277	35,248.00		66,707	113,722	67,183		1,097,137
Nebraska	10,297,728	6,610,842.00		841,304	962,233	372,186	475,957	19,560,250
Nevada	32,016,176	4,946,829.00		1,031,854	1,086,027	653,071	851,813	40,585,770
New Hampshire	6,374,116	3,521,848.00		630,660	301,296	447,685	475,957	11,751,562
New Jersey	328,206,518	3,265,835.00	114,373,118	3,866,374	3,392,366	2,934,441	5,121,895	461,160,547

New Mexico	12,111,890	8,255,401.00	468,274,315	930,474	1,582,267	540,563	475,957	23,876,552
New York	715,662,513	17,714,351.00	263,910	9,188,559	12,311,541	6,723,242	9,832,202	1,239,706,723
North Carolina	53,394,450	22,328,998.00	3,829,837	4,695,662	2,628,026	1,745,007	88,885,890
North Dakota	4,621,308	4,008,716.00	407,148	306,052	180,401	475,957	9,999,582
Ohio	104,731,293	20,134,534.00	21,186,113	5,147,676	5,742,652	3,337,778	3,705,011	163,985,057
Oklahoma	16,900,303	11,415,670.00	1,170,868	2,688,662	979,959	688,393	34,423,855
Oregon	45,714,306	9,863,193.00	11,449,525	1,640,392	1,972,394	948,642	1,029,544	72,617,996
Pennsylvania	181,099,471	20,385,324.00	138,005,589	6,079,291	6,298,813	4,073,469	4,665,229	360,607,186
Puerto Rico	50,930,333	1,416,733.00	3,211,097	2,061,500	5,369,482	1,650,241	1,899,629	66,539,015
Rhode Island	21,499,575	583,720.00	3,360,031	638,485	586,741	351,953	488,517	27,509,022
South Carolina	19,320,533	11,221,693.00	2,036,514	2,609,163	1,362,072	869,434	37,419,409
South Dakota	2,981,037	4,965,203.00	450,566	459,148	201,400	475,957	9,533,311
Tennessee	39,062,706	14,291,778.00	710,198	2,844,058	3,637,095	1,883,718	1,375,601	63,805,154
Texas	246,471,043	34,161,310.00	23,238,865	8,510,140	14,032,530	6,876,194	8,347,600	341,637,682
Utah	39,285,354	4,886,639.00	3,356,325	834,940	1,092,747	529,542	811,092	50,796,639
Vermont	1,810,687	2,649,400.00	382,388	295,370	152,284	475,957	5,766,086
Virgin Islands	982,640	164,152	200,962	18,173	1,365,927
Virginia	72,676,347	12,527,146.00	1,663,503	3,000,334	3,175,759	2,179,529	2,594,020	97,816,638
Washington	124,542,764	9,646,633.00	41,839,080	2,549,491	2,655,109	1,918,356	2,424,769	185,576,202
West Virginia	6,922,834	6,780,388.00	1,485,163	1,126,635	1,312,776	699,061	475,957	18,802,814
Wisconsin	48,332,695	13,583,199.00	1,380,027	2,326,894	2,016,776	1,607,534	1,391,629	70,638,754
Wyoming	1,765,685	4,695,756.00	324,094	294,972	131,919	475,957	7,648,383
Subtotal	4,566,168,307	516,694,675	1,666,333,350	134,160,825	166,145,000	93,425,000	114,061,825	7,256,988,982
Oversight	31,514,768	2,348,250	16,831,650	674,175	573,175	51,942,018
Total	4,597,683,075	519,042,925	1,683,165,000	134,835,000	166,145,000	93,425,000	114,635,000	7,308,931,000
Tribal Transit Program	15,150,000	15,150,000
RTAP	9,393,000	9,393,000
Grand Total	4,597,683,075	543,585,925	1,683,165,000	134,835,000	166,145,000	93,425,000	114,635,000	7,333,474,000

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

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES

Project name	Committee recommendation
40' Fixed Route Transit Buses, DE	\$1,000,000
ACE Boulder Highway Rapid Transit Project, NV	750,000
Albany Transit Multimodal Transportation Center, GA	1,500,000
Automotive-Based Fuel Cell Hybrid Bus Program, DE	500,000
Benzie Transportation Authority Bus and Bus Facilities, Honor, MI	1,000,000
Bridgeport Intermodal Transportation Center, CT	2,500,000
Cache Valley Transit District Expansion, UT	2,000,000
Capital Metro—Bus and Bus Facilities, TX	2,000,000
Cedar Avenue Bus Rapid Transit, Phase I, Dakota County, MN	700,000
Chittenden County Transportation Authority Buses, Equipment, and Facilities, Including Downtown Burlington Transit Center Design, VT	2,000,000
City of Dinuba CNG Fueling Station Expansion, CA	800,000
Colorado Transit Coalition Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, CO	2,500,000
Continue the Port of Anchorage Intermodal Expansion Project, AK	500,000
Coralville Intermodal Facility, Coralville, IA	750,000
C-TRAN Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	1,900,000
Deerfield Valley Transit Association Facilities, Buses, and Equipment, VT	600,000
City of Imperial Downtown Transportation Park, CA	1,000,000
Electric Hybrid Bus Upgrade Grants, IN	2,400,000
Great Falls Transit District Bus Replacement, MT	1,000,000
Harbor Point Bus Expansion, CT	500,000
Harrison County Multimodal, MS	2,000,000
Hobbs Transit Intermodal Facility, NM	800,000
Idaho Transit Coalition Bus and Bus Facilities, ID	1,000,000
Intercity Vehicle Acquisition, WA	1,800,000
Jamaica Intermodal Station Plaza, NY	600,000
JATRAM Fleet Replacement, MS	500,000
KCATA Bus Replacement, MO	2,000,000
Link Transit Vehicle Acquisition, WA	2,300,000
Illinois Downstate Bus and Bus Facilities, IL	4,000,000
Lufkin VA Clinic Shuttle, TX	300,000
LYNX Buses, Orlando, FL	1,500,000
Marble Valley Regional Transit District Buses, Facilities, and Equipment, VT	1,500,000
MARTA Acquisition of Clean Fuel Buses, GA	4,000,000
Metro St. Louis—Downtown Transfer Center, MO	1,150,000
Newark Penn Station Intermodal Improvements, NJ	2,000,000
North Dakota Statewide Transit, ND	1,500,000
Northstar Phase II Commuter Buses, MN	100,000
Pierce Transit Diesel—Electric Bus Acquisition, WA	1,300,000
Purchase Hybrid Buses, Lehigh and Northampton Transportation Authority [LANTA], PA	500,000
Reconstruction of the University Circle Rapid Station, OH	2,000,000
Rural Bus Program for Hawaii, Maui and Kauai, HI	3,500,000
Senior Transportation Program, AL	2,000,000
Spokane Transit Diesel-Electric Hybrid Bus Acquisition, WA	1,300,000
State of Arkansas—Bus and Bus Facilities for Urban, Rural, and Elderly and Disabled Agencies, AR	500,000
Staten Island Ferry Campus Shuttle Bus Service, NY	260,000
Statewide (Rural and Urban) Bus and Bus Facilities, KS	2,000,000
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities for Commuter Choice, NM	2,000,000
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, IA	3,450,000
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, MO	2,000,000
Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, SD	500,000
Statewide Bus Replacement, RI	500,000
Tacoma Intermodal Transit Center, WA	1,000,000
Tennessee Statewide Bus Program, TN	6,000,000
The Clean and Green Bus Replacements Initiative, OH	500,000
The Rapid, Wealthy Street Operations Center Expansion Project, Grand Rapids, MI	2,000,000
Thompsonville Intermodal Transportation Center, CT	1,000,000
Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky Bus Replacement Project, KY	1,600,000

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES—Continued

Project name	Committee recommendation
Transit Maintenance Garage Initiative, IA	700,000
Transit Vehicle and Related Equipment, MO	1,000,000
Washoe County Bus and Bus Facilities, NV	500,000
Western Kentucky University Shuttle Bus Improvement Project, KY	1,075,000
Whatcom Transportation Authority Fleet Replacement Project, WA	1,000,000
Wisconsin Bus Capital on Behalf of Transit Agencies Statewide, WI	3,000,000
Silverton Senior and Disabled Transportation Service, OR	39,429

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

ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Project name	Committee recommendation
Naval Station Norfolk/Virginia Beach Light Rail Study, VA	\$1,000,000
C-TRAN High Capacity Transit—WA	1,750,000
New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Line Improvements, CT	4,000,000
Northwest New Jersey-Northeast Pennsylvania Passenger Rail Project, NJ and PA	1,000,000
Puyallup Bus Rapid Transit Project, WA	1,500,000

RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTERS

	General fund
Appropriations, 2009	\$67,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	67,670,000
House allowance	65,670,000
Committee recommendation	67,670,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

The purpose of the university transportation centers [UTC] program is to foster a national resource and focal point for the support and conduct of research and training concerning the transportation of passengers and property. Funds provided under the FTA's UTC program are transferred to and managed by the Research and In-

novation Technology Administration and combined with a transfer of funds from the Federal Highway Administration.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$67,670,000 for research and university research centers. The Committee recommendation is equal to the budget request, and \$670,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

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

However, the FTA also reported that the transit industry lags behind other sectors in managing its capital assets strategically. Asset management programs would enable transit agencies to take inventory of their capital assets, assess the condition of those assets, use objective and quantitative analysis to estimate reinvestment needs over the long term, and prioritize their capital investments by using all of the information and analysis that was required under the program.

The FTA examined the seven largest transit agencies to inform its report on the condition of transit rail systems. While most of these large agencies took inventory of their capital assets, the inventories varied greatly in how recently the data was collected and in how comprehensive the data were. The FTA found that the large transit agencies regularly assessed the condition of their assets, but that none of the transit agencies had a full asset management program that was used to set long term priorities for capital reinvestment.

The Committee expects the FTA to take a leadership role in improving the use of asset management practices among transit agencies, and the Committee recommendation includes \$5,000,000 in order to support this leadership role. The Committee directs the FTA to use a portion of these funds to develop standards for asset management plans, and to design these standards so that transit agencies are encouraged to place the appropriate priority on protecting safety. The Committee further directs the FTA to use the remaining funds to provide technical assistance to transit agencies that are developing or implementing asset management plans, to improve the ability of the FTA to collect data relevant to asset management, and to conduct a pilot program designed to identify the best practices of asset management. The Committee expects the FTA to include in its pilot program a group of transit agencies that vary in size, and directs the FTA to report its findings to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this act.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$2,559,250,000
Budget estimate, 2010	1,827,343,000
House allowance	1,827,343,000
Committee recommendation	2,307,343,000

¹Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$750,000,000 were provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a level of \$2,307,343,000 for capital investment grants. The recommended level is \$480,000,000 more than the budget request. It is also \$251,907,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level including funding provided through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, but \$498,093,000 more than the level enacted for fiscal year 2009 excluding such funds. This additional funding is provided as part of the Committee recommendation to increase investment in our national infrastructure across a wide variety of transportation modes.

To further support oversight activities, the bill continues a provision requiring FTA to transfer \$2,000,000 to the DOT Office of Inspector General [OIG] for costs associated with audits and investigations of transit-related issues, including reviews of new fixed guideway systems. This transfer must come from funds set aside under the program authorization law for oversight activities.

The Committee recommends the following allocations of capital investment grant funds in fiscal year 2010:

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

Project	Amount
AC Transit BRT Corridor, CA	\$2,000,000
Ann Arbor-Detroit Regional Rail Project, Detroit, MI	5,000,000
ARC/THE Tunnel (New Jersey Trans-Hudson Midtown Corridor), NJ	200,000,000
Baltimore Red Line, MD	4,000,000
Bellevue to Redmond Bus Rapid Transit, WA	9,368,193
Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project, MN	3,500,000
Central Florida Commuter Rail Transit, FL	35,000,000
Central Phoenix/East Valley Light Rail, AZ	61,249,903
City of Charlotte, Charlotte Area Transit System's [CATS] Blue Line Extension—Northeast Corridor Project, NC	24,000,000

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS—Continued

Project	Amount
Commuter Rail Improvements, MA	32,000,000
CTA Chicago Hub (Circle Line), IL	2,000,000
CTA Red Line North Station, Track, Viaduct and Station Rehabilitation, IL	10,000,000
Draper Light Rail, UT	10,000,000
Dulles Corridor Rail Project, VA	85,000,000
Fort Lauderdale—The Downtown, Transit Corridor Program, Downtown Transit Circulator, FL	1,000,000
Galveston-Houston Commuter Rail, TX	2,000,000
HART Light Rail Preliminary Engineering, FL	3,000,000
Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project, HI	30,000,000
Houston North Corridor LRT, TX	75,000,000
Houston Southeast Corridor LRT, TX	75,000,000
Hudson-Bergen MOS-2, NJ	11,039
Improvements to the Rosslyn Metro Station, VA	2,000,000
Lackawanna Cut-Off Restoration Project, PA/NJ	2,000,000
Largo Metrorail Extension, Washington, DC	347,000
Livermore/Amador Route 10 BRT, CA	79,900
Long Island Rail Road East Side Access, NY	193,500,000
Mason Corridor BRT, CO	48,000,000
Metra Connects, IL	2,000,000
Metro Express—Airport Way Corridor BRT Project, CA	2,808,825
Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension, Los Angeles, CA	9,582,551
Metro Rapid Bus System Gap Closure, CA	23,326
Metrorail Orange Line Extension, FL	20,000,000
Mid-Jordan Light Rail, UT	100,000,000
Monterey Bay Rapid Transit, CA	2,830,042
Mountain Links BRT, AZ	681,942
North Shore LRT Connector, PA	6,153
Northstar Corridor Rail Project, MN	711,661
Northstar Phase II—Extension of Northstar Commuter Rail to the St. Cloud Area, MN	4,000,000
Northwest/Southeast Light Rail MOS, TX	86,249,717
Pacific Highway South BRT, WA	6,815
Purple Line, MD	4,000,000
Ravenswood Extension Line, IL	304,744
Roaring Fork Valley, BRT Project, CO	810,000
Route 1 Bus Rapid Transit, Potomac Yard-Crystal City, VA	2,000,000
RTD East Corridor Construction, CO	5,500,000
RTD Gold Corridor, CO	5,000,000
RTD West Corridor, CO	100,000,000
San Bernardino, E Street Corridor sbX BRT, CA	20,000,000
San Francisco Muni Third Street Light Rail—Central Subway Project, CA	2,000,000
Second Avenue Subway Phase I, NY	177,463,000
Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit [SMART], CA	1,000,000
Sound Transit—Central Link Initial Segment, WA	3,144,294
Sound Transit—University Link LRT Extension, WA	110,000,000
South Corridor I-205/Portland Mall LRT, OR	74,229,000
South Sacramento Light Rail Extension, CA	40,000,000
Stamford Urban Transitway, CT	4,500,000
Virginia Railway Express Rolling Stock, VA	4,000,000
Weber County to Salt Lake City Commuter Rail, UT	80,000,000
Wilmington to Newark Commuter Rail Improvement Program, DE	5,000,000
Wilshire Boulevard Bus-Only Lane, CA	13,558,474

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

GRANTS FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$100,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

¹These funds were provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111–5).

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes \$100,000,000 for grants to public transit agencies for making capital investment that will reduce the energy consumption or the greenhouse gas emissions of their public transit systems. The bill requires the FTA to place priority on projects based on the total energy savings that are projected to result from the investment, and the projected energy savings as a percentage of the total energy usage of the public transit agency.

These grants build on the \$100,000,000 investment made in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act [ARRA]. In response to the availability of the ARRA funding, over 200 transit systems and coalitions submitted proposals with a total value of over \$1,000,000,000.

GRANTS TO THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2009	
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	\$150,000,000
Committee recommendation	150,000,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes \$150,000,000 for grants to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority [WMATA] for capital and preventive maintenance expenses. These grants are authorized under section 601 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–432).

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

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

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

Section 161 requires that funds appropriated or limited by this act for specific projects not obligated by September 20, 2012, and

other recoveries, be directed to projects eligible to use the funds for the purposes for which they were originally provided.

Section 162 allows funds appropriated before October 1, 2009, that remain available for expenditure to be transferred to the most recent appropriation heading.

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

Section 164 prohibits the FTA from issuing a final rule under section 5309 of title 49, United States Code, but allows the agency to continue to review comments on the rule.

Section 165 allows funds made available for Alaska or Hawaii ferry boats or ferry terminal facilities to be used to construct new vessels and facilities, or to improve existing vessels and facilities, and provides that funding may be used by the city and county of Honolulu to operate a passenger ferry boat service demonstration project.

Section 166 clarifies local share calculations for a New Starts project supported by funding contributed from the private sector.

Section 167 requires FTA to propose recommendations to Congress, including legislative proposals, for strengthening the agency's role in regulating transit safety.

Section 168 extends funding for previously funded projects.

Section 169 extends the contingent commitment authority for the New Starts program.

Section 170 provides an exemption from the charter bus regulations for the State of Washington. The Committee directs the Inspector General to complete a study on the effect of the charter tours regulation on the quality and price of transit services.

Section 171 clarifies local share calculations for New Starts projects which are multi-modal in nature and located on interstate highway corridors.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2009	\$31,842,000
Budget estimate, 2010	32,324,000
House allowance	32,324,000
Committee recommendation	32,324,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$32,324,000 for the operations, maintenance, and asset renewal of the Saint Lawrence Seaway. This amount is \$482,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, and equal to the President's fiscal year 2010 request. The recommended level includes \$16,317,000 to continue the Agency's Asset Renewal Program [ARP].

The Seaway is entering its 51st year of operation, which means that its infrastructure components are reaching the end of their design life. ARP is a significant, 10-year, multi-project strategy to address the long-term asset renewal needs of the U.S. portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway, with attention to two locks (Snell and Eisenhower), the U.S. segment of the Seaway International Bridge, maintenance dredging, operational systems, facilities and equipment.

While committed to maintaining the safe and reliable functionality of the Seaway, the Committee notes substantial increases to the costs of two major ARP projects, one of which is expected to increase by two or three times the original estimate. Going forward, the Committee expects SLSDC to control costs and implement the ARP in as timely and cost-effective manner as possible. It is crucial for the agency to anticipate changes to project scope and design, and to calculate and report projected estimates in year of expenditure.

The Committee recognizes that it is complex to develop reliable design specifications and accurate cost projections for a 50-part program that will be implemented over a 10-year period. SLSDC based its original cost projections on inputs from four sources: its own historical expenditures for similar work, consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Canadian Saint Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation [SLSMC] for similar lock work, and data from RS Means for general construction cost information. The Committee encourages SLSDC to continue to benchmark ARP against these four sources.

In addition, as SLSDC refines its cost estimates for near-term projects and integrates those estimates into budget requests, the Committee expects SLSDC to achieve an increased level of accuracy by comparing projects to data that is as current and relevant as possible. The Committee encourages SLSDC to work with its Canadian counterpart, SLSMC, to track the actual costs of their modernization projects in the Canadian sectors of the Seaway, and to use these projects as a benchmark in determining the reasonableness of cost estimates and bids received for U.S. projects. The

Committee also encourages SLSDC to increase the dependability of its cost estimation process by requesting independent financial reviews of project cost estimates and independent constructability reviews of project designs prior to contract solicitation for large construction projects to better ensure that projects can be successfully bid and built.

The Committee directs SLSDC to submit semiannual reports regarding the ARP. SLSDC shall, not later than April 30 and October 31 of each year, submit to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees a semiannual report summarizing the activities of the ARP during the immediately preceding 6-month periods ending March 31 and September 30. Such reports shall include up to date information on the status of the ARP, including but not limited to the following: an update on the status of each project that has received funding; cost overruns and cost savings for each active project; total work years of employees per project to date; delays and the cause of delays; schedule changes; up to date cost projections for each project in the ARP, highlighting changes in estimates; and any other deviations from the ARP. The SLSDC is directed to include in the reports any other relevant information relating to the management, funding, and implementation of the ARP.

GAO Audit.—Last year, the Committee included language to conduct an audit and assessment of SLSDC's progress in carrying out ARP. The Committee requests GAO to continue its efforts to monitor the ARP. The first GAO report should be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than May 31, 2010, and should take a comprehensive look at ARP. In general, this audit should include, but is not limited to, an assessment of the accuracy of the cost projections presented in the ARP; a determination of cost estimates not included by the Agency in the ARP; and the need and importance of investment in each project of the ARP to the operation of the SLSDC.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

tation needs. The Committee continues to fund MARAD in its support of the United States as a maritime Nation.

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009	\$174,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	174,000,000
House allowance	174,000,000
Committee recommendation	174,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Maritime Security Program provides resources to maintain a U.S.-flag merchant fleet crewed by U.S. citizens to serve both the commercial and national security needs of the United States. The program provides direct payments to U.S.-flag ship operators engaged in U.S. foreign trade. Participating operators are required to keep the vessels in active commercial service and are required to provide intermodal sealift support to the Department of Defense in times of war or national emergency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$174,000,000 for the Maritime Security Program. This amount is equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and budget request. This level is consistent with the program's authorized level.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

Appropriations, 2009	\$123,360,000
Budget estimate, 2010	152,900,000
House allowance	140,900,000
Committee recommendation	154,900,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$154,900,000 for Operations and Training at the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 2010. This amount is \$31,540,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and \$2,000,000 above the budget request. Funding for the subaccounts within the "Operations and training" account are provided as follows:

	Fiscal year 2010 request	Committee recommendation
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy [USMMA]: ¹		
Salaries and Benefits	\$31,677,000	\$31,677,000
Midshipment Program	8,360,000	8,360,000
Instructional Program	3,765,000	3,765,000
Program, Direction, and Administration	6,188,000	6,188,000

	Fiscal year 2010 request	Committee recommendation
Maintenance, Repair and Operations	9,067,000	9,067,000
Capital Improvements	15,391,000	15,000,000
Subtotal, USMMA	74,448,000	74,057,000
State Maritime Schools:		
Direct Schoolship Payments	2,400,000	2,400,000
Fuel Payments		300,000
Student Incentive Payments	2,000,000	2,150,000
Maintenance and Repair of Training Ships	11,240,000	11,240,000
Subtotal, State Maritime Academies	15,640,000	16,090,000
MARAD Operations:		
Salaries and Benefits	28,602,000	28,602,000
Non-Discretionary Operations	9,731,000	9,731,000
Information Technology	6,214,000	8,155,000
Discretionary Operations and Travel	1,777,000	1,777,000
Discretionary Program Expenses	1,488,000	1,488,000
MARAD-Homeland Security Port Initiative	15,000,000	15,000,000
Subtotal, MARAD Operations	62,812,000	64,753,000
Total, MARAD Operations and Training	152,900,000	154,900,000

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

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

However, the Committee is concerned that for many years, officials at the Academy engaged in questionable financial and management practices that potentially compromised the education of the students at the Academy. Following an internal audit conducted by staff at the Maritime Administration [MARAD], the Committee was alerted to several potential Anti-Deficiency Act violations and other questionable management practices by officials at the Academy. In response, the bipartisan leadership of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies asked the Government Accountability Office [GAO] to undertake a thorough audit of the Academy's finances and operations.

The preliminary findings of the GAO suggest a serious lack of internal controls and accountability, as well as a disregard for funding limits contained in appropriations laws. The Committee is dismayed by the number of violations and the serious flaws in the control process at the Academy. However, these improper practices in which officials at the Academy engaged are also the result of lax oversight on the part of the Department of Transportation and MARAD.

While the GAO's work is not yet complete, the Committee anticipates dozens of recommendations aimed at establishing a fiscal control process and an organizational structure that will establish accountability and restore fiscal integrity at the Academy. These

recommendations will focus on the need to: address potential Anti-Deficiency Act violations, establish a funds control process; establish a comprehensive risk-based internal control system; address problems with nonappropriated fund instrumentalities; and reconcile midshipmen's fees collected with uses.

The Committee recognizes that many of the problems that have already been identified by MARAD as well as the ones likely to be identified by the GAO began many years ago. Moreover, officials at MARAD, DOT, and the Academy have already taken some steps to address some of the problems. In fact, soon after assuming office the Secretary notified Congress of several Anti-Deficiency Act violations. The Committee appreciates the administration's willingness to finally admit the problems at the Academy, as well as some of the proposals, including ones contained in the budget, aimed at correcting issues. In addition, the Academy has a new Superintendent at the Academy who appears to understand the challenges at the Academy, and willing to make the changes necessary to improve Academy's operations.

It is clear, though, that the internal process and organizational changes that are needed will take time to be fully implemented. Therefore, the Committee has once again included language requiring that all funding for the Academy be given directly to the Secretary, and that 50 percent of the funding will not be available until MARAD submits a plan detailing how the funding will be spent. While MARAD did submit a more detailed plan for how funding will be used as part of this year's budget submission, the Committee expects the plan to provide additional specificity as well as make any adjustments necessary to satisfy recommendations of the GAO. The Committee also believes that this process will ensure continued engagement by the Secretary and MARAD officials in the operations at the Academy, as well as establish a system of funds control and accountability.

The Committee does recognize the many capital improvement needs at the Academy, which are important to improving the experiences of the students at the Academy. Therefore the Committee has provided \$15,000,000 for capital improvements at the Academy, an increase of \$6,850,000 over the level provided in fiscal year 2009. However, the Committee wants to ensure that this funding is used for its intended purpose, and directs the DOT to include detailed information as part of this spend plan on the Academy's long-term capital plan. This plan should include new safeguards that will be established to ensure that the funding is used only for capital improvements.

Finally, the Committee expects the Academy to carefully assess the necessity of the numerous NAFIs at the Academy. While the Committee appreciates the important role that the NAFIs can play, it is clear that the management and oversight of these NAFIs was a challenge for the Academy, and warrants a reassessment of their role at the Academy.

Port Initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes \$15,000,000 that was requested by the President for a new initiative to be undertaken in partnership with the Department of Homeland Security to improve the security, capacity, and efficiency of our Nation's ports. This initiative seeks to develop the Nation's

intermodal freight infrastructure by linking coastal and inland ports to the highway and rail networks. The Committee applauds the administration's effort to recognize the important role that our ports and waterways can play in easing congestion and increasing mobility by moving both freight and passengers from our roads to waterways. The funding provided as part of this initiative will allow MARAD to designate and support specific projects that will create new or expanded services along designated Marine Highway corridors. In addition the funding will allow for the collection of data to support the expanded use of a secure national marine highway. The Committee hopes that this pilot will result in expanded use of our waterways.

State Maritime Academies.—The Committee has included an additional \$450,000 above the President's request for State Maritime Academies. The increased funding will support the efforts of the six-State maritime academies to educate and train merchant marine and commercial ship officers. These academies produce the largest number of new licensed officers in the country. The Committee has included an increase of \$150,000 for the Student Incentive Payments to adequately cover these payments to students, which were increased last year from \$4,000 to \$8,000 per student. In addition, the Committee has included a new line item for fuel payments, which are an essential, but costly part of cost of operating the ships used to train its students.

Information Technology.—Integrated, real-time data on vessels is critical to both maritime commerce and the safety and security of our ports and waterways. The Committee has provided additional resources for information technology, so that the agency can continue to improve and enhance data collection and analysis efforts.

SHIP DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2009	\$15,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	15,000,000
House allowance	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	15,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Ship Disposal account provides resources to dispose of obsolete merchant-type vessels of 150,000 gross tons or more in the National Defense Reserve Fleet [NDRF] which the Maritime Administration is required by law to dispose of by the end of 2006. Currently there is a backlog of more than 91 ships awaiting disposal. Many of these vessels are some 50 years old or more and pose a significant environmental threat due to the presence of hazardous substances such as asbestos and solid and liquid polychlorinated biphenyls [PCBs].

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$15,000,000 for the Maritime Administration's Ship Disposal program. This level of funding is equal to the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and the President's request. The Committee strongly supports the Maritime Administration's efforts to dispose of all obsolete vessels that it has in its fleet. The Committee recognizes that the agency faces a chal-

lenge in reducing its backlog since ship disposal activities are currently suspended in the State of California due to conflicting environmental mandates and regulatory constraints. However MARAD has been successful at disposing ships in the James River and Beaumont Reserve Fleets. The Committee expects MARAD to continue its efforts to reduce the backlog.

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL SHIPYARDS

Appropriations, 2009 ¹	\$117,500,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	17,500,000

¹ Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$100,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is recommending an appropriation of \$17,500,000 for assistance to small shipyards and maritime communities. This level of funding is \$100,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, but is equal to the level of nonemergency funding provided for this program in fiscal year 2009. The President did not request funding for this program in fiscal year 2010.

Beginning in fiscal year 2008, the Committee has provided funding for this program, which helps small shipyards improve the efficiency of their operations by providing funding for equipment and other facility upgrades. There were over 250 qualified applicants for the funding provided in fiscal year 2009, both through the Omnibus Appropriations Act and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 whose requests far exceeded available resources. The funding recommended by the Committee will help meet the demand for this funding, and improve the competitiveness of our Nation's small shipyards.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009	\$3,531,000
Budget estimate, 2010	3,360,000
House allowance	3,630,000
Committee recommendation	14,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Program, established pursuant to title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, provides for a full faith and credit guarantee by the U.S. Government of debt obligations issued by (1) U.S. or foreign shipowners for the purpose of financing or refinancing either U.S.-flag vessels or eligible export vessels constructed, reconstructed or reconditioned in U.S. shipyards and (2) U.S. shipyards for the purpose of financing advanced shipbuilding technology and modern shipbuilding technology of a privately

owned general shipyard facility located in the United States. The Program is administered by the Secretary of Transportation acting by and through the Maritime Administrator. Under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, appropriations to cover the estimated costs of a project must be obtained prior to the issuance of any approvals for title XI financing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$14,000,000 for the Maritime Guaranteed Loan Title XI program. Of the amount provided, \$4,000,000 is for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the program. This level of funding is \$10,469,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and \$10,370,000 more than the President's request. The loan guarantee amount of \$10,000,000 will provide for a total loan volume of up to \$170,000,000. The affordable financing opportunities that these loans allow are critical to ensuring that small and medium ship-owners can build ships in the United States. The Committee expects that MARAD will move quickly to approve the loan guarantees, which are critical to our domestic shipbuilding industry.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Section 175 authorizes the Maritime Administration to furnish utilities and services and make repairs to any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under the control of MARAD. Rental payments received pursuant to this provision shall be credited to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Section 176 provides a mechanism to collect and utilize fees collected from midshipmen at the United States Merchant Marine Academy. The language also accounts for fees previously collected and held by the Maritime Administration, and allows for surplus fees from prior years to be refunded to midshipmen.

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

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

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

Appropriations, 2009	\$19,130,000
Budget estimate, 2010	18,968,000
House allowance	19,968,000
Committee recommendation	19,968,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$19,968,000 for this account, of which \$639,000 is to be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund. This level of funding is \$1,000,000 more than the budget request and \$838,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee has provided \$1,000,000 over the budget request and directs that this funding be transferred to the Office of Pipeline Safety for Information Grants to Communities.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

Appropriations, 2009	\$32,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	35,500,000
House allowance	36,500,000
Committee recommendation	35,500,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$35,500,000 for hazardous materials safety, of which \$1,699,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2011. The amount provided is equal to the budget request and \$3,500,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The Committee recommendation includes an increase to the Office of Hazardous Materials Safety of \$1,300,000 for 15 new positions as requested. The funding provided for these positions will enable PHMSA to fill vacancies across the Office of Hazardous Materials Safety, including: research and analysis, technology and training and outreach. The additional resources will also help pay for inspection-related costs necessary for enforcement of hazardous materials safety regulations. The Committee notes that the Hazardous Materials Safety Office currently has several open National Transportation Safety Board recommendations, and hopes that the additional resources and personnel will allow the agency to make progress toward satisfying these recommendations.

PIPELINE SAFETY
(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)
(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2009	\$93,291,000
Budget estimate, 2010	105,239,000
House allowance	105,239,000
Committee recommendation	105,239,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$105,239,000 for the Office of Pipeline Safety. This amount is \$11,948,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and equal to the budget request. Of the funding provided, \$18,905,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and \$86,334,000 shall be from the Pipeline Safety Fund.

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

The Committee recommendation includes funding to support 18 new inspection and enforcement positions. These new positions will meet the authorized level of inspectors and will provide the OPS with the necessary personnel to oversee the 2.5 million miles of pipelines across the country. In order to ensure that OPS is moving forward in hiring these additional personnel, the Committee continues to request quarterly staffing reports from OPS.

In addition to funding for additional personnel, the Committee recommendation also includes an increase of over \$5,000,000 for grants to States, as requested. These grants enable States to assist OPS in conducting oversight on pipelines in our States.

