Calendar No. 596

106TH CONGRESS, *2d Session* | SENATE | REPORT 106–309

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001

JUNE 14, 2000.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2720]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 2720) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amounts of new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 2001

Amount of bill as reported to Senate	$15,295,400,000
Amount of budget estimates, 2001	16,146,737,000
Fiscal year 2000 enacted	14,429,976,000

CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

U.S. COAST GUARD

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

TOTAL OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDED—GENERAL FUNDS AND TRUST FUNDS

In addition to the appropriation of $15,295,400,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2001, large amounts of contract authority are provided by law, the obligation limits for which are contained in the annual appropriations bill. The principal items in this category are the trust funded programs for Federal-aid highways, for mass transit, and for airport development grants. For fiscal year 2001, estimated obligation limitations total $38,432,600,000.

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 2001, 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" 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, and for acquisition, construction, and improvements, Coast Guard, shall be applied equally to each budget item that is listed under said accounts 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.

TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, the previous authorization for most Federal highway, transit, and highway safety programs, expired on September 30, 1997. On May 22, 1998, the Congress passed a new authorization bill, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century [TEA21], which the President signed into law on June 9, 1998. Under this law, most of the authorizations are contract authority; that is, they are available for obligation without appropriation. The role of the appropriations process with respect to contract authority programs generally is to set obligation limitations so that overall Federal spending stays

within legislated targets and to appropriate liquidating cash to cover the outlays associated with obligations that have been made.

The Congress recently enacted, and the President signed, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, providing the most recent statement of aviation policy and priorities for fiscal year 2001. The Committee recommendation, within budgetary realities, attempts to honor the thrust of the priorities articulated in that legislation.

THE GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT

The Government Performance and Results Act [Results Act] requires Federal agencies to develop strategic plans and annual performance plans and reports. The Department's first multiyear strategic plan was submitted September 30, 1997. The second strategic plan will be submitted in September 2000. The Committee is fully committed to support the Department as it seeks to implement the requirements of the Results Act.

The Committee commends the Department for its aggressive implementation of the Results Act.

The combined fiscal year 2001 Performance Plan and fiscal year 1999 Report was delivered to Congress on schedule March 31, 2000. In the fiscal year 2001 Performance Plan, performance measures have been identified for all of the Department's major programs. All of these goals are stated in terms of effects on the American public, and many reflect ambitious target levels of performance. The treatment of management challenges identified by the Inspector General and the General Accounting Office has been changed to make it clearer how they contribute to achieving the Department's outcome goals. For most of the management challenges, specific milestones leading to resolution have also been included.

The 1999 Performance Report included either final or preliminary data for over 90 percent of the measures in the 1999 Performance Plan. The Department either met or had a positive trend for approximately 77 percent of its 1999 goals. For the five goals missed by a significant amount, the Department is reviewing its strategies to see if they need to be changed.

Generally, the goals focus on several of the most important challenges facing the Department of Transportation. One of the weaknesses cited by the GAO in its earlier review of the Department's performance plan was the lack of a consistent link of the performance goals to the strategic outcomes and the lack of consistent inclusion of goals and measures for addressing the management challenges facing the department. That deficiency has in substantial part been addressed in the 2001 Performance Plan. The Office of Inspector General (OIG) has repeatedly identified the lack of accountability for financial activities as a key challenge for the DOT. It remains too early to tell whether the Department's recognition of this continuing deficiency has been adequately addressed.

Many of the challenges identified by the GAO and the OIG are long-standing and will require sustained attention by DOT and the Congress, but the plan's goals and measures are objective, quantifiable, and measurable. For all except a few performance goals, the Department's plan describes target levels of performance in both

annual and multi-year terms. The Committee has suggested some presentation and reporting modifications that would improve the clarity and usefulness of the plan as a management and oversight tool and will watch with interest as those suggestions are considered by the Department.

The specificity and aggressiveness of activity goals and measures vary depending on the likelihood of meeting the relevant challenge. Almost invariably, the goals and measures move the department toward qualitative or quantitative improvement in the safety and performance activities generally considered to be the primary Federal issues relating to transportation. However, the full value of the plan formulation process will be realized when it is used as a critical evaluation tool for gauging the effectiveness of departmental programs and initiatives for improving performance measures. That evaluation dynamic has been elusive to date and, accordingly, the overall potential of the GPRA exercise has yet to be substantially realized.

Another concern might be the scattershot approach to some goals as evidenced by the myriad activities to address a specific challenge, i.e., the identified high-risk information technology initiative for the FAA's air traffic control modernization program. The DOT plan could be significantly improved in this specific area by consistently including goals and measures for addressing endemic, long-term problems facing the department in the procurement, information technology, and financial management arenas.

The plan notes the obvious cross cutting activities at other Federal agencies, but the subcommittee believes that cross-cutting issues present an area ripe for efficiencies or for goal specialization. For example, the plan states that both FAA and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have similar performance goals in the area of aviation fatalities. Another danger of plans built with substantial cross agency participation and support is that, unless the additional agencies share the Department's enthusiasm for the program (i.e., NDGPS, AVTP), the Department may quickly find itself the single parent of a very resource demanding program in its infancy. Greater coordination and reconciling of plans and budget submissions should help foster cross departmental initiatives.

However, a continuing challenge for the Department is maintaining the unqualified financial opinion the Department received for the first time in 1999. The DOT financial management weaknesses at the FAA contribute significantly to this problem. The FAA lacks a cost accounting system or an alternative system for reporting project and activity costs. This deficiency generally makes it questionable whether the Department can adequately link costs factors with performance measures in any area of financial, procurement, or cost effectiveness.

The Department notes that they are pursuing cost accounting improvements, but the subcommittee is concerned that any real improvement in this risk area is at least 2 years off. In addition, the plan acknowledges identified concerns about limitations and expresses a willingness and intent to remedy shortcomings—however, on an anecdotal basis, it is difficult to identify actions taken toward those ends.

The Department continues to have substantial problems in two major risk areas: significant cost overruns, schedule delays and performance shortfalls experienced by the air traffic control modernization program and serious financial management weaknesses at the FAA. These problems have been documented and identified by the OIG, the GAO, the Department and the Congress and solutions have been suggested. Although some actions have been taken to address these recommendations, major performance and management challenges persist. These high risk areas are not new to the agencies or the Department. Solutions have been elusive, but the subcommittee has no reason to question the Department's commitment to finding long term solutions for any of the GAO or IG identified problems.

Clearly, the Department has made major strides with its performance plan, but that plan has yet to penetrate the day-to-day operations of the Department, the modal administrations, or the procurement or personnel processes. In short, the plans are very useful documents for determining how the Department views the relative and absolute importance of its disparate goals and a valuable gauge of whether the Departmental leadership is serious about remedying identified deficiencies or inconsistencies in programs, activities, management, or direction.

DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For a number of years, the Transportation allocation has included a defense allocation for national securities of the Coast Guard in addition to general discretionary resources. This split support for the Transportation function recognizes the interrelated nature of the Coast Guard's multiple mission strategy. In addition, there are a number of other accounts in the Department that have significant defense aspects to their primary and secondary missions and the nature of many of the Department of Transportation programs builds upon, or shares common elements with Department of Defense missions. For example, the Department of Defense GPS (Global Positioning System), that the Department of Defense has spent over $9,000,000,000 for direct procurement and as much as $19,000,000,000 for the entire program, is the backbone for several Department of Transportation modernization programs and new initiatives. Where possible, the Department should strive to coordinate with the Department of Defense to maximize the areas of mutual cooperation, procurement leverage, and program focus.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$60,852,000
Budget estimate, 2001	69,186,000
Committee recommendation	57,469,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $1,355,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69; also does not reflect $500,000 provided to this account and transferred to EPA pursuant to section 365 of Public Law 106–69.

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 composed of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary immediate offices, the Office of the General Counsel, and five assistant secretarial offices for transportation policy, aviation and international affairs, budget and programs, governmental affairs, and administration. These secretarial offices have policy development and central supervisory and coordinating functions related to the overall planning and direction of the Department of Transportation, including staff assistance and general management supervision of the counterpart offices in the operating administrations of the Department.

The budget proposes a consolidated appropriation for the offices funded by this account. The Committee has not approved the consolidated appropriations request for the various offices within the Office of the Secretary and has continued to provide appropriations for each office within the Office of the Secretary.

The Committee recommends a total of $57,469,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation including $60,000 for reception and representation expenses.

Staffing levels.—The Committee notes the current level of vacancies in the Office of Secretary and recognizing the traditional and natural attrition that accompanies a change of administration, the Committee recommendation adjusts the appropriations for salaries and expenses downward to reflect the current staffing levels less a portion of the anticipated turnover. This adjustment is made without prejudice and will be reviewed during the course of the fiscal year 2001 appropriations process and, if necessary, during consideration of subsequent fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations vehicles.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Limitation on Political and Presidential appointees.—The Committee recommendation includes a provision (sec. 305) similar to those carried in previous Department of Transportation and Re-

lated Agencies Appropriations Acts, which limits the number of political and Presidental appointees funded by this act within the Department of Transportation. The ceiling for fiscal year 2001 is 104 personnel, which is the same level enacted in fiscal year 2000 adjusted for the new political appointees envisioned in the new Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration created in fiscal year 2000 by Congress. Further, the bill specifies that no political or presidential appointee may be detailed outside the Department of Transportation or any other agency funded in this bill.

Discretionary Grants.—The Committee continues to be concerned by the Department's oversight and review of the modal administrations discretionary grants, letters of intent, or full funding grant agreements. The Department is directed to comply with the letter, the spirit, and the intent of the 3-day notification language included in the bill (sec. 333) which has been carried in previous Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Acts with respect to all discretionary grants totaling $1,000,000 or more of the Federal Highway Administration (excluding the emergency relief program), any program of the Federal Transit Administration (excluding the formula grants and fixed guideway modernization programs), and the airport improvement program of the Federal Aviation Administration. Further, no notification or announcement should involve funds that are not available for obligation.

Additionally, the Committee is gravely concerned with the Department's management of the discretionary highway program. On more than one occasion, the Department has instituted major initiatives that deviate from the legislative history without keeping Congress adequately informed. Even more troublesome, the Department has left no stone unturned in its search for loopholes that would justify its actions. The Committee reminds the Department that Executive Branch propensities cannot substitute for Congress' own statements concerning the best evidence of Congressional intentions, that is, the official reports of the Congress. The Office of the Secretary is directed to submit a report to the Committee by July 1, 2000 that explains how the department will handle such situations in the future.

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Appropriations, 2000	$1,867,000
Budget estimate, 2001[1]	(2,031,000)
Committee recommendation	1,800,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Immediate Office of the Secretary has the primary responsibility to provide overall planning, direction, and control of departmental affairs. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,800,000 consistent with the general guidance provided for the Office of the Secretary.

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

Appropriations, 2000	$600,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(587,000)
Committee recommendation	500,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary has the primary responsibility of assisting the Secretary in the overall planning and direction of the Department. The Committee has recommended a total of $500,000 for the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary consistent with the general guidance provided for the Office of the Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Appropriations, 2000	$9,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(11,172,000)
Committee recommendation	9,000,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Office of the General Counsel provides legal services to the Office of the Secretary and coordinates and reviews the legal work of 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.

The Committee recommends $9,000,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000 for the Office of the General Counsel, consistent with the general guidance provided for the Office of the Secretary.

Aviation competition guidelines.—When Congress passed the Airline Deregulation Act, it decided that the marketplace, and not regulators, should set airline prices and schedules. That landmark action has generated enormous benefits for the air traveling public. However, the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations has been very concerned about barriers to entry and the health of airline competition which may distort the competitive landscape. The Subcommittee has held a number of hearings over the past 3 years and remains convinced that it is critically important to have a free and competitive market that provides a framework for competition and permits entry into the aviation marketplace for new service, low cost competition, and boutique services. Where robust competition exists, consumers benefit; where significant market power exists (and is exercised), consumers pay the oligopolistic premium. While it should be clear that there is no prospect of support from the Committee to reregulate the airline industry, it should also be clear that airline competition is an area of substantial Congressional interest and attention.

The Committee in the past has suggested that the Department consider a process in which the Department, upon receiving a complaint, would refer such alleged activity to the Department of Justice for further action to determine if it constitutes a permissible competitive action. This would provide greater certainty to the airlines as to what constitutes anti-competitive activity. Such communications between the Department of Transportation and the Department of Justice could include patterns of behavior or the omis-

sion of consistent behavior as it relates to potential competitive services from market participants with varying degrees of market power. The Committee believes that the staffing resources provided in the Committee's recommendation are sufficient for such advisory or referral activity on the part of the Department of Transportation.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POLICY

Appropriations, 2000	$2,824,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(3,131,500)
Committee recommendation	2,500,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Assistant Secretary for Policy is the primary policy officer of the Department and is responsible to the Secretary for analysis, development, articulation, and review of policies and plans for domestic transportation. For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends $2,500,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy consistent with the general guidance provided for the Office of the Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AVIATION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Appropriations, 2000	$7,650,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(7,702,000)
Committee recommendation	7,000,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs is responsible for administering the economic regulatory functions regarding the airline industry and provides departmental leadership and coordination on international transportation policy issues relating to maritime, trade, technical assistance, and cooperation programs. As overseer of airline economic regulation, the Assistant Secretary is responsible for international aviation programs, the essential air service program, airline fitness and licensing, acquisitions, international route awards, and special investigations such as airline delays and computer reservations systems (CRS). For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends $7,000,000 for the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs consistent with the general guidance provided for the Office of the Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BUDGET AND PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2000	$6,870,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(7,241,000)
Committee recommendation	6,500,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

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 consist-

ency 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.

The Committee directs the Office of the Secretary to report monthly on the status of all outstanding report and reporting requirements, including how delinquent Congressionally mandated or requested reports are and an estimated date for delivery. The Committee expects that the Department will constitute this responsibility in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.

The Committee recommends a total of $6,500,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs consistent with the general guidance provided for the Office of the Secretary. At this level, the Committee has included $60,000 for reception and representation expenses for the Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Appropriations, 2000	$2,039,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(2,167,000)
Committee recommendation	2,000,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

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 the Congress; 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 decision-making process.

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs consistent with the general guidance provided for the Office of the Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2000	$17,767,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(20,139,000)
Committee recommendation	17,800,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Assistant Secretary for Administration is the principal adviser to the Secretary on departmental administrative management matters, and is responsible for personnel and training, management policy, employment ceiling control systems, automated systems policy, administrative operations, real and personal property management, acquisition management, and grants management.

The Committee recommends $17,800,000 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration consistent with the general guidance for the Office of the Secretary and which includes the Office of the Secretary portion of rent.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Appropriations, 2000	$1,800,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(1,714,000)
Committee recommendation	1,500,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Office of Public Affairs is the principal adviser to the Secretary and other senior departmental officials and news media on public affairs question. The Office issues news releases, articles, factsheets, 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.

The Committee recommends $1,500,000 for the Office of Public Affairs consistent with the general guidance for the Office of the Secretary.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

Appropriations, 2000	$1,102,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(1,181,000)
Committee recommendation	1,181,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

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

The Committee recommends and appropriation of $1,181,000 for expenses of the Executive Secretariat.

BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

Appropriations, 2000	$520,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(496,000)
Committee recommendation	496,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The primary responsibility of the Board of Contract Appeals is to provide an independent forum for the trial and adjudication of all claims by, or against, a contractor relating to a contract of any element of the Department, as mandated by the Contract Disputes Act of 1978, 41 U.S.C. 601.

The Committee has provided $496,000 for the Board of Contract Appeals Board.

OFFICE OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION

Appropriations, 2000	$1,222,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(1,192,000)
Committee recommendation	1,192,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

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.

The Committee recommends $1,192,000.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY

Appropriations, 2000	$1,454,000
Budget estimate, 2001[1]	(3,494,000)
Committee recommendation	

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Office of Intelligence and Security within the Office of the Secretary coordinates security and intelligence policies and strategies among the modes of transportation and serves as liaison with other Government intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

The Committee recommends the Office of Intelligence and Security be funded from funds made available to the Coast Guard and/or the Federal Aviation Administration. The office is headed by an official from the Coast Guard and the majority of the functions of the office relate to Coast Guard and Federal Aviation Administration missions.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

Appropriations, 2000	$5,075,000
Budget estimate, 2001[1]	(6,929,000)
Committee recommendation	6,000,000

[1] Requested in the consolidated salaries and expenses account.

The Committee recommends $6,000,000 for the Office of the Chief Information Officer.

OFFICE OF INTERMODALISM

Appropriations, 2000	$1,062,000
Budget estimate, 2001	(1)
Committee recommendation	(2)

[1] Included within the Federal Highway Administration's limitation on administrative expenses.

[2] Funding is not included for the Office of Intermodalism in the Office of the Secretary.

The Committee does not recommend funding for the Office of Intermodalism in the Office of the Secretary accounts.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 2000[1]	$7,200,000
Budget estimate, 2001	8,726,000
Committee recommendation	8,000,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $212,000 for TASC pursuant to section 219 of Public Law 106–69.

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.

The Committee has provided a funding level of $8,000,000 for the Office of Civil Rights.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$3,300,000
Budget estimate, 2001	5,258,000
Committee recommendation	5,300,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $10,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69; also does not reflect reduction of $73,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

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, and systems development 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. Within the Committee's recommendation, funding is provided in this account for the 2001 Special Winter Olympics and for a commission authorized in section 228 of FAIR 21.

Missing children.—The Committee is aware of the effective work of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to combat crimes against children and to reunite abducted or runaway children with their families. There are many opportunities in the transportation sector to alert the public to the status of a missing child. For example, truckstops, airports, rail and bus stations, and other transportation facilities are utilized by millions of Americans every day. These are ideal places to raise public awareness of missing children. Moreover, employees in the transportation sector, including flight attendants, bus and truck drivers, and ticket agents, come into contact with hundreds of individuals every day and could be a key element in identifying abducted children. When nonlaw enforcement entities adopt procedures that hinder pedophiles and kidnappers, they are doing a much needed public service. Of note is WalMart's Code Adam Program. When a child disappears in a participating store, Code Adam is addressed over the public address system. Store personnel immediately stop work to look for the child and monitor all exits. If the missing child is not located in 10 minutes, or is seen with someone other than a parent or guardian, the police are called. This program is implemented in all 2,800 WalMart and Sam's Club stores. The Committee urges the transportation sector to consider similar programs.

In addition, transportation facilities are generally public places and present the same dangers that any public place has for unaccompanied children. Parents should remember, and transportation providers can help them to be more aware, that they should be ever diligent and make certain that they take precautions to ensure their child's safety while traveling.

The Committee directs the Secretary and each of the modal administrators to work with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the transportation industry to identify and implement initiatives to maximize the transportation sector's involvement in the effort to relocate missing children. The Committee notes that the Secretary's report to the Committee on Appropria-

tion relating to this initiative indicated that "language will be developed to incorporate in presentations done by the Secretary and other Department Executives," and "A work group geared at synthesizing the information provided by NCMEC (National Center for Missing and Exploited Children) with current Department programs has been formed. The findings of this group will be reported to the Appropriations Committee in June 2000." The Committee looks forward to the June 2000 report and for further action on this initiative by the Department.

TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE CENTER

Limitation, 2000 [1]	($148,673,000)
Budget estimate, 2001 [2]	(163,811,000)
Committee recommendation	(173,278,000)

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $15,000,000 pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.
[2] Proposed without limitations. Includes DOT only.

The Transportation Administrative Service Center [TASC] provides a business operation fund for DOT to provide a wide range of administrative services to the Department and other customers. TASC functions as an entrepreneurial and self-sufficient entity and provides competitive quality services responsive to customer needs. The TASC is governed by a Board of Directors composed of customer agencies operating in a competitive business-like environment. The TASC presents proposed operating and financial plans to the Board at the beginning of each fiscal year. Once the Board has approved those plans the TASC provides products and services to its full customer base. The Director of TASC provides quarterly performance and financial reports to the Board, makes recommendations for changes to the approved plans and is responsible for the day-to-day management of the TASC. DOT administrations must procure consolidated administrative services from the TASC unless a financial analysis of the services demonstrates that it is more cost beneficial to the Department as a whole—not to an individual operating entity alone—to change the nature of the service delivery (to consolidate a service or to decentralize a service). TASC services are being marketed to customers outside DOT to provide greater economies of scale, thus reducing costs to individual customers. TASC services include:

—Functions formerly in DOT's working capital fund [WCF];
—Office of the Secretary [OST] personnel, procurement and information technology support operations;
—Systems development staff;
—Operations of the consolidated departmental dockets facilities; and
—Certain departmental services and administrative operations, such as human resources management programs, transit fare subsidy payments, and employee wellness including substance awareness and testing.

All of the services of the TASC will be financed through customer reimbursements, to the extent possible, on a fee-for-service basis.

The bill includes language that includes a limitation on activities financed through the transportation administrative service center at $173,278,000. The limitation shall not apply to non-DOT entities and the Committee directs that activities shall be provided on a

competitive basis. Further, the Committee directs that the Department shall submit with the Department's congressional budget submission an approved annual operating plan of the transportation administrative service center and quarterly reports to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE AND RURAL AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT FUND

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$45,000,000
Mandatory authority, 2000 [2]	5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [3]	27,900,000
Budget estimate, 2001 (mandatory authority) [2]	22,100,000
Committee recommendation [1 2]	50,000,000

[1] Transfer from FAA operations.
[2] From overflight fees.
[3] Transfer from FAA Grants-in-aid for airports.

The Essential Air Service [EAS] and Rural Airport Improvement Program provides funds directly to commuter/regional airlines to provide air service to small communities that otherwise would not receive air service and for rural airport improvement as provided by the 1996 Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act.

The Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996 authorizes user fees for flights that fly over, but do not land in, the United States. The first $50,000,000 of each year's fees were to go directly to carry out the Essential Air Service Program and, to the extent not used for essential air service, to improve rural airport safety. If $50,000,000 in fees is not available, funding must be transferred from FAA appropriations to the EAS programs.

Many EAS points are located in remote rural areas: 60 of 78 communities receiving subsidized service under the program are more than 100 highway miles from the nearest small, medium, or large hub airport. Thirty more communities are located in Alaska, where, in all but two cases, year-round road access does not exist, and in many instances does not exist at all. Without air service, such communities would be further isolated from the Nation's economic centers. The funding provided is adequate to maintain existing levels of service in Alaska.

Moreover, businesses are typically interested in locating in areas that have convenient access to scheduled air service. Loss of service would seriously hamper small communities' ability to attract new business or even to retain those they now have, resulting in further strain on local economies and loss of jobs.

The following table reflects the points currently receiving service and the annual rates as of March 1, 2000. The $50,000,000 funding level is sufficient to maintain current service levels and quality of service at the communities currently served by the EAS program, although the cost of the program appears to be increasing.

In the lower 48 States, the tables show distances that EAS communities are from other air service centers and subsidy-per-passenger calculations. The distance figures are shown to give a sense of the degree of isolation of the communities, and the subsidy-per-passenger figures are a rough measure of the cost of providing the service compared to the number of passengers benefiting from the service. Neither of those calculations are relevant to Alaska. First, only 2 of the 30 subsidized communities in Alaska have road access to other air service. Thus, the Alaskan communities are clearly

among the most isolated in the Nation. In fact, many are islands and would be all but cut off from the rest of the world without air service. Second, any subsidy-per-passenger calculation would be highly misleading, at best. While subsidy-per-passenger may be used as a crude measure of cost benefit in the lower 48, in many of the subsidized EAS markets the principal traffic being carried on the EAS flights is food being delivered to the bush community. Thus, the whole community benefits from—indeed is fully dependent on—the EAS flights, not just the few who may actually travel on the flights.

EAS SUBSIDY RATES AS OF MARCH 1, 2000

States/communities	Estimated mileage to nearest hub (small, medium, or large) [1]	Average daily enplanements at EAS point (year ending September 30, 1999)	Annual subsidy rates (March 1, 2000)	Subsidy per passenger
ARIZONA:				
Kingman	101	6.1	$432,564	$112.76
Page	282	12.0	686,014	91.25
Prescott	102	21.5	432,564	32.07
Show Low	168	10.7	205,040	30.59
ARKANSAS:				
El Dorado/Camden	108	5.3	825,569	246.73
Harrison	142	6.5	1,125,591	276.76
Hot Springs	53	8.4	1,125,591	212.86
Jonesboro	79	6.6	825,569	198.50
CALIFORNIA:				
Crescent City	234	33.4	314,865	15.06
Merced	114	10.8	951,271	141.14
COLORADO:				
Alamosa	162	14.1	1,060,940	120.59
Cortez	258	26.5	408,227	24.65
Lamar	163	4.9	633,984	205.51
Pueblo	.....	14.0	500,000	57.08
HAWAII:				
Hana	32	14.8	574,500	62.18
Kamuela	39	4.0	424,559	168.88
Kalaupapa	([2])	12.4	136,404	17.54
ILLINOIS: Mattoon	126	2.9	540,449	294.20
IOWA: Ottumwa	85	2.5	380,039	238.57
KANSAS:				
Dodge City	149	19.5	463,179	37.94
Garden City	201	29.2	463,179	25.36
Goodland	176	3.4	909,597	432.11
Great Bend	120	15.7	693,209	70.60
Hays	180	17.2	693,209	64.41
Liberal/Guymon	142	13.9	633,984	72.81
Topeka	71	12.7	722,141	90.96
MAINE:				
Augusta/Waterville	71	10.8	596,806	88.42
Bar Harbor	157	35.8	596,806	26.64
Rockland	80	22.4	596,806	42.47
MICHIGAN:				
Ironwood/Ashland	218	6.1	684,239	180.35
Iron Mountain/Kingsford	101	26.6	473,599	28.41
Manistee	115	4.2	361,808	138.94
MINNESOTA: Mankato	75	.....	([3])	([3])

EAS SUBSIDY RATES AS OF MARCH 1, 2000—Continued

States/communities	Estimated mileage to nearest hub (small, medium, or large) [1]	Average daily enplanements at EAS point (year ending September 30, 1999)	Annual subsidy rates (March 1, 2000)	Subsidy per passenger
MISSOURI:				
Cape Girardeau	138	28.6	278,560	15.58
Fort Leonard Wood	130	18.2	337,124	29.60
Kirksville	137	4.2	450,736	172.37
MONTANA:				
Glasgow	763	6.2	671,032	173.35
Glendive	624	3.7	671,032	289.74
Havre	674	4.3	671,032	248.71
Lewistown	558	3.4	671,032	317.72
Miles City	529	4.7	671,032	229.10
Sidney	653	7.6	671,032	140.15
Wolf Point	698	4.8	671,032	222.34
NEBRASKA:				
Alliance	256	5.9	770,950	210.24
Chadron	311	5.3	770,950	231.03
Hastings	162	.....	([3])	([3])
Kearney	181	21.4	839,487	62.69
McCook	271	7.4	1,401,900	302.59
Norfolk	109	5.8	431,660	118.78
North Platte	277	26.4	106,006	6.42
NEVADA: Ely	237	2.8	1,087,340	627.79
NEW MEXICO:				
Alamogordo/Holloman AFB	91	9.8	777,127	126.61
Clovis	105	12.6	926,594	117.53
Gallup	143	8.2	691,080	134.27
Silver City/Hurley/Deming	133	10.1	872,204	138.29
NEW YORK:				
Massena	115	10.5	371,836	56.45
Ogdensburg	123	8.9	371,836	66.97
Watertown	65	24.1	371,836	24.70
NORTH DAKOTA:				
Devils Lake	396	10.5	613,389	93.40
Dickinson	490	12.1	247,255	32.66
Jamestown	302	10.0	613,389	97.95
Williston	592	19.0	244,216	20.49
OKLAHOMA:				
Enid	84	6.3	972,122	246.61
Ponca City	81	8.4	972,122	185.73
PENNSYLVANIA: Oil City/Franklin	86	29.3	510,261	27.86
PUERTO RICO: Ponce	77	32.8	500,000	24.34
SOUTH DAKOTA:				
Brookings	57	5.9	881,662	240.56
Mitchell	69	.....	([3])	([3])
Yankton	81	4.8	640,976	212.95
TEXAS: Brownwood	138	4.7	865,886	295.42
UTAH:				
Cedar City	178	23.6	679,450	45.93
Moab	240	6.0	595,373	158.64
Vernal	174	11.8	661,624	89.77
VERMONT: Rutland	144	9.8	596,806	97.60
WASHINGTON: Ephrata/Moses Lake	101	37.1	514,313	22.17
WEST VIRGINIA:				
Beckley	173	7.9	627,512	126.54

EAS SUBSIDY RATES AS OF MARCH 1, 2000—Continued

States/communities	Estimated mileage to nearest hub (small, medium, or large) [1]	Average daily enplanements at EAS point (year ending September 30, 1999)	Annual subsidy rates (March 1, 2000)	Subsidy per passenger
Princeton/Bluefield	137	7.2	627,512	139.45
WISCONSIN: Oshkosh	49	13.9	460,392	52.97
WYOMING:				
Laramie	144	31.5	671,151	34.00
Rock Springs	184	30.0	493,151	26.26
Worland	398	9.1	671,151	118.33

[1] Hub designations are recalculated annually and published by the FAA in the Airport Activity Statistics. The above distances are based on the 1998 Airport Activity Statistics, which is based on CY 1998 passenger data.
[2] There is no FAA–designated small, medium or large hub on the island of Molokai.
[3] Hiatus in service.

RENTAL PAYMENTS

Until 1997, payments to the General Services Administration for headquarters and field space rental and related services for all modes were consolidated into this account. Beginning in 1998, however, all GSA rental payments are reflected in the modal budgets. The following table displays by modal administration the GSA rental payments for fiscal years 1999, 2000, and requested for 2001, both in square feet and funding levels.

GSA RENTAL PAYMENTS

[Dollars and square feet in thousands]

Administration	Fiscal year 1999 actual		Fiscal year 2000 estimate		Fiscal year 2001 President's budget	
	Funding	Square feet	Funding	Square feet	Funding	Square feet
Federal Highway Administration	$17,922	912	$20,400	883	$27,334	883
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	4,042	178	4,657	182	5,882	196
Federal Railroad Administration	3,172	135	3,121	138	3,308	140
Federal Transit Administration	3,500	137	3,913	138	4,304	139
Federal Aviation Administration	75,400	3,128	92,105	3,400	92,000	3,415
U.S. Coast Guard	37,450	2,003	34,337	2,027	33,970	2,099
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	203	7	185	6	212	6
Maritime Administration	4,234	259	4,597	260	4,676	260
Research and Special Programs Administration	2,215	79	2,389	82	2,654	86
Office of Inspector General	2,510	108	2,800	107	3,056	107
Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST)	6,713	204	6,921	204	7,190	204
Transportation Administrative Service Center	4,677	215	5,251	216	11,028	382
Bureau of Transportation Statistics	750	20	729	26	930	32
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration [1]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Surface Transportation Board	1,538	66	1,700	66	1,785	66
Total, Department of Transportation	164,326	7,466	183,105	7,735	198,329	8,015

[1] Included in Federal Highway Administration.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2000	$1,900,000
Budget estimate, 2001	1,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,900,000

Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization [OSDBU]/Minority Business Resource Center [MBRC].—The OSDBU/MBRC provides assistance in obtaining short-term working capital and bonding for disadvantaged, minority, and women-owned businesses [DBE/MBE/WBE's]. In fiscal year 2001, the short-term loan program will continue to focus on the lending of working capital to DBE/MBE/WBE's for transportation-related projects in order to strengthen their competitive and productive capabilities.

Since fiscal year 1993, the loan program has been a separate line item appropriation, which segregated such activities in response to changes made by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. For fiscal year 2001, the administration proposes converting this program from a direct loan program to a guaranteed loan program. The limitation on subsidized loans under the Minority Business Resource Center is at the administration's requested level of $13,775,000. The Committee recognizes that ability of certain institutions to provide minority business firms with contracting expertise and directs that the Minority Business Resource Center Program work with the Alabama State University Business Technology Center and Alabama A&M University to develop those institutions' capabilities to assist minority business firms to secure and execute contracts with the Federal Government.

Of the funds appropriated, $1,500,000 covers the subsidy costs for loans not to exceed $13,775,000; and, $400,000 is for administrative expenses to carry out the Direct Loan Program.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$2,900,000
Budget estimate, 2001	3,000,000
Committee recommendation	3,000,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $18,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

This appropriation provides contractual support to assist minority business firms, entrepreneurs, and venture groups in securing contracts and subcontracts arising out of 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 DOT-wide goals and not just OST purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Advisory committees.—The Committee has retained a general provision (sec. 325) which would limit the amount of funds that could be used for the expenses of advisory committees utilized by the Department of Transportation. The limitation specified is $1,500,000.

Rebates, refunds, and incentive payments.—The Department receives funds from various Government programs at different time intervals (that is, weekly, monthly, quarterly). For example, under

the General Services Administration's Travel Management Center [TMC] Program, rebate checks received from the travel contractor are distributed monthly to each element of the Department in proportion to net domestic airline sales arranged by the contractor. Past expenditures have to be analyzed to determine the proper sources to refund which can be a time-consuming process. The staff time and cost associated with the precise accounting for each such refund is prohibitive. To alleviate the need to specifically identify the source for each repayment the Committee has included language (sec. 326), as requested, that allows a fair and sensible allocation of the rebates and miscellaneous and other funds.

Departmental Aircraft.—The Committee continues to be aware of the significant difficulty that the department has had in using aircraft for the movement of Department of Transportation officials and personnel under the Office of Management and Budget guidelines. If the department is unable to make use of dedicated aircraft in an efficient manner, the Committee believes that there are significant cost savings, flexibility, and efficiency to be garnered through utilizing the private sector for the business aircraft requirements of the FAA, the Office of the Secretary, and to a lesser extent, the Coast Guard. Accordingly, the Committee has again included bill language (sec. 332) that permits the fractional ownership of business aircraft by the department which will allow the department to sell underutilized business aircraft in the agency's inventory and utilize those resources for more critical priorities. Fractional aircraft ownership concepts provide access to an entire fleet of aircraft, availability of a mix of aircraft types and sizes, all on very short notice and are eminently compatible with the OMB guidelines. Costs include aircraft share, a monthly management fee (to include maintenance, flight and cabin crew, crew training, and routine service), and an hourly rate for time aboard the aircraft. The Committee believes that fractional ownership of administrative aircraft in a number of situations could prove extremely beneficial in reducing the costs and inefficiencies of the aircraft in administrative roles which are currently owned and operated in the government inventory. Therefore, the Committee urges the department to submit the study requested in last year's conference report and establish a test program of fractional ownership for the Federal Aviation Administration, at a minimum, to replace existing mission support aircraft used for administrative requirements, with a mix of light to mid-size jets to determine the flexibility, efficiency, and cost benefits for the government. Alternatively, the Department should submit by July 1, 2000 language that would exempt the aircraft operations of the Department and the appropriate modal administrations from the OMB guidelines.

Delinquent reporting requirements.—The Committee is increasingly concerned by the Department's apparent selective adherence to required reports and guidance included in the House and Senate reports. If this reticence is not remedied, the Committee will provide incentives to prompt greater attention to Congressional intent.

Safety inspector liability insurance.—The bill includes a general provision requested by the administration (sec. 339) which would extend support for the purchase of professional liability insurance to departmental safety inspectors. Under current law, Federal

agencies can subsidize the purchase of liability insurance by management grade employees, but not for non-supervisory employees. Safety inspectors are inherently at risk for punitive lawsuits and would benefit from having the same reimbursement opportunity that is currently extended for management staff. The provision requires that the departmental share of the liability insurance costs may not exceed one-half.

OTHER

User fees.—The Committee has included bill language, as requested, which permits the Office of the Secretary to continue to credit to this account $1,250,000 in user fees.

In addition, the administration's budget proposal includes provisions that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to charge user fees for Coast Guard, Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Research and Special Programs Administration, Surface Transportation Board, and National Transportation Safety Board services, totaling $1,300,000,000. These provisions were drafted to produce the net effect of reducing the budgetary impact of the administration's request, but the agencies themselves are "held harmless" against potential loss of funds because the language is contingent upon authorization of the user fees. Each affected agency would have access to all budgetary resources provided in the appropriations bill, because the offsetting collections are not reduced from the general fund appropriation until the authorizing legislation is enacted. Despite this fact, the administration's budget takes full credit for these offsetting collections, artificially reducing the budget resources required to fund the overall budget request.

These proposals amount to budgetary "smoke and mirrors". Additionally, these proposed user fees represent new taxes on many different sectors of U.S. business and the traveling public. Congress has consistently rejected such user fee proposals, yet the administration continues to include them in its budget submissions.

The Committee has included a general provision (sec. 338) which directs that in the fiscal year 2002 budget submission, the Department must identify offsets for each proposed user fee. These identified offsets will be reduced from each agency's budget if the proposed fees are not authorized and enacted before the next fiscal year. This provision endeavors to make the administration fiscally accountable for its user fee proposals.

Reductions and emergency supplementals in fiscal year 2000 appropriations.—In fiscal year 2000, reductions were made to a number of accounts due to the limitation or reduction imposed in the Transportation Administrative Service Center. In addition, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, Public Law 106–113 rescinded 0.38 percent of discretionary budget authority and obligation limitations provided for fiscal year 2000. In the Senate Committee report, each account head shows the amount appropriated in Public Law 106–69 before the various reductions or supplementals were made. The table below depicts the amount of funds appropriated for each of the accounts, and the reduction and supplementals.