Technical Assistance Grants.—In fiscal year 2009, the Committee provided funding for the first time for pipeline safety information grants to communities, or technical assistance grants [TAG]. Through this funding, communities will be able to obtain technical assistance in the form of engineering or other scientific analysis of pipeline safety issues. The funding will also help promote public participation in official proceedings. The President’s budget requested no additional funding for additional grants. However, the Committee strongly believes that providing communities with the

resources to obtain expertise and assistance will assist them in protecting their communities from future pipeline incidents. Therefore the Committee has provided an additional \$1,000,000 for TAG grants for 2010.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS
(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

Appropriations, 2009	\$28,506,000
Budget estimate, 2010	28,506,000
House allowance	28,506,000
Committee recommendation	28,506,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Hazardness Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act of 1990 [HMTUSA] requires PHMSA to (1) develop and implement a reimbursable emergency preparedness grant program; (2) monitor public sector emergency response training and planning and provide technical assistance to States, political subdivisions and Indian tribes; and (3) develop and update periodically a mandatory training curriculum for emergency responders.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

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

RESEARCH AND INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2009	\$12,900,000
Budget estimate, 2010	13,179,000
House allowance	12,834,000
Committee recommendation	13,179,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Research and Innovative Technology Administration [RITA] was established in the Department of Transportation, effective November 24, 2004, pursuant to the Norman Y. Mineta Research and Special Programs Improvement Act (Public Law 108-246). The mission of RITA is to strengthen and facilitate the Department's multi-modal and inter-modal research efforts, leverage and enhance intra-modal research efforts, and coordinate and sharpen the multi-faceted research agenda of the Department.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$13,179,000 for Research and Innovative Technology Administration for fiscal year 2010. The amount provided is \$279,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 level and equal to the President's budget request.

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

	Amount
Salaries and Administrative Expenses	\$7,143,000
Alternative Fuels Safety Research and Development	500,000
RD&T Coordination	536,000
Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System [NDGPS]	4,600,000
Position, Navigation, and Timing [PNT]	400,000

Following a 2006 GAO report which was critical of RITA, GAO testified in early 2009 that RITA has since implemented several key GAO recommendations related to: enhancing coordination and preventing duplication of effort in RITA's oversight of DOT's research, development and technology activities; evaluating Departmental research projects against best practices; developing a Department-wide database to catalogue and track DOT research activities; communicating research evaluation results to internal and external stakeholders; and documenting multi-modal research processes. The Committee expects RITA to continue to implement these recommendations.

Furthermore, the Committee expects RITA to implement the remaining GAO recommendations—specifically to develop a strategic plan, including performance goals and measures, an implementation strategy, and an evaluation plan. A well-managed and structured strategic planning process has the potential to transform RITA into a more effective organization. The Committee encourages RITA to develop and implement a detailed action plan—that includes a timetable—for completing the strategic plan, implementation strategy and evaluation plan. GAO will continue to monitor RITA's performance in implementing its recommendations to ensure the effective stewardship of the Department's research dollars.

Alternative Fuels Safety Research and Development.—The Committee recommends \$500,000 for Fuels Safety Research and Development. RITA is updating this program to encompass alternative fuels in addition to hydrogen. This funding provides for alternative fuels safety standards development, coordination and outreach activities, and clears the pathway to fuel technology deployment. RITA will respond to direct stakeholder and industry needs in advancing alternative fuels as part of the administration's goal of a greener, more secure and sustainable economy.

Research, Development, and Technology Coordination.—The Committee recommends \$536,000 for Research, Development, and Technology [RD&T] Coordination with the expectation that RITA will coordinate, facilitate, and review the Department's R&D portfolio

and identify synergies among the programs. GAO reports that RITA has implemented a key recommendation to coordinate, facilitate, and review RD&T activities within and across modes. The Committee applauds these efforts to prevent unnecessary duplication of research efforts, and encourages the Secretary to entrust RITA with the responsibility to facilitate Department-wide research projects that investigate cross-cutting topics like climate change, alternative fuels, and human factors. To succeed at this endeavor, RITA must hire and retain RD&T staff that possess the technical expertise to analyze a wide range of research efforts and identify critical similarities and differences, and the organizational credibility and sensitivity to coordinate intermodal teamwork.

Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System [NDGPS].—The Committee provides \$4,600,000 to support operations and maintenance of the Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System [NDGPS]. This year’s appropriation will maintain current NDGPS service levels.

Position, Navigation, and Timing [PNT].—The Committee provides \$400,000 to support responsibilities in Position, Navigation and Timing [PNT] leadership that were delegated from OST to RITA. The Deputy Secretaries of DOT and the Department of Defense co-chair the National Executive Committee (ExCom) for Space-Based PNT, which brings together nine Federal Departments. RITA supports the Deputy Secretary’s leadership role in ExCom. In addition, RITA directs the PNT National Coordination Office, represents the PNT concerns of civil government and the commercial community, and advises existing and future operations of PNT systems.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Limitation on obligations, 2009	\$27,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	28,000,000
House allowance	28,000,000
Committee recommendation	28,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Under the appropriation of the Federal Highway Administration, the bill provides \$28,000,000 for BTS.

In the aforementioned 2006 report, GAO issued a multi-part recommendation to the RITA Administrator and the BTS Director to ensure that BTS would better meet the needs of its users. GAO rec-

ommended that RITA develop a formal, comprehensive system for: identifying and documenting the primary users of BTS; soliciting feedback from those users on a periodic basis; developing a formal process for documenting and evaluating user feedback; and measuring user satisfaction. Since then, BTS has taken steps to improve user satisfaction with its products and has formalized criteria to determine whether and how user feedback should be incorporated. BTS is in the process of developing performance indicators to measure user satisfaction; this is an important step, as BTS' user groups include Congress, DOT and other Federal agencies, State and local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, universities, the private sector and the traveling public. The Committee encourages BTS to develop a detailed action plan—that includes a timetable—for developing and implementing these performance indicators.

The Committee limits BTS staff to 122 FTEs and 135 FTPs in fiscal year 2010 in order to curtail the significant growth in staffing that occurred previously within this agency.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$91,400,000
Budget estimate, 2010	74,839,000
House allowance	74,839,000
Committee recommendation	75,389,000

¹Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$20,000,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Inspector General Act of 1978 established the Office of Inspector General [OIG] as an independent and objective organization, with a mission to: (1) conduct and supervise audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Department; (2) provide leadership and recommend policies designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of programs and operations; (3) prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse; and (4) keep the Secretary and Congress currently informed regarding problems and deficiencies.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation provides \$75,389,000 for activities of the Office of the Inspector General, which is \$550,000 more than the President's budget request. While the funding level is \$16,011,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level including funding provided through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act [ARRA], it is \$3,989,000 more than the fiscal year enacted level excluding ARRA funds.

The Committee recommendation includes \$550,000 to allow OIG to hire an additional four FTE staff. This will bring OIG to a total of 420 FTEs in fiscal year 2010. The Committee expects the Inspector General to use this funding to hire staff with the expertise necessary to address the Office's most pressing issues.

As the aviation, transit, and rail industries grow in size and complexity, the programs and policies of the Federal Aviation, Transit and Rail Administrations also grow increasingly complicated. The Committee relies on the Inspector General and his staff to provide objective analysis of the Departments' programs. For this reason, the Committee believes that the Inspector General needs to maintain an adequate staffing level.

In addition, the OIG will receive \$6,604,000 transferred from other agencies in this bill for audit and investigation activities within those respective agencies, as noted below:

	Amount
Federal Highway Administration	\$3,809,000
Federal Transit Administration	2,075,000
Federal Aviation Administration	620,000
National Transportation Safety Board	100,000

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

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

Unfair Business Practices.—The bill maintains language which authorizes the OIG to investigate allegations of fraud and unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by air carriers and ticket agents.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriation	Crediting offsetting collections
Appropriations, 2009	\$26,847,000	\$1,250,000
Budget estimate, 2010	27,032,000	1,250,000
House allowance	29,800,000	1,250,000
Committee recommendation	28,332,000	1,250,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

of the rail and pipeline industries and certain non-licensing regulation of motor carriers and water carriers.

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of \$28,332,000. This funding level is \$1,300,000 more than the President's request, and \$1,485,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Included in the recommendation is \$1,250,000 in fees, which will offset the appropriated funding.

Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 [PRIIA].—The enactment of PRIIA delineated new roles and responsibilities for STB, among them to: consult FRA and Amtrak regarding the development of metrics and minimum standards for measuring the performance and service quality of intercity passenger train service; set up a process for receiving and addressing complaints regarding poor on time performance or other service quality deficiencies of intercity passenger rail; and identify for DOT those rail corridors that need to improve on time performance and reliability, so that DOT may consider this information when selecting grantees for high priority rail corridor projects.

The Committee recommends an increase of \$678,000 to help STB meet its PRIIA-related requirements. These funds shall be used to recruit and hire staff with appropriate education and experience to manage these new responsibilities.

Uniform Rail Costing System.—The Uniform Rail Costing System [URCS] is the general purpose, highly specialized cost model that STB employs to make decisions regarding its core regulatory matters, including resolution of rate disputes, abandonment of rail lines, and determination of railroad revenue adequacy. STB's predecessor agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission, invested 5 years' time and leveraged significant technical assistance from economists to develop URCS in 1989.

A diverse group of stakeholders, including DOT, railroad industry leaders, and rail customers, has voiced concerns regarding the key cost and engineering assumptions of URCS, and the resultant integrity, accuracy and robustness of its outputs. The group asserts that URCS no longer generates accurate information that is reflective of industry realities. STB determined that it lacks the resources to review and update URCS; therefore, the agency has requested one-time funding to scope the URCS project, and the Committee provides \$350,000 for this purpose.

The Committee expects STB to use the funds to: (1) work with experts to judge the validity of the criticisms of URCS, and, if the criticisms are found to be valid, then (2) define the proper scope of a project to review and modernize the costing system; and (3) identify a range of at least three cost-effective options—basic, moderate and comprehensive—for the URCS update. The Committee directs

STB to submit a final written report, describing the pros and cons of each of the three options, as well as the time, funding and other resources necessitated by each option, to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations no later than May 30, 2010. The Committee will use this final report as the basis for its decisions regarding fiscal year 2011 requests regarding URCS.

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 186 clarifies the requirement to fund certain programs, projects and activities identified in this report within the accounts of the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, and Federal Transit Administration.

Section 187 authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to allow issuers of any preferred stock to redeem or repurchase preferred stock sold to the Department of Transportation.

Section 188 prohibits funds in this act to make a grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations at least 3 full business days before any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, or full funding grant agreement totaling \$1,000,000 or more is announced by the Department or its modal administration.

Section 189 allows rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees, and other funds received by the Department of Transportation from travel management center, charge card programs, subleasing

of building space and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department of Transportation.

Section 190 requires amounts from improper payments to a third-party contractor that are lawfully recovered by the Department of Transportation be available to cover expenses incurred in recovery of such payments.

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

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

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

Section 194 establishes a 1-year pilot program related to truck weight in the State of Maine. The Committee directs the Secretary of Transportation to study the impact of this pilot program on safety, road durability, commerce, and energy use. The Committee understands that the State of Maine will also make assessments of the effects of the pilot program on safety, road durability, commerce, and energy use. In addition, the Committee directs the Secretary to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than 6 months after the start of the pilot program on the impact to date of the pilot program on bridge safety and weight impacts.

Section 195 requires the Department of Transportation to conduct a study related to the Missouri River.

Section 196 clarifies funding for previously funded projects in Nevada.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$55,197,290,000
Budget estimate, 2010	45,482,659,000
House allowance	47,047,751,000
Committee recommendation	45,828,144,000

¹Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$13,662,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends for fiscal year 2010 an appropriation of \$45,828,144,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is \$9,369,146,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level but \$4,292,854,000 more than the level of non-emergency funding provided in fiscal year 2009. This level of funding is also \$345,485,000 more than the budget request.

The Committee reiterates that the Department must limit the reprogramming of funds between the program, projects, and activities within each account without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations. Unless otherwise identified in the bill or report, the most detailed allocation of funds presented in the budget justifications is approved, with any deviation from such approved allocation subject to the normal reprogramming requirements. It is the

intent of the Committee that all carryover funds in the various accounts, including recaptures and de-obligations, are subject to the normal reprogramming requirements outlined above. No change may be made to any program, project, or activity if it is construed to be policy or a change in policy, without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations. Finally, the Committee expects to be notified regarding reorganizations of offices, programs or activities prior to the planned implementation of such reorganizations, as well as be identified, on a monthly basis, of all ongoing litigation, including any negotiations or discussions, planned or ongoing, regarding a consent decree between the Department and any other entity, including the estimated costs of such decrees. No reprogramming between accounts is allowed under this bill.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION

Appropriations, 2009	\$23,799,456
Budget estimate, 2010	25,969,000
House allowance	25,969,000
Committee recommendation	25,969,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$25,969,000 for this account, which is equal to the budget request and \$2,170,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Amounts are made available as follows:

	Amount
Immediate Office of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary	\$4,619,000
Office of Hearings and Appeals	1,703,000
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	778,000
Immediate Office of the Chief Financial Officer	727,000
Immediate Office of the General Counsel	1,474,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations	2,912,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs	3,110,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	1,218,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Affairs	2,125,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community and Planning Development	1,781,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner	3,497,000

	Amount
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research	1,097,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	928,000

The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–161) included a new salaries and expenses structure for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This structure aligned personnel and operational funding with actual costs by program. This structure improved the transparency of the Department’s use of Federal resources and gave the Committees on Appropriations greater oversight of appropriated funds. The “Executive Direction” account includes funding for the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries to increase accountability over the lead policy makers of the Department. The Committee is pleased that the President’s budget continued to request funding in this structure, and has provided funding as requested to give the Secretary and other executives at HUD the resources needed to implement the Department’s programs.

The Secretary is authorized to transfer funds within offices under Executive Direction following written notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, provided that no amount for any office may be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all transfers. Notice of any change in funding greater than 5 percent must be submitted for prior approval by the Committees. Further, the Secretary must provide quarterly written notification to the Committees regarding the status of pending congressional reports. The bill also provides that no more than \$25,000 provided under the immediate Office of the Secretary shall be available for the official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

ADMINISTRATION, OPERATIONS, AND MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2009	\$527,433,640
Budget estimate, 2010	537,897,000
House allowance	537,897,000
Committee recommendation	537,897,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$537,897,000 for this account, which is equal to the budget request and \$10,463,360 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Funds are made available as follows:

	Amount
Office of Administration Personnel Compensation and Benefits	\$76,958,000
Office of Departmental Operations and Coordination Personnel Compensation and Benefits	11,277,000
Office of Field Policy and Management Personnel Compensation and Benefits	51,275,000
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer Personnel Compensation and Benefits	14,649,000
Office of the Chief Financial Officer Personnel Compensation and Benefits	35,197,000
Office of the General Counsel Personnel Compensation and Benefits	89,062,000
Office of the Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity Personnel Compensation and Benefits	3,296,000
Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives Personnel Compensation and Benefits	1,393,000
Office of Sustainability Personnel Compensation and Benefits	2,400,000
Office of Strategic Planning and Management Personnel Compensation and Benefits	2,520,000
Non-personnel expenses	249,870,000

The Committee continues to provide for the necessary administrative and nonadministrative expenses of the Department. Funds may be used for advertising and promotional activities that support the housing mission area. Further, the Secretary is authorized to transfer funds between offices under this account, after such transfer has been submitted to, and received written approval by, the Committees on Appropriations. No appropriation for any office may be increased or decreased by more than 10 percent.

PERSONNEL COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

Appropriations, 2009	\$190,390,100
Budget estimate, 2010	197,074,000
House allowance	197,074,000
Committee recommendation	197,074,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$197,074,000 for this account, which is equal to the budget request and \$6,683,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2009	\$94,233,700
Budget estimate, 2010	98,989,000
House allowance	98,989,000
Committee recommendation	98,989,000

This account provides salary and benefits funding for Community Planning and Development [CPD] staff in headquarters and in 43 field offices, (funding for the immediate office of the Assistant Secretary is provided out of the “Executive Direction account”). CPD’s mission is to enable the progress of viable urban, suburban and rural communities by promoting integrated approaches to community and economic development. CPD programs also assist in the expansion of opportunities for low- and moderate-income individuals and families in moving towards homeownership. The Assistant Secretary for CPD administers formula and competitive grant programs as well as guaranteed loan programs that help communities plan and finance their growth and development. These programs also help communities increase their capacity to govern and provide shelter and services for homeless persons and other persons with special needs, including person with HIV/AIDS.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$98,989,000 for this account, which is equal to the budget request and \$4,755,300 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

HOUSING

Appropriation, 2009	\$363,198,000
Budget estimate, 2010	374,887,000
House allowance	374,887,000
Committee recommendation	374,887,000

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

and nursing home loans. FHA provides a vital link in addressing America’s homeownership and affordable housing needs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$374,887,000 for this account, which is equal to the budget request and \$11,689,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The FHA program has increased its volume significantly, from only 3 percent of the market share in 2006 to nearly 30 percent today. The Committee understands the important role that FHA is currently playing in providing Americans with access to financing and refinancing options. However, the Committee is greatly concerned that Government is equipped to take the necessary steps to protect itself from increased risk as the FHA volume increases. Therefore it is imperative that the Department has sufficient staff with the appropriate skills to effectively monitor the FHA program and maintain the solvency of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. Over the past few years, the Committee has provided additional resources to allow the Office of Housing to hire additional personnel. In fiscal year 2008, HUD hired more than 160 new employees to work on FHA and expects to gain over 80 more people in fiscal year 2009. The Committee is once again providing resources to hire 20 additional staff to work on the single-family housing portfolio in fiscal year 2010.

The Committee understands that the Department is conducting an assessment of the program’s staffing needs. The Committee directs the Secretary to submit a plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with 120 days of the enactment of this act on the human resource needs of the Office of Housing. The plan should identify the responsibilities, locations and expertise of the FHA staff, including how staff will address any shortfalls or needs that could undermine the program. To the extent possible, the plan should also include how technology advancements may affect personnel needs. The Committee also expects the plan to address the aging of HUD’s staff and then identify actions that HUD can take to prevent problems associated with the retirement of older staff.

The Committee also recognizes that the limited availability of credit in the private market, as well as programmatic changes have increased demand for FHA’s mortgage insurance programs for long-term care facilities and hospitals. Therefore, as part of the staffing plan for FHA, the Committee directs HUD to include information on the steps being taken to ensure sufficient staffing levels with the necessary expertise dedicated to these programs to effectively manage this increased volume and meet the Department’s own targets for application review and processing.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Appropriations, 2009	\$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	11,095,000
House allowance	11,095,000
Committee recommendation	11,095,000

This account provides all salary and benefits funding to support Government National Mortgage Association [GNMA] headquarters staff. GNMA programs help expand the supply of affordable hous-

ing in the United States by linking the capital markets to the Nation's housing markets. GNMA accomplishes this by facilitating the financing of residential mortgage loans insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration [FHA], the Department of Veteran Affairs [VA], and additional entities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$11,095,000, which is equal to the budget request and \$1,095,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee provides an increase to cover the expansion of anticipated FHA guarantees for fiscal year 2010. The Committee provides language to continue allowing funding for personnel compensation and benefits to be derived from the GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2009	\$18,070,850
Budget estimate, 2010	21,138,000
House allowance	21,138,000
Committee recommendation	21,138,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$21,138,000 for this account, which is equal to the budget request and \$3,067,150 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Appropriations, 2009	\$69,020,990
Budget estimate, 2010	71,800,000
House allowance	71,800,000
Committee recommendation	71,800,000

This account provides salary and benefits funding to support staff in headquarters and in 42 field locations, (funding for the immediate office of Assistant Secretary is provided out of the Executive Direction account) in the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity [FHEO]. FHEO is responsible for investigating, resolving, and prosecuting complaints of housing discrimination and conducting education and outreach activities to increase awareness of the requirements of the Fair Housing Act. The Office also develops and interprets fair housing policy, processes complaints, performs compliance reviews and provides oversight and technical assistance to local housing authorities and community development agencies

regarding section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$71,800,000, which is equal to the budget request and \$2,779,010 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The appropriated level for this account reflects the actual needs based on updated information provided by HUD prior to the Committee markup of the bill.

The Committee notes that many communities hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis are also seeing an increase in dishonest and predatory lending practices. The Secretary recently announced the addition of two full time fair housing staff in HUD's Las Vegas office to conduct education and outreach locally, receive discrimination complaints and more readily conduct full investigations. The Committee appreciates the Secretary's recognition that Las Vegas has been one of the places in the Nation hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis, making its residents more susceptible to these predatory and unfair lending practices. The Committee encourages the Secretary to maintain staff in this office to continue to address fair housing issues in and around Las Vegas. In addition, the Committee encourages the Secretary to assess other areas of the country experiencing similar foreclosure problems to see if additional measures or resources are needed to aid those communities.

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

Appropriations, 2009	\$6,727,950
Budget estimate, 2010	7,151,000
House allowance	7,151,000
Committee recommendation	7,151,000

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,151,000 for this account, which is equal to the budget request and \$423,050 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING
 TENANT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE
 (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009 ¹	\$16,975,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 ¹	17,836,000,000
House allowance	18,242,200,000
Committee recommendation ¹	18,187,200,000

¹ Includes an advance appropriation of \$4,000,000,000.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for the section 8 tenant-based (voucher) program. Section 8 tenant-based housing assistance is one of the principle appropriations for Federal housing assistance and provides rental housing assistance to approximately 2 million families. The program also funds incremental vouchers to assist nonelderly disabled families and vouchers for tenants who live in projects where the owner of the project has decided to leave the section 8 program. The program also provides for the replacement of units lost from the assisted housing inventory (tenant protection vouchers). Under these programs, eligible low-income families pay 30 percent of their adjusted income for rent, and the Federal Government is responsible for the remainder of the rent, up to the fair market rent or some other payment standard. This account also provides funding for the Contract Administrator program, Family Self-Sufficiency [FSS], Housing and Urban Development Veterans Supportive Housing [HUD-VASH] Program and the Family Unification program. Under FSS, families receive job training and employment that should lead to a decrease in their dependency on government assistance and help them move toward economic self-sufficiency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$18,137,200,000 for fiscal year 2010; including \$4,000,000,000 as an advance appropriation to be made available on October 1, 2010. This amount is \$301,200,000 more than the budget request and \$1,162,200,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The Committee recommends \$16,339,200,000 for the renewal costs for section 8 contracts, which is \$150,000,000 more than the budget request and \$1,139,200,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Housing choice vouchers allow over 2 million individuals and families across the Nation to find and maintain safe and affordable housing. However, the structure of the program and its reliance on the private market makes the program's costs susceptible to economic changes. Currently, increased unemployment is raising the cost of vouchers for many public housing authorities [PHAs] across the country since PHAs must assume housing costs that tenants can no longer pay as a result of a loss of income. Moreover, an adverse impact of the recession is that fewer households are able leave the program, making increased costs even more difficult for PHAs to bear. Without sufficient resources to cover these increased housing costs, PHAs may be forced to reduce

the number of vouchers to stay within budget. The Committee recognizes that for many program participants, losing their vouchers may result in homelessness. Therefore the Committee provides additional resources to ensure adequate funding for PHAs to continue providing housing for all program participants.

The Committee is pleased that the President's first budget request demonstrated a real commitment to the housing choice voucher program by requesting the level of funding believed to be necessary to fund the renewal of all existing vouchers. However, since the budget was submitted, it has become clear that the funding requested may not be sufficient to meet the actual renewal needs of the program. The Committee recognizes that there will always be uncertainty within the program, and that the recession is making projections for this account particularly difficult. However, the agency must do a better job of tracking voucher use and program costs. The Committee agrees that the program should serve as many people as feasible within the resources allocated. However, this requires vigilant oversight by HUD to ensure that PHAs are managing their programs within budget. The Committee was dismayed to learn of instances where incorrect data may have led to HUD providing PHAs with resource allocations below their renewal needs. Data problems can stem from both faulty input and analysis, but it is HUD's responsibility to monitor these data and program costs, and identify any problems.

In addition to adequate resources, it is also important for the program to have greater stability. Therefore the Committee has not included language proposed in the President's budget, including removing the caps on the number of vouchers that a PHA can lease and giving the Secretary broad authority to reallocate reserves. Instead, the Committee has included language to fund the program in substantially the same manner as fiscal year 2009. Changes to the program must be done in a comprehensive manner. Moreover, the Committee cautions that some of the proposed changes have the potential to quickly and significantly increase the amount of resources needed for the program. At this point, the Committee does not have the confidence that such changes and their potential costs can be managed by HUD and its IT systems.

HUD-Veterans Affairs Supported Housing [HUD-VASH].—The Committee has included \$75,000,000 to support 10,000 additional HUD-VASH vouchers. The President's budget did not include funding for any new HUD-VASH vouchers. These vouchers are an important part of the solution to homelessness among the Nation's veterans. The Committee expects that these vouchers will serve veterans who have experienced long-term homelessness, as well as high risk Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Ensuring Freedom [OIF/OEF] veterans, including those with dependent children.

The Committee has been pleased that both HUD and the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] have worked together to address some of the challenges that emerged when the program was restarted in fiscal year 2008. The VA has increased hiring of case managers, and HUD joined the VA in conducting a joint training of both VA case managers and public housing authority personnel in order to improve the success of the program. These actions have

resulted in increased leasing, which the Committee expects to continue.

When the Secretary appeared before the Committee in June 2009, he noted that having multiple kinds of vouchers within the housing choice voucher program may cause complexity for housing authorities. The Committee acknowledges that public housing authorities must track HUD-VASH vouchers separately, but this is important not only in order to ensure that they continue to serve veterans, but also because these vouchers are administered in conjunction with the VA. The supportive services provided by the VA are one of the reasons that HUD-VASH tenants are more successful in achieving and maintaining housing stability. Separately tracking and monitoring these vouchers helps to ensure that the VA has sufficient case managers to support program participants, while also guaranteeing that these vouchers will continue to serve homeless veterans until homelessness among the Nation's veterans is ended.

The HUD-VASH program has contributed to the overall reduction in homelessness among the Nation's veterans. However, there has been an increase in the number of homeless female veterans, whose number is increasing at a distressing rate, and many of whom have children. The HUD-VASH program has proven to be one of the most effective tools in assisting these women and their families. As the VA works to adapt to the unique needs of female veterans and their children, the Committee wants to ensure that the HUD-VASH program will continue to provide them with permanent and safe housing.

Family Unification Program.—The Committee has provided \$20,000,000 for incremental voucher assistance through the Family Unification Program. This level of funding is the same as the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and \$20,000,000 more than the budget request. The Committee has included language that requires the Secretary to make this funding available to entities with experience in using this program and the sufficient resources available to provide voucher recipients with appropriate supportive services. Congress provided funding for incremental vouchers in fiscal year 2008, but it was not until 2009 under the current administration that these vouchers were awarded. The Committee expects these vouchers to be allocated effectively, but swiftly.

The Family Unification Program assists families that have been separated, or are facing separation due to a lack of housing. The program also provides vouchers to youths age 18 to 21 that are aging out of foster care, or those age 16 or older who lack adequate housing.

The Committee encourages HUD to coordinate the release of these vouchers with providers that are part of HUD's Continuum of Care. Members of the Continuum of Care can assist public housing authorities identify families and youth that could benefit from this program. The Committee also hopes that these vouchers will be used to serve victims of domestic violence who lack a safe and stable home environment.

Vouchers for Persons with Disabilities.—The Committee has not included funding for additional incremental vouchers for non-elderly people with disabilities in fiscal year 2010. The Committee is

concerned with HUD's management of the previous allocations of vouchers for people with disabilities made in fiscal years 2008 and 2009. The Committee requests that HUD provide a letter report on how the competition for these vouchers has been managed. This information should include the criteria for selecting among applicant public housing agencies and efforts to link these resources to human service policies on community integration for people with disabilities.

Tenant Protection Vouchers.—The Committee recommends \$103,000,000 for tenant protection assistance. This is equal to the budget request and \$47,000,000 below the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee has once again included statutory language requiring the Secretary to provide replacement vouchers for all units in use within the past 24 months that cease to be available as assisted housing due to demolition, disposition, or conversion, subject to the availability of funds. The Committee has also included bill language allowing tenant protection in the form of project-based assistance to prevent the displacement of seniors currently residing in section 202 properties built between 1959 and 1974 that are refinanced or rehabilitated. These two statutory changes will prevent the loss of critical housing assistance in communities around the Nation.

Set-asides for Special Circumstances.—The Committee provides a set-aside of \$150,000,000 to allow the Secretary to adjust allocations to PHAs under certain prescribed circumstances. The Committee notes that the set-aside level represents an increase of \$50,000,000 over the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee expects this will provide the Secretary with a means of assisting PHAs with unexpectedly high unemployment and loss of income. Qualifying factors include: (1) public housing agencies that experienced a significant increase, as determined by the Secretary, in renewal costs of tenant-based rental assistance resulting from unforeseen circumstances and voucher utilization or the impact from portability under section 8(r) of the act; (2) public housing agencies with voucher leasing rates at the end of the calendar year that exceed the average leasing for the 12-month period used to establish the allocation; (3) adjustments to costs associated with VASH vouchers; and/or (4) public housing agencies with vouchers that were not in use during the 12-month period in order to be available to meet a commitment pursuant to section 8(o)(13) of the act. A PHA should not receive an adjustment to its allocation from the funding provided under this section if the Secretary determines that such PHA, through negligence or intentional actions, would exceed its authorized level.

Administrative Fees and Family Self-sufficiency Coordinators.—The Committee recommends \$1,550,000,000 for administrative fees, which is \$56,200,000 more than the budget request and \$100,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee also includes bill language allowing the Secretary to utilize unobligated balances, including recaptures and carryovers, remaining from funds appropriated under this heading from fiscal years 2009 and prior fiscal years to increase funding as needed for administrative fees.

The Committee also recommends \$50,000,000 for the Family Self-Sufficiency Coordinators, which is equal to the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Family-Self Sufficiency program provides services, such as childcare, job training and employment counseling, transportation and education, to housing choice voucher recipients. The supportive services provided through this program assist families in achieving economic independence and self-sufficiency.

Transformation Initiative.—The Committee has included language allowing the Secretary to transfer up to \$50,000,000 from this account to the Transformation Initiative. The President’s budget proposed to allow a transfer of up to 1 percent from this account. The Committee did not agree that the proposed uses of funding for the Transformation Initiative warranted such an immediate and significant deviation of funds from the tenant-based rental assistance account. However, the Committee has included the authority to transfer a more limited amount of funding from this account in order to invest in research, demonstrations, and technologies that will provide direct benefits to the tenant-based rental assistance program. Within the Transformation Initiative account, the Committee directs that some of the funding will be dedicated to improving the voucher management system. The existing systems are unable to accurately track vouchers, which results in challenges for both the Department and the Committee in trying to determine the appropriate funding levels for the program. The Committee expects the Secretary to work expeditiously to improve the systems.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$6,450,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	2,244,000,000
House allowance	2,500,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,500,000,000

¹ Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$4,000,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111–5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,500,000,000 for the Public Housing Capital Fund, which is \$256,000,000 more than the budget request and \$3,950,000,000 less than the amount provided for the program in fiscal year 2009. However, the amount is \$50,000,000 more than the nonemergency funding provided in fiscal year 2009.

Of the amount made available under this section, \$40,000,000 is for supportive services for residents of public housing and up to \$8,820,000 is made available to pay the costs of administrative and judicial receiverships. The Committee recommends up to

\$15,345,000 to support the ongoing financial and physical assessment activities at the Real Estate Assessment Center [REAC]. This amount is equal to the budget request.

Public housing provides over 1.2 million low-income households with safe and stable housing. The resources provided in the Capital Fund assist in the preservation of these important national assets. Unfortunately, limited resources have affected the ability of public housing authorities to upgrade and preserve these facilities, leading to a backlog in capital needs of over \$20,000,000,000.

In recognition of the importance of preserving the Nation's affordable housing stock, Congress included an additional \$4,000,000,000 to the Public Housing Capital Fund as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act [ARRA]. With this funding, public housing authorities will be able to increase the energy efficiency of public housing, build new housing or facilities, and bring vacant units back online. In addition, these investments are also creating jobs. While the Committee recognizes the investment that was made in the Capital Fund as part of ARRA, additional funds are warranted as part of the fiscal year 2010 bill to continue to address the backlog and increase the condition and supply of the Nation's public housing.

Early Childhood Education Facilities.—The Committee has included \$50,000,000 to fund grants for public housing agencies to construct, rehabilitate or acquire facilities to provide quality early childhood education and care to children living in and around public housing. Research has demonstrated that effective early learning can have an enormous impact on a child's future success in school and in society. However, the cost of building adequate facilities that best serve children is high, which poses a particular challenge to serving low-income children. These grants will provide public housing agencies the necessary capital to leverage additional resources and increase their ability to work with State, local, non-profit and private sector partners to bring quality early childhood education and childcare opportunities to children living in and around public housing. The funding provided can also be used for facilities that provide other important services to public housing residents, including: job and employment training, adult education, financial literacy education, or other appropriate supportive services.

The administration recently announced its intention to reward the incorporation of early childhood education in community revitalization efforts when selecting grantees to receive HOPE VI awards in its annual competition. The Committee agrees with this emphasis on better integrating housing and supportive service delivery in order to improve educational and economic outcomes for public housing residents. By including funding for competitive grants under the Public Housing Capital Fund, the Committee intends to expand access to capital resources necessary to bring early childhood education or other service facilities to public housing agencies beyond those participating in the HOPE VI program.

Capital Needs Assessment.—In fiscal year 2008, the Committee directed HUD to undertake an assessment of the capital needs of public housing. The Committee requested this study in order to understand the condition of our Nation's public housing stock and to

gain a better understanding of the cost of maintaining this housing. This assessment will help the Committee determine the level of resources necessary to ensure that public housing continues to serve its residents and be an asset to the government. In conducting this assessment, however, the Committee expects HUD to evaluate not only the cost of maintaining the housing as is, but the cost of making reasonable improvements that will ensure efficiently operated housing that meets the needs of tenants.

Therefore, the study should include what capital improvements are necessary to meet the demands of its aging population, which continues to grow. In addition, the study should consider the cost of making green or energy efficiency improvements. Since the last evaluation was conducted, it has become clear that these investments can result in a reduction in the cost of operating public housing. So, while these investments may seem to go beyond what is necessary to maintain public housing, the study should include improvements that can be made to increase the efficiency and sustainability of the portfolio. Moreover, since the Committee also provides the funding to operate public housing, it is necessary to understand how investments in green buildings and energy efficient technologies might result in cost savings on the operating side. In order to ensure that the study provides sufficient information to inform the decisions of Congress, the Committee directs the Department to once again meet with the advisory committee on the scope of the capital needs assessment. The assessment undertaken must evaluate the true capital needs of public housing.

Providing Guidance to PHAs on Disaster-related Damages.— Since Hurricane Katrina, HUD has worked with the Federal Emergency and Management Administration [FEMA] to delineate clear roles and responsibilities for each agency in providing housing and related assistance to citizens in the wake of disasters. In addition, last year, Congress repealed section 9(k) of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act [QHWRA], thereby clarifying that public housing capital funds cannot be used to pay for the repair of public housing damaged in Presidentially declared disasters. In light of this change, HUD must provide public housing authorities [PHAs] clear guidance on the process for applying for funding to make permanent repairs to public housing damaged by disasters. The Committee directs HUD to continue working with FEMA to ensure that Federal policies and procedures for addressing public housing needs following disasters accurately reflect the repeal of section 9(k). Moreover, as policies are developed, they must be clearly communicated to all PHAs.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

Appropriations, 2009	\$4,455,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	4,600,000,000
Housing allowance	4,800,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,750,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for the payment of operating subsidies to approximately 3,100 public housing authorities (except Indian housing authorities) with a total of approximately 1.2 million

units under management in order to augment rent payments by residents in order to provide sufficient revenues to meet reasonable operating costs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,750,000,000 for the public housing operating fund, which is \$150,000,000 more than the budget request and \$295,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee applauds the administration's goal to fully fund the cost of operating public housing. However, the Committee is concerned that the analysis understates the actual costs of operating public housing. As such, the Committee has recommended additional funding in order to maintain safe and sanitary housing and services for public housing residents. The Committee has provided additional funds to offset rising utility costs and increased requirements placed on PHAs.

The bill includes language from the fiscal year 2004 appropriation bill that prohibits the use of operating funds to pay for the operating expenses for a prior year.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING [HOPE VI]

Appropriations, 2009	\$120,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	250,000,000
Committee recommendation	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing [HOPE VI] account makes awards to public housing authorities on a competitive basis to demolish obsolete or failed developments or to revitalize, where appropriate, sites upon which these developments exist. This is a focused effort to eliminate public housing which was, in many cases, poorly located, ill-designed, and not well constructed. Such unsuitable housing has been very expensive to operate, and difficult to manage effectively due to multiple deficiencies.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

However, the Committee notes that there are still over 140 active HOPE VI grants, as well as the additional grants that will be awarded funding in 2009. The Committee remains committed to the success of these projects, and therefore directs the Secretary to continue to provide the necessary oversight, technical assistance and support to existing HOPE VI grantees. As noted in 2009, the Committee is particularly focused on ensuring the success of the

HOPE VI grantees that face imminent expenditure deadlines and encourages the Secretary to support those grantees in expending their funding in a timely and effective manner.

CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS

Appropriations, 2009	
Budget estimate, 2010	\$250,000,000
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	250,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$250,000,000 for the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative. This amount is equal to the level requested by the President. The fiscal year 2009 Omnibus Appropriations bill included \$120,000,000 for the HOPE VI program, which replaces the most severely distressed public housing with mixed-income, mixed-use neighborhoods. Choice Neighborhoods seeks to build on the HOPE VI program by expanding the types of eligible grantees and allowing funding to be used on HUD-owned or assisted housing, as well as the surrounding community.

The Committee agrees that expanding HUD's ability to direct funds to revitalization efforts that reach beyond public housing will

broaden the impact of the Department's community revitalization efforts. However, the Committee notes that the work to replace distressed public housing is not yet complete. Therefore the Committee has included language that stipulates that not less than \$165,000,000 of the funding provided shall be awarded to projects where public housing authorities are the lead applicant.

In addition, this initiative is designed to evaluate and address the services and opportunities that are important to the success of residents living in these newly revitalized neighborhoods, including access to schools, transportation, jobs, and services. The Committee applauds the administration's effort to think holistically about the needs of distressed communities and their residents to ensure that revitalization efforts transform both neighborhoods, and the lives of their residents. However, while the Committee supports the administration's efforts to push communities to work in partnership with other organizations and different State and local agencies, the Committee also expects HUD to recognize that communities have different local needs and structures. So, in developing the criteria for this initiative, HUD should not be overly prescriptive or unnecessarily limiting in what types of partnerships are required or how they are defined.

While the Committee recommends funding to allow this initiative to move forward, the Committee is concerned by the lack of details about how the Secretary will evaluate and determine successful projects. Moreover, there are many important issues to be resolved by the Department before implementing the program, including resident protections. Therefore, the Committee has directed the Secretary to submit a plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 60 days of the enactment of this act detailing how HUD will define functioning, sustainable, mixed-income neighborhoods, as well as what specific goals the Secretary and grant recipients will have to meet. In addition, the Committee expects the plan to include more detail on the role that other Federal agencies will play in this initiative. It is important for the Committee to have a better understanding of how the administration intends to implement the program before the administration publishes criteria for project selection.

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

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

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009 ¹	\$1,155,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	645,000,000
House allowance	750,000,000
Committee recommendation	670,000,000

¹ Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$510,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account funds the Native American Housing Block Grants Program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 [NAHASDA]. This program provides an allocation of funds on a formula basis to Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities to help them address the housing needs within their communities. Under this block grant, Indian tribes will use performance measures and benchmarks that are consistent with the national goals of the program, but can base these measures on the needs and priorities established in their own Indian housing plan.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$670,000,000 for the Native American Housing Block Grants, of which \$2,000,000 is set aside for a credit subsidy to support a loan level not to exceed \$18,000,000 for the section 601 Loan Guarantee Loan Program.

The recommended level of funding is \$485,000,000 less than the amount provided in fiscal year 2009, but \$25,000,000 more than the amount of nonemergency funding provided for this program in fiscal year 2009. The amount is also \$25,000,000 more than the request.

The Committee recognizes the housing and economic development challenges that face so many Native American tribes today. In fact, Native Americans face unemployment and poverty rates that are nearly twice as high as those of other Americans. However, there is little recent data available to quantify the housing needs of Native Americans. The transformation initiative includes funding for research activities, and the Committee has recommended that HUD undertake a study to evaluate the housing needs of Native American. The Committee expects that this research will provide HUD with a better understanding of the housing needs of Native American tribes, which should result in innovative new policies and approaches to addressing their unique needs.

In fiscal year 2009, the Committee included funding to Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development to conduct economic development and entrepreneurship activities for federally recognized Indian tribes. The Committee provided this funding in order to give tribes the resources and tools to enable tribes to promote economic development, create jobs, and increase housing capacity. The Committee directs the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development to coordinate this effort with the Office of Native American Programs.

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

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

Appropriations, 2009	\$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	10,000,000
House allowance	12,000,000
Committee recommendation	13,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$13,000,000 for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant Program, which is \$3,000,000 more than the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Of the amount provided, \$300,000 shall be for training and technical assistance activities, including up to \$100,000 for related travel for Hawaii-based HUD employees.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Appropriations, 2009	\$9,000,000	\$420,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	7,000,000	919,000,000
House allowance	7,000,000	919,000,000
Committee recommendation	7,000,000	919,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides access to private financing for Indian families, Indian tribes, and their tribally designated housing entities that otherwise could not acquire housing financing because of the unique status of Indian trust land. As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account includes the subsidy costs associated with the loan guarantees authorized under this program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,000,000 in program subsidies to support a loan level of \$919,000,000. This subsidy amount is equal to the budget request and \$2,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM
ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Appropriations, 2009	\$1,044,000	\$41,504,255
Budget estimate, 2010	1,044,000	41,504,255
House allowance		
Committee recommendation	1,044,000	41,504,255

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program provides access to private financing for native Hawaiians who otherwise could not acquire housing finance because of the unique status of the Hawaiians Home Lands as trust land. As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account includes the subsidy costs associated with the loan guarantees authorized under this program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,044,000 in program subsidies to support a loan level of \$41,504,255. This subsidy level and loan level is equal to the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS [HOPWA]

Appropriations, 2009	\$310,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	310,000,000
House allowance	340,000,000
Committee recommendation	320,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS [HOPWA] Program provides States and localities with resources and incentives to devise long-term comprehensive strategies for meeting the housing and supportive services needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.

Statutorily, 90 percent of appropriated funds are distributed by formula to qualifying States and metropolitan areas on the basis of the number and incidence of AIDS cases reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention by March 31 of the year preceding the appropriation year. The remaining 10 percent of funds are distributed through a national competition.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$320,000,000 for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program. This level of funding is \$10,000,000 more than both the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and the budget request. The Committee has included language requiring HUD to allocate these funds in a manner that preserves existing HOPWA programs to the extent that these pro-

grams are determined to be meeting the needs of persons with AIDS.

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

Grantees receiving HOPWA funding have demonstrated similar success in their performance reports. According to information HUD gathered from its grantees, from 2007–2008, 92 percent of households receiving rental assistance achieved housing stability with related support. In the same reporting data, individuals receiving short term or transitional housing support maintained their housing stability, or reduced their risk of homelessness by 62 percent.

While the HOPWA program has demonstrated success, there is still substantial work to do to meet the housing demand of low-income persons with HIV/AIDS. Recent data from HUD’s Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress indicate that the number of homeless persons with HIV/AIDS increased slightly from 2007 to 2008. As such, the Committee has increased funding for this account above the President’s request and expects that the additional funding provided will allow grantees to continue to serve those in existing programs and reach additional persons in need.

OFFICE OF RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2009	\$26,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development was established to ensure that the Department has a comprehensive approach to rural housing and rural economic development issues. The account includes funding for capacity building in rural, underserved areas, and grants for Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State and local economic development agencies, rural nonprofits and rural community development corporations to pursue strategies designed to meet rural housing and economic development needs.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The President’s budget proposes to fund the activities of the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development within the Community Development Fund as a new Rural Innovation Fund. The budget therefore requested no funding in fiscal year 2010 for the

Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development. The Committee supports the recommendation to move the program in order to better coordinate community development activities and programs. However, the Committee remains committed to the goals of the program, and retained the structure of the program, while encouraging the Secretary to seek out new and innovative approaches to address the unique housing and economic challenges of rural communities.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$6,900,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	4,450,000,000
House allowance	4,598,607,000
Committee recommendation	4,450,000,000

¹Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$3,000,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, the Department is authorized to award block grants to units of general local government and States for the funding of local community development programs. A wide range of physical, economic, and social development activities are eligible with spending priorities determined at the local level, but the law enumerates general objectives which the block grants are designed to fulfill, including adequate housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income. Grant recipients are required to use at least 70 percent of their block grant funds for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons.

Funds are distributed to eligible recipients for community development purposes utilizing the higher of two objective formulas, one of which gives somewhat greater weight to the age of housing stock. Seventy percent of appropriated funds are distributed to entitlement communities and 30 percent are distributed to nonentitlement communities after deducting designated amounts for set-asides.

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

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

Resources made available as part of this program will be awarded to eligible colleges and universities to implement community activities, revitalize neighborhoods, address economic development and housing issues, and promote energy conservation and homeownership counseling and training. This activity was previously part of the Office of Policy, Development, and Research, but has been moved to better align with program purposes.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,450,000,000 for the Community Development Fund in fiscal year 2010. This level is \$2,450,000,000 less than the level provided to the program in fiscal year 2009, but \$550,000,000 more than the amount provided in fiscal year 2009 not including emergency funding. The recommendation is equal to the budget request.

The Committee has provided \$3,992,000,000 for Community Development Block Grants. This level of funding represents an increase of \$350,033,125 over the nonemergency block grant funding provided in fiscal year 2009. This funding provides States and entitlement communities across the Nation with resources that allow them to undertake a wide range of community development activities, including public infrastructure improvements, housing rehabilitation and construction, job creation and retention, and public services that primarily benefit low and moderate income persons. As States and communities struggle with budget constraints, this funding will allow States and communities to undertake new housing and community development projects, and maintain important services.

The Committee notes that the President's budget proposed altering the existing CDBG formula. However, specific reform legislation was not transmitted for the authorizing committees to consider. As such, the funding provided will be allocated under the existing formula.

Sustainable Communities Initiative.—The Committee has recommended \$150,000,000, as requested, to support the President's Sustainable Communities Initiative. The funding provided will support an interagency collaboration among HUD, DOT, and the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]. The resources provided include: \$100,000,000 for Regional Integrated Planning grants; \$40,000,000 for Community Challenge Planning grants; and \$10,000,000 for joint HUD and DOT research to support and enhance the creation of sustainable, livable communities.

Across the country today, families living in urban, suburban, and rural communities are burdened by the high costs of housing and transportation. Moreover, the housing and transportation options available in many of our communities do not meet the needs of their citizens. The economic recession has only highlighted the need to increase access to affordable housing and public transportation, as well as the need to lower transportation and energy costs. The interagency partnership among HUD, DOT, and EPA is a first step to removing barriers that limit the ability of communities to coordinate the housing, transportation, and water infrastructure resources that support smart community redevelopment. The objective of this interagency partnership is to work together to

identify and remove barriers to collaboration. Removing these barriers should create new opportunities to design and build communities that link the housing, transportation, services, and commercial assets that comprise vibrant, economically diverse communities.

The Committee has provided \$100,000,000 for Regional Integrated Planning Grants. HUD, DOT, and EPA should promote plans that incorporate affordable rental and homeownership options, and consider a variety of transportation options including: transit, ferries, and bicycles. The agencies should also encourage planning that effectively places housing in proximity to transportation, jobs, retail, social services, and other public assets such as schools and libraries. The funding recommended for fiscal year 2010 will support regions' efforts to build and improve the capacity of metropolitan transportation and housing planning organizations to conduct integrated planning. The funding can also be used to provide regions with the technology and tools necessary to conduct effective, integrated regional planning. The Committee has included language stipulating that not less than \$25,000,000 shall go to metropolitan areas with fewer than 500,000 persons. The Committee has included this language to ensure that residents of smaller, more rural communities will also benefit from improved housing and transportation coordination.

In addition, \$40,000,000 has been included to fund similar planning efforts at the local level. The Committee expects that HUD and DOT will prioritize communities located in regions that receive Regional Integrated Planning Grants, so that the local communities will have the capacity and resources to support and increase the success of regional planning efforts. The Committee expects that these resources will be allocated to a wide range of communities, including urban, rural, and suburban communities.

In announcing their partnership, HUD, DOT, and EPA simultaneously released six livability principles. These guiding principles are to: provide more transportation choices; promote equitable, affordable housing; enhance economic competitiveness; support existing communities; coordinate and leverage Federal policies and investment; and value communities and neighborhoods. The Committee agrees with the foundation of this initiative as outlined by HUD, DOT, and EPA. However, the Committee seeks additional detail about the specific manner in which the resources provided by the Committee in fiscal year 2010 will generate projects in support of these principles. In order to gain greater clarity about eligibility requirements for program participation, and the performance measures for selected grantees, the Committee has included language requiring HUD, in consultation with DOT and EPA, to submit a plan to the Committee on Appropriations as well as the Senate Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs and the House Committee on Financial Services establishing grant criteria, as well as performance measures by which the success of grantees will be measured. This plan should also include actions that HUD, working with DOT and EPA, will take to identify and remove statutory or regulatory barriers that are critical to the success of this initiative.

The Committee expects that as HUD, DOT, and EPA work to develop performance measures of grantees and communities, they will integrate accessibility needs. The Committee directs HUD to work with the Access Board on elements that are critical to fostering accessible design and community development.

The Committee has also included \$10,000,000 for HUD, in partnership with DOT, to conduct research around this initiative. This research should provide more data and analysis to inform and improve local and regional planning efforts. In addition the research should provide HUD and DOT with information on how successful approaches to integrated planning by regions and local communities can assist the departments in the development of policies and best practice models. The funding will also be used to conduct an evaluation of the program. The Committee directs an initial evaluation to be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 18 months of grant awards, with annual updates thereafter. These evaluations should include an assessment of grantees, as well as actions undertaken by the departments to integrate lessons learned into this initiative as well as other HUD and DOT programs.

Rural Innovation Fund.—The Committee supports the administration's effort to seek new and innovative ways to address housing and economic challenges in rural communities. However, the administration has not provided a clear vision for how this program will be structured or why the funding is better utilized by States. The Committee has therefore agreed with the President's request to move the program activities under the Community Development Fund, but has maintained the eligibility of existing program participants including Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, and local nonprofits and community development corporations. The Committee expects that in selecting grant recipients in fiscal year 2010, the Secretary will seek out new and innovative approaches to addressing the needs of rural communities.

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

The Committee includes \$65,000,000 for grants to Indian tribes for essential economic and community development activities which is equal to the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The Committee recommends funding for the Economic Development Initiative [EDI] and the Neighborhood Initiatives program [NI]. The Committee clarifies that funding provided through EDI

and NI cannot be used to reimburse costs already incurred on a project before an award is made by HUD for that specific project.

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

The Economic Development Initiatives are as follows:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
Abused Women's Aid in Crisis; Anchorage, AK	For infrastructure improvements at a center to serve victims of domestic violence	\$200,000
Ada Public Works Authority, Ada, OK	For construction of a water tower	400,000
Albany, GA	For the transformation of real estate property and infrastructure into a Certified Industrial Park	450,000
American Red Cross of Northeast IN	For an expansion of the existing facility	200,000
Amos House, Providence, RI	For construction of a training and support center to serve low-income individuals	750,000
Anchorage Community Land Trust, Anchorage, AK	For rehabilitation and renewal of key blighted property along Mountain View Drive	400,000
Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments	For the restoration of the historic Camden Yarns Mill building in downtown Lewiston would rehabilitate a blighted mill on the river.	600,000
Appalachia Service Project, Brenton, WV	For a home repair program for low-income families in Southern West Virginia	750,000
Appalachia Service Project, Chavies, KY	To serve families below the Federal poverty level through a variety of means, such financial assistance with daily purchases or equipping homes with running water.	460,000
Appleton Housing Authority, Appleton, WI	For construction and preservation of low-income elderly housing	420,000
Architectural Heritage Foundation, Lowell, MA	For construction of a mixed-use urban development including space for affordable housing	200,000
Ardmore Development Authority, Ardmore, OK	For infrastructure improvements	600,000
Argentine Neighborhood Dev. Assoc., Kansas City, KS	For property acquisition, infrastructure improvements, and housing construction	1,000,000
Arkansas Food Bank Network, AR	For establishment of a new facility	200,000
Automation Alley, Troy, MI	For construction of the Automation Alley International Business Center	300,000
Blair County, PA	For acquisition, demolition and site preparation within Blair County's blighted urban core areas, including downtown Altoona	250,000
Bolivar County, MS	For the renovation and repair of a historic courthouse	350,000
Boyle County Fiscal Court, Danville, KY	To upgrade the current building and infrastructure in Boyle County	500,000
Boys & Girls Club of Greater Westfield, Westfield, MA	For renovation and expansion of a youth facility	300,000
Boys and Girls Clubs of Southwest Washington	For the expansion of the Boys & Girls Clubs of SW Washington Facility	1,000,000
Bristol Bay Borough, AK	For infrastructure expansion at the Port of Bristol Bay	1,000,000
Buena Vista Charter Township, MI	For the redevelopment of blighted property	400,000
Calhoun County, MS	For renovation and construction of an historic courthouse	900,000
Chippewa-Luce-Mackinac Community Action Human Resources Authority, Luce County, MI	For construction of a new service center to house all the agency's programs which benefit low-income county residents	400,000
City of Anderson, IN	For technology and building infrastructure improvements, tenant build-out and enhancements, and laboratory development for the incubator campus of buildings.	200,000
City of Billings, MT	For the purchase of generators to provide emergency power to critical water facilities	1,000,000
City of Bozeman, MT	For reconstruction following an explosion in a downtown historic district	1,000,000
City of Cincinnati, OH	For redevelopment of Brownfield property into a new light industrial and service center business park	600,000
City of Council Bluffs, IA	For development of low and moderate income housing	350,000
City of Danville, IL	For acquisition, demolition and redevelopment of dilapidated and abandoned structures	350,000
City of Deils Rapids, SD	For restoration, renovation and modernization of an historic public library	500,000

City of Desert Hot Springs, CA	For development of a community facility to address a serious health and public safety problems in a low income area	300,000
City of Forsyth, GA	For renovations of the former Tift College are necessary to house the Georgia Department of Corrections which has been vacant since 1994 and are in various states of disrepair and must be brought up to the current standards.	650,000
City of Gig Harbor, WA	For construction of a multi-use facility by the Boys and Girls Club	750,000
City of Greenville, MS	For renovations and infrastructure enhancements for a youth wellness project	300,000
City of Hattiesburg, MS	For renovations and replacement of buildings and equipment for a park in a blighted neighborhood	500,000
City of Hopkinsville, KY	For necessary infrastructure	3,000,000
City of Hyden, KY	For construction and development of a community wellness facility to serve southeastern Kentucky	500,000
City of Jackson, MS	For property improvements related to the Capitol Street Renaissance Project	805,000
City of Jackson, MS	For renovation and rehabilitation of the City of Jackson's Public Facilities for the Cultural Arts and Science	550,000
City of Lewiston, ME	For the City of Lewiston's ongoing efforts to revitalize its riverfront	900,000
City of Midland, TX	For renovations to 30-year old facilities so that they can continue to serve the Midland community	500,000
City of North Adams, MA	For renovation and restoration of a downtown historic building in order to reduce blight and attract private investment	200,000
City of Oxford, MS	For renovation of a historical structure	400,000
City of Pascagoula, MS	For construction of city of Pascagoula beach park promenade	500,000
City of Pawtucket, RI	For repair and renovation of a historic public library	250,000
City of Peoria, IL	For critical public infrastructure improvements around the Glen Oak and Harrison Community Schools	250,000
City of Philadelphia, PA	For mixed-use Transit Oriented Development in the area around the 9th and Berks rail station	500,000
City of Piedmont, OK	For the construction of a municipal building	1,000,000
City of Quincy	For the acquisition of blighted residential properties to create affordable housing and facilitated mixed-use development	200,000
City of Rochester, NY	For environmental mediation, demolition, and other site preparation for revitalization	350,000
City of Rockford, IL	For capital costs associated with the city's mixed-use development plans	250,000
City of Ruston, LA	Purchase of the equipment needed to construct the city-wide broadband network to be managed and maintained by the city of Ruston.	200,000
City of Springfield, IL	For acquisition of abandoned properties and upgrades to infrastructure	350,000
City of Taunton, MA	For safety and access improvements at a low-income senior center	200,000
City of Tuscaloosa, AL	For the downtown revitalization project	5,000,000
City of Waterbury, CT	For the redevelopment of Brownfields and blighted properties	500,000
City of Wenatchee, WA	For property acquisition and renovation of Wenatchee Pybus Food Bank and Distribution Center	1,500,000
City of Winston-Salem, NC	For creation of office space to recruit businesses to a Winston-Salem, as part of the revitalization of a blighted area	500,000
City of York, PA	For restoration and preservation of historic central market	800,000
Community Area Resource Enterprise (CARE 66), Gallup, NM	For the development of up to 60 units of affordable housing	500,000
Community Chest, Virginia City, NV	For construction of a multi-use community center in Storey County	200,000
County Commissioners of Charles County, MD	For installation of plumbing in low-income housing	300,000
County of Kauai, HI	For on-site infrastructure improvements to enable the construction of 26 residential homes for low-income households	250,000
County of Minnehaha, SD	For construction of a facility to house chronically homeless persons	350,000
Covenant House Alaska, Anchorage, AK	For the relocation of a crisis center facility	500,000
Crossroads, North Kingstown, RI	For the development and construction of a Child Care and Community Center	750,000
Delaware Children's Museum, DE	For the construction of the Delaware Children's Museum in Wilmington, Delaware, as part of a community revitalization effort	200,000
Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit, MI	For removal and replacement of the roof on an historic building	650,000

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
Divide County, Crosby, ND	For reclamation of a former Air Force Base site for redevelopment	300,000
East Central Community Center, Spokane, WA	For design and construction of a community facility	350,000
East Orange Division of Senior Services, East Orange, NJ	For renovation of a Senior Citizen Center	200,000
El Centro de Servicios Sociales, Lorain, OH	For construction and renovations of an aging structure	600,000
Emergency Shelter of the Fox Valley, Appleton, WI	For acquisition and rehabilitation of permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless persons	350,000
Esperanza, Philadelphia, PA	For the planning, design, rehabilitation and construction of affordable housing in the Hunting Park neighborhood	200,000
Eva's Village, Paterson, NJ	For renovation of the center's facilities	800,000
First Steps Primeros Pasos, Georgetown, DE	For construction and start up costs for a bilingual early care and education facility to help children of non-English-speaking families develop the skills needed to succeed	200,000
Food Bank of Delaware, Newark, DE	For expansion of a commercial kitchen, a volunteer room, a Culinary Arts Training Facility, a retail area and additional office space that will allow the food bank to meet growing demand in Kent and Sussex counties	200,000
Freestore Foodbank, Cincinnati, OH	For major renovations on two heavily used food bank facilities	550,000
Garrard County Fiscal Court, Lancaster, KY	For renovation and expansion of the Garrard County EMS building in Lancaster, KY	200,000
Georgia Maritime Trade Center Authority, Savannah, GA	For site preparation in accordance with the Parcel 7/Rivenwalk Civic Master Plan, including planning and preparation work, and the design and construction of a public access floating dock system to accommodate traffic flow to/from the site	900,000
Greater Boston Food Bank, Boston, MA	For construction of a regional food distribution center	600,000
Hampshire County Special Services Center, WV	For the acquisition of an additional facility to provide services and employment to individuals with developmental disabilities ..	1,000,000
Hawaii Public Housing Authority, Honolulu, HI	For code enforcement and renovation of 24 housing units for very low to low income elderly individuals at the Pahala Elderly Housing projects ..	400,000
Hawaii Public Housing Authority, Honolulu, HI	For renovation of housing units to provide 25 refurbished housing units for low income individuals at the Kahale Mua Public Housing ..	400,000
Heritage Services, Omaha, NE	For construction of an 80,000 square foot, multi-level facility that will accommodate an education and interactive learning center ..	800,000
Homeward, Inc., Clarion, IA	For expansion of a construction finance program to develop housing in rural communities for low-income individuals	200,000
Housing Vermont, Burlington, VT	For construction and improvement of housing stock	250,000
Howard County, MD	For rehabilitation and equipment purchase for community and wellness rooms in low- and moderate-income elderly housing community ..	500,000
Iowa Department of Economic Development, Des Moines, IA ..	For rehabilitation of buildings and areas	1,000,000
Jackson County Commission, WV	For expansion of the drill hall and supporting facilities at the proposed Spencer-Ripley Armed Forces Reserve Center	1,500,000
Jackson County, MS	For Phase I of construction and renovation	500,000
KC Parks and Recreation Department, Kansas City	For the construction of new community center	2,000,000
Kids Come First, Columbus, OH	For construction of a child care facility	500,000
King County Housing Authority, King County, WA	For the renovation and expansion of three youth community centers located in three public housing sites	1,000,000
Lanakila Rehabilitation Center, Honolulu, HI	For renovation and expansion of the Wahaiwa Training and Support Complex, which will double capacity to provide training and employment opportunities for people with disabilities and other low income individuals ..	300,000

Longview Housing Authority, Longview, WA	For the rehabilitation of historic building into a veterans housing and service center	500,000
Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule, SD	For purchase of a new playground equipment and upgrades to a kitchen and learning areas of a daycare facility to improve safety for children.	200,000
Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule, SD	For upgrades to a community center	350,000
Luna County Community Recreation Facility, NM	For the renovation of the old Pepsi building to house dedicated youth activities, practice space, and community meeting rooms.	410,000
Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Annapolis, MD	For restoration and preservation of properties to alleviate economic distress through stimulation of private investment and community revitalization.	475,000
Maryland Food Bank, Halethorpe, MD	For infrastructure improvements to a distribution facility and purchase of equipment	400,000
Maui Economic Concerns of the Community, Wailuku, HI	For rehabilitation and improvement of a homeless resource center and affordable housing for low-income residents	500,000
Mid Plains Community College, McCook, NE	For construction of a new Events Center that supports rural economic development and activity in southwestern Nebraska	500,000
Middlesex Community College, Lowell, MA	For redevelopment of an underutilized historic building to expand community services	200,000
Military Business Park, City of Fayetteville, NC	For construction of a military business park	600,000
Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	For redevelopment of a Superfund site and a State park	750,000
Ministry of Caring, Wilmington, DE	For renovations to the Josephine Bakhita House to serve as residence for young adults who are committed to social responsibility and giving back to the community through volunteer service.	200,000
Mookini Luakini Foundation, North Kohala, HI	For construction and renovation of a cultural education center for low income youth	200,000
Mt. Washington Community Development Corporation, Pittsburgh, PA	For planning, designing, site preparation, demolition and construction associated with brownfield redevelopment	200,000
Multi-Disciplinary Combined Facility for the Copper River Native Association, Cantwell, AK	For construction of a facility	1,000,000
Navajo Technical College, Crownpoint, NM	For construction of a regional health center located on the campus of the Navajo Technical College	400,000
Nevada Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND), Las Vegas, NV	For development of an assisted living facility for low-income seniors	700,000
New Futures, Seattle, WA	For the planning, design and construction of a community center	450,000
Noble County Health Department, Caldwell, OH	For the rehabilitation of a 30-year-old building to increase functionality and energy efficiency	400,000
North Olympic Regional Housing Network, Forks, WA	For the purchase and conversion of building into transitional and permanent supportive housing for homeless veterans and their families.	500,000
Northeast Iowa Food Bank, Waterloo, IA	For construction of a food warehouse and distribution center	350,000
Northern Comm. Investment Corp., St. Johnsbury, VT	To continue to expand high-speed, high technology broadband connectivity to New Hampshire's North Country	1,000,000
Northside Community Housing, Inc., St. Louis, MO	To provide renovations in order to preserve affordable housing units for low- and moderate-income seniors, individuals, and families.	1,000,000
Our City Reading, Reading, PA	For rehabilitation of abandoned houses and provision of down- payment assistance to home buyers	200,000
Panhandle Area Development District, Gering, NE	For remodel of an existing building into a physical and virtual small business incubator to serve the Panhandle of Nebraska	300,000
Parish of Ascension, LA	For acquisition of the multi-purpose center	700,000
Pendleton Round-Up Foundation, Pendleton, OR	For the reconstruction and construction needs of facilities which are critical to the local economy	500,000
Pocahontas County Commission, Marlinton, WV	For construction of a multipurpose community center, which would promote the health and wellness of county residents, and provide youth and adult alcohol and drug prevention programs.	3,000,000
Port of Coos Bay, Coos Bay, OR	For purchase of critical dock equipment essential to local economic survival	350,000
Portsmouth Music Hall, Portsmouth, NH	To repair, restore, and modernize the theater and construct an additional space	1,000,000