CHANGES IN FISCAL YEAR 2000 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Account	Public Law 106–69 DOT Appropriations Act				Public Law 106–113		Public Law 106–79 Sec. 8131 Transfer from DOD	Public Law 106–31 Sec. 3029 Ellsworth settlement	Net appropriation and obligation limitation
	Appropriations and obligation limitation	GP 319 TASC	GP 338 Motor carrier	GP 365 Transfer to EPA	Sec. 225 transit	Sec. 301 0.38 percent cut			
Office of the Secretary:									
Salaries and expenses	60,852	−1,355		(1)					59,497
Transportation planning, research, and development	3,300	−73				−10			3,217
Minority business resources center	1,900								1,900
Minority business outreach	2,900					−18			2,882
Office of Civil Rights	7,200	−212							6,988
Subtotal	76,152	−1,640				−28			74,484
U.S. Coast Guard:									
Operating Expenses	2,781,000	−1,963							2,779,037
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	389,326	−349				−1,478			387,499
Environmental compliance and restoration	17,000	−11				−65			16,924
Alteration of bridges	15,000					−57			14,943
Retired pay	730,327								730,327
Reserve training	72,000	−48							71,952
Research, development, test, and evaluation	19,000	−7							18,993
Subtotal	4,023,653	−2,378				−1,600			4,019,675
Federal Aviation Administration:									
Operations	5,900,000	−6,610							5,893,390
Facilities and equipment	2,075,000								2,075,000
Rescission, facilities and equipment	−30,000								−30,000
Research, engineering, and development	156,495								156,495
Grants-in-aid for airports (obligation limitation)	1,950,000					−54,362			1,895,638
Subtotal	10,051,495	−6,610				−54,362			9,990,523
Federal Highway Administration:									
Limitation on administrative expenses	[376,072]	[−1,233]	[−70,484]						[304,355]
Federal-aid highways (obligation limitation)	27,701,350	−1,415	−76,058			−105,260			27,520,032

Exempt obligations	1,206,702								1,206,702
Ellsworth housing settlement								3,000	3,000
Motor carrier safety grants (obligation limitation)	105,000		−105,000						
Subtotal	29,013,052	−1,415	−181,058			−105,260		3,000	28,729,734
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration:									
Motor carrier safety grants (obligation limitation)			105,000						105,000
Office of Motor Carrier Safety (obligation limitation)			76,058						76,058
Subtotal			181,058						181,058
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration:									
Operations and Research, General Fund	87,400	−930							86,470
Operations and Research, Trust Fund (obligation limitation)	72,000	−398							71,602
National driver registration	2,000								2,000
Highway safety grants	206,800								206,800
Subtotal	368,200	−1,328							366,872
Federal Railroad Administration:									
Safety and operations	94,288	−436							93,852
Research and development	22,464								22,464
Next generation high speed rail	27,200					−103			27,097
Alaska railroad rehabilitation	10,000					−38	5,000		14,962
Rhode Island rail development	10,000					−38			9,962
Grants to National Railroad Passenger Corp	571,000								571,000
Amtrak Reform Council	750								750
Subtotal	735,702	−436				−179	5,000		740,087
Federal Transit Administration:									
Administrative expenses (approps and obligation limitation)	60,000	−438							59,562
Formula grants (approps and obligation limitation) [3]	3,048,000								3,048,000
Univ. transportation research (approps and obligation limitation)	6,000								6,000
Transit planning and research (approps and obligation limitation)	107,000					−243			106,757

CHANGES IN FISCAL YEAR 2000 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Account	Public Law 106–69 DOT Appropriations Act				Public Law 106–113		Public Law 106–79 Sec. 8131 Transfer from DOD	Public Law 106–31 Sec. 3029 Ellsworth settlement	Net appropriation and obligation limitation
	Appropriations and obligation limitation	GP 319 TASC	GP 338 Motor carrier	GP 365 Transfer to EPA	Sec. 225 transit	Sec. 301 0.38 percent cut			
Capital investment grants (approps and obligation limitation)[3]	2,501,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	−17,381	.....	.....	2,483,619
Capital investment grants (Trust Fund approps)	.....	.....	.....	.....	6,000	−23	.....	.....	5,977
Job access (approps and obligation limitation)	75,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	75,000
Subtotal	5,797,000	−438	.....	.....	6,000	−17,647	.....	.....	5,784,915
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corp.: Operations and maintenance	12,042	−25	.....	.....	.....	−46	.....	.....	11,971
Research and Special Programs Administration:									
Research and special programs	32,061	−296	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	31,765
Pipeline safety	36,879	−198	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	36,681
Emergency preparedness grants	200	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200
Emergency preparedness grants	14,100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14,100
Subtotal	83,240	−494	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	82,746
Bureau of Transportation Statistics[2]	[31,000]	[−182]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	[30,818]
Office of the Inspector General: Salaries and expenses	44,840	−224	.....	.....	.....	−170	.....	.....	44,446
Surface Transportation Board: Salaries and expenses	17,000	−12	.....	.....	.....	−58	.....	.....	16,930
Total, Department of Transportation, Excluding Maritime Administration	50,222,376	−15,000	.....	.....	6,000	−179,350	5,000	3,000	50,043,441

[1] GP 365 appropriates $500,000 to OST, to be transferred to EPA.
[2] BTS funding included within Federal-aid highways.
[3] Reflects transfer of $50,000,000 from formula grants to capital discretionary pursuant to Public Law 106–69.

Note: Above data does not reflect supplemental funding proposals.

U.S. COAST GUARD

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROGRAM

The U.S. Coast Guard, as it is known today, was established on January 28, 1915, through the merger of the Revenue Cutter Service and the Lifesaving Service. In 1939, the U.S. Lighthouse Service was transferred to the Coast Guard, followed by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation in 1942. The Coast Guard has as its primary responsibilities the enforcement of all applicable Federal laws on the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; promotion of safety of life and property at sea; assistance to navigation; protection of the marine environment; and maintenance of a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war (14 U.S.C. 1, 2).

The Committee recommends a total program level of $4,423,099,000 for the activities of the Coast Guard in fiscal year 2001. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendations
	2000 enacted [1]	2001 estimate	
Operating expenses [2 3]	2,781,000	3,199,000	3,039,460
Acquisition, construction, and improvements [3 4]	389,326	520,200	407,748
Environmental compliance and restoration	17,000	16,700	16,700
Alteration of bridges	15,000		15,500
Retired pay (mandatory)	730,327	778,000	778,000
Reserve training	72,000	73,371	80,371
Research, development, test, and evaluation	19,000	21,320	21,320
Boat safety (mandatory)	64,000	64,000	64,000
Total	4,087,653	4,672,591	4,423,099

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $2,378,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69 or reflect reduction of $1,600,000 for the 0.38 percent reduction pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

[2] Includes funding for national security activities of the Coast Guard scored against budget function 050 (defense discretionary) as follows: Fiscal year 2000 enacted amount includes $300,000,000 in defense discretionary funding; fiscal year 2001 estimate includes $341,000,000 and fiscal year 2001 Committee recommendation includes $641,000,000.

[3] Includes proposed navigation assistance fees in fiscal year 2001 as follows: $116,000,000 in operating expenses, and $96,000,000 in acquisition, construction and improvements.

[4] Includes $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 in asset sales.

OPERATING EXPENSES

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$2,756,000,000	$25,000,000	$2,781,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [2 3]	3,174,000,000	25,000,000	3,199,000,000
Committee recommendation [4]	3,014,460,000	25,000,000	3,039,460,000
Secretary's discretionary transfer authority	100,000,000		100,000,000
Total available funds	3,114,460,000	25,000,000	3,139,460,000

[1] Includes $300,000,000 for national security activities scored against budget function 050 (defense). Excludes $1,963,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.

[2] Includes $341,000,000 for national security activities scored against budget function 050 (defense).

[3] Includes $116,000,000 for proposed navigation assistance fees.

[4] Includes $641,000,000 for national security activities scored against budget function 050 (defense).

The "Operating expenses" appropriation provides funds for the operation and maintenance of multipurpose vessels, aircraft, and shore units strategically located along the coasts and inland waterways of the United States and in selected areas overseas.

The program activities of this appropriation fall into the following categories:

Search and rescue.—One of its earliest and most traditional missions, the Coast Guard maintains a nationwide system of boats, aircraft, cutters, and rescue coordination centers on 24-hour alert.

Aids to navigation.—To help mariners determine their location and avoid accidents, the Coast Guard maintains a network of manned and unmanned aids to navigation along our coasts and on our inland waterways, and operates radio stations in the United States and abroad to serve the needs of the armed services and marine and air commerce.

Marine safety.—The Coast Guard insures compliance with Federal statutes and regulations designed to improve safety in the merchant marine industry and operates a recreational boating safety program.

Marine environmental protection.—The primary objectives of this program are to minimize the dangers of marine pollution and to assure the safety of U.S. ports and waterways.

Enforcement of laws and treaties.—The Coast Guard is the principal maritime enforcement agency with regard to Federal laws on the navigable waters of the United States and the high seas, including fisheries, drug smuggling, illegal immigration, and hijacking of vessels.

Ice operations.—In the Arctic and Antarctic, Coast Guard icebreakers escort supply ships, support research activities and Department of Defense operations, survey uncharted waters, and collect scientific data. The Coast Guard also assists commercial vessels through ice-covered waters.

Defense readiness.—During peacetime the Coast Guard maintains an effective state of military preparedness to operate as a service in the Navy in time of war or national emergency at the direction of the President. As such the Coast Guard has primary responsibility for the security of ports, waterways, and navigable waters up to 200 miles offshore.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation for Coast Guard operating expenses is $3,039,460,000, including $25,000,000 from the oilspill liability trust fund and $641,000,000 from function 050 for the Coast Guard's defense-related activities.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2000 enacted [1]	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Personnel resources:			
Military pay and benefits	1,366,152	1,471,495	1,470,491
Civilian pay and benefits	225,517	243,119	242,945
Military health care	139,815	174,769	174,664

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2000 enacted [1]	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Permanent change of station [PCS] and related travel and transportation	75,045	78,103	69,298
Training and education	81,966	85,557	78,072
Recruiting	5,585	5,585	5,585
FECA/UCX	11,091	11,091	11,091
Total, personnel resources	1,905,171	2,069,719	2,052,146
Operating funds and unit level maintenance:			
Atlantic area command	121,137	125,702	125,509
Pacific area command	123,213	118,891	126,625
District commands:			
1st district	35,967	36,566	36,566
7th district	47,652	49,043	49,043
8th district	28,168	28,674	28,674
9th district	17,304	17,775	17,775
13th district	12,453	13,030	13,030
14th district	9,910	9,734	9,734
17th district	20,465	20,972	20,972
Headquarters directorates	184,326	223,413	222,288
Headquarters managed units	45,236	55,342	53,577
Other activities	1,653	1,653	1,653
Total, operating funds and unit level maintenance	647,484	700,795	705,446
Depot level maintenance:			
Aircraft maintenance	149,321	170,101	157,026
Electronic maintenance	39,366	42,395	40,895
Ocean engineering and shore facility maintenance	97,442	105,785	100,785
Vessel maintenance	102,255	110,205	105,890
Total, depot level maintenance	388,384	428,486	404,596
Account-wide adjustments:			
TASC reduction	−1,963	.....	.....
Undistributed reduction	.....	.....	−122,728
Total appropriation	[2] 2,779,076	3,199,000	3,039,460

[1] Includes reduction of $1,963,000 for TASC pursuant to Public Law 106–69.
[2] Assumes carryover of $160,000,000 from Kosovo emergency supplemental.

Note.—Fiscal year 2000 enacted and fiscal year 2001 request include $300,000,000 and $341,000,000, respectively, for national security activities, budget function 050 (defense).

Military pay and benefit.—The Committee recommends $1,470,491,000 for military pay and allowances, an increase of $104,339,000 above the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The Committee recommendation fully funds the fiscal year 2001 3.7 percent pay raise as well as the budget request for recruiting and retention bonuses, aviator career continuation pay, and 15 year career bonus payments to personnel affected by the Redux repeal as authorized under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

Military health care.—The Committee recommendation includes $174,664,000 for military health care. This is $34,849,000 more than last year's enacted level. The Committee notes that the Coast

Guard has allowed active duty personnel, their dependents, and retirees to enroll in the Uniformed Health Services Family Plan for their medical care.

Military health care task force.—The Coast Guard, as a uniformed service, is required by statute to be a full participant in the Department of Defense TRICARE program. The health care delivery structural requirements of the Coast Guard, however, are vastly different from what is necessary for the Defense Department. Under TRICARE, military personnel and their dependents are expected to rely on the nearest military treatment facility for health services. Unlike DOD personnel who are stationed in large military bases, Coast Guard personnel typically are assigned to small stations, many of which are at remote locations a great distance from the nearest military treatment facility. As a result of this difference, the Coast Guard cannot justify health care facilities at these units and must rely on the participation of health care providers in the community for health services. The Committee commends the Coast Guard for working with DOD to increase the reimbursement rates in remote areas to attract greater civilian participation in TRICARE. Nevertheless, the Committee is concerned that this alone will not improve the quality of health care at remote stations. Also, the Coast Guard does not need to maintain an organic health care system as the military services must for overseas operations. Given these anomalies, the Committee directs the Coast Guard to form a task force to assess the systemic requirements of the Coast Guard in providing health care to its uniformed personnel and determine if the Coast Guard should continue its participation in TRICARE or transition to an alternate health care system, such as the Federal Employee's Health Benefits Program. The task force shall analyze such issues as program administration, access to providers, scope of coverage, and costs to the agency and individual expenses. The task force shall submit its report and recommendations to Congress no later than July 1, 2001 and should provide an interim report for use in the preparation of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Aviation detachment support.—The Administration requests $3,904,000 for personnel, training, fuel, and maintenance to operate three HH–65 helicopters which will support operations on the new polar icebreaker. Although funding for these three helicopters is also requested in the budget estimate, the Coast Guard does not expect delivery of the helicopters until fiscal year 2003. Because the Coast Guard will not have the additional airframes to operate, the Committee expects that this reduction will have no adverse impact on current operations.

Partnership in maritime medicine.—Of the funds provided, $1,750,000 is for Tulane University and the University of Alabama in Birmingham to establish a pilot project to identify and address the unique occupational and health hazards affecting Coast Guard personnel. The research will determine the environmental medicine needs of Coast Guard personnel, develop safety devices to identify early warnings of potential hazards, and serve as a primary source of guidance regarding maritime occupational and environmental health issues.

Permanent change of station.—Within the Committee recommendation, the Committee has reduced $5,000,000 specifically for permanent change of station based on the estimated number of travel orders to be issued during fiscal year 2001 and the projected average cost per move.

Administrative account.—The Committee recommends $1,653,000 for other activities, the same as the budget request, which funds the Chief of Staff's Administrative Account. The Committee understands that the funding in this account is for agency contingencies, natural or mission related emergencies below the scope of supplemental appropriations, and other development initiatives. The Committee directs the Coast Guard to notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of the specific use and amount prior to the obligation of any of the account's funds.

National security.—The accompanying bill provides $641,000,000 from the defense function for Coast Guard support of national security activities. This is $300,000,000 more than the requested level of funding and is $341,000,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The Coast Guard is one of the five Armed Services and serves a unique niche within the national security community. The value of Coast Guard forces to the national security command was evident by their participation in support of NATO operations in Yugoslavia and maritime interception operations to enforce the U.N. embargo against Iraq. The Coast Guard must maintain a high state of operational readiness, and the Committee recommendation provides the necessary resources to ensure that the Coast Guard is able to meet its national security commitments.

Drug interdiction.—The Committee recommends $565,200,000, as requested, for drug interdiction activities, and it should be left to the Commandant's discretion how the drug interdiction funding is distributed. The Committee recommendation increases funding for drug interdiction by $46,240,000 from the fiscal year 2000 level. Included in the Committee recommendation is $17,205,000 to establish a helicopter squadron (HITRON 10) as the initial operating capability of the airborne use of force initiative which has shown promise in improving the Coast Guard's ability to intercept go-fast boats. The Committee is aware that drug trafficking, including the use of go-fast boats, in the Eastern Pacific is rapidly rising and urges the Coast Guard to deploy and operate the helicopter squadron as a national asset.

Ballast water management program.—The Committee recommended funding level includes $3,592,000 to continue the nationwide ballast water management program.

Pacific Area Command.—The Committee recommends $126,625,000 in funding for the command and control functions of the Pacific Area Command. This is $7,734,000 more than the budget estimate and $3,412,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The Administration has requested a change to the reimbursement policy for polar icebreaking services provided to the National Science Foundation. Because the three polar icebreakers fall under the operational control of the Pacific Area Commander, the budget proposed reducing this account by $7,800,000. The Committee denies this request and has restored the funding associated with the proposed policy.

Headquarters directorates.—The Committee recommends $222,288,000 for headquarters directorates, an increase of $37,962,000 above the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The Committee recommendation defers $398,000 from the budget request to develop the International Marine Information and Safety System (IMISS). The IMISS collects data on a voluntary basis from maritime industry and analyzes it through a commercially-operated data center to allow industry participants to take the necessary precautions to prevent marine accidents. The Committee believes that it is more appropriate for industry to fund this system and encourages the Coast Guard to provide guidance and technical expertise to industry partners that desire to establish such a system. Within the funds provided for the Office of the Chief Counsel, $100,000 is specifically to dispose of the backlog of real property conveyances that have been authorized for transfer through legislation.

Maritime transportation system leadership and coordination.—Due to inadequate justification, the Committee has deleted $801,000 for the maritime transportation system leadership and coordination program, a new initiative.

Mackinaw.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,181,000 in funding for continued operation and maintenance of the icebreaking cutter *Mackinaw* during fiscal year 2001.

AMSEA.—The Committee recommends $350,000 to be available only for this marine safety training program that trains fishermen and children in cold water marine safety techniques.

Oil spill geographic information system.—Within the funds provided, the Committee has included $2,000,000 for the development of a geographic information system for oil spill planning, response, and damage assessment in Alabama and Mississippi, including State waters bordering the Gulf of Mexico. The Committee notes that oil spill managers have utilized the baseline maps and related databases of a similar system that was developed for Louisiana in planning for and responding to such incidents.

Marine Fire and Safety Association.—The Committee remains supportive of efforts by the Marine Fire and Safety Association [MFSA] to provide specialized firefighting training and maintain an oilspill response contingency plan for the Columbia River. The Committee encourages the Secretary to provide funding for MFSA consistent with the authorization and directs the Secretary to provide $135,500 to continue efforts by the nonprofit organization comprised of numerous fire departments on both sides of the Columbia River. The funding will be utilized to provide specialized communications, firefighting training and equipment, and to implement the oilspill response contingency plan for the Columbia River.

Indonesian Coast Guard.—Five of the world's busiest shipping lanes and 40 percent of world's shipping pass through the territorial waters of the Republic of Indonesia. At the urging of the United States, Indonesia is separating its coast guard from the military into an independent agency. The Committee directs the Coast Guard to work with representatives from the Indonesian government on officer training and to study turning over surplus vessels for the purpose of improving the capability of the Indonesian Coast Guard fleet.

Depot level maintenance and repair.—The Committee recommends $404,596,000 for depot level maintenance and repair, which is $23,890,000 lower than the budget request. The Committee notes that these funds were requested to address spare part shortages and deferred maintenance activities during fiscal year 2000. The Committee has provided funding specifically to eliminate the recurring and non-recurring backlog in all Coast Guard maintenance accounts in another appropriations bill.

BILL LANGUAGE

Secretary's discretionary transfer authority.—The bill includes language that permits the Secretary to transfer up to $100,000,000 from Federal Aviation Administration operations to Coast Guard operating expenses for the purposes of providing additional funds for drug interdiction activities or activities related to the Office of Intelligence and Security.

Maritime user fees.—The accompanying bill includes a provision that prohibits the planning, finalization, or implementation of any regulation that would promulgate new maritime user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of enactment of this act.

Audit Reimbursement.—The bill includes a provision to transfer $5,000,000 to the Department of Transportation Inspector General. The transferred funding will reimburse the IG for audits and investigations of Coast Guard-related issues, programs, and systems. Other agencies are also required to transfer funds to the department IG.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

User fees.—The Fiscal Year 2000 Transportation Appropriations Act included a provision prohibiting the Coast Guard from levying new user fees that Congress has not authorized. Notwithstanding this prohibition, the administration's budget request proposes to collect $212,000,000 from new user fees for navigation services provided by the Coast Guard. Although the Committee has rejected the administration's proposal to raise taxes on transportation users year after year, the administration has again resorted to such budget gimmickry because it presents a budget request that is artificially high.