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, WI	For site acquisition, demolition, remediation and redevelopment of priority sites in the 30th Street Industrial Corridor	300,000
Riverfront, Inc., La Crosse, WI	For expansion of a training facility for vocational and independent living services	300,000
Rockland Housing Action Coalition, Nanuet, NY	For construction of permanent, supportive rental housing for existing and returning disabled veterans and their families	1,000,000
Rocky Mountain Youth Corps, Rancho de Taos, NM	For preconstruction costs of a youth facility	300,000
Saginaw County, MI	For an energy efficient infrastructure demonstration project to support the renaissance of downtown Saginaw	350,000
Scranton City, PA	For elimination of slum and blight	300,000
Self-Help Housing Corporation of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI	For the construction of 76 lot subdivision for self-help housing project for low-income families	500,000
Silver Stage Youth Organization, Silver Springs, NV	For design and construction of a multi-purpose youth facility	200,000
Snohomish County, Everett, WA	For the acquisition and renovation of a new facility for use by Dawson's Place Child Advocacy Center	1,000,000
Spirit Lake Nation, Fort Totten, ND	For construction of low-income senior housing units	750,000
Squamscott Community Commons, Exeter, NH	For the construction of a new community center	1,000,000
St. Louis County Economic Council, St. Louis, MO	For the final design and construction of Wellston Child Care Center	2,250,000
Starr Commonweath, Battle Creek, MI	For renovations to facilities serving at-risk youth	900,000
Tallahatchie County, MS	For renovation of the Emmett Till Memorial Complex	195,000
The Arc of Spokane, Spokane, WA	For capital costs and equipment acquisition for the renovation of the Arc of Spokane's Indiana building	1,000,000
The Institute for Human Services, Honolulu, HI	For construction of a job and skills training center at Hawaii's oldest and largest emergency homeless shelter	200,000
The Old Slater Mill Association, Pawtucket, RI	For completion of the historic restoration project at the Historic Slater Mill	200,000
Theodore Roosevelt Medora Foundation, Medora, ND	For restoration and expansion of historic property	300,000
Tides Family Services, West Warwick, RI	For renovation and expansion a center for at-risk youth in Providence, RI	350,000
Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority, Toledo, OH	For purchase and remediation of the 110-acre former Jeep Parkway property	1,300,000
Town of Gorham, NH	For renovation of a community facility to house programs serving children, youth and families in Coos County	200,000
Town of Greenville, ME	For completing the Greenville Junction Wharf, including the construction of boat trailer parking, a handicapped-accessible boat launch, picnic tables and benches, steel sheet piles, and composite wood cribbing to replace the rotting timbers.	250,000
Town of North Kingstown, RI	For construction of a new senior center	300,000
Town of Silver City, NM	For the construction of the Vistas de Plata, a 56 unit affordable housing project	600,000
Tundra Women's Coalition, Bethel, AK	For replacement of a women's facility	500,000
United Way of Dave County, Madison, WI	For acquisition and redevelopment of apartment units in order to provide supportive housing for homeless families	200,000
United Way of Kitsap County, Bremerton, WA	For capital costs related to the development of the United Way Non-profit Community Center	500,000
Utah Food Bank Services, UT	For expanding the capacity to collect and distribute food to low-income individuals and families	250,000
Vermont Association of Area Agencies on Aging, Barre, VT	For improvements to facilities for seniors	500,000
Vermont Division for Historic Preservation, Montpelier, VT	For preservation of historic assets	200,000
Vermont Foodbank, Barre, VT	For energy efficiency improvements	200,000
Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Montpelier, VT	For enhancement of affordable housing and community development linked with land conservation and historic preservation	4,000,000
Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Montpelier, VT	For the construction and improvement of housing stock	250,000
Volunteers of America Michigan, Lansing, MI	For expansion of housing shelters and community access to medical, social, civic, and economic services	400,000

Waipa Foundation, Hanalei, HI	For construction, renovation, and equipment purchase for a State-certified commercial kitchen, food mill, and underground oven, for vocational training and processing of value-added agricultural products in low-income and farming communities.	400,000
Watson's Children's Shelter, Missoula, MT	For construction of an emergency children's shelter	250,000
Wayne State College, Wayne, NE	For construction of a new collaborative education center	300,000
West Columbia, SC	To establish an enrichment complex for families and children	250,000
West Valley City, UT	For the construction of a new City Center Plaza in a blighted area. The plaza is a critical element of a major redevelopment project currently underway along with a planned intermodal center.	1,000,000
Westerly Area Rest Meals (WARM Inc.), Westerly, RI	For expansion and renovation of a community soup kitchen	300,000

The neighborhood initiatives are as follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVES

Recipient and location	Project purpose	Committee recommendation
Capitol Hill Housing, Seattle, WA	For the construction of affordable housing	\$725,000
Center for Planning Excellence, Baton Rouge, LA	For provision of technical assistance to a community regarding sustainable development, neighborhood revitalization, housing and land use planning	1,000,000
City of Gig Harbor, Gig Harbor, WA	For improved physical access to area businesses	1,500,000
City of Olympia, Olympia, WA	For downtown revitalization and business access improvements	1,100,000
Consumer Credit Counseling Service, Las Vegas, NV	For foreclosure prevention efforts	500,000
Growing Places, Centralia, WA	For facility and infrastructure improvements to an education and job training facility serving at-risk youth	500,000
Holyoke Community College, Holyoke, MA	For completion of construction of a one-stop education, social services, and job training center serving low-income persons	250,000
homeWORD, Missoula, MT	For development of rental housing that is affordable to working families	500,000
Jacksonville Area Legal Aid, Jacksonville, FL	For foreclosure prevention training and other legal services	400,000
Jefferson County, CO	For the housing authority to establish a new program of housing and supportive services for homeless veterans over age 50	500,000
Kitsap Community Resources, Bremerton, WA	For the construction of an early learning center	750,000
Lighthouse for the Blind, Inc., Seattle, WA	For the improved accessibility of community and transit services for blind, low vision, and deaf-blind individuals in King, Pierce, and Spokane counties in Washington State	550,000
Mississippi State University, Starkville, MS	For community planning and development	500,000
NeighborWorks Lincoln, Lincoln, NE	For neighborhood revitalization including elimination of blight, construction of single family homes, rehabilitation and repairs	500,000
North End Action Team, Middletown, CT	For foreclosure prevention assistance	200,000
Northern Community Investment Corporation, Berlin, NH	For capitalization of a revolving loan fund to support businesses in New Hampshire's North Country	500,000
South Dakota Science and Technology Authority, Lead, SD	For infrastructure improvements to the Homestake Mine	400,000
Southeastern Connecticut Housing Alliance, Norwich, CT	For programs to increase affordable housing	200,000
Technology Access Foundation, White Center, WA	For the construction of the TAF Community Learning Space facility	500,000
Town of Huntington, NY	For construction of a state-of-the-art community center for veterans	800,000
Urban League of Southern Connecticut, Stamford, CT	For homeownership and foreclosure prevention counseling	300,000
YWCA of Yakima, Yakima, WA	For upgrades to the YWCA's Bringing It Home supportive housing project for victims of domestic violence	300,000
YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts, New Bedford, MA	For construction of a community center and women's transitional housing facility	200,000

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, authorizes the Secretary to issue Federal loan guarantees of private market loans used by entitlement and non-entitlement communities to cover the costs of acquiring real property, rehabilitation of publicly owned real property, housing rehabilitation, and other economic development activities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has recommended a loan level guarantee of \$275,000,000 for the section 108 loan guarantees account for fiscal year 2010. This guaranteed loan level is equal to both the fiscal year 2009 level and the budget request. This program enables Community Development Block Grant recipients to use their CDBG dollars as leverage as part of economic development projects and housing rehabilitation programs. Communities are allowed to borrow up to five times their most recent CDBG allocation. The Committee strongly supports this program, which is even more critical with limited credit in the private market. The Committee has included the language proposed by the President which allows the program to continue, while eliminating the need for a Federal appropriation.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2009	\$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	
House allowance	25,000,000
Committee recommendation	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Section 108(q) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, authorizes the Brownfields Redevelopment program. This program provides competitive economic development grants in conjunction with section 108 loan guarantees for qualified brownfields projects. Grants are made in accordance with section 108(q) selection criteria. The program supports the cleanup and economic redevelopment of contaminated sites.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$4,075,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	1,825,000,000
House allowance	2,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,825,000,000

¹ Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$2,250,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title II of the National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, authorizes the HOME Investment Partnerships Program. This program provides assistance to States and units of local government for the purpose of expanding the supply and affordability of housing to low- and very low-income people. Eligible activities include tenant-based rental assistance, acquisition, and rehabilitation of affordable rental and ownership housing and, also, construction of housing. To participate in the HOME program, State and local governments must develop a comprehensive housing affordability strategy. There is a 25 percent matching requirement for participating jurisdictions which can be reduced or eliminated if they are experiencing fiscal distress.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,825,000,000 for the Home Investment Partnership Program. This amount is \$2,250,000,000 less than the amount provided in fiscal year 2009, but equal to the 2009 program level not including emergency funding. The level recommended is also equal to the budget request.

The Home Investment Partnership Program is HUD's major housing production program. Since 1992, the HOME program has succeeded in producing over 870,000 units. The majority of the units produced serve low-income or extremely low-income residents and include homeownership, rental and homeowner rehabilitation. In addition to construction and rehabilitation, HOME funds can also be used for rental assistance, and there are over 197,000 households receiving rental assistance through the HOME program. The flexibility provided in the HOME program allows participating jurisdictions to use HOME funds to effectively meet the needs of their communities.

The Committee notes that in fiscal year 2008, HUD reallocated funding to conduct a "green buildings" competition, in order to encourage the use of green buildings and energy efficient technologies. The Committee hopes that HUD will continue to encourage the use of green buildings and energy efficient technologies as part of HOME programs.

Technical Assistance.—The Committee has not included funding for technical assistance within the amount provided for the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, but has instead allowed funding provided under this heading to go toward the Transformation Initiative as requested. However, the Committee expects that technical assistance funding will still be awarded to qualified nonprofit

intermediaries to provide technical assistance to Community Housing and Development Organizations [CHDOs], as well as for technical assistance for jurisdictions participating in the HOME program.

SELF-HELP AND ASSISTED HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2009	\$64,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	77,000,000
House allowance	85,000,000
Committee recommendation	85,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program is comprised of the Self-Help Homeownership Program [SHOP], which assists low-income homebuyers willing to contribute “sweat equity” toward the construction of their houses. The funds will increase nonprofit organizations’ ability to leverage funds from other sources and produce at least 2,000 new homeownership units. This account also includes funding for the Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing Program, as well as assistance to rural communities as authorized under sections 6301 through 6305 of Public Law 110–246. These grantees develop the capacity of nonprofit community development entities to undertake community development and affordable housing projects.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$85,000,000 for the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Program, which is \$8,000,000 more than the budget request and \$21,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee has included \$27,000,000 for the Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program authorized under section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Extension Act of 1996.

The Committee recommends \$50,000,000 for capacity building as authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993. The Committee notes that funding provided under this section requires a statutory 3-to-1 match to further leverage resources to assist more communities. The Committee provides \$8,000,000 to carry out capacity building activities in rural communities as authorized under section 6301 through 6305 in Public Law 110–246.

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

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009	1 \$3,177,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	1,793,715,000
House allowance	1,850,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,875,000,000

¹ Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$1,500,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Homeless Assistance Grants Program provides funding to break the cycle of homelessness and to move homeless persons and families to permanent housing. This is done by providing rental assistance, emergency shelter, transitional and permanent housing, and supportive services to homeless persons and families. The emergency grant is a formula funded grant program, while the Supportive Housing, Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Single-Room Occupancy and Shelter Plus Care Programs are competitive grants. Homeless assistance grants provide Federal support to one of the Nation's most vulnerable populations. These grants assist localities in addressing the housing and service needs of a wide variety of homeless populations while developing coordinated Continuum of Care [CoC] systems that ensure the support necessary to help those who are homeless to attain housing and move toward self-sufficiency.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,875,000,000 for Homeless Assistance Grants in fiscal year 2010. This amount is \$81,285,000 more than the President's request. This amount is \$1,302,000,000 less than the amount provided in fiscal year 2009, but \$198,000,000 more than the nonemergency funding provided in fiscal year 2009. Of the amount appropriated, up to \$6,000,000 is for technical assistance and data analysis. The Committee has also provided the Secretary with the authority to transfer up to \$12,500,000 of Homeless Assistance funding to the Transformation Initiative. Sufficient funding has also been included to fully fund Shelter Plus Care renewals on an annual basis. The Committee has continued bill language that: (1) requires not less than 30 percent of the funds appropriated, excluding renewal costs, shall be for permanent housing for both individuals and families; (2) requires the renewal of all expiring Shelter Plus Care contracts on an annual basis if the contract meets certain requirements; (3) requires a 25 percent match for social services; and (4) requires all homeless funding recipients to coordinate and integrate their programs with other mainstream and targeted social programs.

On July 9, 2009, the Secretary released the Annual Homelessness Assessment Report [AHAR] for 2008, as required by Congress. While the report found that the number of homeless in the United States remained relatively unchanged from 2007 to 2008, the data did reveal an increase of 9 percent in homelessness among families. Our Nation's suburban and rural communities also experienced an

increase in homelessness. While these figures are alarming, what is perhaps even more distressing is that the data collection ended as the economic crisis was accelerating.

Congress took action to help address this concern by including \$1,500,000,000 as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act for homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing activities. The Committee expects that this funding will provide communities with the necessary resources to aid families that are struggling to remain in stable housing. However, more action is necessary. The Committee has recommended additional resources for homeless programs in fiscal year 2010 to help communities respond to and prevent increased homelessness in this difficult economic time. The Committee expects that this additional funding will allow the Secretary to fund an increased number of new projects, and directs that resources be targeted to the most pressing needs identified in the AHAR, including family homelessness and suburban and rural homelessness.

Coordination with the Department of Education.—The President recently signed the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing [HEARTH] Act into law (Public Law 111–22). This bill will expand the definition of homelessness and also provide communities with more resources and tools to prevent homelessness. This is particularly important in assisting children and youth who are homeless or at-risk of homelessness. HUD and the Department of Education both provide critical resources to assist these children and youth in achieving housing stability and improving educational outcomes. While each agency’s role is different, it is imperative—for serving these children and youth successfully—that the departments work in coordination to best identify and serve these children and youth in need. By working in partnership on the Federal level and then providing clear and coordinated guidance to homeless education liaisons and homeless service providers in the field, communities will be able to better identify and provide homeless or at-risk children and youth with the housing and education services to which they are entitled. While each department has different statutory guidelines, the goal must be to effectively coordinate and utilize Federal resources to provide these vulnerable children and youth the services that they need.

As HUD works to develop the regulations and guidance necessary to implement the HEARTH Act, there is an opportunity to encourage communities to find new and innovative ways to prevent and end homelessness. Moreover, in an effort to foster a more collaborative approach to homelessness, HUD should work with other Federal agencies during this process to design programs at HUD that support and complement other Federal programs. In order to facilitate this, the Committee directs the Secretary to work with the Secretary of Education and develop measures and guidance that will result in better coordination between HUD and the Department of Education, as well as measures that will result in better coordination in delivering housing and education services to homeless and at-risk children and youth in our communities. These measures and guidance should include: coordination on Continuum of Care plans on identifying and making homeless families and youth aware of education services available to them; designating

agency staff to ensure that children are enrolled in school and connected to appropriate community services; establishing policies and practices consistent with the education subtitle of the McKinney-Vento Act and other related laws relating to the provision of educational and related services to individuals and families experiencing homelessness; and ensuring that collaborative applicants for Continuum of Care funding take into account the educational needs and the school of origin of children placed in emergency or transitional shelters.

Increased Homelessness Among Female Veterans.—Homelessness among our Nation’s veterans is a tragedy that requires not only attention, but also action. Congress has taken steps to provide homeless veterans with increased housing and services with programs such as the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program, which takes veterans off the street or out of shelters and places them in permanent housing. While officials at the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] have seen a decrease in the overall number of homeless veterans, unfortunately, there has been an increase in homelessness among our Nation’s female veterans. Recent data from the VA indicate that the number of female veterans who end up homeless has doubled over the last decade, and in fact 1 out of every 10 homeless veterans under the age of 45 today is a woman. Faced with mental trauma related to military service and challenges in transitioning into the civilian workforce, these female veterans are between two and four times more likely to become homeless than other women. Many of these female veterans also have children in their care, which can make accessing housing services from the VA challenging. As the Secretary looks to fund additional programs to serve families as part of the homeless competition in fiscal year 2010, the Committee encourages special attention to programs that will provide services to female veterans and their children. In addition, as the Secretary works in coordination with the VA and the Department of Labor to execute the demonstration program to prevent homelessness among our Nation’s veterans, for which the Committee included funding in fiscal year 2009, selected grantees should have plans to address the unique and growing needs of female veterans who are at-risk of homelessness.

Permanent Supportive Housing.—The Committee continues language that requires 30 percent of funds be set aside for permanent supportive housing for individuals and families. This will support Federal, State, and local efforts to increase the supply of permanent housing. Meeting the goal of creating 150,000 new units of permanent housing is critical to efforts to end chronic homelessness among individuals and families.

Annual Homeless Assessment Report [AHAR].—The Annual Homeless Assessment Report stems from congressional directives begun in 2001 that charged the Department with collecting homeless data through the implementation of a new Homeless Management Information System [HMIS]. The AHAR report included HMIS data, information provided by Continuums of Care, and a count of sheltered and unsheltered persons from one night in January of each year. The Committee applauds the Secretary’s efforts to improve and collect more real time data on homelessness in our communities. Because of the importance of these data and the

AHAR report, the Committee has retained some funding within the account to support those efforts.

The Committee requests that HUD submit the AHAR report by June 14, 2010. The Committee further hopes that HUD's efforts to increase participation in the HMIS effort will lead to improved information about and understanding of the Nation's homeless.

Renewal Costs.—The Committee reiterates the directive included in the conference report for the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (House Report 108–792) regarding out-year costs of renewing HUD's permanent housing programs. The Department should continue to include 5-year projects, on an annual basis, for the cost of renewing the permanent housing component of the Supportive Housing Program and the Shelter Plus Care Program in its fiscal year 2011 budget justifications.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009 ^{1 2}	\$9,500,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010 ¹	8,100,000,000
House allowance	8,700,000,000
Committee recommendation ¹	8,100,000,000

¹ Includes an advance appropriation.

² Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$2,000,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111–5).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Section 8 project-based rental assistance provides a rental subsidy to a private landlord that is tied to a specific housing unit as opposed to a voucher which allows a recipient to seek a unit, subject primarily to certain rent caps. Amounts in this account include funding for the renewal of expiring section 8 project-based contracts, including section 8, moderate rehabilitation, and single room occupancy [SRO] housing. This account also provides funds for contract administrators.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of \$8,100,000,000 for the annual renewal of project-based contracts, of which not less than \$232,000,000, but not to exceed \$258,000,000 is for the cost of contract administrators. The recommended level of funding is \$1,400,000,000 less than the amount provided in fiscal year 2009, but is \$600,000,000 more than the amount of non-emergency funding provided for this program in fiscal year 2009. The recommendation is also equal to the budget request.

The section 8 project-based account provides the necessary funding to ensure that many of our Nation's vulnerable elderly, disabled, and low-income citizens have safe and stable housing. The funding provided pays the cost of privately owned housing for these residents. However, for several years, HUD created great instability in this program by requesting insufficient resources to pay the full renewal costs if its contracts. HUD managed the program

by short-funding contracts, and in some instances delaying payments to landlords. The effect of this policy was to push the costs of the program into a future year, thereby creating a shortfall of over \$2,000,000,000 in the amount necessary to fully fund all existing contracts. As a result of this policy of short-funding contracts and delaying contract payments, landlords reconsidered program participation, and residents living in project-based housing feared losing their housing.

In order to restore stability to the program, and fulfill the Federal Government’s commitment under existing contracts, Congress included \$2,000,000,000 in emergency funding as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. This funding allowed HUD to return to the practice of fully fund all contracts for 12 months. The amount of funding recommended in this bill will allow HUD to continue this practice in fiscal year 2010. The Federal Government has an important role to play in creating and sustaining affordable housing, especially for its most vulnerable citizens. However, it cannot do it alone; it requires partnerships with State and local governments, nonprofits and others in the private sector. By providing the resources necessary to fully funding contracts, the Committee expects that the Federal Government will be able to maintain and create new partnerships with local, nonprofit and private sector entities to sustain and create new affordable housing for our Nation’s low-income citizens.

Transformation Initiative Transfer.—The President’s budget proposed to transfer up to 1 percent of the funding from this account to the Transformation Initiative. The Committee is not convinced that this initiative warrants such a significant investment from the section 8 project-based rental assistance program. Moreover, the Committee does not want to leave the program with insufficient funding to cover contract costs in fiscal year 2010. However, the Committee does see some benefits that the initiative can provide to the program. This includes investments in better information technology to improve management of project-based contracts. Therefore the Committee includes language allowing up to \$20,000,000 to be transferred from this account to the Transformation Initiative.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009	\$765,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	765,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	785,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for housing for the elderly under section 202. Under this program, the Department provides capital grants to eligible entities for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of housing for seniors and provides project-based rental assistance [PRAC] to support operational costs for such units.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$785,000,000 for the section 202 program. This level is \$20,000,000 more than the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The Committee recommends \$90,000,000 for service coordinators and for the continuation of existing congregate service grants; up to \$25,000,000 for the conversion of projects to assisted living housing or for substantial rehabilitation for emergency capital repairs; \$20,000,000 for grants to nonprofits for architectural and engineering work, site control, and planning activities.

The Committee notes that the number of Americans aged 65 and older is growing in number, as well as a percentage of the total U.S. population. Unfortunately, the supply of affordable housing to assist our Nation's low-income elderly is not sufficient to meet this increased demand. According to a May 2007 report from HUD to Congress on the worst case housing needs, elderly households constituted over 21 percent of the Nation's worst case housing needs in 2005, an increase of over 14 percent from the 2003 level. In order to address these housing needs, new units of affordable elderly housing are needed. HUD's section 202 program, the HUD program exclusively for the elderly, is an important part producing additional units to meet this growing need. As such, the Committee has increased resources for this account in order to increase the supply of housing for the elderly. The Committee expects HUD to use the additional funding, and make any programmatic changes necessary to ensure that we are increasing our production of affordable housing for the elderly.

HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009	\$250,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	250,000,000
House allowance	350,000,000
Committee recommendation	265,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This account provides funding for housing for the persons with disabilities under section 811. Under this program, the Department provides capital grants to eligible entities for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or construction of housing for persons with disabilities. Up to 25 percent of the funding may be made available for tenant-based assistance under section 8 and provides project-based rental assistance [PRAC] to support operational costs for such units.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$265,000,000 for the section 811 program. This level is \$15,000,000 more than the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. HUD is directed to ensure all tenant-based assistance made available under this account shall remain available for persons with disabilities upon turnover. The Committee has provided \$87,100,000 for incremental section 8 vouchers under this program. In addition, section 811 funds may be used for inspections by HUD's Real Estate As-

assessment Center [REAC] and for related inspection activities. HUD is directed to submit a budget to the Committees on Appropriations before funding REAC inspections.

In February 2008, a report by HUD indicated that over 1,000,000 households with disabilities had some of the Nation’s worst case housing needs. This information underscores the importance of the section 811 program, which provides both capital and rental assistance to help low-income disabled Americans find affordable housing in order to live independently. The Committee has provided increased funding for the section 811 program in order to increase the number of units created for low-income disabled Americans. The Committee expects that in addition to utilizing this funding to support more supportive housing projects to serve the disabled, the Department will also examine ways to make the program and project process more efficient.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE

Appropriations, 2009 ¹	\$65,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	100,000,000
House allowance	70,000,000
Committee recommendation	100,000,000

¹Funding for this activity was previously provided under the Home Investment Partnership Office Partnership account.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the Housing Counseling Assistance program, which is the same as the budget request and \$35,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The Committee has also included language stipulating that not less than \$15,000,000 shall be for HUD-certified housing counseling agencies located in the 100 metropolitan statistical areas with the highest rate of home foreclosures to assist homeowners with mortgage mitigation efforts and mortgage scam prevention. The Committee remains concerned about the high incidents of foreclosures in these areas, and that vulnerable homeowners may be the target of rescue scams. Therefore, the Committee has targeted some of the increased funding that the President has requested for fiscal year 2010 to help address the needs in the areas most affected.

The Committee expects HUD to work the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NeighborWorks America) as it administers the funding for foreclosure prevention counseling. The combination of these programs will provide a comprehensive approach to the counseling needs of homeowners facing foreclosure and help iden-

tify the most appropriate options for these homeowners. The counseling programs that have proven most effective should be used as models for the other counseling programs.

The Committee does recognize that while housing counseling agencies are experiencing increased demand for foreclosure counseling, it is also important to provide sufficient resources to support a variety of counseling activities, including pre-purchase counseling, rental counseling, and HECM counseling. It is critical for the department to ensure that as people enter the housing or rental market, they have the necessary counseling to ensure their success.

HECM Counseling.—The Committee is concerned about the findings of a GAO report published in June 2009 which evaluated the delivery of HECM counseling services. GAO found that in many instances, the HECM counseling, which HUD requires for program participants, was inadequate and incomplete. Due to the growing use and complexity of HECM, the Committee believes comprehensive counseling is integral to ensuring that prospective participants are fully informed about the terms, conditions, processes, and alternatives to HECM. The Committee urges the Department to review its oversight controls and administration of these counseling services to make certain HECM counseling services are being executed to fully meet agency requirements.

ENERGY INNOVATION FUND

Appropriation, 2009	
Budget estimate, 2010	\$100,000,000
House allowance	50,000,000
Committee recommendation	75,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The funding provided will support the Local Initiatives Fund, which will address the broader housing market, both single and multifamily, by leveraging private sector financing to stimulate the development of model residential energy efficiency retrofit initiatives in specific markets. These local initiatives may include streamlined delivery of energy audits or start up of local energy retrofit funds. In addition, in the single-family housing sector, the Energy Innovation Fund will be used to develop an Energy Efficient Mortgage [EEM] Innovation pilot program, which will extend the benefits of the existing FHA EEM and title I Energy Efficient Property Improvement loan programs to more homeowners. Funding will also be used to develop a Multifamily Energy Pilot [MEP], which will target borrowers in the following FHA Multifamily programs seeking energy efficiency improvements in multifamily rehabilitation projects.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$75,000,000 for the Energy Innovation Fund. The recommended level is \$25,000,000 less than the budget request and \$100,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The funding provided for this initiative will support and test three different ways to affect the presence and accessibility of financing for energy efficiency upgrades to both single and multifamily properties. The Local Initiatives Fund will provide the necessary resources to support and test various models of spurring residential energy efficiency retrofits. In addition to increasing the energy efficiency of homes, HUD also expects this initiative to provide a variety of models that could be replicated in a variety of communities. The Committee expects that in addition to seeking out a variety of models, HUD will also seek to ensure geographic diversity and a mix of urban and rural areas in order to develop multiple best practices models that could be replicated in a variety of markets.

In addition, the fund will support two pilot projects that will test the best ways in which to increase and expand the use of FHA loans for energy efficiency upgrades. The Energy Efficient Mortgage Innovation pilot program will seek to make energy efficiency mortgages attractive to consumers. In a similar way, the Multifamily Energy Pilot seeks to target owners participating in various FHA multifamily programs to assist them in finding financing to make energy efficiency improvements in multifamily rehabilitation projects.

The Committee supports the efforts of the Secretary to make energy efficiency mortgages more affordable and attractive to homeowners and property owners. Energy Efficiency upgrades can be costly, and the benefits may not be realized by the homeowner for many years. By addressing the cost issue the Secretary is attempting to break down a barrier to energy-efficiency rehabilitation projects. The Committee expects that the energy improvements, especially in multifamily properties will lead to cost savings for low-income residents living in these properties.

The Committee directs the Department to submit a plan to implement the Energy Innovation Fund within 120 days of enactment. The plan shall identify how it will allocate funds, including both loans and grants and how these funds will be targeted. In addition, it is expected that HUD shall establish a timeline for the use of the funds and benchmarks for success. The Committee also expects HUD to continue to update the House and Senate Committees on Appropriation on any successes or challenges that are identified as the program is implemented.

OTHER ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Appropriations, 2009	\$27,600,000
Budget estimate, 2010	40,000,000
House allowance	40,000,000
Committee recommendation	40,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$40,000,000 for HUD-assisted, State-aided, noninsured rental housing projects which is the same as the budget request and \$12,400,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

RENT SUPPLEMENT

(RESCISSION)

The Committee recommends a rescission of \$27,600,000 for section 236 payments to State-aided, noninsured projects which is equal to the budget request and \$10,000,000 less than the 2009 enacted level.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 authorized HUD to establish a revolving fund for the collection of rents in excess of the established basic rents for section 236 projects. Subject to appropriations, HUD is authorized to transfer excess rent collection received after 1978 to the Flexible Subsidy Fund.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that the account continue to serve as the repository for the excess rental charges appropriated from the Rental Housing Assistance Fund; these funds will continue to offset flexible subsidy outlays and other discretionary expenditures to support affordable housing projects. The language is designed to allow surplus funds in excess of allowable rent levels to be returned to project owners only for purposes of the rehabilitation and renovation of projects.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

Appropriations, 2009	\$16,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	16,000,000
House allowance	16,000,000
Committee recommendation	16,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, as amended by the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000, authorizes the Secretary to establish Federal manufactured home construction and safety standards for the construction, design, and performance of manufactured homes. All manufactured homes are required to meet the Federal standards, and fees are charged to producers to cover the costs of administering the act.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$16,000,000 to support the manufactured housing standards programs of which \$7,000,000 is expected to be derived from fees collected and deposited in the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund account and not more than \$10,000,000 shall be available from the general fund. The total amount recommended is equal to the budget request and the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on guaranteed loans	Administrative contract expenses	Program costs
Appropriations, 2009	\$50,000,000	\$315,000,000,000	\$116,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	50,000,000	400,000,000,000	188,900,000	\$798,000,000
House allowance	50,000,000	400,000,000,000	188,900,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000	400,000,000,000	188,900,000	288,000,000

¹ Administrative expenses for MMI are funded within the Office of Housing.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on guaranteed loans	Administrative contract expenses	Program costs
Appropriations, 2009	\$50,000,000	\$45,000,000,000	\$48,871,000	\$8,600,000
Budget estimate, 2010	20,000,000	15,000,000,000	8,600,000
House allowance	20,000,000	15,000,000,000	8,600,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000	15,000,000,000	8,600,000

¹ Administrative expenses for GSR are funded within the Office of Housing.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal Housing Administration [FHA] fund covers the mortgage and loan insurance activity of HUD mortgage/loan insurance programs which are grouped into the mutual mortgage insurance [MMI] fund, cooperative management housing insurance [CMHI] fund, general insurance fund [GI] fund, and the special risk insurance [SRI] fund. For presentation and accounting control purposes, these are divided into two sets of accounts based on shared characteristics. The unsubsidized insurance programs of the mutual mortgage insurance fund and the cooperative management housing insurance fund constitute one set; and the general risk insurance and special risk insurance funds, which are partially composed of subsidized programs, make up the other.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has included the following amounts for the "Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program" account: a limitation on guaranteed loans of \$400,000,000,000 a limitation on direct loans of \$50,000,000 and \$188,900,000 for administrative contract expenses of which up to \$70,794,000 may be transferred to the Working Capital Fund to be used solely for the maintenance of FHA information technology systems. Of the amount provided for administrative expenses \$7,500,000 is to be used for consumer education and outreach.

The Committee has also provided an appropriation of \$288,000,000 to support guaranteed loans under the Home Equity Conversion Mortgage or reverse mortgage program. The HECM program provides an opportunity for our Nation's elderly to take equity out of their homes so they can pay for medicine or other critical services while remaining in their homes. This program is especially important for many elderly today who are experiencing financial losses in their retirement accounts.

For the GI/SRI account, the Committee recommends \$15,000,000,000 as a limitation on guaranteed loans and a limitation on direct loans of \$20,000,000.

Since its inception in 1934, the FHA has played a critical role in meeting the demands of borrowers that the private market would not serve—creating housing products that have insured over 34 million homes.

After many years of being crowded out of the market by risky products, such as subprime mortgages, the FHA has once again increased its share of the market from just 2 percent in 2006 to over 24 percent at the end of 2008. The FHA has resumed its traditional role of providing mortgage options for hardworking Americans. In addition, the FHA is a part of the administration's efforts to assist Americans that are facing unaffordable mortgages refinance into more affordable ones.

The Committee applauds the efforts of the administration to use the FHA to provide Americans with mortgage options in the absence of available credit in the private market. The FHA has an important role to play in bringing stability to the housing market. It is also an important alternative for many Americans who still face predatory lenders with risky or fraudulent mortgage products. However, it is also critical for HUD to manage the risk that the FHA is taking on in its efforts to assist Americans during this turbulent time in the housing market. The American taxpayers must not assume all of the risk of homeowners that are at increased risk of default or foreclosure. As such it is critical that the Secretary remain focus on the solvency of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance [MMI] Fund.

In his testimony before the Committee on April 2, 2009, the Secretary recognized the need for FHA to take additional steps to protect the solvency of the MMI Fund. He stated:

“[W]e all know that the FHA team cannot sustain their efforts and protect the programs over the long-term without an infusion of resources: for new staffing with new skills, investments in new state-of-the-art technologies, and new efforts to reach out to enforcement agencies at all levels of government to better monitor FHA partners.”

The Committee agrees with the Secretary's assessment and will continue to assist the Secretary in his efforts to improve the FHA's systems and staffing.

In fiscal year 2010, the Committee has once again included resources to increase staffing for the Office of Housing, and has requested the Secretary to submit a staffing plan to the Committees, in order to ensure that HUD is quickly getting staff with the necessary expertise on board. Moreover, the Committee has continued

its support of the modernization of FHA systems. As part of the administration's Transformation Initiative, the Committee has directed that not less than \$100,000,000 shall be for the information technology systems and expects a significant portion of these resources to be spent on the modernization of the FHA's systems.

The Committee remains committed to the mission of FHA—to provide hardworking Americans underserved by the private market with the ability to achieve homeownership. The Committee will work with the administration to ensure that FHA has the necessary tools to fulfill its mission, while continuing to provide the necessary oversight ensure the solvency of the MMI Fund, and protect the interests of the taxpayers.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009: Limitation on guaranteed loans	\$300,000,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010: Limitation on guaranteed loans	500,000,000,000
House allowance: Limitation on guaranteed loans	500,000,000,000
Committee recommendation: Limitation on guaranteed loans	500,000,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Government National Mortgage Association [GNMA], through the mortgage-backed securities program, guarantees privately issued securities backed by pools of mortgages. GNMA is a wholly owned corporate instrumentality of the United States within the Department. Its powers are prescribed generally by title III of the National Housing Act, as amended. GNMA is authorized by section 306(g) of the act to guarantee the timely payment of principal and interest on securities that are based on and backed by a trust, or pool, composed of mortgages that are guaranteed and insured by the Federal Housing Administration, the Rural Housing Service, or the Department of Veterans Affairs. GNMA's guarantee of mortgage-backed securities is backed by the full faith and credit of the United States.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends a limitation on new commitments on mortgage-backed securities of \$500,000,000,000. This level is the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 2008 level.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriations, 2009	\$58,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	50,000,000
House allowance	50,000,000
Committee recommendation	48,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended, directs the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to undertake programs of research, evaluation, and reports relating to the Department's mission and programs. These functions are carried out internally and through grants and contracts with industry, nonprofit research organizations, educational institutions, and through agreements with State and local governments and other Federal agencies. The research programs seek ways to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and equity of HUD programs and to identify methods to achieve cost reductions. Additionally, this appropriation is used to support HUD evaluation and monitoring activities and to conduct housing surveys.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$48,000,000 for research, technology, and community development activities in fiscal year 2009. This level is \$10,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and \$2,000,000 less than the budget request.

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

The effects of risky subprime mortgages on the housing market, and the economy as a whole, have been devastating. While HUD must continue to work to address the problems stemming from the subprime crisis, HUD must also work to better anticipate other areas of risk in the housing market. In order to effectively do this, HUD must have the necessary information on which to base policy decisions and resource allocation. The Committee expects that the additional funding provided in fiscal year 2010 will allow the Department to gather the data necessary to track and evaluate trends in the housing market, including better regional data. This information should allow the agency to identify, among other things, the potential impacts various mortgage products may have on the stability of the housing market in different regions and across the entire country. In particular, the Committee expects the Department to gather better data on Alternative documentation or Alt-A loans, a large number of which are going to reset in the near future. HUD must seek to ensure that the Department has the necessary tools to respond to any needs or problems associated with these mortgages. The Committee encourages HUD to also collect data on and consider how other areas of the economy are affecting credit markets, access to credit for prospective homebuyers and how deterioration in credit markets can affect homeownership, foreclosure rates and the housing market overall.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2009	\$53,500,000
Budget estimate, 2010	72,000,000
House allowance	72,000,000
Committee recommendation	72,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The fair housing activities appropriation includes funding for both the Fair Housing Assistance Program [FHAP] and the Fair Housing Initiatives Program [FHIP].

The Fair Housing Assistance Program helps State and local agencies to implement title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended, which prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of housing and in the provision of brokerage services. The major objective of the program is to assure prompt and effective processing of title VIII complaints with appropriate remedies for complaints by State and local fair housing agencies.

The Fair Housing Initiatives Program is authorized by section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, and by section 905 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992. This initiative is designed to alleviate housing discrimination by increasing support to public and private organizations for the purpose of eliminating or preventing discrimination in housing, and to enhance fair housing opportunities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$72,000,000 for the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. Of the amounts provided, \$29,500,000 is for the fair housing assistance program [FHAP] and \$42,500,000 is for the fair housing initiatives program [FHIP]. The total amount is equal to the budget request and \$18,500,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

The Committee applauds the administration's request to increase funding for the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. A significant amount of the additional resources provided will support the administration's Initiative to Combating Mortgage Fraud and Abuse. This increase builds on the additional resources that the Committee provided last year to target and combat mortgage rescue scams. In addition to traditional enforcement activities, the administration is proposing to dedicate \$4,500,000 for enforcement related to mortgage rescue scams and other fraudulent or abusive lending practices.

The increased funding will also support education and outreach activities. The Committee notes that in fiscal year 2009, the Committee provided the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation with \$6,000,000 to develop an outreach and education campaign to combat mortgage rescue scams. In order to increase the effectiveness of combating these rescue scams, it is important for the Federal Government to have one clear message. Therefore, the Committee directs HUD to work with the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation on outreach and education efforts, so that all efforts and

messages will be coordinated, and resources can be used to most effectively inform the public about mortgage rescue scams.

These additional resources for the Fair Housing Assistance Program [FHAP] are necessary to help address and better respond to the increased cases brought to fair housing agencies. In addition to housing discrimination, the increased funding will also help to respond to the increased complaints of lending discrimination and mortgage abuse, including mortgage rescue scams, which often target minority communities.

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

OFFICE OF HEALTHY HOMES AND LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$240,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	140,000,000
House allowance	140,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

¹Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$100,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title X of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 established the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act under which HUD is authorized to make grants to States, localities, and Native American tribes to conduct lead-based paint hazard reduction and abatement activities in private low-income housing. This has become a significant health hazard, especially for children. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], some 434,000 children have elevated blood levels, down from 1.7 million in the late 1980s. Despite this improvement, lead poisoning remains a serious childhood environmental condition, with some 2.2 percent of all children aged 1 to 5 years having elevated blood lead levels. This percentage is much higher for low-income children living in older housing.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$140,000,000 for lead-based paint hazard reduction and abatement activities for fiscal year 2010. This amount is equal to the budget request and \$100,000,000 less than the amount available in fiscal year 2009, but equal to the amount of nonemergency funding the program received in fiscal year 2009. Of this amount, HUD may use up to \$20,000,000 for the Healthy Homes Initiative under which HUD conducts a number of activities designed to identify and address housing-related illnesses. The Committee includes bill language requiring \$250,000 of the total amount made available to the Lead Hazard Reduction Program to be used in conducting communications and outreach activities to potential applicants of the Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant program.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$48,000,000 for the lead hazard reduction program established in fiscal year 2003

to focus on major urban areas where children are disproportionately at risk for lead poisoning. These funds are awarded on a competitive basis to the areas with the highest lead abatement needs.

There remains significant lead risks in privately owned housing, particularly in unsubsidized low-income units. For that reason, approximately 1 million children under the age of 6 in the United States suffer from lead poisoning. While lead poisoning crosses all socioeconomic, geographic, and racial boundaries, the burden of this disease falls disproportionately on low-income and minority families. In the United States, children from poor families are eight times more likely to be poisoned than those from higher income families. Nevertheless, the risks associated with lead-based paint hazards can be addressed fully over the next decade.

The Committee also encourages HUD to work with grantees on its lead-based paint abatement hazards programs so that information is disclosed to the public on lead hazard abatements, risk assessment data and blood lead levels through publications and Internet sites such as Lead-SafeHomes.info.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Appropriations, 2009	\$224,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	200,000,000
House allowance	200,000,000
Committee recommendation	200,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Working Capital Fund, authorized by the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, finances information technology and office automation initiatives on a centralized basis.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$200,000,000 for the Working Capital Fund for fiscal year 2010. This level of funding is \$24,000,000 less than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and equal to the budget request. The Working Capital Fund is also supported with additional funding provided through a transfer of \$70,794,000 from the FHA's Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund as proposed by the President.

The Committee notes that HUD proposed, and the Committee has approved, to address the major systems changes necessary at HUD through the Transformation Initiative. As such the funding provided to the Working Capital Fund will only be used to support the maintenance and operations of HUD systems.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations, 2009	¹ \$135,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	120,000,000
House allowance	120,000,000
Committee recommendation	126,000,000

¹Of the funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2009, \$15,000,000 was provided as emergency spending as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This appropriation will finance all salaries and related expenses associated with the operation of the Office of the Inspector General [OIG].

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$126,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General [OIG]. The amount of funding provided is \$9,000,000 less than the amount provided in fiscal year 2009, but equal to the amount of nonemergency funding. The level provided is also \$6,000,000 more than the President’s request.

The Committee expects the OIG to continue to monitor and conduct oversight over HUD’s programs. This is especially important as HUD implements new initiatives funded in this bill.

The Committee directs the HUD IG to use the additional \$6,000,000 above the budget request to target fraud and abuse by lenders, sellers, mortgage bankers and brokers, and homebuyers, including those seeking to refinance mortgages under the FHA Mutual Mortgage Insurance program. The HUD IG should seek to maximize its funding by partnering with other Federal agencies and entities with similar programs, and take advantage of individuals with financial expertise. FHA single family mortgage has exploded as a share of the market, growing from 2 percent in 2006 to nearly 24 percent at the end of 2008. FHA is filling an important role in the market today, as credit in the private market remains limited. However, the Committee has provided the additional resources to the IG to ensure that since FHA is growing exponentially, the FHA is not taking on excessive risk, and has the necessary expertise to manage and oversee the increased volume.

TRANSFORMATION INITIATIVE

Appropriations, 2009	
Budget estimate, 2010	\$20,000,000
House allowance	20,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Transformation Initiative is the Department’s effort to improve and streamline the systems and operations at HUD. Managed by the Office of Strategic Planning and Management, this initiative has four elements: (1) research, evaluation, and program metrics; (2) program demonstrations; (3) technical assistance and capacity building; and (4) information technology. Funding to support these activities is provided by transfer from HUD programs. In addition, the funding provided will support the administration’s efforts to combat rescue fraud by investing in anti-fraud technologies and conducting education and outreach to counseling providers and consumers.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee includes a recommended level of funding of up to \$228,601,060 for the Transformation Initiative. This level of funding includes an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for efforts to combat mortgage fraud, which is equal to the President's request. In addition, up to \$208,601,060 is included by transfer from other HUD accounts, to be available for 3 years. The President's budget proposed transfers of up to \$434,000,000 to be available for 5 years. No funding was provided for this initiative in fiscal year 2009.

The inclusion of the transformation initiative in the President's budget demonstrates the administration's commitment to addressing the management and operational challenges that have plagued HUD for far too long. The Department has information technology [IT] systems that cannot perform at the level necessary to appropriately manage and oversee its programs. Moreover, the organizational structure has limited collaboration and communication within the Department. In addition, there have been limited efforts to think critically about emerging problems or more adeptly respond to pressing housing issues. Therefore, the Committee appreciates that this initiative seeks to utilize a variety of tools, including research, demonstrations and systems modernization to better equip the Department to address the Nation's housing needs.

However, while the Committee is supportive of the administration's efforts to think strategically about how to create a more sophisticated and efficient HUD, the Committee cannot provide the Secretary the amount of flexibility or funding requested. The amount of funding recommended in the bill represents the Committee's shared commitment to improving HUD. The process of transforming HUD will take a great deal of effort and this transformation will take time. As such, the funding for these long-term investments is not required all at once. It is important that funding transferred from HUD program budgets to the transformation initiative is justified by near-term investment and payoff. The Committee has chosen to limit the amount of funding available from tenant-based rental assistance, project-based rental assistance and the public housing operating fund accounts to be more in line with expected benefits.

The Committee notes that HUD is currently undergoing a strategic planning effort. Upon its completion, HUD and Congress will have a framework for the activities and associated costs necessary to support its work each year. The bill language requires that HUD submit a plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations 30 days after the enactment of the act to be approved by the Committees detailing how HUD intends to spend the funding provided under this heading. In order to provide the flexibility necessary to allow the Secretary to respond to emerging challenges, the Secretary may also amend this plan as necessary with the approval of the Committees.

The Committee applauds the Secretary's desire to change and reinvigorate the Department. The Committee will work to provide the Department with the necessary tools, as well as the necessary oversight to ensure that HUD reaches its goals.

Technology.—Of the amount provided the Committee has set at least \$100,000,000 aside for information technology investments. The Committee has placed the greatest priority on this activity because it is elemental to improving the operations of the Department and to protecting the taxpayer dollars.

Out of this funding, the Committee directs HUD to move forward with the modernization of the Federal Housing Administration's [FHA] systems. The fiscal year 2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act included language requiring HUD to develop a plan to modernize FHA's systems, and take steps to procure new technology in fiscal year 2010. The Committee understands that the life-cycle cost of this modernization effort is likely to exceed \$100,000,000.

The Committee also supports the Department's goal to modernize the voucher management system. HUD is responsible for monitoring nearly 2,500 public housing authorities with section 8 vouchers, and ensuring that the funding provided is sufficient to continue serving the individuals and families with the vouchers. Current systems challenges hinder this effort.

The Committee has been impressed with the Department's efforts to date to conduct an assessment of the Department's modernization, and to begin strategically planning for the development of these new systems, including the identification of related costs and staffing needs. However, since these initiatives are critical and require substantial investment of taxpayer resources, the Committee is requiring HUD to develop a spend plan for its information technology projects. This plan should include the identification of projects to be undertaken, project goals and costs. In addition, the Committee directs the Government Accountability Office [GAO] to evaluate this plan, and monitor HUD's progress in achieving project goals and staying on time and on budget. This plan may also include additional IT system investments that will improve the efficiency of HUD programs.

Technical Assistance.—The Committee has provided at least \$40,000,000 for technical assistance. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to better deliver technical assistance to HUD program participants. This effort could include combining technical assistance for various programs to encourage better program coordination by program participants. The Committee directs to continue to provide technical assistance to the following programs: CDBG, HOME Investment Partnerships, homeless programs, HOPE VI, Choice Neighborhoods, Public Housing, the Housing Choice Voucher Program, Fair Housing Assistance Program, Housing Counseling, and Healthy Homes. In addition, technical assistance will be necessary to help ensure that new programs, such as Sustainable Communities Initiative and Choice Neighborhoods are well understood and executed.

Research, Demonstrations, and Evaluations.—The Committee supports HUD's effort to fund important research that will result in more informed and data-driven housing policies. The Committee has provided the Secretary flexibility to determine how much funding will be allocated to research and how much will be allocated to demonstrations and evaluations. However, the Secretary is directed to undertake a Native American housing needs assessment. It is clear that the housing needs of Native Americans living on reserva-

tions are substantial, but better data is needed to quantify those needs in order for HUD and Congress to better address them.

The Committee is also directing HUD to conduct a demonstration on pre-purchase counseling as required by the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008. HUD must also conduct an evaluation of the Moving to Work [MTW] Demonstration program. The Committee expects HUD to move quickly to gather data from PHAs participating in MTW, so that this evaluation can be done in a timely manner. Such an evaluation can help to inform the current debates on the program.

Finally, the Committee encourages the Secretary to plan or begin a demonstration on the conversion of public housing to Section 8 project-based vouchers. This research should include and estimate of costs and benefits of such conversions.

Combating Mortgage Fraud Initiative.—In addition to amounts transferred into this account, the President has requested, and the Committee has included, and appropriation of \$20,000,000 to support the Combating Mortgage Fraud Initiative. This funding is part of a Department-wide effort to address the increasing problem of mortgage fraud. Activities for this effort supported by the transformation initiative include, but are not limited to, developing anti-fraud IT data tools and providing technical assistance to assist housing counseling agencies in combating fraud. In addition, new resources have been provided to the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity to assist consumers in avoiding mortgage fraud, as well as take enforcement action in instances when fraud has occurred. The Committee expects that the funding and activities provided in different programs will be coordinated.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends administrative provisions. A brief description follows.

SEC. 201. This section promotes the refinancing of certain housing bonds.

SEC. 202. This section clarifies a limitation on use of funds under the Fair Housing Act.

SEC. 203. This section clarifies the allocation of HOPWA funding for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 204. This section requires HUD to award funds on a competitive basis unless otherwise provided.

SEC. 205. This section allows funds to be used to reimburse GSEs and other Federal entities for various administrative expenses.

SEC. 206. This section limits HUD spending to amounts set out in the budget justification.

SEC. 207. This section clarifies expenditure authority for entities subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

SEC. 208. This section requires quarterly reports on all uncommitted, unobligated and excess funds associated with HUD programs.

SEC. 209. This section makes a number of corrections to the award of HOPWA funding.

SEC. 210. This section requires HUD to submit its fiscal year 2011 budget justifications according to congressional requirements.

SEC. 211. This section exempts Los Angeles County, Alaska, Iowa, and Mississippi from the requirement of having a PHA resident on the board of directors for fiscal year 2006. Instead, the public housing agencies in these States are required to establish advisory boards that include public housing tenants and section 8 recipients.

SEC. 212. This section allows HUD to authorize the transfer of existing project-based subsidies and liabilities from obsolete housing to housing that better meets the needs of the assisted tenants.

SEC. 213. This section provides allocation requirements for Native Alaskans under the Native American Indian Housing Block Grant program.

SEC. 214. This section exempts GNMA from certain requirements of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 215. This section reforms certain section 8 rent calculations as to athletic scholarships.

SEC. 216. This section expands the availability of Home Equity Conversion Mortgages during 2010.

SEC. 217. This section requires HUD to maintain section 8 assistance on HUD-held or owned multifamily housing.

SEC. 218. This section requires HUD to report quarterly to the Appropriations Committees on the use of sole-source contracting by HUD.

SEC. 219. This section allows the recipient of a section 202 grant to establish a single-asset nonprofit entity to own the project and may lend the grant funds to such entity.

SEC. 220. This section clarifies the use of the 108 loan guaranteed program for nonentitlement communities.

SEC. 221. This section extends the HOPE VI program until September 30, 2010.

SEC. 222. This section allows public housing authorities with less than 400 units to be exempt from management requirements in the operating fund rule.

SEC. 223. This section restricts the Secretary from imposing any requirement or guideline relating to asset management that restricts or limits the use of capital funds for central office costs, up to the limit established in QWHRA.

SEC. 224. This section requires the Secretary to report quarterly on the status of all project-based section 8 housing.

SEC. 225. This section requires allotment holders to meet certain criteria of the CFO.

SEC. 226. This section limits attorney fees.

SEC. 227. The section modifies the NOFA process to include the Internet.

SEC. 228. This section would allow refinancing of certain section 202 loans.

SEC. 229. The section makes reforms to the Federal Surplus Property Program under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

SEC. 230. This section increases the aggregate number of Moving-to-Work agencies by three public housing agencies.

SEC. 231. This section allows the Secretary to consider industry standard appraisal practices, including the cost of repairs when determining market value.

SEC. 232. This section allows the Secretary to transfer up to 5 percent of funds among the accounts appropriated under the title "Personnel Compensation and Benefits."

SEC. 233. This section allows the Disaster Housing Assistance Programs to be considered a program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the purpose of income verification and matching.

TITLE III
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ACCESS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009	\$6,550,000
Budget estimate, 2010	7,000,000
House allowance	7,200,000
Committee recommendation	7,400,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Access Board (formerly known as the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board) was established by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The Access Board is responsible for developing guidelines under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Architectural Barriers Act, and the Telecommunications Act. These guidelines ensure that buildings and facilities, transportation vehicles, and telecommunications equipment covered by these laws are readily accessible to and usable by people with disabilities. The Board is also responsible for developing standards under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act for accessible electronic and information technology used by Federal agencies. The Access Board also enforces the Architectural Barriers Act. In addition, the Board provides training and technical assistance on the guidelines and standards it develops to Government agencies, public and private organizations, individuals and businesses on the removal of accessibility barriers.

In 2002, the Access Board was given additional responsibilities under the Help America Vote Act. The Board serves on the Board of Advisors and the Technical Guidelines Development Committee, which helps Election Assistance Commission develop voluntary guidelines and guidance for voting systems, including accessibility for people with disabilities.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$7,400,000 for the operations of the Access Board. This level of funding is \$850,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and \$400,000 more than the President's request.

Across all levels of government, Access Board is regarded as a leading source of information on accessible design, and as an effective coordinating body. The Committee provides \$400,000 more than the President's fiscal year 2010 request in order to provide the Access Board with sufficient resources to manage the expanded responsibilities described below.

Collaboration with Other Federal Agencies.—The Department of Transportation [DOT], the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD], and the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] are launching an interdepartmental initiative to promote livability and sustainability. The Committee encourages DOT and HUD to coordinate their discussions with Access Board to ensure that this interdepartmental initiative prioritizes accessibility and universal design as key tenets of livability.

As a Federal agency that directly represents the public, particularly people with disabilities, Access Board is ideally positioned to advise and provide technical assistance to DOT and HUD regarding how to best include the needs of persons with disabilities in all aspects of this initiative, including proposal requirements, design criteria, and performance measures. Accessibility and universal design serve all people, not only those with disabilities. By requiring grantees to meet the needs of persons with disabilities, the Departments will simultaneously fund projects that will be safe, accessible and flexible for all community members, regardless of ability, age, and size, including pedestrians, bicyclists, older people, and young people. Additionally, employing universal design principles is known to generate lower total project costs, and thereby promote more effective stewardship of Federal funds.

Additionally, the Committee encourages the Secretary of DOT to coordinate discussions with Access Board as the Department launches its high-speed rail initiative. Access Board is ideally positioned to provide technical assistance about how to best recognize and include the needs of persons with disabilities in all aspects of the high speed rail initiative, including proposal requirements, design criteria, and performance measures.

Training and Technical Assistance.—The Committee acknowledges that Access Board is a key provider of training and technical assistance regarding accessibility matters. The Committee recognizes that Access Board is providing timely and important guidance to agencies that are implementing projects funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Also during fiscal year 2010, Access Board plans to engage in an intensified rulemaking process, issuing one final guideline and five proposed rules; in an average year, Access Board typically issues up to two rules. These publications may increase the demand for training and technical assistance. The additional funding provided by the Committee will support a timely rulemaking process, and accelerate the development and deployment of training and technical assistance materials and tools.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009	\$22,800,000
Budget estimate, 2010	24,558,000
House allowance	23,712,000
Committee recommendation	24,558,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Federal Maritime Commission [FMC] is an independent regulatory agency which administers the Shipping Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-237) as amended by the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-258); section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (41 Stat. 998); the Foreign Shipping Practices Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-418); and Public Law 89-777.

FMC regulates the international waterborne commerce of the United States. In addition, the FMC has responsibility for licensing and bonding ocean transportation intermediaries and assuring that vessel owners or operators establish financial responsibility to pay judgments for death or injury to passengers, or nonperformance of a cruise, on voyages from U.S. ports. Major program areas for fiscal year 2010 include pursuing information technology initiatives to modernize core business applications and processes and expand web-based applications for FMC's stakeholders; supporting front-line seaport security efforts; and studying two topics: passenger vessel financial responsibility for non-performance, and the impact of eliminating anti-trust immunity for ocean liner operations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee includes \$24,558,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 2010. This amount is \$1,758,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009
Budget estimate, 2010
House allowance	\$19,000,000
Committee recommendation	19,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Office of Inspector General [OIG] for Amtrak was created by the Inspector General Act Amendment of 1988. The Act recognized Amtrak as a "designated Federal entity" and required the railroad to establish an independent and objective unit to conduct and supervise audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of Amtrak; to provide leadership and coordination and recommend policies for activities designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of Amtrak, and for activities designed to prevent and detect fraud and abuse in Amtrak operations; and to provide a means for keeping the Amtrak leadership and the Congress fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of Amtrak and the necessity for and progress of corrective action.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation includes \$19,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Amtrak Office of Inspector General. The

Amtrak OIG has historically received its funding from the amounts provided as grants to Amtrak, and the President’s budget request includes no separate funding level for this office. However, the Committee believes that the Amtrak OIG can no longer be dependent on Amtrak for its funding. The budgets of these two entities must be separated in order to support an independent and objective OIG for the railroad.

The relationship between an inspector general and the agency for which it works is a difficult one to navigate even under the best circumstances, but the Committee has been severely disappointed in the inability of the Amtrak OIG and Amtrak to maintain even the facade of a professional and productive interaction. As discussed earlier in this report, the Committee is not interested in disentangling the different stories coming from each agency. Instead, the Committee hopes that Amtrak and its new inspector general will be able to find a way to work productively with each other. A working relationship between the two agencies is necessary for the Committee to feel confident in the audit and investigative work that informs congressional oversight.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009	\$91,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	95,400,000
House allowance	99,200,000
Committee recommendation	96,900,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Initially established along with the Department of Transportation [DOT], the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB] commenced operations on April 1, 1967, as an independent Federal agency. The board is charged by Congress with investigating every civil aviation accident in the United States as well as significant accidents in the other modes of transportation—railroad, highway, marine, and pipeline—and issuing safety recommendations aimed at preventing future accidents. Although it has always operated independently, NTSB relied on DOT for funding and administrative support until the Independent Safety Board Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–633) severed all ties between the two organizations starting in 1975.

In addition to its investigatory duties, NTSB is responsible for maintaining the Government’s database of civil aviation accidents and also conducts special studies of transportation safety issues of national significance. Furthermore, in accordance with the provisions of international treaties, NTSB supplies investigators to serve as U.S. accredited representatives for aviation accidents overseas involving U.S.-registered aircraft, or involving aircraft or major components of U.S. manufacture. NTSB also serves as the “court of appeals” for any airman, mechanic, or mariner whenever certificate action is taken by the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] or the U.S. Coast Guard Commandant, or when civil penalties are assessed by FAA.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends \$96,900,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board, which is \$1,500,000 more than the budget request and \$5,900,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Bill language is included that allows NTSB to reimburse the DOT Inspector General up to \$100,000 for costs associated with audits and investigations. In addition, the Committee has once again included language that allows NTSB to continue to make payments on its lease for the NTSB training facility with funding provided in the bill.

Modernization of the Data Recorder Lab.—The FAA requires all large commercial aircraft and some small commercial, corporate and private aircraft to be equipped with two different kinds of data recorders. Cockpit voice recorders create an archive of radio transmissions and other sounds made during a flight, and flight data recorders monitor aspects of a flight such as altitude, airspeed and heading. Immediately after an accident, these data recorders are moved to the NTSB data recorder laboratory, and the recorded information is analyzed with computer and audio equipment.

These data recorders play an increasingly large role in determining the probable cause of an accident, and they often provide information that would otherwise be inaccessible to NTSB investigators. The use of similar data recorders has also become more common in other modes of transportation. The Federal Railroad Administration requires railroad locomotives to carry event recorders, and large ships and passenger ships must have voyage data recorders as well. Today many automobiles are now equipped with event data recorders that archive information such as the vehicle's speed and whether an airbag was deployed. In addition to growing use of data recorders, the technology used in the recorders themselves has become more sophisticated.

Unfortunately, the laboratory that the NTSB uses to analyze the data recorded by these devices has become outdated. NTSB is too often forced to turn to agencies outside of the United States in order to perform data analysis that is essential to its own investigations. Given the important role that the data recorders play in determining the probable causes of accidents, the Committee does not believe that the NTSB can afford to lose the capability of analyzing data recorded during transportation accidents. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 for the modernization of the NTSB data recorder laboratory.

Implementation of the Rail Safety Law.—The Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008, enacted in October of last year, included a new requirement for the NTSB to provide family assistance immediately following an accident that involves a rail passenger carrier and a major loss of life. In the case of such an accident, the NTSB will serve as an important point of contact between the Federal Government and the families of passengers who have been involved in the accident. NTSB will serve as a liaison between the rail passenger carrier and the families as well. In addition, the NTSB must facilitate the recovery and identification of fatally injured passengers involved in an accident, designate a nonprofit organization that will provide for the emotional care and support of families,

and communicate to families what services are available to them and the ongoing findings from the accident investigation.

The Committee appreciates the importance of these new responsibilities. Just over 10 years ago, the Aviation Disaster Family Assistance Act of 1996 gave the same responsibilities to the NTSB in response to aviation disasters. Since that time, the NTSB has been able to provide essential services to the victims of aviation disasters and their families. In order to make sure that the NTSB is able to extend these services to the victims of rail passenger accidents and their families, the Committee has included an additional \$500,000 to cover the cost of three additional staff members, training activities, and improved coordination with railroads.

Expiration of NTSB's Lease.—The lease that the NTSB holds on its current office space is due to expire early in fiscal year 2011. The agency has begun to work with the General Services Administration on the search for a new headquarters location, and if this process moves expeditiously, then it will likely require the agency to incur costs over the next fiscal year related to the agency's move. The Committee recommendation includes \$2,416,000 to cover these costs. However, because it is unclear whether these costs will be incurred toward the end of the fiscal year 2010 or towards the beginning of fiscal year 2011, the bill also includes language that makes these funds available over the next 2 fiscal years.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Appropriations, 2009	\$181,000,000
Budget estimate, 2010	166,800,000
House allowance	196,800,000
Committee recommendation	243,000,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation was created by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (title VI of the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1978, Public Law 95-557, October 31, 1978). Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation now operates under the trade name "NeighborWorks America." NeighborWorks America helps local communities establish efficient and effective partnerships between residents and representatives of the public and private sectors. These partnership-based organizations are independent, tax-exempt, nonprofit entities and are frequently known as Neighborhood Housing Services [NHS] or mutual housing associations.

Collectively, these organizations are known as the NeighborWorks network. Nationally, 235 NeighborWorks organizations serve nearly 3,000 urban, suburban, and rural communities in 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$243,000,000 for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation [NRC] for fiscal year 2010. This amount is \$76,200,000 more than the budget request and \$62,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The

Committee continues to support the set-aside of \$5,000,000 for the multifamily rental housing initiative, which has been successful in developing innovative approaches to producing mixed-income affordable housing throughout the Nation. The Committee directs NRC to provide a status report on this initiative in its fiscal year 2011 budget justifications.

Housing Counseling Assistance.—The Committee has included \$65,000,000 to continue the National Foreclosure Mitigation Counseling Program initiated by Congress in fiscal year 2008.

To date, the NFMC program has allowed nearly 400,000 families facing foreclosure to receive counseling. In addition, NRC has also used the funding provided by Congress to train over 4,400 counselors. The program has been successful in reaching hard-hit areas, as well as low-income and minority communities. Overall, 76 percent of clients who received counseling had not entered foreclosure.

While the number of foreclosures resulting from subprime mortgages may be going down, the total number of foreclosures continues to climb. Recent information from RealtyTrac indicates that the number of foreclosures increased by 15 percent in the first half of 2009 compared with 2008. More and more, these foreclosures are the result of a job loss or loss of income. In an attempt to stem the number of foreclosures, the administration proposed the Making Home Affordable program, which assists homeowners facing foreclosure to refinance or modify their mortgages in order to reduce the amount of their income they pay toward their mortgage. Counseling is an important element of this plan in order to increase success, and counselors receiving NFMC funding have already begun to counsel homeowners participating in the Making Home Affordable Program. In order to address the increasing number of foreclosures and meet the demand of homeowners participating in the Making Home Affordable Program, the Committee has included \$65,000,000 for the NFMC program in fiscal year 2010. This is \$31,200,000 more than the level requested by the President.

Capital Assistance To Create or Sustain Affordable Housing.—The Committee has included an additional \$45,000,000 for capital grants to assist NeighborWorks organizations in creating or rehabilitating affordable housing, as well as creating financing or lending tools. The Committee has included this additional funding in order to assist communities that have been adversely impacted by the foreclosure crisis and the economic recession.

The Committee expects that this additional funding will aid the efforts of communities that received Neighborhood Stabilization Program [NSP] funding. However, the Committee also expects that a significant amount of the additional funding provided will assist smaller and rural communities that have affordable housing needs, including those that may not have received NSP funding. The Committee directs the NRC to include information in its fiscal year 2011 budget describing how this additional funding was used to assist communities in their efforts to create or sustain affordable housing.

Rural Areas.—The Committee also continues to support Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation's efforts in building capacity in rural areas. The Committee urges the Corporation to continue its efforts in addressing the needs of rural communities.

UNITED STATES INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2009	\$2,333,000
Budget estimate, 2010	2,680,000
House allowance	2,400,000
Committee recommendation	2,680,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness is an independent agency created by the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 to coordinate and direct the multiple efforts of Federal agencies and other designated groups. The Council was authorized to review Federal programs that assist homeless persons and to take necessary actions to reduce duplication. The Council can recommend improvements in programs and activities conducted by Federal, State, and local government as well as local volunteer organizations. The Council consists of the heads of 18 Federal agencies such as the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Veterans Affairs, Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Labor, and Transportation; and other entities as deemed appropriate.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,680,000 for the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness [ICH]. This amount is \$347,000 more than the fiscal year 2009 enacted level and equal to the budget request.

The primary mission of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness [ICH] is to coordinate the Federal response to homelessness. The ICH was recently reauthorized as part of the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 [HEARTH]. The act added new members to the council, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and also increased the frequency of ICH meetings. These actions reaffirmed the important role that the ICH must play in improving Federal collaboration around ending homelessness.

In recent years, the ICH has focused its efforts on ending chronic homelessness. These efforts to assist State and local governments in creating and implementing plans to end chronic homelessness have resulted in reductions in chronic homelessness. However, while the Committee shares the goal of ending chronic homelessness, it is time for the ICH to redefine both its role and its focus in order to better reflect its broader mission of ending homelessness for all persons.

This re-evaluation and reassessment should be reflected in the ICH's performance budget for fiscal year 2011. All of the performance goals and measures included in the fiscal year 2010 budget relate to chronic homelessness. Moreover, these goals are more focused on outcomes related to city and State performance than on outcomes on the Federal level. The performance goals for the 2011 budget must include measures of success in reviewing and recommending changes to Federal programs or activities; how the ICH's actions will result in improved collaborative efforts between Fed-

eral agencies; and how the ICH will remove barriers to collaboration or create new ways for Federal agencies to partner in efforts to end homelessness.

Federal Collaboration and Joint Training.—Recent data from HUD indicate that homelessness among families increased by 9 percent from 2007 to 2008. The effects of homelessness on children can be long-term and devastating. According to a 2005 study funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, children who are homeless are sick at twice the rate of other children. They also have twice the rate of learning disabilities and are twice as likely to repeat a grade as other children.