The Committee is exasperated with the continued submission of user fees proposals in the budget request that the Committee has not approved. The Committee, therefore, has included a general provision (sec. 338) that requires the Department to identify a specific spending offset in its budget request for each dollar that is proposed to be collect by new user fees not authorized by Congress. This provision will encourage responsibility and accountability in future budget requests.

Vessel traffic safety fairway, Santa Barbara/San Francisco.—The bill retains a general provision (sec. 313) that would prohibit funds to plan, finalize, or implement regulations that would establish a vessel traffic safety fairway less than 5 miles wide between the Santa Barbara traffic separation scheme and the San Francisco traffic separation scheme. On April 27, 1989, the department published a notice of proposed rulemaking that would narrow the originally proposed 5-mile-wide fairway to two one-mile-wide fairways

separated by a 2-mile-wide area where off-shore oil rigs could be built if Lease Sale 119 goes forward. Under this revised proposal, vessels would be routed in close proximity to oil rigs because the 2-mile-wide non-fairway corridor could contain drilling rigs at the edge of the fairways. The Committee is concerned that this rule, if implemented, could increase the threat of offshore oil accidents off the California coast. Accordingly, the bill continues the language prohibiting the implementation of this regulation.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$369,326,000	$20,000,000	$389,326,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [2 3]	500,200,000	20,000,000	520,200,000
Committee recommendation	387,747,660	20,000,000	407,747,660

[1] Excludes $349,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69. Excludes $1,478,000 reduction for the 0.38 percent reduction pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.
[2] Includes $10,000,000 in asset sales funding for Y2K.
[3] Includes $96,000,000 in proposed navigation assistance fees.

This appropriation provides for the major acquisition, construction, and improvement of vessels, aircraft, shore units, and aids to navigation operated and maintained by the Coast Guard. Currently, the Coast Guard has in operation approximately 250 cutters, ranging in size from 65-foot tugs to 399-foot polar icebreakers, more than 2,000 boats, and an inventory of more than 200 helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft. The Coast Guard also operates approximately 600 stations, support and supply centers, communications facilities, and other shore units. The Coast Guard provides over 48,000 navigational aids—buoys, fixed aids, lighthouses, and radio navigational stations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The following table summarizes the Committee's programmatic recommendations:

	Fiscal year 2000 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 2001 estimate [2]	Committee recommendation
Vessels	$134,560,000	$257,180,000	$145,936,660
Deepwater replacement project	44,200,000	42,300,000	42,300,000
Aircraft	44,210,000	43,650,000	41,650,000
Other equipment	51,626,000	60,313,000	54,304,000
Shore facilities and aids to navigation	63,800,000	61,606,000	68,406,000
Personnel and related support	50,930,000	55,151,000	55,151,000
Total	389,326,000	520,200,000	407,747,660

[1] Excludes $340,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69. Excludes $1,478,000 reduction for the 0.38 percent reduction pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.
[2] Includes $96,000,000 in proposed navigation assistance fees. Also includes $10,000,000 in asset sales.

VESSELS

The Committee recommends $145,936,660 for vessel acquisition and improvements. The projected allocation of these funds is shown in the table below:

VESSELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Acquire vessels and equipment:		
Seagoing buoy tender [WLB] replacement	$123,730	$82,486
Follow-on for polar icebreaker replacement	1,000	1,000
87-foot Patrol Boat (WPB) replacement	7,000	7,000
Survey and design—cutters and boats	500	500
Great Lakes icebreaker (GLIB) replacement	110,000	40,000
Surface search radar replacement project	1,150	1,150
Repair, renovate, or improve existing vessels and small boats:		
Configuration management	3,600	3,600
Alex Haley Conversion Project	3,200	3,200
Over-the-Horizon Cutter Boats	1,500	1,500
Coast Guard Patrol Craft (WPC) Conversion Project	1,000	1,000
Polar class icebreaker reliability improvement project [RIP]	4,500	4,500
Total (new program level)	257,180	145,937

Seagoing buoy tender (WLB) replacement.—The Committee recommends $82,486,660 for the procurement of 2 Juniper class Seagoing Buoy Tenders (WLB) but defers the budget request of $41,243,340 for a third buoy tender. The reduction is without prejudice and is due to the fact that guaranteed spending greatly reduces the Committee's ability to fund other priorities that are not protected by a firewall.

Great Lakes icebreaker.—In August 1999, the Coast Guard received authorization to proceed with validation, full-scale development, and production of a vessel to replace the Mackinaw, the 56-year-old heavy icebreaker for the Great Lakes. The Committee is very supportive of retaining a heavy icebreaking capability in the Great Lakes and concurs with the Coast Guard recommendation to replace the Mackinaw with a new vessel. The Committee, however, is concerned with the estimated costs to design and build a replacement for the Mackinaw. The National Science Foundation leases the R/V Nathaniel B. Palmer, an icebreaker with capabilities similar what the Coast Guard proposed for the Great Lakes Icebreaker (GLIB). Although the Palmer cost $70,000,000 to design and build, the Coast Guard projects to spend approximately $130,000,000 on the GLIB. By another comparison, the USCG Healy, a polar icebreaker with more robust capabilities, was designed and constructed for $25,000 a ton and the GLIB will cost $52,000 a ton. The Committee urges the Coast Guard to follow the ship building acquisition strategies of the Navy, especially in regards to government design, which have proven to reduce costs.

The Committee recommends $40,000,000 and the accompanying bill provides the Commandant with the authority to enter into a contract for the GLIB on an incremental basis. If the Coast Guard provides the Committee with an additional justification of the cost and procurement strategy outlined for the GLIB, the Committee is willing to reconsider this approach in conference with the House. The Committee also directs the Department's Inspector General to certify to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that

the design specifications and requirements of the Request for Proposals (RFP) will not preclude full and fair competition.

DEEPWATER PROJECT

In fiscal year 1996, the Coast Guard received approval to initiate the Integrated Deepwater Systems project, a major acquisition of surface ships, aircraft, sensors, and communications equipment to conduct operations beyond 50 miles offshore. The Deepwater project is projected to be the largest and most expensive acquisition program in the Coast Guard's history. It also promises to be its most complex acquisition. While the Committee finds merit in an acquisition strategy that avoids a one-for-one asset replacement, the Committee is concerned that it may be too ambitious and unproven for an agency that has experienced difficulty in managing large and complex acquisition programs. In addition, the Committee remains concerned that the acquisition of Deepwater assets under this project, which is projected to reach $500,000,000 annually, is not affordable within current budget constraints and could preclude funding for other important projects, such as the modernization of the National Distress System. The Committee's concerns have been echoed by the Department's Inspector General which recently added the Deepwater program to its list of the top 12 management challenges facing the Department of Transportation. The Committee urges the Coast Guard to identify and manage the risk associated with a project of this magnitude.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the Committee recommendation fully funds the budget request of $42,300,000 to complete the functional design and proposal review phases of the Deepwater project. It is the Committee's understanding that the Coast Guard intends to request $350,000,000 for the Deepwater project in the fiscal year 2002 budget submission. The industry teams' proposals, however, are not due until April 2001 and the final decision on which assets will be replaced or modernized will not occur until July 2001. This is inconsistent with best acquisition management practices and fails to acknowledge the experience in other major procurements, such as those by the Federal Aviation Administration, which have shown that lack of certainty in design and funding increases the likelihood that projects will undergo schedule slippages and cost overruns. As this project transitions from design development to asset acquisition, the Committee urges the Coast Guard to adopt budget planning practices that use information available from the industry teams to develop cost and schedule estimates to justify the fiscal year 2002 budget request. The Committee also directs the Coast Guard to identify in their fiscal year 2002 budget justification specific assets to be acquired or modernized, the quantity requested, and the cost associated with each item. Failure to provide this justification will contribute to the already substantial challenge of meeting the projected budgetary requirements for outyear funding of this project.

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft procurement, the Committee recommends $41,650,000. Funds for aircraft acquisitions are distributed as follows:

AIRCRAFT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
HH–65 helicoper mission computer unit replacement	3,650	3,650
HH–65 LTS–101 engine life cycle cost reduction	1,000	11,000
Aviation simulator modernization project	3,000	3,000
Coast Guard cutter Healy aviation support	36,000	24,000
Total	43,650	41,650

HH–65 helicopter engine.—The Committee recommends $11,000,000 for the HH–65 LTS–101 engine life cycle cost reduction, an increase of $10,000,000 above the budget estimate. The increased funding is specifically to initiate the non-recurring engineering phase of the HH–65 engine power restoration program. Due to aircraft modifications and the Rescue Swimmer requirement, additional weight has been added to the HH–65 helicopter without comparable improvements in engine performance. The Coast Guard has identified the need to improve the performance of the LTS–101 engine to extend the mission endurance, range, and on-station time of the HH–65 helicopter.

The Committee believes the power restoration initiative complements the life cycle cost reduction program and that by accelerating this program, the Coast Guard will develop an improved engine capability more efficiently.

USCG Cutter Healy aviation support.—The Committee recommends $24,000,000 for the procurement of two HH–65 aircraft and associated equipment to support polar icebreaking operations. The Committee recommendation deletes $12,000,000 and the request to acquire a third airframe due to budget constraints.

OTHER EQUIPMENT

The Committee recommends $54,304,000 for other equipment. The following table displays the project allocations:

OTHER EQUIPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Fleet logistics system [FLS]	5,500	5,500
Ports and waterways safety system [PAWSS]	8,100	7,550
Marine information for safety and law enforcement [MISLE]	8,500	8,500
Defense message system [DMS] impementation	2,471	2,471
Global maritime distress and safety system (GMDSS)	3,083	3,083
Personnel management information system/joint uniform military pay system II	2,000	2,000

OTHER EQUIPMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Aviation logistics management information system [ALMIS]	1,100	1,100
National distress system modernization	22,000	22,000
Search and rescue capabilities enhancement project	1,500	1,500
Commercial satellite communication upgrade	5,459	.....
Local notice to mariners (LNM) automation	600	600
Total	60,313	54,304

Ports and waterways safety systems.—The Committee recommends $7,550,000 for installation of the Ports and Waterway Safety System at Berwick Bay, Louisiana and Sault Saint Marie. The Committee recommendation is $3,050,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level and $550,000 below the budget request. The Committee believes that the recommended level is sufficient and urges the Coast Guard to reduce unnecessary costs associated with the system.

National Distress System.—The Committee has provided $22,000,000 for the National Distress and Response System (NDRS) modernization project. The Committee urges the Coast Guard to expeditiously develop an upgraded system.

Commercial satellite communications.—The Committee defers the $5,459,000 requested for the acquisition of commercial satellite communications equipment. The Committee has provided funding for this project in another appropriations act.

SHORE FACILITIES AND AIDS TO NAVIGATION

The program level recommended is $68,406,000.

SHORE FACILITIES AND AIDS TO NAVIGATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Shore—General:		
Survey and design shore projects	7,000	7,000
Minor AC&I shore construction projects	8,000	8,000
Coast Guard housing	12,400	12,400
Shore—Air stations: Renovate air station hangar, Kodiak	8,200	8,200
Shore—Centers/groups/stations:		
Transportation improvements—Coast Guard Island, Alameda, CA	8,000	8,000
Coast Guard medium endurance cutter waterfront improvements, Portsmouth, VA	2,400	2,400
Homeporting pier construction—Homer, AK	.....	5,800
Modernize CG facilities—based, Cape May, NJ	5,800	5,800
Rebuild CG Station, Port Huron, MI—Phase I	1,300	1,300
Modernize air station, Port Angeles hangar, Port Angeles, WA	3,800	3,800
Helipad modernization, Craig, AK	.....	1,000

SHORE FACILITIES AND AIDS TO NAVIGATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Aids to navigation facilities: Waterways aids-to-navigation projects	4,706	4,706
Total	61,606	68,406

PERSONNEL AND RELATED SUPPORT

The program level recommended is $55,151,000. Within the amount provided, $1,000,000 shall be for core acquisition costs. The Committee has provided the full amount requested for AC&I personnel and related support.

BILL LANGUAGE

Capital investment plan.—The Committee is extremely disappointed that the administration ignored the provision in last year's act requiring the submission of a 5-year capital investment plan no later than the date of the initial submission of the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request. The Committee does not request reports unnecessarily, and the failure to deliver this particular report suggests that there are systemic failures in the planning and budgeting of capital assets. The Committee has included a provision which prohibits the obligation of funds made available for the Integrated Deepwater Replacement Project until the report is delivered to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Disposal of real property.—The bill includes a provision crediting to this appropriation proceeds from the sale or lease of the Coast Guard's surplus property. The bill does not include language that the administration requested which would have reduced appropriations under this heading as asset sales or leases are realized. This Committee believes that would provide a disincentive for the timely disposal of surplus property.

GENERAL PROVISION

Quarterly acquisition reports.—The Committee has included a general provision reinstating a requirement that the Coast Guard submit a quarterly report regarding the status of major acquisition programs.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$17,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	16,700,000
Committee recommendation	16,700,000

[1] Excludes $11,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69. Excludes $65,000 reduction for the 0.38 percent reduction pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

The Environmental Compliance and Restoration account provides funds to address environmental problems at former and current Coast Guard units as required by applicable Federal, State, and local environmental laws and regulations. Planned expenditures for

these funds include major upgrades to petroleum and regulated-substance storage tanks, restoration of contaminated ground water and soils, remediation efforts at hazardous substance disposal sites, and initial site surveys and actions necessary to bring Coast Guard shore facilities and vessels into compliance with environmental laws and regulations.

The accompanying bill provides $16,700,000 for environmental compliance and restoration. The recommendation is the same as the budget request and $300,000 less the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. Within the amount provided, the Commandant is directed to provide $100,000 in reimbursement to the current owner of the former Coast Guard lighthouse facility at Cape May, New Jersey for costs incurred for clean-up of lead contaminated soil at that facility. This reimbursement shall be made only if such payment is authorized in law.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000[1]	$15,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001[2]	
Committee recommendation	15,500,000

[1] Excludes $57,000 reduction for the 0.38 percent reduction pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.
[2] Up to $11,000,000 which will be reimbursed from Federal-aid highways.

The "Alteration of bridges" appropriation provides funds for the Coast Guard's share of the cost of altering or removing bridges obstructive to navigation. Under the provisions of the Truman-Hobbs Act of June 21, 1940, as amended (33 U.S.C. 511 et seq.), the Coast Guard, as the Federal Government's agent, is required to share with owners the cost of altering railroad and publicly owned highway bridges which obstruct the free movement of navigation on navigable waters of the United States in accordance with the formula established in 33 U.S.C. 516.

The administration has not requested appropriated funds for the alteration of bridges that are unreasonable obstructions to maritime trade and transportation. Instead, the President's budget requests funding from the Federal-Aid Highways program for the alternation of highway bridges, with program administration remaining under the Coast Guard. The Committee disagrees with this approach because it is inconsistent with the purpose of the Truman-Hobbs Act. Also, it would preclude funding for modifications to railroad bridges which impede marine navigation because they are not eligible under the Federal-Aid Highway program.

The Committee has provided an appropriation from the highway trust fund of $15,500,000 for the alteration of bridges, which is $500,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level and $4,500,000 more than the highway trust fund limitation requested by the administration. The Committee recommendation is to be distributed as follows:

	Committee recommendation
Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA	$3,750,000
Sidney Lanier Bridge, Brunswick, GA	2,000,000
CSX Railroad Bridge, Mobile, AL	3,750,000

	Committee recommendation
Elign, Joliet, and Eastern RR Bridge, Divine, IL	3,000,000
Limehouse Highway Bridge, Johns Island, SC	3,000,000
Total	15,500,000

RETIRED PAY

Appropriations, 2000 (mandatory)	$730,327,000
Budget estimate, 2001 (mandatory)	778,000,000
Committee recommendation (mandatory)	778,000,000

The "Retired pay" appropriation provides for retired pay of military personnel of the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve, members of the former Lighthouse Service, and for annuities payable to beneficiaries of retired military personnel under the retired serviceman's family protection plan (10 U.S.C. 1431–1446) and survivor benefit plan (10 U.S.C. 1447–1455), and for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act. The average number of personnel on the retired rolls is estimated to be 33,499 in fiscal year 2001, as compared with an estimated 32,684 in fiscal year 2000 and 31,812 in fiscal year 1999.

RESERVE TRAINING

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$72,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	73,371,000
Committee recommendation	80,371,000

[1] Excludes $48,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.

Under the provisions of 14 U.S.C. 145, the Secretary of Transportation is required to adequately support the development and training of a Reserve force to ensure that the Coast Guard will be sufficiently organized, manned, and equipped to fully perform its wartime missions. The purpose of the Reserve training program is to provide trained units and qualified persons for active duty in the Coast Guard in time of war or national emergency, or at such other times as the national security requires. Coast Guard reservists must also train for mobilization assignments that are unique to the Coast Guard in times of war, such as port security operations associated with the Coast Guard's Maritime Defense Zone [MDZ] mission and include deployable port security units.

The Committee has included $80,371,000 for reserve training. This is $7,000,000 above the budget request and $8,371,000 more than last year's enacted level. The administration proposed reducing more than 700 reserve billets to support a Selected Reserve strength of 7,300. The Coast Guard would implement this reduction in reserve personnel by reducing accessions and offering enlisted and commissioned reservists voluntary separations, and if necessary seek involuntary separations. The administration also recommended a commensurate reduction to the number of full-time support personnel assigned to the Reserve. This request is counterproductive to an organization with pressing readiness concerns, considering that Reservists are largely integrated into active component commands and perform virtually all the operational duties of their active duty counterparts. Furthermore, it contradicts the aggressive 3-year recruiting effort to eliminate the personnel shortfall below the level of 8,000 which was reached at the beginning

of fiscal year 2000. The Committee recommendation fully maintains a Selected Reserve level of at least 8,000 and provides Reserve training funding as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Functional program element	Fiscal year 2000 levels [1]	Fiscal year 2001 estimate (7,300 SELRES)	Committee recommendation (8,000 SELRES)
Initial training	2,581	2,650	4,170
Continuing training	43,844	45,574	49,429
Operation and maintenance support	15,672	15,915	16,398
Program management and administration	9,903	9,232	10,374
Total	72,000	73,371	80,371

[1] Excludes $48,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$15,500,000	$3,500,000	$19,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	17,820,000	3,500,000	21,320,000
Committee recommendation	17,820,000	3,500,000	21,320,000

[1] Excludes $7,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.

The Coast Guard's Research and Development Program seeks to improve the tools and techniques with which Coast Guard carries out its varied operational missions and to increase the knowledge base upon which it depends to fulfill its regulatory responsibilities.

The Committee recommends a funding level of $21,320,000 for research and development projects, which is $2,320,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. Of this amount $3,500,000 is to be derived from the oil spill liability trust fund. This recommendation is consistent with the budget request.

Budget justification.—The Committee is disappointed by the lack of specificity in the budget justification for RDT&E projects and funding as well as by non-responsive answers to hearing questions. The Committee expects the Coast Guard in its fiscal year 2002 budget justification to submit detailed funding data and project descriptions for each of the seven programs in the RDT&E appropriation.

Marine Environmental Protection.—The Committee has included not less than $1,000,000 to continue the development and testing of methods to verify appropriate ship ballast exchange to ensure that alien aquatic species are not introduced into American waterways.