Since the problems with homelessness may only increase as unemployment remains high and the country works to recover from the recession, it is imperative to work across Federal departments and programs to prevent or end homelessness for children. As part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 [ARRA], Congress included significant resources within HUD to prevent homelessness or reduce the amount of time individuals or families are homeless. By moving children quickly out of shelters, or helping them avoid shelter stays all together, some of the harmful effects of homelessness can be minimized. It is also critical for children to continue attending school. In addition to the obvious educational benefits of remaining in school, it can also provide children with some stability and routine at a time of great uncertainty or upheaval.

While the Committee is pleased that HUD and the Department of Education [DOE] coordinated their efforts around the homeless education and homelessness and rapid rehousing funding included in ARRA, this coordination must continue beyond ARRA. Moreover, the ICH must take on a greater role in facilitating and improving Federal coordination around ending homelessness. The Committee directs the ICH to work with the HUD, DOE, and other appropriate agencies on how to effectively deliver housing, education and related services to children that are homeless or at-risk of homelessness. This should include identifying barriers to program coordination as well as recommending solutions. In addition, the ICH is directed to conduct joint training between service providers participating in HUD's homeless programs and homeless education liaisons on how to better coordinate housing and education services for children that are homeless or at-risk of homelessness. This training should provide participants in both housing and education programs with a better understanding of the full range of services available to these children, as well as better ways to identify children who are homeless or at-risk in order to ensure that they have the support and services necessary to help prevent or end their homelessness.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

Section 401 requires pay raises to be absorbed within appropriated levels in this act or previous appropriations acts.

Section 402 prohibits pay and other expenses for non-Federal parties in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this act.

Section 403 prohibits obligations beyond the current fiscal year and prohibits transfers of funds unless expressly so provided herein.

Section 404 limits expenditures for consulting service through procurement contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection.

Section 405 authorizes the reprogramming of funds and specifies the reprogramming procedures for agencies funded by this act.

Section 406 ensures that 50 percent of unobligated balances may remain available for certain purposes.

Section 407 requires departments and agencies under this act to report information regarding all sole-source contracts.

Section 408 prohibits the use of funds for employee training unless such training bears directly upon the performance of official duties.

Section 409 continues the provision prohibiting the use of funds for eminent domain unless such taking is employed for public use.

Section 410 prohibits funds in this act to be transferred without express authority.

Section 411 protects employment rights of Federal employees who return to their civilian jobs after assignment with the Armed Forces.

Section 412 prohibits the use of funds for activities not in compliance with the Buy American Act.

Section 413 prohibits funding for any person or entity convicted of violating the Buy American Act.

Section 414 requires all departments, agencies, or Federal entities funded under this act to notify the Committees 7 days in advance of any announcement of a new program or authority.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill “which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.”

The Committee is filing an original bill, which is not covered under this rule, but reports this information in the spirit of full disclosure.

The Committee recommends funding for the following programs or activities which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2010:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

- Federal Aviation Administration:
 - Operations
 - Facilities and Equipment
 - Research, Engineering, and Development
 - Grants-in-Aid for Airports
- Federal Highway Administration:
 - Federal-aid Highways
- Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration:
 - Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs
 - Motor Carrier Safety Grants
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration:
 - Operations and Research
 - National Driver Register
 - National Driver Register Modernization
 - Highway Traffic Safety Grants
- Federal Transit Administration:
 - Administrative Expenses
 - Formula and Bus Grants
 - Research and University Research Centers
 - Capital Investment Grants
 - Grants for Energy Efficiency and Greenhouse Gas Reduction
- Maritime Administration:
 - Operations and Training
 - Ship Disposal
 - Maritime Security
 - Title XI
- Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration:
 - Administration Expenses
 - Pipeline Safety
- Research and Innovative Technology Administration:
 - Research and Development
- Surface Transportation Board

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Rental Assistance:

- Section 8 Contract Renewals and Administrative Expenses
- Section 441 Contracts
- Section 8 Preservation, Protection, and Family Unification
- Contract Administrators
- Public Housing Capital Fund
- Public Housing Operating Fund
- Choice Neighborhoods

Native American Housing Block Grants:

- Native American Housing Block Grants
- Federal Guarantees

Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund

Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant

Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund

Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids

Rural Housing and Economics Development

Community Development Fund:

- Community Development Block Grants
- Economic Development Initiatives
- Neighborhood Initiatives

HOME Program:

- HOME Investment Partnership

Self Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity:

- Capacity Building
- Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program
- National Housing Development Corporation
- Housing for the Elderly
- Housing for Persons with Disabilities
- Energy Innovation Fund

FHA General and Special Risk Program Account:

- Limitation on Guaranteed Loans
- Limitation on Direct Loans
- Credit Subsidy
- Administrative Expenses

GNMA Mortgage Backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account:

- Limitation on Guaranteed Loans
- Administrative Expenses
- Policy Development and Research
- Fair Housing Activities, Fair Housing Program
- Lead Hazards Reduction Program
- Salaries and Expenses

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

National Transportation Safety Board

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(c), RULE XXVI, OF THE
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, on July 30, 2009, the Committee ordered reported H.R. 3288, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September

30, 2010, and for other purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, with the bill subject to further amendment and consistent with the budget allocation, by a recorded vote of 30–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Inouye	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Feinstein	
Mr. Durbin	
Mr. Johnson	
Ms. Landrieu	
Mr. Reed	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Pryor	
Mr. Tester	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Brownback	
Mr. Alexander	
Ms. Collins	
Mr. Voinovich	
Ms. Murkowski	

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE
STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include “(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee.”

In compliance with this rule, the following changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

TITLE 23—HIGHWAYS

CHAPTER 1—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

§ 127. Vehicle weight limitations—Interstate System

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) No funds shall be apportioned in any fiscal year under section 104(b)(1) of this title to any State which does not permit the use of The Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways within its boundaries by vehicles with a weight of twenty thousand pounds carried on any one axle, including enforcement tolerances, or with a tandem axle weight of thirty-four thousand pounds, including enforcement tolerances, or a gross weight of at least eighty thousand pounds for vehicle combinations of five axles or more.

* * * * *

(11) With respect to [that portion of the Maine Turnpike designated Route 95 and 495, and that portion of Interstate Route 95 from the southern terminus of the Maine Turnpike to the New Hampshire State line, laws (including regulations)]¹ *all portions of the Interstate Highway System in the State, laws (including regulations)* of the State of Maine concerning vehicle weight limitations that were in effect on October 1, 1995, and are applicable to State highways other than the Interstate System, shall be applicable in lieu of the requirements of this subsection.

* * * * *

TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE

CHAPTER 8—LOW-INCOME HOUSING

SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROGRAM OF ASSISTED HOUSING

§ 1437v. Demolition, site revitalization, replacement housing, and tenant-based assistance grants for projects

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(m) **Funding**

(1) Authorization of appropriations

There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section \$574,000,000 for fiscal year [2009] 2010.

* * * * *

¹The changes to current law made by this section would be effective for a period of 365 days, after which time the law would revert back to current law.

(o) Sunset

No assistance may be provided under this section after **[September 30, 2009]** *September 30, 2010*.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 90—NEIGHBORHOOD AND CITY REINVESTMENT, SELF-HELP AND REVITALIZATION

SUBCHAPTER I—NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

§ 8104. Officers and employees

(a) Employment, compensation and benefits

The board shall have power to select, employ, and fix the salary and benefits of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the performance of its duties under this subchapter, without regard to the provisions of title 5 governing appointments in the competitive service, classification, and General Schedule pay rates, except that no officer, employee, attorney, or agent of the corporation may be paid salary at a rate in excess of the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule. The Corporation shall also apply the provisions of section 5307(a)(1), (b)(1) and (b)(2) of title 5 governing limitations on certain pay as if its employees were Federal employees receiving payments under title 5, *except that the board-appointed officers may be paid salary at a rate not to exceed level II of the Executive Schedule.*

* * * * *

TITLE 46—SHIPPING

SUBTITLE V—MERCHANT MARINE

PART C—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

CHAPTER 535—CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

§ 51314. Limitation on charges and fees for attendance

(a) **PROHIBITION.**— * * *

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition specified in subsection (a) does not apply with respect to any item or service provided to cadets for which a charge or fee is imposed as of October 5, 1994. The Secretary of Transportation shall notify Congress of any change made by the Academy in the amount of a charge or fee authorized under this subsection. *Such fees shall be credited to the Maritime Administration’s Operations and Training appropriation, to remain available until expended, for those expenses directly related to the purposes of the fees. Fees collected in excess of actual expenses may be refunded to the Midshipmen through a mechanism approved by the Secretary. The Academy shall maintain a separate and detailed accounting of fee revenue and all associated expenses.*

* * * * *

SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS, PUBLIC LAW 109-59

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Subtitle G—High Priority Projects

SEC. 1702. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Subject to section 117 of title 23, United States Code, the amount listed for each high priority project in the following table shall be available (from amounts made available by section 1101(a)(16) of this Act) for fiscal years 2005 through 2009 to carry out each such project:

		Highway Projects High Priority Projects	
No.	State	Project Description	Amount
1	CA	Construct safe access to streets for bicyclists and pedestrians including crosswalks, sidewalks and traffic calming measures, Covina	\$400,000
*	*	* * * * *	*
3137	PA	I-70/I-79 South Interchange Redesign and Upgrade	\$1,600,000
3138	KS	Elimination of highway-railway crossings at the City of Pittsburgh Port Authority to increase safety and reduce congestion <i>Elimination of highway-railway crossings and rehabilitation of rail along the KO railroad to Osborne</i>	\$4,584,000
*	*	* * * * *	*
3922	FL	West Palm Beach, Construction of U.S. 1, Flagler Drive Waterfront Redevelopment and Traffic Calming Project	\$2,000,000
3923	FL	Leon County FL: Capital Circle, NW/SW, widen Capital Circle, NW/SW to 4 lanes from I-10 to West U.S. 90	\$7,000,000
*	*	* * * * *	*
4572	NV	Transportation improvements on Laughlin-Bullhead City Colorado Bridge	\$3,000,000
4573	NV	Transportation improvements for Mesquite Airport Access <i>Design and construct interchange on I-15 in Mesquite</i>	\$8,000,000
*	*	* * * * *	*
4866	RI	Replace Warren Bridge in Warren	\$11,000,000
4866A	RI	Repair and restore <i>Removal of and enhancements around railroad bridge in Westerly</i>	\$11,000,000
*	*	* * * * *	*
		* * * * *	*

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC.
308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the budget resolution for 2010: Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies:				
Mandatory				(¹)
Discretionary	67,700	67,700	134,469	¹ 134,461
Projection of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2010				² 48,130
2011				34,876
2012				16,420
2013				7,606
2014 and future years				9,903
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2010	NA	34,198	NA	29,912

¹ Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

² Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power of the purse. The Committee believes strongly that Congress should make the decisions on how to allocate the people's money.

As defined in Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the term "congressional directed spending item" means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator, providing, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative, formula-driven, or competitive award process.

For each item, a Member is required to provide a certification that neither the Member nor the Senator's immediate family has a pecuniary interest in such congressionally directed spending item. Such certifications are available to the public on the website of the Senate Committee on Appropriations (www.appropriations.Senate.gov/Senators.cfm).

Following is a list of congressionally directed spending items included in the Senate recommendation discussed in this report, along with the name of each Senator who submitted a request to the Committee of jurisdiction for each item so identified. Neither the Committee recommendation nor this report contains any limited tax benefits or limited tariff benefits as defined in rule XLIV.

PRESIDENTIALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

Agency	Account	Project	Amount
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	ARC/THE Tunnel, New Jersey Trans-Hudson Midtown Corridor, NJ	\$200,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Belleuve to Redmond Bus Rapid Transit, WA	\$9,368,193
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Central Florida Commuter Rail Transit, FL	\$35,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Central Phoenix/East Valley Light Rail, AZ	\$61,249,903
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Commuter Rail Improvements, MA	\$32,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Dulles Corridor Rail Project, VA	\$85,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Houston North Corridor LRT, TX	\$75,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Houston Southeast Corridor LRT, TX	\$75,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Hudson-Bergen MOS-2, NJ	\$11,039
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Largo Metrorail Extension, Washington, DC	\$347,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Livermore/Amador Route 10 BRT, CA	\$79,900
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Long Island Rail Road East Side Access, NY	\$193,500,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Mason Corridor BRT, CO	\$48,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Metro Express—Airport Way Corridor BRT Project, CA	\$2,808,825
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension, Los Angeles, CA	\$9,582,551
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Metro Rapid Bus System Gap Closure, CA	\$23,326
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Monterey Bay Rapid Transit, CA	\$2,830,042
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Mountain Links BRT, AZ	\$681,942
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	North Shore LRT Connector, PA	\$6,153
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Northstar Corridor Rail Project, MN	\$711,661
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Northwest/Southeast LRT MOS, TX	\$86,249,717
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Pacific Highway South BRT, WA	\$6,815
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Ravenswood Extension Line, IL	\$304,744
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Roaring Fork Valley, BRT Project, CO	\$810,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	RTD West Corridor, CO	\$100,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Salt Lake City—Mid Jordan LRT, UT	\$100,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	San Bernardino, E Street Corridor sdx BRT, CA	\$20,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Second Avenue Subway Phase I, NY	\$177,463,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Sound Transit—Central Link Initial Segment, WA	\$3,144,294
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Sound Transit—University Link LRT Extension, WA	\$110,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	South Corridor I-205/Portland Mall LRT, OR	\$74,229,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	South Sacramento Light Rail Extension, CA	\$40,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Weber County to Salt Lake City Commuter Rail, UT	\$80,000,000
Federal Transit Administration	Capital Investment Grants	Wisshire Boulevard Bus Only Lane, CA	\$13,558,474

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary (OST).	Transportation Planning, Research, and Development [TPR&D].	Freight Policy Transportation Institute, WA	\$750,000	Senator Murray
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary (OST).	Transportation Planning, Research, and Development [TPR&D].	Hampton Roads-Crater Multimodal Transportation and Distribution Study, VA	\$250,000	Senator Warner
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary (OST).	Transportation Planning, Research, and Development [TPR&D].	Vehicle Research Institute—Advanced Materials Transit Vehicle Design, WA	\$750,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Department of Transportation, Office of the Secretary (OST).	Transportation Planning, Research, and Development [TPR&D].	Whatcom Smart Trips, WA	\$750,000	Senator Murray
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting Building Construction—Southern Illinois Airport, Carbondale, IL	\$800,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Burlington International Airport Taxiway and Apron Improvements, VT	\$1,000,000	Senator Leahy
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport, KY	\$1,500,000	Senator McConnell
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Devils Lake Regional, ND	\$500,000	Senators Conrad, Dorgan
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Eagle River Union Airport, WI	\$895,000	Senator Kohl
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Golden Triangle Regional Airport, MS	\$2,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Grand Forks International, ND	\$2,500,000	Senators Conrad, Dorgan
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Gulfport-Biloxi Airport, MS	\$2,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Jackson-Evers International Airport, MS	\$2,000,000	Senator Cochran
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Lamar Municipal Airport, MO	\$2,750,000	Senator Bond
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Lanett Municipal Airport, AL	\$5,000,000	Senator Shelby
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Louisville International Airport, KY	\$750,000	Senator McConnell
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Mid Delta Regional, MS	\$1,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Nashville International Airport, TN	\$1,500,000	Senator Alexander, Corker
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Niagara Falls International Airport Runway 10L–28R Mill and Overlay, NY	\$400,000	Senator Gillibrand
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Oakland County International Airport Terminal Building, Pontiac, MI	\$750,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Runway reconstruction—Quad Cities International Airport, Moline, IL	\$500,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	San Marcos Municipal Airport, TX	\$1,000,000	Senator Hutchinson
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Sheboygan County Memorial Airport, WI	\$950,000	Senator Kohl
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Airport Improvement Program [AIP]	Sikeston Memorial Municipal Airport, MO	\$1,700,000	Senator Bond
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Facilities and Equipment [F&E]	Air Traffic Control Facility, Palm Springs International Airport, CA	\$2,000,000	Senators Boxer, Feinstein
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Facilities and Equipment [F&E]	Air Traffic Control Facility, Nantucket Memorial Airport, MA	\$1,000,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Facilities and Equipment [F&E]	Juneau International Airport MALSR Lighting, AK	\$1,000,000	Senator Murkowski

Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	NextGen Integrated Airport Project, FL	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinetz	\$850,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinetz
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Piedmont Triad International Airport Instrument Landing System, NC	Senator Burr	\$1,250,000	Senator Burr
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Rutland-Southern Vermont Regional Airport, VT	Senator Leahy	\$250,000	Senator Leahy
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	TOPIA—Mobile Object Infrastructure Technology, WA	Senator Murray	\$2,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Alien Species Action Plan Inspection Facility, HI	Senator Inouye	\$900,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	St. Louis University Center for Aviation Safety Research, MO	Senator Bond	\$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Advanced Materials in Transport Aircraft Structures, WA	Senators Murray, Cantwell	\$500,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Advanced Materials Research, KS	Senators Brownback, Roberts	\$1,500,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Center of Excellence for Commercial Space Transportation, FL	Senator Nelson	\$1,000,000	Senator Nelson
Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]	Nondestructive Inspection (NDI) Training for Composite Airframe Structures, KS	Senators Brownback, Roberts	\$250,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Capitol Street Renaissance Project—Transportation Improvements, MS	Senators Cochran, Wicker	\$1,150,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Interstate 55 Interchange Lighting, MS	Senators Cochran, Wicker	\$600,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Interstate 55 Interchange, MD	Senator Bond	\$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Jonestown Bypass, MS	Senators Cochran, Wicker	\$1,250,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Poplar Bluff Industrial Park Bypass, MO	Senator Bond	\$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Route 34, MO	Senator Bond	\$1,150,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Statesman Boulevard and Trail, MS	Senator Cochran	\$1,500,000	Senator Cochran
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Boulder City Bypass, NV	Senator Reid	\$1,000,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	BRAC-Related Improvements, Anne Arundel County, MD	Senators Mikulski, Cardin	\$2,300,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	BRAC-Related Improvements, Harford County, MD	Senators Mikulski, Cardin	\$2,300,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	BRAC-Related Improvements, Montgomery County, MD	Senators Mikulski, Cardin	\$2,300,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Choctaw Lake-Bluff Lake Route, MS	Senator Cochran	\$1,500,000	Senator Cochran
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	CR 97, Nicolls Road Highway Improvements, NY	Senator Gillibrand	\$400,000	Senator Gillibrand
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	FH-24, Banks to Lowman, ID	Senators Crapo, Risch	\$2,000,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Federal Lands Improvement Project, HI	Senator Inouye	\$4,000,000	Senator Inouye
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Flight 93 National Memorial, PA	Senators Specter, Casey	\$1,400,000	Senators Specter, Casey
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Forest Road Upgrade, MS	Senator Wicker	\$500,000	Senator Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Hoover Dam Bypass Bridge, AZ	Senator Kyl	\$4,250,000	Senator Kyl
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Kalispel Tribe Road Development from Sprague Avenue to US 2, WA	Senator Murray	\$1,300,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Navajo Route 42, Ojeto Road Resurfacing Project, UT	Senator Bennett, Hatch	\$1,000,000	Senator Bennett, Hatch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Pyramid Highway Corridor, NV	Senators Reid, Ensign	\$1,100,000	Senators Reid, Ensign

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways)	Reconstruction of BIA Route 7 on the Turtle Mountain Reservation, ND.	\$1,200,000	Senators Conrad, Dorgan
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways)	Repairs to Waterville Road, TN	\$200,000	Senator Alexander
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways)	SD Highway 63 Resurfacing, SD	\$3,000,000	Senator Thune
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways)	South Access to the Golden Gate Bridge, Doyle Drive, City and County of San Francisco, CA.	\$2,750,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways)	Southern Nevada Beltway Interchanges, NV	\$2,250,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways)	SR-160 Nevada Expansion, NV	\$2,250,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways)	Standing Rock Sioux Tribe—Community Streets Project—Bear Soldier South, SD.	\$600,000	Senator Johnson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways)	West River Trail Bridge, VT	\$170,000	Senator Sanders
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Federal lands (Public Lands Highways) (Public Lands Highways).	BRAC-Related Improvements, Prince George's County, MD	\$2,300,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Ferry Boats and Terminal Facilities	New Vessel Program—Propulsion System Acquisition, WA	\$3,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	24th Street/1-15 Interchange, UT	\$2,000,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-10 Interchange at Pecue Lane, LA	\$1,100,000	Senators Vitter, Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-12 Interchange at LA-16, Denham Springs, LA	\$650,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-15 Corridor of the Future, NV	\$1,000,000	Senators Reid, Ensign
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-15 Custer Avenue Interchange, MT	\$3,000,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-235/US 54 and Central Ave Interchange, KS	\$500,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-29 Fargo North to Shyenne River, ND	\$1,000,000	Senators Conrad, Dorgan
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-5 Columbia River Crossing, WA	\$2,000,000	Senators Murray, Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-70 Viaduct Realignment, KS	\$500,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-85 Widening in Davidson and Rowan Counties, NC	\$1,700,000	Senator Burr
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-90 Belgrade East Interchange, MT	\$1,500,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-95 Interchange with SR 202 (Butler Boulevard), FL	\$1,000,000	Senator Martinez
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	1-95 Pawtucket River Bridge Replacement, RI	\$1,800,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	IH-35W Congestion Relief, Fort Worth, TX	\$2,000,000	Senators Hutchinson, Cornyn
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	Interchange 280: Interchange Improvements, Harrison, NJ	\$2,000,000	Senators Menendez, Lautenberg
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	Interstate 29: Reconstruction and Utility Relocation Project, IA	\$1,000,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	Interstate 40: New Conway South Interchange, AR	\$800,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM]	Interstate 430/630: Interchange Modification, AR	\$3,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln

Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM] ...	Interstate 540: Fayetteville-North, AR ...	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM] ...	Interstate 81 Exit 3 Interchange Improvements, PA ...	Senators Specter, Casey
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM] ...	Interstate 95/Fairfax County Parkway Interchange at Newington Road, VA ...	Senators Webb, Warner
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM] ...	Kapolei Interchange Complex, HI ...	Senator Inouye
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM] ...	Marion Road Interchange, SD ...	Senator Thune
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM] ...	Meadowood Interchange, NV ...	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM] ...	Starr Road Interchange, NV ...	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Interstate Maintenance [IM] ...	Turnpike Improvement Project, SR-1 & I-95, DE ...	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	10th Avenue South Corridor Extension, Waverly, IA ...	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	4th Street Improvement Project, City of Moro, OR ...	Senators Merkley, Wyden
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	53rd Ave. Bridge and Roadway Extension Project, OR ...	Senators Merkley, Wyden
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	70th Avenue and Valley Avenue East Corridor Project, WA ...	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Airport Road Replacement, TN ...	Senator Alexander
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	ADHS Corridor H, WV ...	Senator Byrd
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Anchor Lake Interchange and Service Road, MS ...	Senator Cochran
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Arterial Road and Bridge Improvements, Matanuska-Sustina Borough, AK ...	Senators Murkowski, Begich
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Artesia Road Bypass, MS ...	Senator Cochran
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Bergen County Specialized Bus Transit, NJ ...	Senators Menendez, Lautenberg
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Blair Bypass—South Corridor, NE ...	Senator Ben Nelson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Blue Earth CSAH 12 Extension/TH 14 Interchange, MN ...	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Bonneville Clark Couplet, NV ...	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Bossier Parish Congestion Relief Plan, Bossier Parish, LA ...	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Brett Way Extension, OR ...	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Broad Street Parkway/Washua River Bridge Enhancements, NH ...	Senator Shaheen
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Broadway Bridge Replacement Project, WA ...	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Brush Creek—Troost Avenue Streetscape Improvements, MO ...	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Byram-Clinton/Morrell Parkway, MS ...	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Cannon AFB BRAC County Road Improvements, NM ...	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Cape Girardeau Riverwalk Trail, MO ...	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Carson City Freeway—Phase II, NV ...	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Central City, Trinity River Vision, Fort Worth, TX ...	Senators Hutchinson, Cornyn
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	East Loop, Brownsville, TX ...	Senator Hutchinson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	Church Street Marketplace and Side Streets Improvements, VT ...	Senator Leahy
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	City of Hines Street Rehabilitation Project, OR ...	Senators Merkley, Wyden
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	City of Providence Street Paving, RI ...	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities [STP] ...	City of Tuscaloosa Streetscape, AL ...	Senator Shelby

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Coalfields Expressway, WV	\$2,000,000	Senator Byrd
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Collins Road Improvements, Cedar Rapids, IA	\$1,000,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Construction of Four Lane Highway on US 69 in Crawford, Bourbon, and Cherokee Counties, KS	\$1,500,000	Senator Brownback
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Countywide Regional Loop Trail, Mount Clemens, MI	\$2,000,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Defense Access Road, MS	\$1,000,000	Senator Cochran
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Denali Commission Transportation Program, AK	\$1,000,000	Senators Begich, Murkowski
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	East Chester Street Improvement, TN	\$785,000	Senator Alexander
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	East Metropolitan Corridor, MS	\$2,000,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Emergency Access Ramp to Interstate 84, NY	\$1,000,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Fairfax County Parkway Interchange Improvements at Fair Lakes Boulevard and Monument Drive, VA	\$600,000	Senators Warner, Webb
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	FNSB Road and Bridge Improvements, AK	\$1,000,000	Senator Murkowski
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Gluckstadt Road and Interchange, MS	\$1,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Golden Gate Bridge Seismic Retrofit Construction Project, CA	\$2,000,000	Senators Boxer, Feinstein
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Greensboro Greenway, NC	\$500,000	Senator Hagan
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Hardy County Complex Access Road, WV	\$1,500,000	Senator Byrd
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Hastings Bridge/Highway 61 Right-of-Way and construction, MN	\$500,000	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Hattiesburg Longleaf Trace Rails To Trails, MS	\$500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Henry Avenue Bridge Reconstruction, WI	\$1,000,000	Senator Kohl
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	High Bridge Renovation, MT	\$300,000	Senator Tester
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Highway 226: Highway 67 to Highway 49, AR	\$1,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Highway 63: Interchange Improvements, AR	\$2,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Hogan Road Traffic Improvements, ME	\$550,000	Senators Collins, Snowe
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Holly Springs Road, MS	\$1,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Hutchins Street Reconstruction, Berlin, NH	\$800,000	Senator Shaheen
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Highway 167: Louisiana State Line to Sheridan, AR	\$1,400,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Hybrid Composite-Concrete Bridges, ME	\$2,000,000	Senators Collins, Snowe
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	I-40 Boulevard Construction, OK	\$1,000,000	Senator Inhofe
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	I-44 Range Line Road Interchange, MO	\$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	I-69, TX	\$500,000	Senators Hutchinson, Cornyn
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Improvement of the South Connector Street, SD	\$1,250,000	Senator Thune
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Improvements to 159th Street, KS	\$2,000,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Indian River Inlet Bridge, DE	\$800,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Infrastructure Improvement at Height of Land, ME	\$2,900,000	Senators Collins, Snowe

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	International Railway Station/Intermodal Transportation Center, NY ...	\$800,000	Senators Schumer, Gillibrand
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Interstate 69/Great River Bridge- Highway 65-MS Highway 1, AR ...	\$2,000,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Iowa Highway 14-57 Complete Streets Corridor Improvements, Parkersburg, IA	\$2,000,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Jenny Barker Road/K-156/Mary St. Reconfiguration, KS	\$500,000	Senators Brownback, Roberts
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Kettering Gateway Project, Flint, MI	\$1,200,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	King Coal Highway, WV	\$2,000,000	Senator Byrd
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Kittitas Highway Safety Improvements, WA	\$2,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Knowlton Road Reconstruction, Mercer County, IL	\$500,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	LA 1 Goldenmeadow to Port Fourchon, Lafourche Parish, LA	\$1,000,000	Senators Landrieu, Vitter
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Lafayette Interchange, MO	\$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Lake Harbour Drive, MS	\$1,500,000	Senator Cochran
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Lake Merritt Improvement Project, CA	\$850,000	Senator Boxer
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Lesner Bridge Replacement, VA	\$500,000	Senators Webb, Warner
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Lewis and Clark Legacy Trail, ND	\$700,000	Senators Conrad, Dorgan
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Longfellow Bridge Approach and Gateway, MA	\$1,000,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Lower Main Street Infrastructure Project, Claremont, NH	\$500,000	Senator Shaheen
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Lowry Avenue Bridge Replacement, MN	\$500,000	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Mahoning Road Infrastructure and Economic Development Project, OH	\$1,000,000	Senator Voivovich
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	MD 404 Improvements in Caroline, Talbot, and Queen Anne's Counties, MD	\$400,000	Senator Mikulski
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Missouri River Freight Corridor Development Study, MO	\$900,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	MLK-Lincoln Avenue Railroad Grade Separation, WA	\$2,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	MO-13 and MO-82 Interchange, MO	\$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Naugatuck River Greenway, CT	\$1,000,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Nevada Pacific Parkway, NV	\$550,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	New York State Route 12, NY	\$500,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Newberg-Dundee Transportation Improvement Project, OR	\$400,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Newport Cliff Walk Restoration, RI	\$500,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	North Broad Street Redevelopment Project, NJ	\$500,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Northern Avenue Bridge Rehabilitation, MA	\$1,300,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Northwest 66th Avenue Reconstruction, IA	\$600,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Ohio Hub Plan, OH	\$700,000	Senator Brown
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Oktibbeha County Southern Bypass, MS	\$500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Old Taylor Road Roundabouts, MS	\$500,000	Senator Cochran

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Ontario Oregon Railroad Underpass Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, OR	\$300,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Park Road Bridge Replacement and Dubuque Street Elevation Project, Iowa City, IA	\$1,500,000	Senator Grassley
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Pioneer Street Rail Overpass Safety Improvement Project, WA	\$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Pony Express Boulevard, Herriman, UT	\$1,000,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Port of Everett Infrastructure Improvement Project, WA	\$1,200,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	R-170 Landslide Road Replacement, WA	\$2,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Reconstruction and Upgrade of 2300 West between 1900 South and the Interstate 15 West Frontage Road in Lehi, UT	\$1,500,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Regional East-West Trail and Bikeway, Albuquerque, NM	\$1,000,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Remediation and Reuse of Reclaimed Port Land, DE	\$750,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Replacement and Rehabilitation of Municipal Bridges and Trestles, City of Ketchikan, AK	\$500,000	Senators Murkowski, Begich
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Reunion Interchange, MS	\$1,500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Rickenbacker Intermodal East-West Connector, OH	\$2,000,000	Senator Voinovich
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Road Improvements from 57th Street North to 1000ft South of 26th Street, Sioux Falls, SD	\$1,500,000	Senator Johnson
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Route 1/Route 123 Interchange Improvements, VA	\$600,000	Senators Webb, Warner
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Route 160 and Route 60 Interchange Improvements, MO	\$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Route 27 Renaissance 2000 Project, NJ	\$1,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Route 60/422 Interchange, PA	\$500,000	Senators Specter, Casey
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Rutland Center Street Marketplace Improvements, VT	\$1,000,000	Senator Leahy
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	San Bernardo Avenue Restoration, Laredo, TX	\$500,000	Senator Hutchison
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	San Jose Boulevard Improvements, Carlsbad, NM	\$750,000	Senators Tom Udall, Bingaman
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Sellwood Bridge Replacement Project, OR	\$1,300,000	Senators Merkley, Wyden
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Sitka Waterfront Development, AK	\$500,000	Senator Begich
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	South Street Reconstruction and Streetscape Improvements, NY	\$1,000,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Southeast Connector, IA	\$2,000,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	Southwest Arterial Project, IA	\$400,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	St. John's Heritage Parkway Interchanges, Cities of Melbourne and Palm Bay, Brevard County, FL	\$2,000,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP)	State Route 24/48, MS	\$1,900,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker

Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Street and Utility Reconstruction—Main Avenue, Park Rapids, MN ...	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Sue Ann Big Crow and Ogjala Trail and Bike Path enhancement, Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, SD.	Senator Johnson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Theford Village Pedestrian Improvements, VT	Senator Leahy
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Tupelo Thoroflare Northern Loop, MS	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	U.S. 195 Safety Improvements, Cheney-Spokane Road Interchange, WA.	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	U.S. Highway 97 and J Street Intersection Project, OR	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	U.S. Route 35, WV	Senator Byrd
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	U.S. Route 422 Westbound Off-Ramp Improvements at the Oaks Interchange, PA.	Senator Specter
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	University of Kentucky Academy for Community Transportation Innovation, KY.	Senators Webb, Warner
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Urban Collector Road, MS	Senator McConnell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	US 16B Improvements near US 16 to near SD 79, SD	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	US 395 from Moana to Stead, NV	Senator Thune
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	US 70 Bridge Repairs, TN	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	US 93 Corridor and Kalspell Bypass, MT	Senator Alexander
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	US-63, MO	Senators Baucus, Tester
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Vidalia Port Access Road, Vidalia, LA	Senator Bond
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Wadhams Road Bridge over Black River, St. Clair, MI	Senator Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	Waterfront Redevelopment Access Project, WA	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	West County Line Road, MS	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	West Haven Rail Passenger Station, CT	Senator Cochran
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation Priorities (STP) ...	West Virginia Route 10, WV	Senators Lieberman, Dodd
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	5th and 6th Street Reconstruction, OR	Senator Byrd
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	7th Street Gateway Streetscape Enhancement Project, NJ	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Access Road to Melbourne International Airport, FL	Senators Menendez, Lautenberg
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Autumn Street Parkway, San Jose, CA	Senator Bill Nelson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Beaudry Road Crossing and Pathway Project, WA	Senator Feinstein
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Camden Waterfront Neighborhood Development Initiative, NJ	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Completion of future I-99, US Route 15 in Steuben County, NY	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Surface Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].		Senator Schumer