Inspector general report.—The Committee is concerned that the research and development program lacks focus and is uncertain of the contribution of research activities to acquisition programs and the agency's operational capability. To exercise appropriate congressional oversight, the Committee believes it would be beneficial for an external review of this program. The Committee directs the Department's Inspector General to conduct a systematic analysis of the Coast Guard's research and development program. The Inspector General should analyze the management and direction of re-

search and the allocation of funds. The report should also examine if the Coast Guard has sufficiently defined how individual projects further the Department's performance goals.

BOAT SAFETY

(AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000 (mandatory)	$64,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 (mandatory)	64,000,000
Committee recommendation (mandatory)	64,000,000

This account provides financial assistance for a coordinated National Recreational Boating Safety Program for the several States. Title 46, United States Code, section 13106, establishes a "Boat safety" account from which the Secretary may allocate and distribute matching funds to assist in the development, administration, and financing of qualifying State programs. The "Boat safety" account consists of amounts transferred from the highway trust fund which are derived from the motorboat fuel tax (18.4 cents per gallon).

The Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century provides $64,000,000 of mandatory funding from the "Aquatic Resources Trust fund" annually for this program. Of this amount, $59,000,000 is provided for grants to States and $5,000,000 for Coast Guard administration. The President's budget requests no discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2000.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROGRAM

The Federal Aviation Administration traces its origins to the Air Commerce Act of 1926, but more recently to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which established the independent Federal Aviation Agency from functions which had resided in the Airways Modernization Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and parts of the Civil Aeronautics Board. FAA became an administration of the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967, pursuant to the Department of Transportation Act (October 15, 1966).

The total recommended program level for the FAA for fiscal year 2001 amounts to $12,540,358,000. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2000 enacted	2001 budget estimate	
Operations [1]	5,900,000	6,592,235	[2] 6,470,250
Direct appropriation	.....	5,587,235	6,350,250
Secretary's discretionary transfer authority	.....	.....	100,000
User fees: Budget authority (mandatory) [3]	.....	1,005,000	50,000
Facilities and equipment [4]	2,075,000	2,495,000	2,656,765
Research, engineering, and development	156,495	184,366	183,343
Airport improvement program [5]	1,950,000	1,950,000	3,200,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2000 enacted	2001 budget estimate	
Total available budget resources	10,081,495	11,221,601	12,540,358

[1] Excludes fiscal year 2000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.
[2] Includes $120,000,000 available from the Airport Improvement Program if necessary to maintain aviation safety.
[3] Includes $965,000,000 new user fees proposed in President's budget request.
[4] Excludes fiscal year 2000 rescission of prior year balances pursuant to Public Law 106–69.
[5] Excludes fiscal year 2000 reduction pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

The FAA is a complex and multilayered organization that consistently defies any rational management models. The organization has the best and the worst organizational characteristics of a bureaucracy: intense stability and intense resistance to change. Accordingly, technological modernization of air traffic systems, streamlining of regulatory processes, personnel changes, accounting changes, and program reviews meet broad institutional resistance while the entire organization would ostensibly concur with the goal of each such initiative.

The FAA was reauthorized in early 2000 and unprecedented resources for the Facilities and Equipment and Airport Improvement Program accounts were authorized. The Committee recommendation has made every attempt to honor those authorized levels in the hope that these additional resources may help alleviate the anticipated capacity constraints that accompany increased air traffic operations and passenger enplanements. However, the Committee anticipates that the solution to the aviation industries' growing pains is not simply one of committing more Federal resources to infrastructure investment or air traffic control modernization, as important as those investments are. Unfortunately, the formula for growing the capacity of the nation's airways is one that cannot be solved without increased efficiency and substantial managerial improvement at the FAA in all aspects of its missions; two goals that have been elusive or unattainable to date.

For the past several years, the Committee has focused aviation capital investment on airport infrastructure, on technology that will allow airports and the airlines to be more efficient, and on technology and process changes that will increase the efficiency of the air traffic control system and personnel. While the progress is not as rapid as the Committee would like and the promised efficiencies from the new controller agreement have yet to be realized, the Committee anticipates that the pressures on the operations account culminating from the FAA's failure to manage its workforce or program to appropriated levels combined with the increased pressure on those accounts from the focus of the recently enacted and signed Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (FAIR 21) on the capital accounts will necessitate a comprehensive reevaluation of the agency's approach to operational functions.

It's also important to note that FAA's budget growth has come in an environment where their workload has only grown 2 percent over the past 10 years. The FAA moves airplanes, not passengers and operations are currently projected to grow at an average 2.1

percent per year over the next 10 years which is far in excess of the historical experience. The estimate for operations growth from fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2001 is 1.5 percent. Traditionally, the FAA's estimates have been high by 50–100 percent on enplanements and by slightly less on operations. But, assuming the projections are correct (even though they are being made in a period of unprecedented economic growth), the FAA's appropriation will undoubtably continue to outpace, in percentage terms, the growth in the FAA's workload. Unfortunately, the missing piece of the equation is significant productivity gains and cost saving measures on the part of the FAA.

The President's budget request for the FAA proposed more than 10 percent growth over last year's appropriation. The budget request is not lean, particularly when viewed in the context of the current budgetary constraints and compared to other agencies in the Federal Government, or even within the Department of Transportation.

Since the submission of the budget request, the Congress has passed and the President has signed an authorization for the FAA which envisions an appropriation for the agency in excess of $12,600,000,000, more than 25 percent growth over fiscal year 2000. Given the budgetary constraints facing the Committee, this level of growth is difficult to sustain and absent some dramatic change in the performance of the FAA in program execution, is difficult to justify on any objective measure. The focus of the Congress and the Administration should not be on whether we are committed to spending increased resources on the FAA—clearly that question is answered by how much scarce Federal resources have been committed to the FAA. The question that remains is whether the FAA is capable of spending these resources wisely and whether this spending will translate into increased aviation safety and productivity.

Clearly, some of the refocusing that the FAA Administrator has done with the Facilities and Equipment budget—emphasizing the Free Flight Phase I initiative, for example—provides the Committee with a sense that the agency's modernization priorities are becoming more aligned with the Congressional focus. However, some of the continuing problems with some of the Agency's largest procurements fuel concern that the agency continues to face substantial difficulties in the administration of major procurements. Clearly, there is a critical need for continued, and perhaps increased oversight, from within the FAA, and from organizations like the Department of Transportation Inspector General, the General Accounting Office, and the Congress.

Expenditures on FAA programs continue to exceed the taxes paid into the aviation trust fund, demonstrating the importance the Congress places on maintaining a robust investment in the air transportation system. The Committee's focus as we review the FAA's programs is on how to do things better, not how to insulate the FAA from oversight or to create additional restraints on the FAA Administrator's attempts to manage the agency.

OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$5,900,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	6,592,235,000
Committee recommendation	[2] 6,470,250,000

[1] Excludes reduction of $6,610,000 for TASC pursuant to Public Law 106–69.
[2] Includes $120,000,000 available from the Airport Improvement Program if necessary to maintain aviation safety.

FAA's "Operations" appropriation provides funds for the operation, maintenance, communications, and logistic support of the air traffic control and navigation systems and activities. It also covers the administration and management of the regulatory, commercial space, medical, engineering, and development programs.

User fees.—The administration proposed to collect $965,000,000 in new user fee taxes from commercial aviation users of the air traffic control system. The fees would be available for appropriation only for aviation purposes. The administration, at the time of the submission of the budget request, also estimated collecting $22,000,000 of the $50,000,000 authorized in overflight fees for fiscal year 2001. These fees are to be available without Appropriations Committee action for the essential air service program (under the Office of the Secretary of Transportation) and rural airport safety.

FAA's operations costs have risen from $3,800,000,000 in 1990 to nearly $6,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 and these figures continue to rise. FAA's fiscal year 2001 operations budget request of almost $6,600,000,000 is a 12 percent increase over fiscal year 2000 figures. By 2003, FAA projects its Operations account will grow to about $7,200,000,000. This Committee has repeatedly cautioned that FAA's operations costs need to be contained. In fiscal year 1999, FAA faced an operations shortfall of over $280,000,000 which required cuts in safety and non-safety programs alike. This year the agency requested a $77,000,000 supplemental appropriation to fund operations activities such as controller training and contract maintenance for the air traffic control system. These shortfalls are clear examples of the need for FAA to contain its rising costs of operations.

Provisions of FAIR 21 underscore the need for FAA to substantially improve its fiscal management. FAIR 21 provides FAA with $18,500,000,000 in committed funding for capital investment over the next 3 years but provides only enough trust fund revenue to meet about 65 percent of FAA's projected operations requirements for that period. In addition, the significant increases in capital investment provided by FAIR 21 will require improvements in FAA's oversight of its contracting actions. This must include ensuring that independent government cost estimates are prepared, reflect accurate pricing, and are not inflated. Audits of proposed contract costs and actual charges are also necessary. Since 1996, FAA's reliance on Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) has dropped significantly as evidenced by the number of audits performed. For example, in 1996 approximately 185 DCAA audits were performed on FAA contracts. However, in 1999, the number of audits had dropped to only 37. To protect the increased capital investment provided by FAIR 21, the Committee expects that FAA will obtain the

needed contract audit support from DCAA and the DOT IG is instructed to monitor FAA's progress in this regard.

The need for FAA to improve its fiscal responsibility is clear. In February of this year, the DOT IG testified before this Committee that a necessary tool for improving FAA's fiscal management was development of a strategic business plan. This plan should, at a minimum, (1) describe corporate strategies and operating plans, (2) define long-term capital requirements and strategies for investing in infrastructure and future technology, and (3) provide strategies for controlling costs and enhancing productivity. The Committee agrees that such a plan would be beneficial providing that it is specific enough to identify savings and efficiencies at all levels of the agency. The Committee is specifically concerned about FAA's oversight of areas particularly susceptible to waste and abuse such as extended employee travel, substantial delinquencies involving employee use of government credit cards, and curbing employee parking at private garages where other DOT agencies do not offer similar benefits. Accordingly, the DOT IG is instructed to evaluate FAA's actions in these areas and report on their results.

The bill includes $4,414,869,000 for the operations activities of the Federal Aviation Administration from the airport and airway trust fund. An additional $120,000,000 is made available from the airport and airway trust fund for air traffic services through the AIP program. The balance of the operations appropriation will come from the general fund.

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

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendation in comparison to the budget estimate:

[In thousands of dollars]

	2000 program level [1]	2001 budget estimate	Committee recommendations
Air traffic services	4,648,907	5,210,434	[2] 5,159,391
Aviation regulation and certification	640,162	691,979	691,979
Civil aviation security	131,474	144,328	138,462
Research and acquisitions	174,083	196,497	182,401
Commercial space transportation	6,560	12,607	10,000
Regional coordination	95,321		99,347
Human resources	52,809		49,906
Financial services	38,981		43,000
Staff offices	73,093	[3] 336,390	95,764
Essential air service	32,000	([4])	([5])
Total	5,893,390	6,592,235	6,470,250
New user fees		(965,000)	
Appropriated funds		6,592,235	6,470,250

[In thousands of dollars]

	2000 program level [1]	2001 budget estimate	Committee recommendations
Secretary's discretionary transfer authority ..	.....	.....	100,000
Total available funds	5,893,390	6,592,235	6,570,250

[1] Includes $6,610,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.
[2] Includes $120,000,000 available from the Airport Improvement Program if necessary to maintain aviation safety.
[3] Proposes to consolidate Human resources, Region/center operations, and Financial services into the Staff offices line of business in fiscal year 2001.
[4] Proposes that the Essential air service (EAS) payment be paid out of the Airport Improvement Program in fiscal year 2001.
[5] Includes funds generated by overflight user fee and fiscal year 2001 payment.

AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES

The Committee recommendation makes available a total of $5,159,391,000 for the operation and maintenance of the national air traffic control and flight service system.

The Committee is confident that this level, although constrained, is sufficient for air traffic services and offers the following analysis for illustration of the flexibility represented by the Committee's recommendation. The requirements for funding for this activity could be predicated on a series of adjustments to the prior fiscal year appropriated level. Initially, the appropriation could be adjusted downward for the overflight fees that were not forthcoming in prior fiscal years, but are currently anticipated at a level of $22,100,000 for fiscal year 2001. The Administrator and the Secretary have both indicated that the FAA has been able to maintain a safe air traffic control environment notwithstanding the inability to access the revenues that would have come from these fees although the administration has proposed supplemental funding that has yet to be enacted. In addition, substantial controller staff years in this appropriation are directly attributable solely to union activities and over $62,000,000 is attributable to direct overtime staffing. Given the high level of staff-years committed to union activities viewed in conjunction with the seemingly unalterable trend for substantial reliance on overtime staffing, the Committee encourages the Federal Aviation Administration to pursue greater flexibility in staffing arrangements to reduce the current reliance on overtime.

While the Committee does not recommend reducing the appropriation by the approximately 38 percent growth in overtime staffing over the past 2 years and the over $200,000,000 of other special pay allotments, the FAA should pursue efficiencies that would result from a greater coordination of activities in this area. Reductions have been assumed for $65,726,000 in NAS plan handoff costs above the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level and for other savings discussed elsewhere in the report.

Further, the Committee notes that the FAA forecasting of aviation activity has tended to be overly optimistic as discussed later in this report. The FAA has consistently overestimated future aviation activity which has a cascading impact on the Air Traffic Services budget as it takes 3 to 5 years to fully train a new controller. Overestimates in the need for new controllers 5 years from now will likely lead to significant future expenditures for unnecessary

resources. Air traffic control operation costs continue to increase faster than demand for FAA air traffic control services. The high likelihood that future FAA workloads are overestimated provide ample guidance for FAA management adjustments as resource constraints are addressed.

In addition, the FAA must increase the efficiency of the air traffic control work force. Some of those possible efficiencies are mentioned in this and other reports. The average annual growth in operations at air traffic control towers, en route centers, and flight service stations from 1992 to 1997 has been 0.05 percent, 2.13 percent, and 0.55 percent, respectively. Current average aircraft handled per hour at en route centers are just over 3 per controller hour, and current average operations per hour at air traffic control towers are approximately 6 per controller hour. Those averages would seem to indicate that there is some room for improvement in controller efficiency or staffing coordination.

The Committee is confident that careful management of the funds provided in this act will ensure sufficient resources are available to cover the substantial salary increases contained in the controller's pay agreement.

Maintenance concerns.—The Committee is aware of increasing concerns and complaints about the FAA's decisions to impose agency-wide spending restrictions on activities funded by the operations appropriation while excluding other similar activities elsewhere in the account from similar restrictions. The Committee has refrained from earmarking more money for specific items such as staffing and training in the operations account to provide the maximum level of flexibility for the Administrator as she manages the FAA workforce but reiterates the concern that adequate resources are committed to maintaining the FAA's capital plant.

Remote maintenance and monitoring.—The Committee recommendation includes $350,000 for expansion of RMMS to Beaumont and Longview, Texas. The Committee encourages the FAA to explore remote certification and maintenance options for older, remotely located radar systems. The Committee understands that COTS technology allows for remote maintenance and certification of several systems in the FAA inventory by continuously measuring the facility's critical performance parameters and transmitting the test results through a standard phone line to appropriate FAA officials. The Committee recommendation includes funds for a greater exploration and implementation of RMM capabilities.

Contract tower program.—The Committee recommendation includes $55,300,000 for the contract tower program as well as $5,000,000 for the contract tower cost-sharing program. The $5,000,000 is in addition to those funds provided for the regular contract tower program.

The Department of Transportation's Inspector General has found that the contract tower program has provided level I air traffic control services at a lower cost for 110 towers previously operated by the FAA and provided air traffic control services at 50 towers the FAA could not have afforded to staff.

The cost sharing program allows those towers that fall below the FAA threshold to participate in the program by contributing a local match. This program enables small airports to have their tower

staffed with an FAA certified air traffic controller; thereby ensuring the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.

The program continues to receive strong user and airport support as a cost-effective way to enhance aviation safety. Additionally, the Department of Transportation Inspector General just completed a new audit of the program validating its safety and cost benefits and the National Transportation Safety Board has added its support. The Committee continues to fully support this program and the contract tower cost-sharing program. Therefore, the bill includes resources to fully fund the contract tower program including a pilot program to expand the program at the discretion of the Administrator to two visual flight rule (VFR) air traffic control towers operated by the FAA, and additional funds are provided for the cost-sharing program. It should be noted that the Committee is concerned that earlier this year the FAA considered contract tower funding reductions that could have eliminated nearly half the airports that benefit from the program. No such program cuts should be proposed in the future because aviation safety would be jeopardized and the FAA effectively would be penalizing a program that has proved its cost effectiveness and its significant aviation safety benefits. The Committee understands that the appropriated levels for contract tower operations are sufficient to maintain operations at all eligible contract tower facilities.

Within 60 days of enactment of this Act, the FAA Administrator is directed to provide to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee the plan proposing the extension of the contract tower program requested in prior appropriations bills. The plan should identify potential cost savings and other benefits, such as the positive impact on controller staffing at busier FAA air traffic facilities, and include a timeline for expanding the contract tower program to these facilities during the fiscal year. Average savings from the current contract tower program as compared to an FAA managed baseline average about $250,000 per facility annually. Accordingly, since the savings should be greater with a former level II or III VFR tower, the Committee believes that savings from expanding the program to two towers offer substantial savings.

Inclusion of Olive Branch Airport, Henderson Airport, and Tupelo Municipal Airport in the contract tower program.—The Committee bill recommendation includes funding for inclusion of the Olive Branch, Henderson, and Tupelo Municipal Airports in the contract tower program. It is the Committee's understanding that these airports are eligible for the program and encourages the FAA to work with the local airport authority to facilitate its participation in the program.

Lawton Air Traffic Control Tower.—The Committee has been advised that the U.S. Army intends to discontinue operation of the Fort Sill Army Radar Approach Control (ARAC) at the Henry Post Army Airfield. Accordingly, the Committee directs the FAA to work with the local aviation officials to facilitate the transfer of the operation of that facility or coordination of a joint operational agreement that will continue the operation of air traffic control services in that airspace in an appropriate manner that will preserve aviation safety and efficient airspace management. The Committee rec-

ommendation provides up to $1,500,000 for a continuation of air traffic control services in that airspace.

Introduction of Regional Jets.—The Committee directs the FAA to develop strategies and procedures to maximize the efficiency of the National Airspace System (NAS) as it relates to the integration of increased operations of regional jets at the nations most congested airports. This initiative should include strategies to maximize the use of runway 11/29 at Newark International airport by all aircraft and investigating the impacts of the integration of regional jet operations on air traffic efficiency in the New York TRACON airspace and balancing current traffic flows to maximize airspace capacity for arrivals and departures in that airspace. FAA should consult and collaborate with all impacted airport sponsors and airport users to develop and implement procedures pursuant to this effort.

GPS approaches.—The Committee recommendation includes sufficient funds to continue the FAA's work on GPS approaches and to initiate preliminary consideration and analysis of GPS approaches for helipads to be integrated with helipad lighting design, in addition to the funds made available in the Airport Improvement Program account. The Committee recommendation also includes funding for a GPS approach for Bert Mooney Airport in Butte, MT.

National airspace redesign.—Of the funds appropriated for this activity, the $8,500,000 for the NY/NJ Airspace Redesign cannot be reprogrammed by the FAA for other activities, including airspace redesign activities outside the NY/NJ metro area.

Oceanic Traffic Services.—Given the difficulty that the FAA has experienced in modernizing the oceanic service function, the Committee has once again provided discretionary authority to the FAA Administrator permitting the contracting out of the oceanic services function. The Committee notes that the FAA Administrator has the discretion under this authority to establish requisite staffing standards and requirements. The demands on the air traffic routes in the Pacific and the North Atlantic desperately require the capacity enhancement that technological and operational modernization promises for oceanic services. The Committee will continue to watch the progress of the procurement for improved oceanic communications closely and would anticipate that the FAA Administrator would avail herself of the authority granted to the agency in the areas of procurement reform and in this legislation that permit her great flexibility in modernizing this system. The Committee emphasizes that this authority is permissive as opposed to directive and encourages the FAA Administrator to exercise this authority if the agency continues to experience difficulty in the modernization of this capability.

The Committee also notes that the FAA elected to pay the potential contractors to participate in the procurement and anticipates that there will be no slippage from the current schedule. Given the pay to participate scenario that the FAA is currently operating under, if the schedule does slip, the Committee assumes any unsolicited proposal that promises a cost effective alternative system would be given every appropriate consideration. Further, recognizing the immediate benefits of improved oceanic communication,

particularly over the Pacific, the Committee urges the Administrator to field an operational system in Anchorage, Alaska and Oakland, California within 12 months of contract signing.

NAS Handoff.—The Committee recommendation includes $69,700,000 for NAS handoff activities. This is the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000. The Committee notes that the FAA anticipates spending only $44,400,000 on NAS handoff activities in fiscal year 2000 and that only $13,000,000 will come from the Operations appropriations under current execution plans at the FAA. The Committee assumes that appropriate notification to the Committees on Appropriations will occur as the FAA executes this and other activities.

Training.—The Committee notes and commends the FAA on its commitment to operational training over the past several years in light of budgetary constraints and competing operational priorities. However, the Committee remains concerned about the short term pressure on training resources in light of immediate budgetary pressures. Specifically, the Committee is concerned that the requested operational training program levels appear inadequate to meet the required controller proficiency and developmental training requirement to maintain operational safety and improve efficiency. In addition, the Committee is concerned that the FAA has slipped into a practice of utilizing members of the Controller Work Force (CWF) rather than the Air Traffic Instructional Services (ATIS) program contract. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation includes $23,000,000, which is less than the $25,000,000 in training needs identified by the ATC facilities participating in the ATIS program for training activities under the training contract. Further, the Committee directs that the FAA not utilize CWF members for this training if such utilization would result in an increase in the direct or indirect use of overtime funds. Within the limitations of this policy, the Committee expects the Administrator to ensure that controllers are fully trained for their programmed positions at tower, TRACON, and center facilities, especially at the nation's busier facilities during the summer travel season. The Committee further directs the FAA to coordinate with the Committee before utilizing these funds for any activities other than air traffic instructional services training at field facilities for developmental and proficiency training of controllers.

Adak, Alaska.—The Committee directs the FAA to report on the condition of existing aviation infrastructure at Adak, Alaska and the necessary improvements for safety and improved efficiency for aviation commercialization.

NIOSH study.—The Committee notes the great challenges pilots flying in remote locations of Alaska face from severe climatic conditions, extreme geographical features including the nation's highest mountain ranges, and an inadequate aviation infrastructure such as basic runway lights, in an area one-fifth the size of the continental United States. It strongly supports the interagency cooperative effort of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), the National Transportation Safety Board, other Federal, State, and private parties, and FAA efforts to improve aviation safety in the State through cooperative review and enhancement of safety procedures and practices. The Committee di-

rects FAA to continue its participation in this important endeavor at existing levels.

AVIATION REGULATION AND CERTIFICATION

The Committee provides $691,979,000 for aviation regulation and certification, the same level as the budget request.

Aviation safety program.—FAA's flight standards service conducts a program known as the aviation safety program (ASP), which produces and distributes safety educational programs and materials for general aviation pilots. Since the large majority of aviation accidents in this country are general aviation accidents, the Committee believes this is a valuable program and should not be reduced in funding below the fiscal year 2000 level.

Boeing 737 flight data recorders.—Appropriate consideration should be given to ensure that the technological feasibility of any final rule requiring airlines to further upgrade and retrofit flight data recorders on all 737 aircraft. Timeframes established for compliance should be realistic and to the extent consistent with safety, the FAA is encouraged to offer appropriate relief to carriers which have been aggressive and early in terms of compliance with existing FAA regulations in this area. Carriers should have incentives to comply with FAA safety regulations early and to be aggressive in their implementation schedules. When a carrier has demonstrated such aggressiveness and early compliance, the FAA Administrator should, consistent with other safety considerations, consider that behavior when promulgating follow on rulemakings. To fail to do so could provide a strong disincentive to implement safety enhancements any sooner than absolutely necessary under existing law or regulation.

CIVIL AVIATION SECURITY

The Committee provides $138,462,000 for civil aviation security. The Committee has provided substantial budgetary increases for FAA's civil aviation security function over the past several years, and yet has difficulty determining whether those additional resources are translating into substantial improvements in aviation security. The FAA is directed to develop and submit with the fiscal year 2002 budget request the strategic plan for pursuit of the civil aviation security program recommended by the Inspector General in 1998.

RESEARCH AND ACQUISITIONS

The Committee provides $182,401,000 for research and acquisition, an increase of 8 percent above the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The Committee believes this level to be adequate for the activities of this office coordinating the financing, planning, and management of the FAA's acquisition and research functions.

Next generation e-mail.—The Committee recommends an increase of $4,000,000 above the fiscal year 2000 level for improvements to the FAA's e-mail systems.

Telecommunications bandwidth.—The Committee recommendation defers the requested upgrades to the bandwidth of certain telecommunications systems.

COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION

The Committee provides $10,000,000 for the Office of Commercial Space Transportation. The reduction below the budget request is made without prejudice due to budgetary constraints. The Committee notes that the recommended amount provided by the Committee represents an increase of 46 percent above fiscal year 2000 levels.

FINANCIAL SERVICES

The Committee provides $43,000,000 for financial services, an increase of 2.4 percent above fiscal year 2000 levels.

Restraints on growth.—The budget request envisioned substantial funding for new program initiatives or programmatic growth that cannot be accommodated given the budget constraints facing the operations account. While providing resources that accommodate the base funding levels for these initiatives, the Committee recommendation does not fully fund the new initiatives. A comparison of some of these initiatives with recommended levels is presented below.

Activity	Fiscal year—	
	2000 enacted	2001 recommendation
DELPHI implementation	$100,000	$3,800,000
IPPS replacement	50,000	4,400,000
Asset management	2,516,000	3,000,000

HUMAN RESOURCES

The Committee provides $49,906,000 for human resources, an increase of 2.4 percent above the fiscal year 2000 level. The reduction is due to budget constraints and is made without prejudice. The budget request presented this office under the request for "staff offices." The Committee bill maintains the budget presentation enacted in prior fiscal years and encourages the FAA to present the request for fiscal year 2002 consistent with the structure in this, and last year's, appropriations legislation.

REGIONAL COORDINATION

The Committee provides $99,347,000 for regional coordination, an increase of 1.5 percent above the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The budget request presented this funding in the "Staff offices" request. The Committee bill maintains the budgeting approach enacted in fiscal year 2000.

STAFF OFFICES

The Committee provides $95,764,000 for staff offices, which is 22 percent above the fiscal year 2000 enacted level.

Second career training program.—The Committee has included bill language which was included in the President's budget request which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for the second career training program. This prohibition has been carried in annual appropriations acts for many years.

Sunday premium pay.—The bill retains a provision, first included in the fiscal year 1995 appropriations bill, which prohibits FAA from paying Sunday premium pay, except in those cases where the individual actually worked on a Sunday. This provision is identical to that which was in effect for fiscal years 1995–2000. It was requested by the administration for fiscal year 2001.

Manned auxiliary flight service stations.—The Committee has retained bill language which was requested by the administration to prohibit the use of funds for operating a manned auxiliary flight service station in the contiguous United States. There is no funding provided in the "Operations" account for such stations in fiscal year 2001.

Secretary's discretionary transfer funds.—The Committee has included language that provides authority for the Secretary to transfer up to $100,000,000 from Coast Guard operating expenses, for the purpose of air traffic control operations and maintenance to enhance aviation safety and security.

OIG audit reimbursement.—The Committee recommendation directs the FAA to reimburse the Office of Inspector General $19,000,000 for audit and other aviation review work conducted in that office.

Restriction on multiyear leases.—The bill maintains a restriction on multiyear leases as enacted in fiscal year 2000.

Charting Services.—For several years, the DOT and NOAA have attempted to transfer the aeronautical charting and cartography functions from NOAA to the DOT. Public Law 106–181 authorizes the transfer of these activities from the Department of Commerce to the FAA by October 1, 2000 which the Committee supports. If the FAA is unable to accept the transfer of the functions by October 1, 2000 and seeks legislative relief from the requirements included in Public Law 106–181, the Committee expects that the FAA would pay the full cost of any services provided by NOAA.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$2,075,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	2,495,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,656,765,000

[1] Excludes $30,000,000 rescission of prior year balances.

Under the "Facilities and equipment" appropriation, safety, capacity and efficiency of the Federal airway system are improved by the procurement and installation of new equipment and the construction and modernization of facilities to keep pace with aeronautical activity and in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration's comprehensive capital investment plan [CIP], formerly called the national airspace system [NAS] plan.

The Federal Aviation Administration's most recent estimate is that it will spend approximately $37,500,000,000 on the Air Traffic Control Modernization effort from 1981 through 2004. The estimate for the modernization of the system has continued to evolve and escalate and the FAA has deployed several new systems since 1981. However, the FAA has not delivered virtually any system (and certainly not any major ones) within cost, schedule, or performance

goals due primarily to a complete failure to impose acquisition management discipline. Last year, the General Accounting Office testified:

> "From the inception of the air traffic control modernization program to today, FAA has not consistently followed a disciplined management approach for acquiring new systems. In the 1980's and early 1990's, FAA did not follow the phased approach of Federal acquisition guidance designed to help mitigate the cost, schedule, and performance risk associated with the development of major systems. The agency believed that it could develop and install new systems more quickly by combining several of the five phases outlined in this guidance. However, as a result of not following this disciplined, phased approach, FAA often encountered major difficulties such as those associated with developing the Advanced Automation System. In 1995, the Congress exempted FAA from many Federal procurement rules and regulations, in April, 1996, FAA implemented an acquisition management system, which emphasized, once again, the need for a disciplined approach to acquisition management. However, we (GAO) found continuing weaknesses in key areas such as how FAA monitors the status of projects throughout their life-cycle."

Earlier this year, the Department of Transportation Inspector General testified:

> "The problems with these acquisitions (WAAS, STARS, AMASS) are not the result of a lack of funding or the result of burdensome procurement and personnel rules. What all these systems have in common are difficulties with software development and human factors. . . . As a result of these problems, schedules have proven to be unrealistic and costs have increased. FAA has taken steps to address problems with WAAS, STARS, and AMASS but only after major problems have surfaced. FAA can do more to protect the Government, make contractors more accountable, and address human factors issues earlier in the development and acquisition processes.
>
> "In addition, FAA needs to identify and resolve human factors concerns early in the acquisition process to avoid cost overruns and schedule delays.
>
> "In fairness to FAA, we must recognize that the development of new technologies, particularly those involving complex software and new aircraft avionics, involve research and development risks for which the United States bears much of the cost. Many of the firms developing these systems for FAA rank among the most technologically sophisticated in the world. Once developed, this technology is considered 'off the shelf' and can be sold at a fraction of the costs to other ATC providers."

Further, the Department of Inspector General's Top 12 Management Issues Report highlighted air traffic control modernization stated:

> "FAA acknowledges past problems and is addressing them with a more incremental approach—'build a little, test a little'—to some acquisitions. . . . Also, FAA completed the initial phase of the HOST Replacement program, on schedule and within budget, before the year 2000. Further, FAA is currently on schedule with the Display System Replacement program, which modernizes domestic enroute centers by replacing aging and unsupportable display equipment."

Clearly, management and modernization of the National Airspace System is a herculean and complicated task, and a challenge which will continue as long as air travel is the fastest, most cost-effective, and safest means of traveling significant distances. Modernization is an incremental and persistent responsibility. Although FAA has recently modified procurement processes and implemented an acquisition management system in 1996, the schedule delays, cost escalations, and performance problems continue to plague modernization efforts. While there are several core issues that continue to appear as reasons for the problems as noted above, most of those core issues are arguably rooted in the FAA's organizational culture. Many observers of the FAA acquisition dynamic have concluded that the FAA culture has led employees to act in ways that do not evidence a strong commitment to mission focus, accountability, coordination, and adaptability. The Administrator is currently undertaking a number of steps to change the FAA culture, and some anecdotal examples may indicate that those efforts are having some success at the margin.

Some have expressed the concern that the cited examples of success are distinguishable on the specific circumstances: DSR's problems, delays, and cost overruns were relegated to the procurement's predecessor and HOST was up against a firm deadline (Y2K) which precluded the FAA's from any reengineering or changing any significant aspect of the procurement. If those concerns have merit, it may well be that the FAA's traditional approach to procurements is flawed from the start. Perhaps the Congress and the FAA should spend less time with cost benefit analysis, that invariably become moot as decision-making tools as costs escalate, as relating to major procurements and more time engaged in a dialogue with all interested stakeholders about what the system of the future should look like and what we can commit for such a system. The Committee believes that a dialogue of that nature would inevitably lead to greater buy-in up front by the users (industry), the operators (controllers, maintenance personnel), and the Congress. In addition, such a dialogue should have the added benefit of providing greater certainty for the program managers and the contractors concerning requirement changes or developmental modifications and would facilitate greater agency accountability.

Clearly, changing the FAA culture is a long term proposition, but the Committee recommendations have been reviewed with a focus on reinforcing greater accountability, mission focus, and striving for better or alternative ways of improving the system.

CIP MILESTONES FOR MAJOR SYSTEM ACQUISITIONS

System name	1983 NAS plan	Year of first-site implementation				2000 CIP	1983 NAS plan	Year of last-site implementation			1999 CIP	2000 CIP
		1991 CIP	1993 CIP	1998 CIP	1999 CIP			1991 CIP	1993 CIP	1998 CIP		
Advanced Automation System (AAS)	1990	1991	1991	([1])	([1])	([1])	1994	2001	2004	([1])	([1])	([1])
Display System Replacement (DSR)	.....	.....	.....	1998	1998	1998	.....	.....	.....	2000	2000	2000
Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS)	.....	.....	.....	1998	([2])	[3] 1999	.....	.....	.....	2005	([2])	2008
Tower Automation Program (TAP)	.....	.....	.....	([4])	([4])	([4])	.....	.....	.....	([4])	([4])	([4])
Air Route Surveillance Radar (ARSR–4)	1988	1993	1994	1996	1996	1996	1991	1996	1996	1999	1999	2000
Airport Surface Detection Equipment (ASDE–3)	1987	1992	1993	1993	1993	1993	1990	1994	1996	1999	1999	2002
Automated Weather Observing System (AWOS)/Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS)	1986	1989	1989	1989	1989	1989	1990	1997	1997	2002	2002	2002
Central Weather Processor (CWP)	1990	1991	1991	1991	1991	1991	1991	1998	[5] 1992	[5] 1993	[5] 1993	[5] 1993
Flight Service Automation System (FSAS)	1984	1991	1991	1991	1991	1991	1989	1995	1994	1995	1995	1995
Mode-S	1988	1993	1994	1994	1994	1994	1993	1996	1996	[6] 1999	[6] 1999	[7] 2004
Radio Microwave Link (RML) Replacement and Expansion	1985	1986	1986	1986	1986	1986	1989	1994	1993	1993	1993	1993
Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR)	([8])	1993	1994	1994	1994	1994	([8])	1996	1996	2001	2000	2000
Voice Switching and Control System (VSCS)	1989	1995	1995	1995	1995	1995	1992	1997	1997	1997	1997	1997

[1] The AAS Program has been restructured into three areas: En Route (DSR), Terminal (STARS), and Tower (TAP).
[2] STARS schedule is under review.
[3] First IOC for Early Display Configuration for STARS.
[4] The Tower Automation Program (TAP) has been terminated.
[5] Dates denoted are for MWP I only. The CWP–RWP segment has been eliminated as a continuation of the CWP Program, and has been merged with MWP II into the Weather and Radar Processor (WARP) Program.
[6] Dates denoted are for Interim Beacon Interrogator (IBI) Last-Site Implementation.
[7] Date denoted is for full Mode-S Last-Site Implementation.
[8] TDWR was not included in the 1983 NAS Plan.

Source: FAA 1983 NAS Plan; 1991, and 1993 CIP; February 1998 GAO testimony Observations on FAA's Modernization Program and December 1998 GAO report Status of the FAA's Modernization Program.

REASONS FOR DELAY AND COST INCREASES IN CIP PROJECTS

System name	Reasons for delay
Advanced Automation System (AAS)	In general, AAS delays were due to an overly ambitious plan, inadequate FAA oversight of the contractor, and ineffective resolution of requirements issues. The AAS Program has been restructured into three areas: En Route, Terminal, and Tower.
Air Route Surveillance Radar (ARSR–4).	Problems with the radar's development and site preparation delayed first-site implementation. Testing took longer than originally expected. Delays have also occurred due to changes in system design, interface problems with other ATC systems, and slips in site construction. Past delays were due to environmental issues at Ajo, Arizona and typhoon damage at Mount Santa Rosa, Guam (which was commissioned in January 2000). However, the AJO system has been further delayed until completion of the technician familiarization training and the evaluation of system reliability.
Airport Surface Detection Equipment (ASDE–3).	Original delays occurred because FAA and the contractor underestimated software complexity. FAA changed some requirements, and testing uncovered some performance problems. Software development, establishing remote towers, site selection/preparation, and the addition of seven systems further delayed the program. Though the agency previously experienced site preparation delays which subsequently delayed installations, only the La Guardia and Charlotte systems now remained to be installed. One ASDE–3 system had been used to provide spare parts and the time necessary to refurbish it has caused the recent delay in last-site implementation.
Automated Weather Observing System (AWOS)/Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS).	Site prep, installation, and maintenance problems, as well as delays in receiving Government-furnished equipment contributed to original delays. Last-site implementation delay occurred because of communications funding shortfalls and installation delays of the communications infrastructure to deliver weather information. Recent delays are associated with the addition of ASOS systems per fiscal year 1997 and fiscal year 1998 Congressional direction.
Central Weather Processor (CWP)	Early software development problems and software discrepancies during testing delayed the system in early stages. The program was descoped to just the CWP–MWP I segment, which is now fully implemented.
Flight Service Automation System (FSAS).	Original delays occurred because of software development and testing problems with the Model I system. Program implementation is complete.
Mode S	Problems in developing hardware and software during initial phases delayed the system, and software problems caused a delay in first-site implementation. Implementation of the last-site initially moved out due to en route interface requirements and site preparation delays. Recent delays in the last-site implementation are attributed to a deferral of all funding for the Mode-S program from fiscal year 1998-fiscal year 2000 to fiscal year 2001–04. The FAA chose to defer the funding as it was determined that the interim capability (interim beacon interrogator) of Mode-S was acceptable and satisfied the capability requirements over the past several years. However, implementation of the full capability of Mode-S is critical to meet the end-state requirements of the NAS. With funding restored in fiscal year 2001-fiscal year 2004, the last site implementation in full Mode-S will be 2004.