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Downtown Development Authority Streetscape, Dahlonega, GA	\$392,000	Senator Chambliss
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	El Camino East/West Corridor, AL	\$1,500,000	Senator Sessions
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Fish Lake Trail Completion, WA	\$2,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Freeways and Arterial System of Transportation [FAST], NV	\$700,000	Senator Reid
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Hamilton Street Overpass Safety Project, WA	\$1,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	I-84, Broadway Avenue to Gowen Road Widening, ID	\$400,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	I-84, Caldwell to Nampa Widening, ID	\$1,000,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Interchange design and construction Kansas Highway10 and Lone Elm Interchange, Lenexa, KS.	\$500,000	Senator Roberts
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Interstate 579 Cap—Urban Green Space & Park Plaza, Pittsburgh, PA.	\$1,000,000	Senator Casey
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Iowa Technology Corridor West Grand Avenue Extension, IA	\$600,000	Senator Harkin, Grassley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Loop 82 Railroad Overpass, TX	\$700,000	Senator Cornyn
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Midtown Transportation Infrastructure, NY	\$1,400,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Monongalia Health Systems Access Road, WV	\$1,000,000	Senator Byrd
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	New Hanover Greenway System, NC	\$250,000	Senator Hagan
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	New Orleans City Park Infrastructure Improvements, New Orleans, LA.	\$2,000,000	Senator Landrieu
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Ninth Street Island Bridge Project, MT	\$625,000	Senator Tester
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Pedestrian Safety Improvement Project, NY	\$300,000	Senator Gillibrand
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] ...	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP]	Riggin Road at the Walnut Street Intersection, IN	\$1,000,000	Senator Lugar

Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Salters Road Expansion Along I-85, Greenville, SC	\$300,000	Senator Graham
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	South Lawrence Trafficway, KS	\$1,250,000	Senator Roberts
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	State Road 133 from Albany to Moultrie, GA	\$800,000	Senator Chambliss
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Town of Lexington Unified Traffic Plan—Phase I, SC	\$1,000,000	Senator Graham
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Union Crossing, MA	\$400,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	US 113 Improvements in Worcester County, MD	\$400,000	Senator Mikulski
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	US 417/Cobb Parkway Expansion and Bridge Replacement, GA	\$500,000	Senator Isakson
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	US 78 Upgrade to Interstate Standards, MS	\$1,000,000	Senator Wicker
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	US Highway 169 Widening Project, OK	\$500,000	Senator Inhofe
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	US-95, Thomecreek to Moscow, ID	\$400,000	Senators Crapo, Risch
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Wetzel Street Bridge Replacement, WV	\$500,000	Senator Byrd
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Widen Hwy 99W between SPRR overpass and NW Circle Boulevard, OR.	\$300,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]	Transportation & Community & System Preservation [TCSP].	Scoping Study on Audubon and Natcher Parkways in Western Kentucky, KY.	\$375,000	Senator Bunning
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Grade Crossings on Designated High-speed Rail Corridors.	55th Street East Grade Separation, ND	\$1,900,000	Senators Conrad, Dorgan
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Grade Crossings on Designated High-speed Rail Corridors.	Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations, CA	\$2,000,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Grade Crossings on Designated High-speed Rail Corridors.	Livingston Railroad Grade Separation Undercrossing, MT	\$600,000	Senators Baucus
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Grade Crossings on Designated High-speed Rail Corridors.	Railway-Highway Grade Crossing Mitigation, Northeastern IL	\$2,000,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program.	Grade Crossing Mitigation, Galesburg, IL	\$3,000,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program.	Port of Alexandria Rail Spur, City of Alexandria, LA	\$500,000	Senator Landrieu

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program.	Shelby Intermodal Hub, MT	\$1,000,000	Senators Baucus, Tester
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program.	Southern Rail Corridor, MN	\$500,000	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program.	Waterfront Rail Reconstruction Project: Kawasaki SWIMO, NY	\$800,000	Senator Schumer
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Rail Line Relocation and Improvement Program.	West Freight Access Project, WA	\$3,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Research and Development [R&D]	Caltrain—Positive Train Control, CA	\$500,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Research and Development [R&D]	Constructed Facilities Center at West Virginia University, WV	\$250,000	Senator Byrd
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Research and Development [R&D]	MetroLink—Positive Train Control, CA	\$500,000	Senators Feinstein, Boxer
Federal Railroad Administration [FRA]	Research and Development [R&D]	PEERS Rail Grade Crossing Safety, Statewide, IL	\$500,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis [AA]	C-TRAN High Capacity Transit—Alternatives Analysis, WA	\$1,750,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis [AA]	Naval Station Norfolk/Virginia Beach Light Rail Study, VA	\$1,000,000	Senators Warner, Webb
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis [AA]	New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Rail Line Improvements, CT	\$4,000,000	Senator Dodd
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis [AA]	Northwest New Jersey—Northeast Pennsylvania Passenger Rail Project, NJ/PA	\$1,000,000	Senator Specter
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Alternatives Analysis [AA]	Puyallup Bus Rapid Transit Project—Alternatives Analysis, WA	\$1,500,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	40' Fixed Route Transit Buses, DE	\$1,000,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	ACE Boulder Highway Rapid Transit Project, WY	\$750,000	Senators Ensign, Reid
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Albany Transit Multimodal Transportation Center, GA	\$1,500,000	Senator Chambliss
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Automotive-Based Fuel Cell Hybrid Bus Program, DE	\$500,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Benzie Transportation Authority Bus and Bus Facilities, Honor, MI	\$1,000,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Bridgeport Intermodal Transportation Center, CT	\$2,500,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Cache Valley Transit District Expansion, UT	\$2,000,000	Senators Hatch, Bennett
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Capital Metro—Bus and Bus Facilities, TX	\$2,000,000	Senators Cornyn, Hutchison
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Cedar Avenue Bus Rapid Transit, Phase I, Dakota County, MN	\$700,000	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Chittenden County Transportation Authority Buses, Equipment, and Facilities, Including Downtown Burlington Transit Center Design, VT	\$2,000,000	Senators Leahy, Sanders
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	City of Dinuba CNG Fueling Station Expansion, CA	\$800,000	Senator Boxer
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Colorado Transit Coalition Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, CO	\$2,500,000	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	Coralville Intermodal Facility, Coralville, IA	\$750,000	Senators Grassley, Harkin
Federal Transit Administration [FTA]	Bus & Bus Facilities	C-TRAN Transit Vehicle Replacement, WA	\$1,900,000	Senator Murray

Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Deerfield Valley Transit Association Facilities, Buses, and Equipment, VT.	Senator Leahy
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	City of Imperial Downtown Transportation Park, CA	\$600,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Electric Hybrid Bus Upgrade Grants, IN	\$1,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Great Falls Transit District Bus Replacements, MT	\$2,400,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Harbor Point Bus Expansion, CT	\$1,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Harrison County Multimodal, MS	\$500,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Hobbs Transit Intermodal Facility, NM	\$2,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Idaho Transit Coalition Bus and Bus Facilities, ID	\$800,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Intercity Transit Vehicle Acquisition, WA	\$1,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Jamaica Intermodal Station Plaza, NY	\$1,800,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	JATRAM Fleet Replacement, MS	\$600,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	KCATR Bus Replacement, MO	\$500,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Link Transit Vehicle Acquisition, WA	\$2,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Illinois Downstate Bus and Bus Facilities, IL	\$2,300,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Lufkin VA Clinic Shuttle, TX	\$4,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	LYNX Buses, Orlando, FL	\$300,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Marble Valley Regional Transit District Buses, Facilities, and Equipment, VT.	\$1,500,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	MARTA Acquisition of Clean Fuel Buses, GA	\$4,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Metro St. Louis—Downtown Transfer Center, MO	\$1,150,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Newark Penn Station Intermodal Improvements, NJ	\$2,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	North Dakota Statewide Transit, ND	\$1,500,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Northstar Phase II Commuter Buses, MN	\$100,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Pierce Transit Diesel-Electric Bus Acquisition, WA	\$1,300,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Port of Anchorage Intermodal Expansion Project, AK	\$500,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Purchase Hybrid Buses, Leigh and Northampton Transportation Authority (LANTA) PA	\$500,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Reconstruction of the University Circle Rapid Station, OH	\$2,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Rural Bus Program for Hawaii, Maui and Kauai, HI	\$3,500,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Senior Transportation Program, AL	\$2,000,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Silverton Senior and Disabled Transportation Service, OR	\$39,429
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Spokane Transit Diesel-Electric Hybrid Bus Acquisition, WA	\$1,300,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	State of Arkansas—Bus and Bus Facilities for Urban, Rural, and Elderly and Disabled Agencies, AR.	\$500,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Staten Island Ferry Campus Shuttle Bus Service, NY	\$260,000
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Statewide (Rural and Urban) Bus and Bus Facilities, KS	\$2,000,000

Senator Schumer
Senators Brownback, Roberts

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued

Agency	Account	Project	Amount	Member
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities for Commuter Choice, NM	\$2,000,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, IA	\$3,450,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, MO	\$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus and Bus Facilities, SD	\$500,000	Senator Johnson
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Statewide Bus Replacement, RI	\$500,000	Senator Reed
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Tacoma Intermodal Transit Center, WA	\$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Tennessee Statewide Bus Program, TN	\$6,000,000	Senators Alexander, Corker
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	The Clean and Green Bus Replacements Initiative, OH	\$500,000	Senators Brown, Voinovich
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	The Rapid, Wealthy Operations Center Expansion Project, Grand Rapids, MI	\$2,000,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Thompsonville Intermodal Transportation Center, CT	\$1,000,000	Senators Dodd, Lieberman
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky Bus Replacement Project, KY	\$1,600,000	Senator McConnell
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Transit Maintenance Garage Initiative, IA	\$700,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Transit Vehicle and Related Equipment, MO	\$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Washoe County Bus and Bus Facilities, NV	\$500,000	Senator Reid
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Western Kentucky University Shuttle Bus Improvement Project, KY	\$1,075,000	Senator McConnell
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Whatcom Transportation Authority Fleet Replacement Project, WA	\$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Bus & Bus Facilities	Wisconsin Bus Capital on Behalf of Transit Agencies Statewide, WI	\$3,500,000	Senator Kohl
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	AC Transit BRT Corridor, CA	\$2,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Ann Arbor—Detroit Regional Rail Project, Detroit, MI	\$5,000,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	ARC/THE Tunnel (New Jersey Trans-Hudson Midtown Corridor)	\$200,000,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Baltimore Red Line, MD	\$4,000,000	Senators Cardin, Mikulski
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Bellevue to Redmond Bus Rapid Transit, WA	\$9,368,193	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Central Corridor Light Rail Transit Project, MN	\$3,500,000	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	City of Charlotte, Charlotte Area Transit System's (CATS) Blue Line Extension—Northeast Corridor Project, NC	\$24,000,000	Senators Burr, Hagan
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	CTA Chicago Hub (Circle Line), IL	\$2,000,000	Senators Durbin, Burris
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	CTA Red Line North Station, Track, Viaduct and Station Rehabilitation, IL	\$10,000,000	Senator Durbin
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Draper Light Rail, UT	\$10,000,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Dulles Corridor Rail Project, VA	\$85,000,000	Senators Webb, Warner
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Fort Lauderdale, The Downtown Transit Corridor Program, Downtown Transit Circulator, FL	\$1,000,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez

Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Galveston-Houston Commuter Rail, TX	\$2,000,000	Senator Hutchison
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	HART Light Rail Preliminary Engineering, FL	\$3,000,000	Senators Bill Nelson, Martinez
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project, HI	\$30,000,000	Senators Inouye, Akaka
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Houston North Corridor LRT, TX	\$75,000,000	Senator Hutchison
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Houston Southeast Corridor LRT, TX	\$75,000,000	Senator Hutchison
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Improvements to the Rosslyn Metro Station, VA	\$2,000,000	Senators Webb, Warner
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Lackawanna Cut-Off Restoration Project, PA/WI	\$2,000,000	Senator Casey
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Metra Connects, IL	\$2,000,000	Senators Burris, Durbin
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension, Los Angeles, CA	\$9,582,551	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Metrorail Orange Line Extension, FL	\$20,000,000	Senator Martinez
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Mid-Jordan Light Rail, UT	\$100,000,000	Senators Bennett, Hatch
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Northstar Corridor Rail Project, MN	\$711,661	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Northstar Phase II—Extension of Northstar Commuter Rail to the St. Cloud Area, MN	\$4,000,000	Senator Klobuchar
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Northwest/Southeast Light Rail MOS, TX	\$86,249,717	Senators Hutchison, Cornyn
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Purple Line, MD	\$4,000,000	Senators Cardin, Mikulski
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Route 1 Bus Rapid Transit, Potomac Yard-Crystal City, VA	\$2,000,000	Senators Warner, Webb
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	RTD East Corridor, CO	\$5,500,000	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	RTD Gold Corridor, CO	\$5,000,000	Senators Mark Udall, Bennet
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	RTD West Corridor, CO	\$100,000,000	Senators Bennet, Mark Udall
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	San Francisco Muni Third St. Light Rail—Central Subway Project, CA	\$2,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Seattle Pacific Highway South Bus Rapid Transit, WA	\$6,815	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit, CA	\$1,000,000	Senators Boxer, Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Sound Transit—Central Link Initial Segment, WA	\$3,144,294	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Sound Transit—University Link LRT Extension, WA	\$110,000,000	Senator Murray
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	South Sacramento Light Rail Extension, CA	\$40,000,000	Senator Feinstein
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Stamford Urban Transitway, CT	\$4,500,000	Senators Lieberman, Dodd
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Virginia Railway Express Rolling Stock, VA	\$4,000,000	Senators Webb, Warner
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Weber County to Salt Lake City Commuter Rail, UT	\$80,000,000	Senator Bennett
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Wilmington to Newark Commuter Rail Improvement Program, DE	\$5,000,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)	Capital Investment Grants	Wisshire Boulevard Bus-Only Lane, CA	\$13,558,474	Senator Feinstein

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Abused Women's Aid in Crisis; Anchorage, AK.	For infrastructure improvements at a center to serve victims of domestic violence.	\$200,000	Senator Murkowski
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Ada Public Works Authority, Ada, OK	For construction of a water tower	\$400,000	Senator Inhofe
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Albany, GA	For the transformation of real estate property and infrastructure into a Certified Industrial Park.	\$450,000	Senator Chambliss
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	American Red Cross of Northeast Indiana, IN.	For expansion of an existing facility	\$200,000	Senator Lugar
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Amos House, Providence, RI	For construction of a training and support center to serve low-income individuals.	\$750,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Anchorage Community Land Trust, Anchorage, AK.	For rehabilitation and renewal of key blighted property along Mountain View Drive.	\$400,000	Senator Begich
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments, ME.	For restoration of the historic Camden Yarns Mill building in downtown Lewiston would rehabilitate a blighted mill on the river.	\$600,000	Senators Collins, Snowe
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Appalachia Service Project, Brenton, WV.	For a home repair program for low-income families in Southern West Virginia.	\$750,000	Senator Byrd
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Appalachia Service Project, Chavies, KY ..	To serve families below the Federal poverty level through a variety of means, such as financial assistance and equipping homes with running water.	\$460,000	Senator Bunning
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Appleton Housing Authority, Appleton, WI.	For construction and preservation of low-income elderly housing.	\$420,000	Senator Kohl
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Architectural Heritage Foundation, Lowell, MA.	For construction of a mixed-use urban development including space for affordable housing.	\$200,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Ardmore Development Authority, Ardmore, OK.	For infrastructure improvements	\$600,000	Senator Inhofe

Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Argentine Neighborhood Development Association, Kansas City, KS.	For property acquisition, infrastructure improvements, and housing construction.	\$1,000,000	Senator Brownback
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Arkansas Food Bank Network, AR	For establishment of a new facility	\$200,000	Senators Pryor, Lincoln
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Automation Alley, Troy, MI	For construction of the Automation Alley International Business Center.	\$300,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Blair County, PA	For acquisition, demolition, and site preparation within Blair County's blighted urban core areas, including downtown Altoona.	\$250,000	Senators Casey, Specter
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Bolivar County, MS	For the renovation and repair of a historic courthouse.	\$350,000	Senator Cochran
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Boyle County Fiscal Court, Danville, KY ...	For upgrades to current building and infrastructure in Boyle County.	\$500,000	Senator Bunning
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Boys and Girls Club of Greater Westfield, Westfield, MA.	For renovation and expansion of a youth facility.	\$300,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Boys and Girls Clubs of Southwest Washington, WA.	For expansion of the existing youth facility.	\$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Bristol Bay Borough, AK	For infrastructure expansion at the Port of Bristol Bay.	\$1,000,000	Senator Murkowski
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Buena Vista Charter Township, MI	For redevelopment of blighted property ...	\$400,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Calhoun County, MS	For renovation and construction of a historic courthouse.	\$900,000	Senator Cochran
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Chippewa-Luce-Mackinac Community Action Human Resources Authority, Luce County, MI.	For construction of a new service center to house all the agency's programs, which benefit low income county residents.	\$400,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Anderson, IN	For technology and building infrastructure improvements, tenant build-out and enhancements, and laboratory development.	\$200,000	Senator Lugar
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Billings, MT	For purchase of generators to provide emergency power to critical water facilities.	\$1,000,000	Senator Tester
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Bozeman, MT	For reconstruction following an explosion in a downtown historic district.	\$1,000,000	Senator Baucus

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Cincinnati, OH	For redevelopment of Brownfield property into a new light industrial and service center business park.	\$600,000	Senator Voinovich
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Council Bluffs, IA	For development of low and moderate income housing.	\$350,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Danville, IL	For acquisition, demolition and redevelopment of dilapidated and abandoned structures.	\$350,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of DeS Moines, IA	For restoration, renovation and modernization of an historic public library.	\$500,000	Senator Johnson
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Desert Hot Springs, CA	For development of a community facility to address a serious health and public safety problems in a low-income area.	\$300,000	Senator Boxer
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Forsyth, GA	For renovations of the former Tift College to house the Georgia Department of Corrections; buildings are in disrepair and must be brought up to the code.	\$650,000	Senator Chambliss
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Gig Harbor, WA	For construction of a multi-use facility for the Boys and Girls Club.	\$750,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Greenville, MS	For renovations and infrastructure enhancements for a youth wellness project.	\$300,000	Senator Cochran
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Hattiesburg, MS	For renovations and replacement of buildings and equipment in a park in a blighted neighborhood.	\$500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Hopkinsville, KY	For infrastructure improvements at the Hopkinsville-Christian County Industrial Mega Site.	\$3,000,000	Senator McConnell
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Hyden, KY	For construction and development of a community wellness facility to serve southeastern Kentucky.	\$500,000	Senator Bunning
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Jackson, MS	For property improvements related to the Capitol Street Renaissance Project.	\$805,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Jackson, MS	For renovation and rehabilitation of the City of Jackson's Public Facilities for the Cultural Arts and Science.	\$550,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Lewiston, ME	For the City of Lewiston's ongoing efforts to revitalize its riverfront.	\$900,000	Senators Collins, Snowe
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Midland, TX	For renovations to 30-year-old facilities which serve the Midland community.	\$500,000	Senator Cornyn
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of North Adams, MA	For renovation and restoration of a downtown historic building in order to reduce blight and attract private investment.	\$200,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Oxford, MS	For renovation of a historical structure ...	\$400,000	Senator Cochran
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Pascagoula, MS	For construction of City of Pascagoula beach park promenade.	\$500,000	Senators Wicker, Cochran
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Pawtucket, RI	For repair and renovation of a historic public library.	\$250,000	Senator Reed
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Peoria, IL	For critical public infrastructure improvements around the Glen Oak and Harrison Community Schools.	\$250,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Philadelphia, PA	For mixed-use, transit-oriented development in the area around the 9th and Berks rail station.	\$500,000	Senator Casey
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Piedmont, OK	For the construction of a municipal building.	\$1,000,000	Senator Inhofe
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Quincy, IL	For the acquisition of blighted residential properties to create affordable housing and facilitate mixed-use development.	\$200,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Rochester, NY	For environmental mediation, demolition, and other site preparation for revitalization.	\$350,000	Senator Gillibrand
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Rockford, IL	For capital costs associated with the city's mixed-use development plans.	\$250,000	Senator Durbin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Ruston, LA	For purchase of equipment needed to construct a city-wide broadband network to be managed and maintained by the City of Ruston.	\$200,000	Senator Landrieu
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Springfield, IL	For acquisition of abandoned properties and upgrades to infrastructure.	\$350,000	Senator Durbin

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Taunton, MA	For safety and access improvements at a low-income senior center.	\$200,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Tuscaloosa, AL	For a downtown revitalization project	\$5,000,000	Senator Shelby
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Waterbury, CT	For redevelopment of Brownfields and blighted properties.	\$500,000	Senators Lieberman, Dodd
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Wenatchee, WA	For property acquisition and renovation of Wenatchee Pybus Food Bank and Distribution Center.	\$1,500,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of Winston-Salem, NC	For creation of office space to recruit businesses to a Winston-Salem, as part of the revitalization of a blighted area.	\$500,000	Senator Hagan
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	City of York, PA	For restoration and preservation of historic central market.	\$800,000	Senator Casey
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Community Area Resource Enterprise (CARE 66), Gallup, NM.	For development of up to 60 units of affordable housing.	\$500,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Community Chest, Virginia City, NV	For construction of a multi-use community center in Storey County.	\$200,000	Senator Reid
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	County Commissioners of Charles County, MD.	For installation of plumbing in low-income housing.	\$300,000	Senator Mikulski
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	County of Kauai, HI	For on-site infrastructure improvements to enable the construction of 36 residential homes for low-income households.	\$250,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	County of Minnehaha, SD	For construction of a facility to house chronically homeless persons.	\$350,000	Senator Johnson
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Covenant House Alaska, Anchorage, AK ...	For the relocation of a crisis center facility.	\$500,000	Senator Murkowski
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Crossroads, North Kingstown, RI	For the development and construction of a Child Care and Community Center.	\$750,000	Senator Whitehouse
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Delaware Children's Museum, DE	For the construction of the Delaware Children's Museum in Wilmington, Delaware, as part of a community revitalization effort.	\$200,000	Senators Carper, Kaufman

Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit, MI	For removal and replacement of the roof on an historic building.	\$650,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Divide County, Crosby, ND	For reclamation of a former Air Force base site for redevelopment.	\$300,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	East Central Community Center, Spokane, WA.	For design and construction of a community facility.	\$350,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	East Orange Division of Senior Services, East Orange, NJ.	For renovation of a senior citizen center.	\$200,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	El Centro de Servicios Sociales, Lorain, OH.	For construction and renovations of an aging structure.	\$600,000	Senator Brown
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Emergency Shelter of the Fox Valley, Appleton, WI.	For acquisition and rehabilitation of permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless persons.	\$350,000	Senator Kohl
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Esperanza, Philadelphia, PA	For the planning, design, rehabilitation and construction of affordable housing in the Hunting Park neighborhood.	\$200,000	Senator Specter
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Eva's Village, Paterson, NJ	For renovation of the center's facilities ...	\$800,000	Senators Lautenberg, Menendez
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	First Steps Primeros Pasos, Georgetown, DE.	For construction and start-up costs for a bilingual early care and education facility to help children of non-English-speaking families develop skills needed to succeed.	\$200,000	Senators Kaufman, Carper
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Food Bank of Delaware, Newark, DE	For expansion of a commercial kitchen, a volunteer room, a culinary training facility, a retail area and additional office space to allow the food bank to meet growing demand in Kent and Sussex counties.	\$200,000	Senators Kaufman, Carper
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Freestore Foodbank, Cincinnati, OH	For major renovations on two heavily used food bank facilities.	\$550,000	Senator Brown
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Garrard County Fiscal Court, Lancaster, KY.	For renovation and expansion of the Garrard County EMS building in Lancaster, KY.	\$200,000	Senator Bunning

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Georgia International and Maritime Trade Center Authority, Savannah, GA.	For site preparation in accordance with the Parcel 7/Riverwalk Civic Master Plan, including planning and preparation work, and the design and construction of a public access floating dock system to accommodate traffic flow to/from the site.	\$900,000	Senator Chambliss
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Greater Boston Food Bank, Boston, MA ...	For construction of a regional food distribution center.	\$600,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Hampshire County Special Services Center, Wv.	For the acquisition of an additional facility to provide services and employment to individuals with developmental disabilities.	\$1,000,000	Senator Byrd
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Hawaii Public Housing Authority, Honolulu, HI.	For code enforcement and renovation of 24 housing units for very low- to low-income elderly individuals at the Pahala Elderly Housing Project.	\$400,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Hawaii Public Housing Authority, Honolulu, HI.	For renovation of 25 housing units for low income individuals at Kahale Mua Public Housing.	\$400,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Heritage Services, Omaha, NE	For construction of an 80,000 square foot, multi-level facility that will accommodate an education and interactive learning center.	\$800,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Homeward, Inc., Clarion, IA	For expansion of a construction finance program to develop housing in rural communities for low income individuals.	\$200,000	Senators Harkin, Grassley
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Housing Vermont, Burlington, VT	For construction and improvement of housing stock.	\$250,000	Senator Sanders
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Howard County, MD	For rehabilitation and equipment purchase for community and wellness rooms in low- and moderate-income elderly housing community.	\$500,000	Senator Mikulski
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Iowa Department of Economic Development, Des Moines, IA.	For rehabilitation of buildings and areas.	\$1,000,000	Senator Harkin

Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Jackson County Commission, WV	For expansion of the drill hall and supporting facilities at the proposed Spencer-Ripley Armed Forces Reserve Center.	\$1,500,000	Senator Byrd
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Jackson County, MS	For Phase I of construction and renovation Walter Anderson Arts Pavilion.	\$500,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Kansas City Parks and Recreation Department, Kansas City, MO.	For the construction of new community center.	\$2,000,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Kids Come First, Columbus, OH	For construction of a child care facility ..	\$500,000	Senator Voinovich
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	King County Housing Authority, King County, WA.	For renovation and expansion of three youth community centers located in three public housing sites.	\$1,000,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Lanakila Rehabilitation Center, Honolulu, HI.	For renovation and expansion of the Wahiawa Training and Support Complex, which will double capacity to provide training and employment opportunities for people with disabilities and other low-income individuals.	\$300,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Longview Housing Authority, Longview, WA.	For rehabilitation of an historic building into a veterans housing and service center.	\$500,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule, SD.	For purchase of new playground equipment and upgrades to a kitchen and learning areas of a daycare facility to improve safety for children.	\$200,000	Senator Johnson
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule, SD.	For upgrades to a community center	\$350,000	Senator Johnson
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Luna County Community Recreation Facility, NM.	For the renovation of the old Pepsi building to house dedicated youth activities, practice space, and community meeting rooms.	\$410,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Annapolis, MD.	For restoration and preservation of properties to alleviate economic distress through stimulation of private investment and community revitalization.	\$475,000	Senators Cardin, Mikulski
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Maryland Food Bank, Halethorpe, MD	For infrastructure improvements to a distribution facility and purchase of equipment.	\$400,000	Senators Mikulski, Cardin

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Maui Economic Concerns of the Community, Wailuku, HI.	For rehabilitation and improvement of a homeless resource center and affordable housing for low-income residents.	\$500,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Mid Plains Community College, McCook, NE.	For construction of a new events center that supports rural economic development and activity in southwestern Nebraska.	\$500,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Middlesex Community College, Lowell, MA.	For redevelopment of an underutilized historic building to expand community services.	\$200,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Military Business Park, City of Fayetteville, NC.	For construction of a military business park.	\$600,000	Senator Hagan
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Ministry of Caring, Wilmington, DE	For renovations to the Josephine Bakhita House to serve as residence for young adults who are committed to social responsibility and volunteer service.	\$200,000	Senators Kaufman, Carper
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, MT.	For redevelopment of a Superfund site and a State park.	\$750,000	Senator Baucus
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Mookini Luakini Foundation, North Kohala, HI.	For construction and renovation of a cultural education center for low-income youth.	\$200,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Mount Washington Community Development Corporation, Pittsburgh, PA.	For planning, design, site preparation, demolition, and construction associated with Brownfield redevelopment.	\$200,000	Senator Specter
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Multi-Disciplinary Combined Facility for the Copper River Native Association, Cantwell, AK.	For construction of a facility	\$1,000,000	Senator Murkowski
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Navajo Technical College, Crownpoint, NM.	For construction of a regional health center located on the campus of the Navajo Technical College.	\$400,000	Senators Bingaman, Tom Udall
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Nevada Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND), Las Vegas, NV.	For development of an assisted living facility for low income seniors.	\$700,000	Senator Reid
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	New Futures, Seattle, WA	For the planning, design and construction of a community center.	\$450,000	Senator Murray

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Noble County Health Department, Caldwell, OH.	For the rehabilitation of a 30-year old building to increase functionality and energy efficiency.	\$400,000	Senator Brown
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	North Olympic Regional Housing Network, Forks, WA.	For the purchase and conversion of a building into transitional and permanent supportive housing for homeless veterans and their families.	\$500,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Northeast Iowa Food Bank, Waterloo, IA ..	For construction of a food warehouse and distribution center.	\$350,000	Senator Harkin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Northern Community Investment Corporation, St. Johnsbury, VT.	For expansion of high-speed broadband connectivity to New Hampshire's North Country.	\$1,000,000	Senator Gregg
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Northside Community Housing, Inc., St. Louis, MO.	For renovations to preserve affordable housing units for low- and moderate-income seniors, individuals, and families.	\$1,000,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Our City Reading, Reading, PA	For rehabilitation of abandoned houses and provision of down payment assistance to home buyers.	\$200,000	Senator Specter
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Panhandle Area Development District, Gering, NE.	For remodel of an existing building into a physical and virtual small business incubator to serve the Panhandle of Nebraska.	\$300,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Parish of Ascension, LA	For acquisition of the multi-purpose center.	\$700,000	Senator Landrieu
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Pendleton Round-Up Foundation, Pendleton, OR.	For reconstruction and construction needs of facilities which are critical to the local economy.	\$500,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Pocahontas County Commission, Marlinton, WV.	For construction of a multipurpose community center, to promote health and wellness of county residents, and provide youth and adult alcohol and drug prevention programs.	\$3,000,000	Senator Byrd
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Port of Coos Bay, Coos Bay, OR	For purchase of critical dock equipment essential to local economic survival.	\$350,000	Senators Wyden, Merkley
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Portsmouth Music Hall, Portsmouth, NH ..	For repairs, restoration and modernization of a theater and construction of an additional space.	\$1,000,000	Senator Gregg

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, WI.	For site acquisition, demolition, remediation and redevelopment of priority sites in the 30th Street Industrial Corridor.	\$300,000	Senator Kohl
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Riverfront, Inc., La Crosse, WI	For expansion of a training facility for vocational and independent living services.	\$300,000	Senator Kohl
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Rockland Housing Action Coalition, Manuét, NY.	For construction of permanent, supportive rental housing for existing and returning disabled veterans and their families.	\$1,000,000	Senator Schumer
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Rocky Mountain Youth Corps, Rancho de Taos, NM.	For preconstruction costs of a youth facility.	\$300,000	Senators Tom Udall, Bingaman
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Saginaw County, MI	For an energy efficient infrastructure demonstration project to support the renaissance of downtown Saginaw.	\$350,000	Senators Stabenow, Levin
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Scranton City, PA	For elimination of slum and blight	\$300,000	Senator Casey
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Self-Help Housing Corporation of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI.	For the construction of 76-lot subdivision for self-help housing project for low income families.	\$500,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Silver Stage Youth Organization, Silver Springs, NV.	For design and construction of a youth facility.	\$200,000	Senator Reid
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Snohomish County, Everett, WA	For acquisition and renovation of a new facility for use by Dawson's Place Child Advocacy Center.	\$1,000,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Spirit Lake Nation, Fort Totten, ND	For construction of low-income senior housing units.	\$750,000	Senators Dorgan, Conrad
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Squanscott Community Commons, Exeter, NH.	For the construction of a new community center.	\$1,000,000	Senators Gregg, Shaheen
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	St. Louis County Economic Council, St. Louis, MO.	For the final design and construction of Wellston Child Care Center.	\$2,250,000	Senator Bond
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Starr Commonwealth, Battle Creek, MI	For renovations to facilities serving at-risk youth.	\$900,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Tallahatchie County, MS	For renovation of the Emmett Till Memorial Complex.	\$195,000	Senators Cochran, Wicker

Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	The Arc of Spokane, Spokane, WA	For capital costs and equipment acquisition for renovation of the Arc of Spokane's Indiana building.	Senator Murray	\$1,000,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	The Institute for Human Services, Honolulu, HI.	For construction of a job and skills training center at Hawaii's oldest and largest emergency homeless shelter.	Senator Inouye	\$200,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	The Old Slater Mill Association, Pawtucket, RI.	For completion of the historic restoration project at the Historic Slater Mill.	Senator Whitehouse	\$200,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Theodore Roosevelt Medora Foundation, Medora, ND.	For restoration and expansion of historic property.	Senator Conrad	\$300,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Tides Family Services, West Warwick, RI.	For renovation and expansion a center for at-risk youth of Providence RI.	Senator Reed	\$350,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority, Toledo, OH.	For purchase and remediation of the 110-acre former Jeep Parkway property.	Senator Voinovich	\$1,300,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Town of Gorham, NH	For renovation of a community facility to house programs serving children, youth and families in Coos County.	Senator Shaheen	\$200,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Town of Greenville, ME	For the completion of the Greenville Junction Wharf.	Senator Snowe	\$250,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Town of North Kingstown, RI	For construction of a new senior center ..	Senators Reed, Whitehouse	\$300,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Town of Silver City, NM	For construction of Vistas de Plata, a 56-unit affordable housing project.	Senators Tom Udall, Bingaman	\$600,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Tundra Women's Coalition, Bethel, AK	For replacement of a women's facility	Senator Begich	\$500,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	United Way of Dave County, Madison, WI.	For acquisition and redevelopment of apartment units in order to provide supportive housing for homeless families.	Senator Kohl	\$200,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	United Way of Kitsap County, Bremerton, WA.	For capital costs related to the development of the United Way Non-profit Community Center.	Senator Murray	\$500,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Utah Food Bank Services, Utah	For expanding the capacity to collect and distribute food to low-income individuals and families.	Senator Bennett	\$250,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Vermont Association of Area Agencies on Aging, Barre, VT.	For improvements to facilities for seniors.	Senator Sanders	\$500,000
Housing and Urban Development [HUD]	Economic Development Initiatives.	Vermont Division for Historic Preservation, Montpelier, VT.	For preservation of historic assets	Senator Sanders	\$200,000

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Vermont Foodbank, Barre, Vermont	For energy efficiency improvements	\$200,000	Senator Sanders
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Montpelier, VT.	For enhancement of affordable housing and community development linked with land conservation and historic preservation.	\$4,000,000	Senator Leahy
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Montpelier, VT.	For the construction and improvement of housing stock.	\$250,000	Senator Sanders
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Volunteers of America Michigan, Lansing, MI.	For expansion of housing shelters and community access to medical, social, civic, and economic services.	\$400,000	Senators Levin, Stabenow
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Waipa Foundation, Hanalei, HI	For construction, renovation, and equipment purchase for a State-certified commercial kitchen, food mill, and underground oven, for vocational training and processing of value-added agricultural products in low-income and farming communities.	\$400,000	Senator Inouye
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Watson's Children's Shelter, Missoula, MT.	For construction of an emergency children's shelter.	\$250,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Wayne State College, Wayne, Nebraska ...	For construction of a new collaborative education center.	\$300,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	West Columbia, SC	To establish an enrichment complex for families and children.	\$250,000	Senator Graham
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	West Valley City, UT	For the construction of City Center Plaza in a blighted area, a critical element of a major redevelopment project with a planned intermodal center.	\$1,000,000	Senator Hatch
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Economic Development Initiatives.	Westerly Area Rest Meals (WARM, Inc.), Westerly, RI.	For expansion and renovation of a community soup kitchen.	\$300,000	Senators Reed, Whitehouse

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVES

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Capitol Hill Housing, Seattle, WA	For construction of affordable housing	\$725,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Center for Planning Excellence, Baton Rouge, LA.	For provision of technical assistance to a community regarding sustainable development, neighborhood revitalization, housing and land use planning.	\$1,000,000	Senator Landrieu
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	City of Gig Harbor, WA	For improved physical access to area businesses.	\$1,500,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	City of Olympia, WA	For downtown revitalization and business access improvements.	\$1,100,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Consumer Credit Counseling Service, Las Vegas, NV.	For foreclosure prevention efforts	\$500,000	Senator Reid
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Growing Places, Centralia, WA	For facility and infrastructure improvements to an education and job training facility serving at-risk youth.	\$500,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Holyoke Community College, Holyoke, MA.	For completion of construction of a one-stop education, social services, and job training center serving low-income persons.	\$250,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	homeWORD, Missoula, MT	For development of rental housing that is affordable to working families.	\$500,000	Senators Tester, Baucus
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Jacksonville Area Legal Aid, Jacksonville, FL.	For foreclosure prevention training and other legal services.	\$400,000	Senator Bill Nelson
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Jefferson County, CO	For the housing authority to establish a new program of housing and supportive services for homeless veterans over age 50.	\$500,000	Senators Mark Udall, Bennett
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Kitsap Community Resources, Bremerton, WA.	For the construction of an early learning center.	\$750,000	Senators Murray, Cantwell
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Lighthouse for the Blind, Seattle, WA	For the improved accessibility of community and transit services for blind, low vision, and deaf-blind individuals in King, Pierce, and Spokane counties in Washington State.	\$550,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Mississippi State University, Starkville, MS.	For community planning and development.	\$500,000	Senator Cochran

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS—NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVES—Continued

Agency	Account	Recipient and location	Project purpose	Amount	Member
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	NeighborWorks Lincoln, Lincoln, NE	For neighborhood revitalization including elimination of blight, construction of single family homes, rehabilitation and repairs.	\$500,000	Senator Ben Nelson
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	North End Action Team, Middletown, CT ..	For foreclosure prevention assistance	\$200,000	Senator Dodd
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Northern Community Investment Corporation, Berlin, NH.	For capitalization of a revolving loan fund to support businesses in New Hampshire's North Country.	\$500,000	Senator Shaheen
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	South Dakota Science and Technology Authority, Lead, SD.	For infrastructure improvements to the Homestake Mine.	\$400,000	Senators Johnson, Thune
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Southeastern Connecticut Housing Alliance, Norwich, CT.	For programs to increase affordable housing.	\$200,000	Senator Dodd
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Technology Access Foundation, White Center, WA.	For the construction of the TAF Community Learning Space facility.	\$500,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Town of Huntington, NY	For construction of a state-of-the-art community center for veterans.	\$800,000	Senator Schumer
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	Urban League of Southern Connecticut, Stamford, CT.	For homeownership and foreclosure prevention counseling.	\$300,000	Senator Dodd
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	YWCA of Yakima, Yakima, WA	For upgrades to the YWCA's Bringing It Home supportive housing project for victims of domestic violence.	\$300,000	Senator Murray
Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	Neighborhood Initiatives	YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts, New Bedford, MA.	For construction of a community center and women's transitional housing facility.	\$200,000	Senators Kennedy, Kerry

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010
 [In thousands of dollars]

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION							
Office of the Secretary							
Salaries and expenses	98,248	103,184	102,306	100,975	+2,727	-2,209	-1,331
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(2,400)	(2,631)	(2,631)	(+231)	(+2,631)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(759)	(986)	(986)	(+227)	(+986)
Office of the General Counsel	(19,838)	(20,359)	(20,359)	(+521)	(+20,359)
Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy	(10,107)	(11,100)	(10,107)	(+10,107)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(10,200)	(10,559)	(10,559)	(+359)	(+10,559)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,400)	(2,440)	(2,400)	(+400)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(26,000)	(25,520)	(26,265)	(+265)	(+26,265)	(-40)
Office of Public Affairs	(2,020)	(2,123)	(2,123)	(+103)	(+2,123)	(+68)
Office of the Executive Secretariat	(1,595)	(1,658)	(1,711)	(+116)	(+1,711)	(+53)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(1,369)	(1,433)	(1,499)	(+130)	(+1,499)	(+66)
Office of Intelligence, Security, and Emergency Response	(8,675)	(10,600)	(9,072)	(+397)	(+9,072)	(-1,528)
Office of the Chief Information Officer	(12,885)	(13,215)	(13,263)	(+378)	(+13,263)	(+48)
National infrastructure investment	1,100,000	+1,100,000	+1,100,000	+1,100,000
Supplemental discretionary grants for national service transportation system (emergency) (Public Law 111-5)	1,500,000	-1,500,000
Financial management capital	5,000	5,000	2,000	5,000	+3,000
Office of Civil Rights	9,384	9,667	9,667	9,667	+283
Rescission of excess compensation for air carriers	-848	+848
Transportation planning, research, and development	18,300	10,233	-10,067	-2,000	-6,500
Maritime Study (sec. 195)	14,733	8,233	+2,000	+2,000	+2,000
Working capital fund	(128,094)	(147,596)	(147,500)	(+19,406)	(+147,500)	(-96)
Minority business resource center program	912	912	912	923	+11	+11	+11
Minority business resource center program (Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)
Minority business outreach	3,056	3,074	3,074	3,074	+18
Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	73,013	125,000	125,000	125,000	+51,987
Total, Office of the Secretary	1,707,065	257,070	257,692	1,354,872	-352,193	+1,097,802	+1,097,180

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued
 (In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Appropriations	(207,913)	(257,070)	(257,692)	(1,354,872)	(+ 1,146,959)	(+ 1,097,802)	(+ 1,097,180)
Rescissions	(- 848)	(- 848)
Emergency appropriations	(1,500,000)	(- 1,500,000)
Federal Aviation Administration							
Operations	9,042,467	9,335,798	9,347,168	9,359,131	+ 316,664	+ 23,333	+ 11,963
Air traffic organization	(7,099,019)	(7,300,739)	(7,305,902)	(- 206,883)	(+ 7,305,902)	(+ 5,163)
Aviation safety	(1,164,597)	(1,231,765)	(1,236,565)	(- 71,968)	(+ 1,236,565)	(+ 4,800)
Commercial space transportation	(14,094)	(14,737)	(14,737)	(- 643)	(+ 14,737)
Financial services	(111,004)	(113,681)	(113,681)	(- 2,677)	(+ 113,681)
Human resource management	(96,091)	(100,428)	(100,428)	(- 4,337)	(+ 100,428)
Region and center operations	(331,000)	(341,977)	(341,977)	(- 10,977)	(+ 341,977)
Staff offices	(180,859)	(196,063)	(196,063)	(- 15,204)	(+ 196,063)
Information services	(46,500)	(49,778)	(49,778)	(- 3,278)	(+ 49,778)
Facilities & equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	2,742,095	2,925,202	2,925,202	2,942,352	+ 200,257	+ 17,150	+ 17,150
Supplemental funding for facilities and equipment (emergency) (Public Law 111-5)	200,000	- 200,000
Research, engineering, and development (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	171,000	180,000	195,000	175,000	+ 4,000	- 5,000	- 20,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,600,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(- 600,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(3,514,500)	(3,515,000)	(3,515,000)	(3,515,000)	(+ 500)
Small community air service development program	(8,000)	(8,000)	(+ 8,000)	(+ 8,000)
Administration	(87,454)	(93,422)	(93,422)	(93,422)	(+ 5,968)
Airport Cooperative Research Program	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)
Airport technology research	(19,348)	(22,472)	(22,472)	(22,472)	(+ 3,124)
Rescission of contract authority (BY AIP)	- 80,000	- 392,960	- 312,960	- 392,960	- 392,960
Subtotal	(3,434,500)	(3,515,000)	(3,515,000)	(3,122,040)	(- 312,460)	(- 392,960)	(- 392,960)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
					2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Motor carrier safety operations and programs (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(234,000)	(234,000)	(239,828)	(238,500)	(+ 4,500)	(- 1,328)
(Limitation on obligations)	(234,000)	(239,828)	(239,828)	(238,500)	(+ 4,500)	(- 1,328)
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(307,000)	(289,000)	(310,070)	(310,070)	(+ 3,070)
(Limitation on obligations)	(307,000)	(310,070)	(310,070)	(310,070)	(+ 3,070)
National motor carrier safety program (HTF) (rescission of contract authority)	- 19,572	- 400	+ 19,172	- 400
Motor carrier safety (HTF) (rescission of contract authority)	- 2,231	- 3,400	- 1,169	- 3,400
Motor carrier safety grants (HTF) (rescission of contract authority)	- 6,503	- 1,530	+ 4,973	- 1,530
Motor carrier safety operations and programs (HTF) (rescission of contract authority)	- 4,839	+ 4,839
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Admin	- 33,145	- 4,002	+ 29,143	- 4,002
Rescissions of contract authority	- 33,145	- 5,330	+ 27,815	- 5,330
(Limitations on obligations)	(541,000)	(549,898)	(549,898)	(548,570)	(+ 7,570)	(- 1,328)
Total budgetary resources	(507,855)	(549,898)	(549,898)	(544,568)	(+ 36,713)	(- 5,330)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
Operations and research (general fund)	127,000	129,774	131,986	135,803	+ 8,803	+ 3,817
Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(105,500)	(82,000)	(108,642)	(105,500)	(+ 23,500)	(- 3,142)
(Limitation on obligations)	(105,500)	(107,329)	(108,642)	(105,500)	(- 1,829)	(- 3,142)
Subtotal, Operations and research	(232,500)	(237,103)	(240,628)	(241,303)	(+ 8,803)	(+ 675)
National driver register (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,000)	(4,078)	(4,000)	(4,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(4,000)	(4,078)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(- 78)
General fund contribution	3,350	3,350	+ 3,350

Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(619,500)	(626,047)	(619,500)	(619,500)	(619,500)	(-6,547)	(-235,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(235,000)	(626,047)	(619,500)	(619,500)	(-6,547)	(-235,000)	(-25,000)
Highway safety programs (23 USC 402)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(-25,000)	(-25,000)	(-124,500)
Occupant protection incentive grants (23 USC 405)	(124,500)	(124,500)	(124,500)	(124,500)	(-124,500)	(-124,500)	(-34,500)
Safety belt performance grants (23 USC 406)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(34,500)	(-34,500)	(-34,500)	(-139,000)
State traffic safety information system improvement grants (23 USC 408)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(-139,000)	(-139,000)	(-29,000)
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (23 USC 410)	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	(29,000)	(-29,000)	(-29,000)	(-7,000)
High visibility enforcement	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(-7,000)	(-7,000)	(-7,000)
Child safety and booster seat grants	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(-7,000)	(-7,000)	(-18,500)
Motorcyclist safety	(18,500)	(18,500)	(18,500)	(18,500)	(-18,500)	(-18,500)	-2,299
Grant administration	-10,900	-10,900	-10,900	-10,900	-2,299	-2,299	-14,004
Operations and research (rescission of contract authority)	-544	-544	-544	-544	-14,004	-14,004	-14,004
National driver register (rescission of contract authority)	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200
Highway traffic safety grants (rescission of contract authority)	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200	-60,200
Subtotal	(551,856)	(630,125)	(1,246,350)	(610,547)	(-19,578)	(-635,803)	(-635,803)
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin	55,356	129,774	135,336	122,850	67,494	6,924	12,486
Appropriations	(127,000)	(129,774)	(135,336)	(139,153)	(+12,153)	(+9,379)	(+3,817)
Rescissions of contract authority	(-71,644)	(737,454)	(1,351,642)	(-16,303)	(+55,341)	(-16,303)	(-16,303)
(Limitations on obligations)	(729,000)	(867,228)	(1,486,978)	(729,000)	(-8,454)	(-8,454)	(-622,642)
Total budgetary resources	(784,356)	(867,228)	(1,486,978)	(851,850)	(-15,378)	(-15,378)	(-635,128)
Federal Railroad Administration							
Safety and operations	159,445	168,770	172,533	171,770	12,325	3,000	-763
Railroad research and development	33,950	34,145	37,145	34,145	+195		-3,000
Capital assistance to States—Intercity Passenger Rail Service	90,000	1,000,000	4,000,000	1,200,000	-90,000		
Capital assistance for high speed rail corridors and intercity passenger rail service	8,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000	1,200,000	+1,200,000	+200,000	-2,800,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	8,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000	1,200,000	-8,000,000		
Subtotal	8,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000	1,200,000	-6,800,000	+200,000	-2,800,000
Rail line relocation and improvement program	25,000		40,000	25,000		+25,000	-15,000
Railroad safety technology				50,000		+50,000	+50,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
					2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
National Railroad Passenger Corporation						
Operating grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	550,000	572,348	553,348	553,348	+ 3,348	- 19,000
Office of Inspector General	19,000	- 19,000
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	940,000	929,625	929,625	1,001,625	+61,625	+ 72,000
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (emergency) (Public Law 111-5)	1,300,000	- 1,300,000
Efficiency incentive grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (rescission)	- 36,834	+ 36,834
Total, National Railroad Passenger Corporation	2,753,166	1,501,973	1,501,973	1,554,973	- 1,198,193	+ 53,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration						
Appropriations	11,061,561	2,704,888	5,751,651	3,035,888	- 8,025,673	- 2,715,763
Rescissions	(1,798,395)	(2,704,888)	(5,751,651)	(3,035,888)	(+ 1,237,493)	(- 2,715,763)
Emergency appropriations	(- 36,834)	(+ 36,834)
.....	(9,300,000)	(- 9,300,000)
Federal Transit Administration						
Administrative expenses	94,413	97,478	97,478	97,478	+ 3,065
Formula and Bus Grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (Liquidation of contract authorization)	(8,670,000)	(8,852,000)	(8,852,000)	(9,400,000)	(+ 730,000)	(+ 548,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(8,260,565)	(5,000,000)	(8,343,171)	(8,343,171)	(+ 82,606)	(+ 3,343,171)
General Fund share	3,343,171	- 3,343,171
Rescission of current year contract authority	- 100,000	+ 100,000
Subtotal	(8,160,565)	(8,343,171)	(8,343,171)	(8,343,171)	(+ 182,606)
Research and University Research Centers	67,000	67,670	65,670	67,670	+ 670	+ 2,000
Capital investment grants	1,809,250	1,827,343	1,827,343	2,307,343	+ 498,093	+ 480,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	750,000	- 750,000
Subtotal	2,559,250	1,827,343	1,827,343	2,307,343	- 251,907	+ 480,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued
 (In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
					2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Administrative expenses:						
General Fund	18,491	18,329	19,329	19,329	+ 838	+ 1,000
Pipeline Safety Fund	639	639	639	639		
Pipeline Safety information grants to communities	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)		(+ 1,000)
Subtotal	(19,130)	(18,968)	(19,968)	(19,968)	(+ 838)	(+ 1,000)
Pipeline safety:						
Pipeline Safety Fund	74,481	86,334	86,334	86,334	+ 11,853	
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	18,810	18,905	18,905	18,905	+ 95	
Subtotal	(93,291)	(105,239)	(105,239)	(105,239)	(+ 11,948)	
Emergency preparedness grants:						
Emergency preparedness fund	188	188	188	188		
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)	(28,318)		
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration	172,927	188,213	190,213	189,213	+ 16,286	+ 1,000
Research and development	12,900	13,179	12,834	13,179	+ 279	+ 345
Office of Inspector General						
Salaries and expenses	71,400	74,839	74,839	75,389	+ 3,989	+ 550
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	20,000				-20,000	
Subtotal	91,400	74,839	74,839	75,389	-16,011	+ 550
Surface Transportation Board						
Salaries and expenses	26,847	27,032	29,800	28,332	+ 1,485	+ 1,300
Offsetting collections	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250		

	25,597	25,782	28,550	27,082	+ 1,485	+ 1,300	- 1,468
Total, Surface Transportation Board							
Total, title I, Department of Transportation							
Appropriations	61,599,818	57,626,943	21,522,212	21,564,891	-40,034,927	-36,062,052	+ 42,679
Rescissions	(16,998,830)	(57,626,943)	(21,522,212)	(21,979,484)	(+ 4,980,654)	(- 35,647,459)	(+ 457,272)
Rescission of contract authority	(- 39,065)				(+ 39,065)		
Emergency appropriations	(48,120,000)				(+ 3,063,354)	(- 414,593)	(- 414,593)
(Limitations on obligations)	(53,745,065)	(14,802,352)	(54,866,711)	(54,242,741)	(- 48,120,000)	(+ 39,440,389)	(- 623,970)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)			
Total budgetary resources without emergencies	(67,224,883)	(72,429,295)	(76,388,923)	(75,807,632)	(+ 8,582,749)	(+ 3,378,337)	(- 581,291)
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT							
Management and Administration							
Executive direction	23,799	25,969	25,969	25,969	+ 2,170		
Administration, operations, and management	527,434	537,897	537,897	537,897	+ 10,463		
Personnel compensation and benefits:							
Public and Indian Housing	190,390	197,074	197,074	197,074	+ 6,684		
Community Planning and Development	94,234	98,989	98,989	98,989	+ 4,755		
Housing	363,198	374,887	374,887	374,887	+ 11,689		
Office of the Government National Mortgage Association	10,000	11,095	11,095	11,095	+ 1,095		
Policy Development and Research	18,071	21,138	21,138	21,138	+ 3,067		
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity	69,021	71,800	71,800	71,800	+ 2,779		
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control	6,728	7,151	7,151	7,151	+ 423		
Subtotal	751,642	782,134	782,134	782,134	+ 30,492		
Total, Management and Administration	1,302,875	1,346,000	1,346,000	1,346,000	+ 43,125		
Public and Indian Housing							
Tenant-based rental assistance:							
Renewals	15,200,000	16,189,200	16,387,200	16,339,200	+ 1,139,200	+ 150,000	- 48,000
Tenant protection vouchers	150,000	103,000	120,000	103,000	- 47,000		- 17,000
Family self-sufficiency coordinators		50,000	60,000	50,000	+ 50,000		- 10,000
Administrative fees	1,500,000	1,493,800	1,600,000	1,550,000	+ 50,000	+ 56,200	- 50,000
Incremental family unification vouchers	20,000			20,000		+ 20,000	+ 20,000
Veterans affairs supportive housing	75,000		75,000	75,000		+ 75,000	
Nonelderly disabled incremental vouchers	30,000						

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
					2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-7,929)				(+7,929)	
Subtotal	16,975,000	17,836,000	18,242,200	18,137,200	+1,162,200	+301,200
Advance appropriations	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000		
Less appropriations from prior year advances	-4,158,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000	+158,000	
Total, Tenant-based rental assistance	16,817,000	17,836,000	18,242,200	18,137,200	+1,320,200	+301,200
Public Housing Capital Fund	2,450,000	2,244,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	+50,000	+256,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	4,000,000				-4,000,000	
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-14,577)				(+14,577)	
Subtotal	6,450,000	2,244,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-3,950,000	+256,000
Public Housing Operating Fund	4,455,000	4,600,000	4,800,000	4,750,000	+295,000	+150,000
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing	120,000		250,000		-120,000	
Choice neighborhoods		250,000		250,000	+250,000	
Native American housing block grants	645,000	645,000	750,000	670,000	+25,000	+25,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	510,000				-510,000	
Subtotal	1,155,000	645,000	750,000	670,000	-485,000	+25,000
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	9,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	-2,000	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(420,000)	(919,000)	(919,000)	(919,000)	(+499,000)	
Native Hawaiian housing block grant	10,000	10,000	12,000	13,000	+3,000	+1,000
Native Hawaiian loan guarantee fund program account	1,044	1,044	1,044	1,044		
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(41,504)	(41,504)	(41,504)	(41,504)		
Total, Public and Indian Housing	29,017,044	25,593,044	26,562,244	26,328,244	-2,668,800	+735,200
Appropriations	(24,507,044)	(25,593,044)	(26,562,244)	(26,328,244)	(+1,821,200)	(-234,000)
Emergency appropriations	(4,510,000)				(-4,510,000)	(-234,000)

Community Planning and Development						
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	310,000	310,000	350,000	320,000	+10,000	+10,000
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-1,750)				(-1,750)	
Rural housing and economic development	26,000				-26,000	
Community development fund	3,900,000	4,450,000	4,598,607	4,450,000	+550,000	+550,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	3,000,000				-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-3,175)				(+3,175)	
Subtotal	6,900,000	4,450,000	4,598,607	4,450,000	-2,450,000	-148,607
Section 108 loan guarantees:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(275,000)	(275,000)	(275,000)	(275,000)		
Credit subsidy	6,000		6,000		-6,000	-6,000
Brownfields redevelopment	10,000		25,000		-10,000	-25,000
HOME investment partnerships program	1,825,000	1,825,000	2,000,000	1,825,000		-175,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	2,250,000				-2,250,000	
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-4,200)				(+4,200)	
Subtotal	4,075,000	1,825,000	2,000,000	1,825,000	-2,250,000	-175,000
Self-help homeownership opportunity program	64,000	77,000	85,000	85,000	+21,000	+8,000
Homeless assistance grants	1,677,000	1,793,715	1,850,000	1,875,000	+198,000	+81,285
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-2,675)				(+2,675)	
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	1,500,000				-1,500,000	
Total, Community Planning and Development	14,588,000	8,455,715	8,914,607	8,555,000	-6,013,000	-359,607
Appropriations	7,818,000	8,455,715	8,914,607	8,555,000	+737,000	-359,607
Emergency appropriations	6,750,000				-6,750,000	
Housing Programs						
Project-based rental assistance:						
Renewals	6,868,000	7,868,000	8,474,328	7,868,000	+1,000,000	-606,328
Contract administrators	232,000	232,000	232,000	232,000		
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(-10,000)				(+10,000)	
Subtotal	7,100,000	8,100,000	8,706,328	8,100,000	+1,000,000	-606,328
Advance appropriations	400,000	400,000	393,672	400,000		+6,328
Less appropriations from prior year advances		-400,000	-400,000	-400,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Total, Project-based rental assistance	7,500,000	8,100,000	8,700,000	8,100,000	+ 600,000	- 600,000	
Housing for the elderly	765,000	765,000	1,000,000	785,000	+ 20,000	- 215,000	
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(- 1,600)	250,000	350,000	265,000	+ 15,000	- 85,000	
Housing for persons with disabilities	250,000	250,000	350,000	265,000	+ 15,000	- 85,000	
Working capital fund (transfer out)	(- 1,600)	100,000	70,000	100,000	+ 35,000	+ 30,000	
Housing counseling assistance	65,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	+ 35,000	+ 30,000	
Manufactured housing fees trust fund	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	+ 35,000	+ 30,000	
Offsetting collections	- 10,600	- 7,000	- 7,000	- 7,000	+ 3,600	
Subtotal	5,400	9,000	9,000	9,000	+ 3,600	
Green retrofit program for multifamily housing (emergency) (Public Law 111-5)	2,250,000	- 2,250,000	
Energy Innovation Fund	100,000	50,000	75,000	+ 75,000	+ 25,000	
Rental housing assistance	27,600	40,000	40,000	40,000	+ 12,400	
Rent supplement (rescission)	- 37,600	- 27,600	- 27,600	- 27,600	+ 10,000	
Total, Housing Programs	10,825,400	9,336,400	10,191,400	9,346,400	- 1,479,000	- 845,000	
Appropriations	(8,623,600)	(9,371,000)	(10,226,000)	(9,381,000)	(+ 757,400)	(- 845,000)	
Rescissions	(- 37,600)	(- 27,600)	(- 27,600)	(- 27,600)	(+ 10,000)	
Emergency appropriations	(2,250,000)	(- 2,250,000)	
Offsetting collections	(- 10,600)	(- 7,000)	(- 7,000)	(- 7,000)	(+ 3,600)	
Federal Housing Administration							
FHA—Mutual mortgage insurance program account:							
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(315,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(+ 85,000,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	
Offsetting receipts (HECM)	- 391,000	798,000	288,000	+ 391,000	
Positive credit subsidy	116,000	181,400	181,400	181,400	+ 288,000	+ 288,000	
Administrative contract expenses	25,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	+ 65,400	
Additional contract expenses	- 11,000	

Working capital fund (transfer out)	(- 46,794)	(- 70,794)	(- 70,794)	(- 70,794)	(- 24,000)
Consumer education and outreach	7,500	7,500	7,500	+ 7,500
FHA—General and special risk program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(45,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(- 30,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(- 30,000)
Offsetting receipts	- 140,000	- 140,000	- 140,000	- 140,000
Credit subsidy	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600
Right of first refusal (sec. 237)	5,000	+ 5,000
rescission of prior year balances	- 5,000
Administrative contract expenses	47,871	- 47,871
Consumer education and outreach	1,000	- 1,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	- 332,529	869,500	71,500	364,500	+ 697,029	+ 293,000
Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)						
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(300,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(+ 200,000,000)
Offsetting receipts	- 170,000	- 720,000	- 720,000	- 718,000	- 548,000	+ 2,000
Additional offsetting receipts	- 23,000	+ 23,000
Additional contract expenses	12,000	- 12,000
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association	- 181,000	- 720,000	- 720,000	- 718,000	- 537,000	+ 2,000
Policy Development and Research						
Research and technology	58,000	50,000	50,000	48,000	- 10,000	- 2,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing activities	53,500	72,000	72,000	72,000	+ 18,500
Office of Lead Hazard Control						
Lead hazard reduction	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	100,000	- 100,000
Subtotal	240,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	- 100,000
Management and Administration						
Working capital fund	224,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	- 24,000
(By transfer)	(94,300)	(70,794)	(70,794)	(70,794)	(- 23,506)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued
 (In thousands of dollars)

Item	2009 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
					2009 appropriation	Budget estimate
FHA combating mortgage fraud		20,000	20,000	20,000	+20,000
Office of Inspector General	120,000	120,000	120,000	126,000	+6,000	+6,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 111-5)	15,000	-15,000
Subtotal	135,000	120,000	120,000	126,000	-9,000	+6,000
Total, Management and Administration	359,000	340,000	340,000	346,000	-13,000	+6,000
Appropriations	(344,000)	(340,000)	(340,000)	(346,000)	(+2,000)	(+6,000)
Emergency appropriations	(15,000)	(-15,000)
(Grand total, Management and Administration, less emer- gencies)	(1,646,875)	(1,686,000)	(1,686,000)	(1,692,000)	(+45,125)	(+6,000)
GSE conforming loan limits (emergency) (Public Law 111-5)	37,000	-37,000
Extension of GSE conforming loan limits	80,000	-80,000
Rescissions:						
Fiscal year 2008 advance appropriation (rescission)	-750,000	+750,000
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Develop- ment	55,197,290	45,482,659	47,047,751	45,828,144	-9,369,146	-1,219,607
Appropriations	(38,662,490)	(41,977,259)	(43,548,679)	(42,320,744)	(+3,658,254)	(-1,227,935)
Rescissions	(-792,600)	(-27,600)	(-27,600)	(-27,600)	(+765,000)
Advance appropriations	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,393,672)	(4,400,000)	(+6,328)
Emergency appropriations	(13,662,000)	(-13,662,000)
Offsetting receipts	(-724,000)	(-860,000)	(-860,000)	(-858,000)	(-134,000)	(+2,000)
Offsetting collections	(-10,600)	(-7,000)	(-7,000)	(-7,000)	(+3,600)
(By transfer)	(94,300)	(70,794)	(70,794)	(70,794)	(-23,506)
(Transfer out)	(-94,300)	(-70,794)	(-70,794)	(-70,794)	(+23,506)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(100,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(-30,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(660,736,504)	(916,235,504)	(916,235,504)	(916,235,504)	(+255,499,000)

	(41,535,290)	(45,482,659)	(47,047,751)	(45,828,144)	(+ 4,292,854)	(+ 345,485)	(- 1,219,607)
(Title II, non-emergency discretionary total)							
TITLE III—OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board							
Federal Maritime Commission	6,550	7,000	7,200	7,400	+ 850	+ 400	+ 200
National Infrastructure Bank (legislative proposal)	22,800	24,558	23,712	24,558	+ 1,758		+ 846
National Transportation Safety Board:		5,000,000				- 5,000,000	
Salaries and expenses	91,000	95,400	99,200	96,900	+ 5,900	+ 1,500	- 2,300
Rescission of unobligated balances	- 671				+ 671		
Amtrak Office of Inspector General				19,000	+ 19,000	+ 19,000	+ 19,000
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	181,000	166,800	196,800	243,000	+ 62,000	+ 76,200	+ 46,200
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness	2,333	2,680	2,400	2,680	+ 347		+ 280
Total, title III, Other Independent Agencies	303,012	5,296,438	329,312	393,538	+ 90,526	- 4,902,900	+ 64,226
Grand total (net)	117,100,120	108,406,040	68,899,275	67,786,573	- 49,313,547	- 40,619,467	- 1,112,702
Appropriations	(60,123,003)	(109,300,640)	(69,800,203)	(69,093,766)	(+ 8,970,763)	(- 40,206,874)	(- 706,437)
Rescissions	(- 831,488)	(- 27,600)	(- 27,600)	(- 27,600)	(+ 803,888)		
Rescissions of contract authority	(- 3,479,947)			(- 414,593)	(+ 3,065,354)	(- 414,593)	(- 414,593)
Advance appropriations	(4,400,000)	(4,400,000)	(4,393,672)	(4,400,000)			(+ 6,328)
Emergency appropriations	(61,782,000)				(- 61,782,000)		
Negative subsidy receipts	(- 724,000)	(- 860,000)	(- 860,000)	(- 858,000)	(- 134,000)	(+ 2,000)	(+ 2,000)
Offsetting collections	(- 10,600)	(- 7,000)	(- 7,000)	(- 7,000)	(+ 3,600)		
(Limitation on obligations)	(53,745,065)	(14,802,352)	(54,866,711)	(54,242,741)	(+ 497,676)	(+ 39,440,389)	(- 623,970)
(Exempt contract authority)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)			
Total budgetary resources less emergencies	(109,063,185)	(123,208,392)	(123,765,986)	(122,029,314)	(+ 12,966,129)	(- 1,179,078)	(- 1,736,672)

○