REASONS FOR DELAY AND COST INCREASES IN CIP PROJECTS—Continued

System name	Reasons for delay
Radar Microwave Link (RML) Replacement and Expansion.	In the early stages, site acquisition and prep problems delayed the system. Other delays occurred because of a change in the prime contractor and due to problems encountered during operational test and evaluation. Program implementation is complete.
Standard Terminal Automation Replacement System (STARS).	Delays are primarily associated with new computer-human interface requirements that require custom software development, a fundamental change in the STARS program acquisition strategy. Additional requirements to the program including Automated Radar Terminal System (ARTS) color displays at selected Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON) facilities, ARTS IIIE systems for 3 TRACONs, and Early Display Configuration development and deployment at up to 16 sites contributed to the delays.
Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR).	Site availability and land acquisition problems have delayed last-site implementation. Recent delays are associated with land procurement and environmental issues at the last 2 sites (Chicago-Midway and New York.
Voice Switching and Control System (VSCS).	Early delays were due to the two prototype contracts having technical difficulties in meeting FAA's requirements for system reliability. Additional delays occurred because of software development and integration problems during the upgrade of the prototype to a production model. The implementation schedule has not changed since the 1991 CIP. The last site implementation was achieved on schedule in February 1997.

The bill includes an appropriation of $2,656,765,000 for the facilities and equipment of the Federal Aviation Administration. This appropriation represents an increase of 28 percent above the level provided for fiscal year 2000. The bill does not provide the advanced appropriations requested by the administration. The Committee's recommended distributions of the funds for each of the major accounts are as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Program name	Fiscal year 2000 enacted	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION			
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPING	$26,696,300	$40,848,000	$45,848,000
SAFE FLIGHT 21	16,000,000	25,000,000	35,000,000
SUBTOTAL—ADV DEV/PROTOTYPING	42,696,300	65,848,000	80,848,000
AVIATION WEATHER SERVICES IMPROVEMENTS	23,862,000	15,400,000	15,400,000
EN ROUTE AUTOMATION	6,000,000	14,600,000	14,600,000
OCEANIC AUTOMATION SYSTEM	27,000,000	51,970,000	51,970,000
AERONAUTICAL DATA LINK (ADL) APPLICATIONS	25,000,000	30,200,000	30,200,000
NEXT GENERATION VHF A/G COMMUNICATION SYSTEM	6,100,000	12,300,000	12,300,000
FREE FLIGHT PHASE ONE	179,625,000	170,800,000	175,800,000
FREE FLIGHT PHASE TWO	.....	50,000,000	25,000,000
SUBTOTAL—EN ROUTE PROGRAMS	267,587,000	345,270,000	325,270,000
TERMINAL AUTOMATION (STARS)	112,440,000	114,850,000	116,850,000
AFSS VOICE SWITCH REPLACEMENT	1,000,000	.....	.....

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

Program name	Fiscal year 2000 enacted	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
LOCAL AREA AUGMENTATION SYSTEM FOR GPS (LAAS)	.....	9,300,000	37,000,000
WIDE AREA AUGMENTATION SYSTEM (WAAS)	.....	65,000,000	.....
SUBTOTAL—LANDING/NAVAIDS	1,000,000	74,300,000	37,000,000
FAA TECHNICAL CENTER FACILITY—BUILDING LEASE	1,322,500	.....	.....
NAS IMPROVEMENT OF SYSTEM SUPPORT LABORATORY	.....	2,162,000	2,162,000
TECHNICAL CENTER FACILITIES	11,477,500	8,795,500	8,795,000
TECHNICAL CENTER INFRASTRUCTURE SUSTAINMENT	.....	2,726,000	2,726,000
SUBTOTAL, RDT&E EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	12,800,000	13,683,500	13,683,000
TOTAL ACTIVITY 1	436,523,300	613,951,500	573,651,000
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT			
EN ROUTE AUTOMATION	160,000,000	122,200,000	122,200,000
NEXT GENERATION WEATHER RADAR (NEXRAD)	4,900,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
AIR TRAFFIC OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT	.....	940,000	940,000
WEATHER AND RADAR PROCESSOR (WARP)	15,000,000	24,710,000	24,710,000
AERONAUTICAL DATA LINK (ADL) APPLICATIONS	.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
ARTCC BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS/PLANT IMPROVEMENTS	36,900,000	58,000,000	58,950,000
VOICE SWITCHING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (VSCS)	17,500,000	.....	.....
AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	15,000,000	25,944,000	25,944,000
CRITICAL COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT	850,000	1,880,000	1,880,000
DOD BASE CLOSURE—FACILITY TRANSFER	3,900,000	.....	.....
BACK-UP EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS (BUEC)	1,580,000	.....	.....
AIR/GROUND COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE	.....	16,074,000	16,074,000
AIR/GROUND COMMUNICATION RFI ELIMINATION	1,700,000	.....	.....
VOLCANO MONITOR	2,000,000	.....	2,000,000
ATC BEACON INTERROGATOR (ATCBI) REPLACEMENT	25,000,000	77,612,000	77,612,000
ATC EN ROUTE RADAR FACILITIES	2,700,000	2,844,000	2,844,000
EN ROUTE COMMS AND CONTROL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,430,000	5,031,606	7,631,000
RCF FACILITIES—EXPAND/RELOCATE	6,700,000	.....	.....
AVIATION WEATHER SERVICES IMPROVEMENTS	.....	8,218,000	8,218,000
FAA TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE	6,100,000	29,400,000	29,400,000
SUBTOTAL—EN ROUTE PROGRAMS	301,260,000	378,153,606	383,703,000
AIRPORT SURFACE DETECTION EQUIPMENT (ASDE)	10,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
AIRPORT SURFACE DETECTION EQUIPMENT (ASDE–X)	.....	8,400,000	8,400,000
TERMINAL DOPPLER WEATHER RADAR (TDWR)—PROVIDE	9,300,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
TERMINAL AUTOMATION (STARS)	82,800,000	75,550,000	75,550,000
TERMINAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES—REPLACE	78,900,000	105,000,000	117,100,000
CONTROL TOWER/TRACON FACILITIES—IMPROVE	24,782,700	40,259,672	40,259,672
TERMINAL VOICE SWITCH REPLACEMENT (TVSR)/ETVS	10,900,000	5,000,000	10,900,000
EMPLOYEE SAFETY/OSHA AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE STDS	22,000,000	28,400,000	28,400,000
CHICAGO METROPLEX	700,000	.....	.....
NEW AUSTIN AIRPORT AT BERGSTROM	1,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
POTOMAC METROPLEX	17,100,000	25,800,000	25,800,000
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA METROPLEX	17,500,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
ATLANTA METROPLEX	7,700,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
NAS INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NIMS)	3,520,000	13,100,000	13,100,000
AIRPORT SURVEILLANCE RADAR (ASR–9)	4,000,000	4,722,000	17,000,000
AIRPORT MOVEMENT AREA SAFETY SYSTEM (AMASS)	18,200,000	20,650,000	20,650,000
VOICE RECORDER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	2,500,000	2,632,000	3,632,000
TERMINAL DIGITAL RADAR (ASR–11)	76,100,000	108,250,000	75,000,000
WEATHER SYSTEMS PROCESSOR	24,000,000	22,400,000	22,400,000
DOD/FAA ATC FACILITIES TRANSFER	3,000,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
PRECISION RUNWAY MONITORS	3,300,000	2,000,000	17,000,000
TERMINAL RADAR (ASR)—IMPROVE	3,838,800	3,233,600	3,233,000
TERMINAL COMMUNICATIONS IMPROVEMENTS	1,124,000	1,250,700	1,550,700
RCE EQUIPMENT	3,400,000	.....	.....
MODE S—PROVIDE	.....	1,974,000	1,974,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

Program name	Fiscal year 2000 enacted	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
TERMINAL APPLIED ENGINEERING		6,700,000	6,700,000
REMOTE RADAR CAPABILITY	900,000		
SUBTOTAL—TERMINAL PROGRAMS	417,065,500	494,921,972	508,249,372
AUTOMATED SURFACE OBSERVING SYSTEM (ASOS)	9,900,000	8,213,900	13,213,900
OASIS	10,000,000	23,100,000	23,100,000
WEATHER MESSAGE SWITCHING CENTER REPLACEMENT		2,500,000	2,500,000
FLIGHT SERVICE FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,364,400	1,277,500	1,277,500
FLIGHT SERVICE STATION SWITCH MODERNIZATION		6,000,000	6,000,000
FLIGHT SERVICE STATION MODERNIZATION	2,600,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
SUBTOTAL—FLIGHT SERVICE PROGRAMS	23,864,400	45,091,400	50,091,400
VOR	2,000,000	2,632,000	2,632,000
NEXT GENERATION NAVIGATION/LANDING SYSTEMS	114,000,000		164,400,000
INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEM (ILS)—ESTABLISH/UPGRADE		16,000,000	
ILS—REPLACE MARK 1A, 1B, AND 1C	1,000,000	1,000,000	
LOW LEVEL WINDSHEAR ALERT SYSTEM (LLWAS)	2,200,000	5,734,000	5,734,000
RUNWAY VISUAL RANGE (RVR)	6,300,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
WIDE AREA AUGMENTATION SYSTEM (WAAS)		46,000,000	
NDB SUSTAIN	1,000,000	940,000	940,000
NAVIGATIONAL AND LANDING AIDS—IMPROVE	3,146,800	2,955,922	2,955,922
ILS—REPLACE GRN–27		1,000,000	1,000,000
APPROACH LIGHTING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT (ALSIP)	8,700,000	1,040,000	21,450,000
PRECISION APPROACH PATH INDICATORS (PAPI)	3,500,000		6,000,000
DISTANCE MEASURING EQUIPMENT (DME)	1,200,000	1,128,000	1,428,000
VISUAL NAVAIDS	1,000,000	2,820,000	2,820,000
INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES AUTOMATION (IAPA)	900,000		
GULF OF MEXICO OFFSHORE PROGRAM		1,900,000	3,600,000
LORAN-C UPGRADE/MODERNIZATION		20,000,000	
SUBTOTAL—LANDING AND NAVIGATIONAL AIDS	144,946,800	106,149,922	215,959,922
ALASKAN NAS INTERFACILITY COMM SYSTEM (ANICS)	3,600,000	2,500,000	7,200,000
FUEL STORAGE TANK REPLACEMENT AND MONITORING	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
FAA BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT—IMPROVE/MODERNIZE	4,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS—SUSTAIN/SUPPORT	17,500,000	28,200,000	28,200,000
AIR NAVAIDS AND ATC FACILITIES (LOCAL PROJECTS)	2,000,000	1,880,000	1,880,000
AIRCRAFT RELATED EQUIPMENT PROGRAM	1,840,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
COMPUTER AIDED ENG GRAPHICS (CAEG) REPLACEMENT	3,000,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (SAMS)		5,400,000	
SUBTOTAL—OTHER ATC FACILITIES	42,440,000	67,080,000	66,380,000
TOTAL ACTIVITY 2	929,576,700	1,091,396,900	1,224,383,694
NON-ATC FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT			
NAS MANAGEMENT AUTOMATION PROGRAM (NASMAP)	800,000	1,034,000	1,034,000
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT	22,500,000	22,600,000	22,600,000
AVIATION SAFETY ANALYSIS SYSTEM (ASAS)	14,000,000	15,980,000	15,980,000
OPERATIONAL DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (ODMS)	600,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
FAA EMPLOYEE HOUSING—PROVIDE	8,000,000		
LOGISTICS SUPPORT SYSTEM AND FACILITIES	2,300,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
TEST EQUIPMENT—MAINTENANCE SUPPORT	1,000,000	940,000	940,000
INTEGRATED FLIGHT QUALITY ASSURANCE	3,000,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
SAFETY PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS SUBSYSTEM (SPAS)	5,200,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
NATIONAL AVIATION SAFETY DATA CENTER	1,500,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
NAS RECOVERY COMMUNICATIONS (RCOM)		4,700,000	4,700,000
PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT SYSTEM	5,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
EXPLOSIVE DETECTION TECHNOLOGY	97,500,000	97,500,000	99,500,000
FACILITY SECURITY RISK MANAGEMENT	11,500,000	19,339,000	19,339,000
INFORMATION SECURITY	7,500,000	11,200,000	11,200,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

Program name	Fiscal year 2000 enacted	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
NAS RECOVERY COMMUNICATIONS (RCOM)	1,000,000	.....	.....
SUBTOTAL—SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	181,400,000	190,693,000	192,693,000
AERONAUTICAL CENTER INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION	.....	7,200,000	7,200,000
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) TRAINING FACILITIES	.....	1,880,000	1,880,000
DISTANCE LEARNING	.....	2,162,000	2,162,000
SUBTOTAL—TRAINING EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES	.....	11,242,000	11,242,000
TOTAL ACTIVITY 3	181,400,000	201,935,000	203,935,000
MISSION SUPPORT			
SYSTEM ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT	22,200,000	24,711,000	24,711,000
PROGRAM SUPPORT LEASES	31,100,000	33,800,000	33,800,000
LOGISTICS SUPPORT SERVICES	5,600,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
MIKE MONRONEY AERONAUTICAL CENTER—LEASE	14,600,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
IN-PLANT NAS CONTRACT SUPPORT SERVICES	2,800,000	2,619,000	2,619,000
TRANSITION ENGINEERING SUPPORT	38,700,000	37,539,000	37,539,000
FREQUENCY AND SPECTRUM ENGINEERING—PROVIDE	3,000,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION MOVES	2,500,000	26,400,000	26,400,000
FAA SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE	1,000,000	3,534,000	3,534,000
TECHNICAL SERVICES SUPPORT CONTRACT (TSSC)	40,000,000	44,911,000	44,911,000
RESOURCE TRACKING PROGRAM	.....	3,450,000	3,450,000
CENTER FOR ADVANCED AVIATION SYSTEM DEV. (MITRE)	61,000,000	63,400,000	68,400,000
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION	69,700,000	[1] 135,000,000	63,578,706
TOTAL ACTIVITY 4	222,500,000	263,564,000	332,142,706
PERSONNEL AND RELATED EXPENSES			
PERSONNEL AND RELATED EXPENSES	295,000,000	322,652,600	322,652,600

[1] Requested in operations.

ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Advanced Technology Development and Prototyping.—The Advanced Technology Development and Prototyping covers a range of timely and critical initiatives within the Engineering, Development, Test and Evaluation activity. The Committee recommendation provides $45,848,000 for this activity including the airport-related research proposed for funding under the airport improvement program request and $2,000,000 for the airfield pavement improvement program authorized under section 905 of Public Law 106–181. In addition, funding is included in Advanced Technology Development and Prototyping for ADS–B, GPS availability, accuracy, and integrity including $2,600,000 for GPS harmonization work to be undertaken as part of a multi-agency initiative to explore the vulnerability of the GPS signal to interference and $1,000,000 for anti-jamming work. In addition, the Committee recommendation provides $4,000,000 for Commercial Remote Sensing Products and Spatial Information Technologies.

Universal Access Systems (UAS).—FAA is directed to work with organizations representing airports, airline pilots, and other interested parties to deploy expeditiously the continuously-updated data needed on approved flight crew members that will allow universal access systems to operate properly. Existing systems that deliver

data and other information to airport computer systems should be used if they will facilitate rapid deployment and provide the best cost, benefit, and data security. This program presents an opportunity for the FAA to partner with industry to develop the universal data and standards needed to make such security systems available in the near future, and utilize digital networks already designed for airport sponsors maximizing the incentives to field universal security systems on a voluntary basis.

Safe Flight 21.—The Committee recommendation provides $35,000,000 for the Safe Flight 21 initiatives. Half the additional funding above the request is to extend the Capstone program into Southeastern Alaska including communications upgrades. The other half of the increase is to expand the Ohio Valley program with a specific focus on utilizing ADS–B technologies to contribute to runway incursion solutions. The Committee is encouraged by initial reports of the progress of the Safe Flight initiative and commends the FAA for the approach and focus of the effort in this area.

En route programs

Aviation Weather Services Improvements.—The Committee recommendation fully funds the budget request for Aviation Weather Service Improvements and notes that weather is the major contributor to air traffic delays, accounting for 65 percent of all delays and a factor in 40 percent of accidents.

En Route Automation.—The Committee recommendation fully funds the en route automation requests and provides $65,000,000 for Eunomia to develop and en route communications gateway that will replace current Peripheral Adapter Module Replacement Item (PAMRI) functionality which has demonstrated increasingly difficult to maintain.

Oceanic Automation System.—The Committee fully funds the request for the Oceanic ATOP procurement and notes that the FAA recently downselected from three vendors to two. The FAA anticipates a further downselect before the end of the calendar year. As noted elsewhere in the report, the Oceanic procurement has experienced substantial delays and difficulties in the past and the Committee encourages the FAA to aggressively manage this procurement to field improved capability in the oceanic environment. The Committee has provided authority for the FAA to contract out this entire function at the discretion of the FAA Administrator if the current procurement strategy experiences further difficulties in order to expedite this modernization and to provide the greatest possible flexibility in this regard for the administrator.

Free Flight Phase One.—The Committee recommendation provides $175,800,000 for the Free Flight Phase One activities. Within the amount provided for Free Flight Phase I, the Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the continued expansion and improvement of the Departure Spacing Program (DSP). Within this amount, sufficient funding (approximately $2,000,000) is for the installation of bar-coded strips at the tower facilities serving Newark International Airport, LaGuardia Airport, Kennedy International Airport and Philadelphia International Airport. This enhancement is expected to improve both the safety and efficiency of the DSP pro-

gram in that region. The Committee notes that the DSP program holds great promise for providing improved data on the frequency and cause of delays at these airports. The Administrator is encouraged to design and implement improvements to the program so as to maximize the opportunities for data gathering and information sharing on the matter of delays.

Free Flight Phase Two.—The Committee recommendation provides $25,000,000 for the expansion of the Free Flight initiatives, half of the budget request. The reduction to the request is made without prejudice and will be revisited as the fiscal year 2000 Free Flight activities progress with a focus on whether such an aggressive expansion of the program can be successfully implemented in fiscal year 2001. Within the Committee recommendation, funding is included to provide pFast for Denver International Airport.

Terminal programs

Terminal Automation (STARS).—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 above the budget requests for the Terminal Automation program and is heartened by the positive reports from the users of the initially deployed system in the field. The additional funds are to be used for activity 2 efforts and to deploy a DBRITE system to the Mid-Delta regional airport.

The Committee has become aware that the FAA is considering disbursing used radar equipment to the new St. Louis Gateway TRACON due to open in 2001. It is the Committee's understanding that all of the equipment designated to go in the new TRACON is state-of-the-art except for the vitally important radar scopes. The Committee requests that the FAA review its decision regarding the radar scopes for the St. Louis Gateway TRACON.

Local Area Augmentation System For GPS (LAAS).—The Committee recommendation provides funding the LAAS program from within the Next Generation Navigation systems. The Committee provides $37,000,000 for the LAAS program within this line and notes that there has been substantial private development of the LAAS capability and that an agreement has recently been reached to install a LAAS system at Memphis Airport. The FAA is encouraged to take full advantage of the private investment in this initiative. Further, the Committee is concerned that the integrity issue that has recently plagued the Wide Area Augmentation System procurement (WAAS) be aggressively managed as it relates to the LAAS system so as to minimize the impact that integrity issues may ultimately have on both the cost and schedule for the LAAS procurement. $4,000,000 of the increased funding for this program is for a continuation of the development work on a low cost next generation precision gyroscope utilizing silicon manufacturing technologies. The Committee continues to view developmental work in this area as critical to extending the benefits of satellite based navigational services to the general aviation community by providing the technological developments that will permit affordable inertial navigational capability for general aviation users.

Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS).—The Committee recommendation within the Next Generation Navigational/Landing Systems line for WAAS is the budget request adjusted for the shifts announced by the FAA after discovery of the most recent schedule

and technical delays in the program and taking into account the funding provided in the Advance Technology Development and Prototyping line for the developmental work funded in that line. The Committee remains concerned about the single strand nature of this procurement and encourages the FAA to proceed cautiously with this procurement. In addition, the Committee encourages the FAA to take full advantage of the secondary or ancillary benefits that the WAAS signal may provide for other aviation purposes. Accordingly, the FAA should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good in this regard and should explore what applications of the technology might be of use to the aviation community notwithstanding the certification difficulties of the current system. Clearly, the value of the WAAS signal to airports, general aviation users, avionics manufacturers, and others is significant even before the primary use of the signal is capable of being certified. The FAA should pursue incremental uses and applications of applying the WAAS signal as a potential solution for runway incursion issues, and other critical aviation challenges. The following table outlines the progression of this procurement to ever higher costs, ever diminished capability, and ever longer schedule to full operating capability, however reduced:

DEVELOPMENT COSTS, SCHEDULES, AND PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS FOR WAAS

[Dollars in millions]

Year	Estimated development costs	Initial operating capability	Performance expectation	Full operating capability	Performance expectation
June 1994 ...	$508	June 1997	Precision approach capability was for a 19.2 meter Vertical Protection Limit, with 95 percent availability, throughout 50 percent of the continental United States. In the best case, this would provide Category I precision approach minima (200 feet height above touchdown and ¾mile visibility, ½ mile with approach lights).	Dec. 2000	Precision approach capability was for a 19.2 meter Vertical Protection Limit, with 99.999 percent availability, throughout 100 percent of the total NAS. In the best case, this would provide Category I precision approach minima (200 feet height above touchdown and ¾ mile visibility, ½ mile with approach lights).
Jan. 1998	[1] 1,007	July 1999	Same as June 1994	Dec. 2001	Same as June 1994.
Jan. 1999	1,007	Sept. 2000	Same as June 1994	To be determined	Same as June 1994.
Sept. 1999 ..	[2] 2,484	Sept. 2000	Same as June 1994	Dec. 2006	Same as June 1994.
June 2000 ...	[3] 2,724	Dec. 2002	Limited precision approach capability to 50 meters Vertical Protection Limit, with 95 percent availability, throughout 75 percent of the continental United States. In the best case, this would provide vertically guided approach to at around a 350 feet height above touchdown and 1 mile visibility.	To be determined	To be determined.

[1] The Jan. 1998 program development costs for WAAS include the prime contractor costs, development of standards and procedures, technical engineering and program support, and the first year of costs for satellites. According to FAA, a primary reason for the cost growth between June 1994 and January 1998 was due to unanticipated development costs to build greater reliability into the WAAS ground component.

[2] The Sept. 1999 estimate for WAAS development includes $1,300,000,000 in satellite service acquisition through 2020. In earlier estimates, satellite service acquisition costs were included in the cost of operating WAAS.

[3] GAO estimated the increase between the Sept. 1999 and June 2000 based on information provided by FAA and its experts. We estimate that meeting the June 1994 performance expectation for initial WAAS could add up to $240,000,000 to the cost of developing WAAS and potentially take 3 years or more beyond Sept. 2000.

Technical Center Facilities.—The Committee recommendation provides for the full request for technical center facilities although the justification describes activities that would more appropriately be funded in the operations account.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

En Route programs

Aeronautical Data Link (ADL) Applications.—The Committee provides full funding of the requests for Aeronautical Data Link (ADL) and encourages the FAA to pursue this capability aggressively in order to achieve the advantages that it promises for elements of the Free Flight Phase 1 initiative as well as improving the safety and efficiency of the NAS. The Air Transport Association (ATA) has identified $4,000,000 of unnecessary costs, in part due to air traffic control communications-related inefficiencies, and has stated that ADL is one of the key elements of NAS automation needed to reduce these inefficiency costs. Specifically, the en route Controller Pilot Data Link Communication module should be reviewed to determine where the greatest work load relief and communications traffic volume can be addressed. The Committee is informed that over 50 percent of the communications between controllers in the en route environment and commercial pilots are a function of handing off aircraft from one sector to another. If this category of communications could be addressed through application of data link and cooperative coordination with the airlines, the risk of controller/pilot confusion could be minimized and substantial efficiencies could be realized. In addition, the FAA should consider contracting for the National Airspace System's air-ground communications system with a provider who would build, operate and evolve a single system to support both air traffic control and airline operations communications in order to reduce the complexity and other risks in the FAA's air-ground digital communications program, to rationalize FAA's spending on communications, and to eliminate the present redundancy in the air-ground communication system.

ARTCC Building Improvements/Plant Improvements.—The Committee recommendation provides $58,950,000 for this activity, including $13,950,000 for the full cost of the Combined En Route Radar Approach (CERAP) ASOS Controller Equipment/Information Display System (ACE–IDS).

Air Traffic Management.—The Committee recommendation provides the requested level for Air Traffic Management although the justification describes activities more appropriately funded in the operations account.

Volcano Monitor.—The Committee recommendation provides $2,000,000 for the volcano monitor activity, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

En Route Communications and Control Facilities Improvement.—The Committee recommends $7,631,000 for this program. Of the funds provided, $3,200,000 is only for the relocation of RTR–A and RTR–D systems at Lambert-St. Louis International Airport.

Terminal programs

Terminal Air Traffic Control Facilities—Replace.—The Committee recommendation provides $117,100,000 for this program. The recommendation provides funding for the following projects:

Chantilly, VA	$75,000
Gulfport, MS	75,000
Kalamazoo, MI	75,000
Deer Valley, AZ	75,000
Broomfield, CO	75,000
Wilmington, DE	305,000
Wilkes Barre, PA	959,200
Miami, FL	51,900
Orlando, FL	177,900
Atlanta, GA	167,900
Newburgh, NY	1,000,000
Champaign, IL	749,000
Topeka, KS	4,361,840
Savannah, GA	7,741,015
La Guardia, NY	25,440,000
Boston, MA	24,944,308
Oakland, CA	25,912,347
St. Louis, MO	3,317,000
Billings-Logan, MT	3,100,000
Houston Hobby, TX	818,550
Little Rock, AR	642,000
Roanoke, VA	2,140,000
Seattle, WA	25,000
Bedford, MA	535,000
Salina, KS	267,500
Newark, NJ	2,407,500
Merrill Field, AK	321,000
Pt. Columbus, OH	1,000,000
N. Las Vegas, NV	214,000
Birmingham, AL	1,359,000
Grand Canyon, AZ	267,000
W.K. Kellogg, MI	1,000,000
Missoula, MT	500,000
Pangborn, WA	1,000,000
Paine Field, WA	1,000,000
Martin State, MD	1,000,000
McArthur Airport, NY	1,000,000
Richmond, VA	1,000,000
Rogue Valley, OR	1,000,000
Vero Beach, FL	1,000,000

Control Tower/Tracon Facilities—Improve.—The Committee recommendation provides $40,259,672 for this program, including funding to continue the cable loop relocation project at Lambert-St. Louis International Airport and $2,400,000 for the removal and relocation of the ASR–9 at that airport.

Terminal Voice Switch Replacement (TVSR)/ETVS.—The Committee recommendation provides $10,900,000 for the program, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

Employee Safety/OSHA and Environmental Compliance Standards.—The Committee recommendation provides $28,400,000 for this program. The Committee notes that the budget justification fails to provide the greater detail for this program requested in the fiscal year 2000 Committee report. The administration should expect reductions in the appropriation for this program if such justification is not forthcoming.

Potomac Metroplex.—The Committee recommendation provides $17,100,000, the same level provide in fiscal year 2000 and leaving slightly less than that amount for future funding requirements.

Precision Runway Monitors.—The Committee recommendation includes funding above the request for acquisition of additional precision runway monitor equipment. The Committee recommendation provides necessary resources for the installation of a precision runway monitor at Newark International Airport.

Airport Surveillance Radar.—The Committee recommendation provides $17,000,000 for this program including preliminary funding for radars for Palm Springs Regional Airport, Yakutat Airport, Gallatin Field, Central Oregon Regional, Eagle County Regional Airport, and Salt Lake City International Airport. Further, the power systems upgrades envisioned in this program, whether a new design or an existing system requiring modernization, shall be subject to competitive bidding by GSA approved contractors and will utilize commercial off the shelf (COTS) products when available. Priority will be given to power system components that meet the established quality standards of the FAA, are compatible with the existing power system infrastructure, are of the latest proven technology, and provide the most cost-effective solution.

Voice Recorder Replacement Program.—The Committee recommendation provides $3,632,000 for this program. The Committee directs the FAA to conduct a study evaluating the benefits and advisability of deployable flight data recorders to complementing current voice and data recorders and provide the report with the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Terminal Digital Radar (ASR–11).—The Committee recommendation provides $75,000,000 for continued production of the digital airport surveillance radar system. Air Force operation tests completed in February 2000 indicted several developmental issues that must be resolved. Problems included generation of false weather cells, loss of aircraft detection capability close to the airport, and a shortfall in computer processor capability which limits the system's ability to handle future requirements. The Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center recommended that the problems be corrected prior to the fielding of low initial productions units. The appropriated level is sufficient given the delays due to the current deficiencies identified in the testing.

Terminal Communications Improvements.—The Committee provides $1,550,700 for the terminal communications improvements program, including funding for the installation of remote air-ground communications facilities for Park City and Heber Valley airports in support of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games.

Flight Service Programs

Automated Surface Observing System (ASOS).—The Committee recommendation provides $5,000,000 above the request to upgrade existing systems with poor reliability and outdated technology with modern equipment.

Flight Service Station Modernization.—The Committee recommendation provides the full budget request for this program. Further, the power systems upgrades envisioned in this program, whether a new design or an existing system requiring moderniza-

tion, shall be subject to competitive bidding by GSA approved contractors and will utilized commercial off the shelf (COTS) products when available. Priority will be given to power system components that meet the established quality standards of the FAA, are compatible with the existing power system infrastructure, are of the latest proven technology, and provide the most cost-effective solution.

Landing and Navigational Aids

Next Generation Navigation System.—The Committee provides $164,400,000 for the various initiatives under this heading, to be distributed as follows:

Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS)	$73,000,000
Instrument Landing System Establishment	43,700,000
ILS—Replace Mark 1A, 1B, and 1C	1,000,000
ILS—Replace GRN–27	1,000,000
Nationwide Differential Global Positioning System	18,700,000
Loran-C Upgrade/Modernization	25,000,000
TLS	2,000,000

Instrument Landing System Establishment/upgrade.—The Committee recommends $43,700,000 to be distributed as follows:

Meridian/Key Field Airport	$2,000,000
Hartsfield (5th runway)	4,900,000
Evanston Airport, WY	2,500,000
Muscatine Municipal Airport	1,600,000
Lafayette Regional Airport	1,000,000
Kalealoa Airport	2,300,000
Athens-Decatur	1,000,000
Gulf Shores Municipal Airport	1,300,000
Lehigh Valley International Airport	2,000,000
Klawock Airport	1,000,000
Mexico, MO	2,000,000
Harry Browne Airport	1,000,000
Wexford County Airport	1,500,000
London-Corbin Airport	1,600,000
Cat I/II/III ILS and associated equipment	18,000,000

Runway Visual Range (RVR).—The Committee recommendation provides $5,000,000 for this program including $300,000 for Sawyer Airport RVR equipment and tower equipment and $1,000,000 for Reading, PA RVR equipment.

Approach Lighting System Improvement (ALSIP).—The Committee recommends $21,450,000, to be distributed as follows:

Meridian/Key Field MALSR	$2,300,000
Hartsfield MALSR	2,300,000
Juneau Airport ALSIP	2,000,000
Las Cruces International Airport ALSIP	2,750,000
Salt Lake City International Airport ALSIP	3,000,000
Newport Airport ALSIP	2,500,000
Bethel Airport ALSIP	2,000,000
North Bend ALSIP	1,000,000
Saginaw MBS International Airport ALSIP	500,000
Baton Rouge MALSR	2,000,000
ALSIP procurement and related expenses	1,100,000

Distance Measuring Equipment (DME).—The Committee recommendation provides $1,428,000 for the DME program. The additional funding above the request is for the installation of a DME on Newark Runway 11, where the ILS has no marker beacons to identify key points on the ILS approach.

Gulf of Mexico Offshore Program.—The Committee recommendation provides $3,600,000 to accelerate the implementation of CNS in the Gulf of Mexico.

Other ATC Facilities

Alaskan NAS Interfacility Comm System (ANICS).—The Committee recommendation provides $7,200,000 to remedy prior years budget reductions consistent with the recently completed GAO review of the cost benefit analysis of the ANICS program.

Electrical Power Systems—Sustain/Support.—The Committee provides $28,200,000 for this program. The power systems upgrades envisioned in this program, whether a new design or an existing system requiring modernization, shall be subject to competitive bidding by GSA approved contractors and will utilize commercial off the shelf (COTS) products when available. Priority will be given to power system components that meet the established quality standards of the FAA, are compatible with the existing power system infrastructure, are of the latest proven technology, and provide the most cost-effective solution.

Special Use Airspace Management System (SAMS).—The Committee does not provide the recommended funding for lack of complete justification. This activity will be reviewed prior to conclusion of the fiscal year 2001 appropriation process.

Non ATC Facilities and Equipment

Explosive detection technology.—The Committee recommendation provides $99,500,000 for this activity, $2,000,000 above the request. The recommended level includes $2,000,000 for the Safe Passenger Alliance (SAFPAS) initiative to study the requisite technology to develop remote check-in locations in and around cities.

Mission Support

Center For Advanced Aviation System Dev. (MITRE).—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $5,000,000 for the Center for Advanced Aviation System Development consistent with the budget request for other FAA CAASD activities. Funding is included within this recommendation to continue the development of Flight Management System procedures for Newark and Teterboro airports at MITRE/CAASD.

National Airspace System Implementation.—The Committee recommendation includes $63,578,706 for this activity, $71,422,000 below the budget request.

MAJOR EQUIPMENT ACTIVITY

TERMINAL DOPPLER WEATHER RADAR

City	Acceptance	Commissioning dates
Memphis	July 1993	December 1994
Houston Intercontinental	March 1993	July 1994
Atlanta	April 1993	December 1995
Washington National	February 1994	January 1996
Denver	December 1993	August 1995
Chicago O'Hare	March 1994	July 1996
St. Louis	May 1994	February 1995

TERMINAL DOPPLER WEATHER RADAR—Continued

City	Acceptance	Commissioning dates
Orlando	June 1994	April 1996
New Orleans	July 1994	March 1996
Tampa	July 1994	March 1996
Miami	November 1995	June 1996
Pittsburgh	December 1994	July 1997
Andrews AFB	December 1994	August 1996
Newark	December 1994	October 1997
Boston	April 1995	January 1996
Kansas City	December 1994	July 1995
Detroit	March 1996	September 1996
Houston Hobby	August 1995	July 1996
Dallas/Love	May 1995	January 1996
Dallas/Fort Worth	June 1995	June 1996
Dayton	May 1995	April 1998
Wichita	June 1995	September 1995
Indianapolis	July 1995	October 1996
Cincinnati	July 1996	June 1997
Philadelphia	July 1996	October 1997
Phoenix	April 1997	April 1998
Milwaukee	September 1997	November 1997
Chicago Midway	April 1999	November 2000
Cleveland	July 1996	October 1996
Columbus	December 1996	May 1997
San Juan	November 1998	August 2000
West Palm Beach	February 1996	May 1997
Nashville	December 1997	April 1998
Louisville	December 1997	March 1999
Washington Dulles	November 1996	May 1998
Charlotte	September 1995	December 1995
Salt Lake City	September 1997	November 1999
Fort Lauderdale	November 1998	November 1999
Baltimore	November 1996	May 1997
Raleigh-Durham	December 1997	January 1998
Minneapolis	April 1997	May 1997
Oklahoma City	April 1997	September 1997
Tulsa	July 1997	May 1998
New York City (JFK and LGA)	August 1999	November 2000
Las Vegas	April 1999	June 2000

AIRPORT SURFACE DETECTION EQUIPMENT [ASDE–3]

Site location	Delivery date	Commissioning date
FAA Academy [1]		
WJH Technical Center [2]		
Pittsburgh, PA	December 1989	June 1996
San Francisco	November 1991	October 1995
Dallas/Fort Worth [3]	February 1992	March 1995
Philadelphia	February 1992	March 1996
Los Angeles [3]	August 1992	April 1995
Detroit	August 1992	December 1994
Cleveland	August 1992	December 1994
Boston	August 1992	March 1995
Portland	August 1992	December 1994
Atlanta	September 1992	January 1995

AIRPORT SURFACE DETECTION EQUIPMENT [ASDE–3]—Continued

Site location	Delivery date	Commissioning date
Seattle	September 1992	December 1993
Los Angeles [3]	February 1993	February 1995
Denver (DIA) [3]	March 1993	May 1995
St. Louis	December 1993	February 1995
Denver (DIA) [3]	December 1993	October 1995
New York-Kennedy	January 1994	February 1995
Minneapolis	July 1994	March 1995
Anchorage	August 1994	October 1995
New Orleans	October 1994	September 1995
Baltimore	November 1994	June 1995
Kansas City	December 1994	May 1995
Miami	February 1995	November 1996
Houston [3]	February 1995	August 1995
Memphis	June 1995	December 1997
Chicago	June 1995	April 1996
Houston [3]	August 1996	July 1997
Charlotte	February 2001	May 2002
Louisville [4]	August 1998	September 1999
Reagan Washington National	February 1996	TBD [5]
Cincinnati	October 1995	September 1996
Dulles	May 1997	February 1998
San Diego	November 1995	November 1996
Dallas-Fort Worth [3 4]	November 1996	February 1998
Andrews AFB	January 1998	February 1999
Salt Lake City	March 1998	June 1999
Las Vegas [4]	June 1999	December 2000
New York-LaGuardia	February 2000	June 2001
Newark	June 1998	May 1999

[1] FAA training/field support/depot support facility.
[2] To be relocated to Aeronautical Center, Oklahoma City.
[3] Dual sensor facilities.
[4] Asset redirected from Tampa, Raleigh-Durham, Orlando, Orange County.
[5] A study is underway on the relocation of the ASDE–3 antenna to address multipath issues.

Terminal air traffic control facilities

Funding for terminal air traffic control started in previous years:

St. Louis (TRACON), MO
Houston (Hobby), TX
Little Rock, AR
Roanoke, VA
Seattle (ATCT), WA
Bedford, MA
Salina, KS
Newark, NJ
Merrill Field, AK
Pt. Columbus, OH
North Las Vegas, NV
Birmingham, AL
Grand Canyon, AZ

Phase III funding for terminal air traffic control facilities started in fiscal year 1998 and before:

Topeka, KS
Savannah, GA
LaGuardia, NY
Boston, MA
Oakland, CA

Phase II funding for terminal air traffic control facilities:

Wilmington, DE
Wilkes Barre, PA
Miami, FL
Orlando, FL
Atlanta, GA
Newburgh (Stewart), NY
Champaign, IL

Phase I funding for terminal air traffic control facilities to be replaced in fiscal year 2001:

Chantilly, VA
Gulfport, MS
Kalamazoo, MI
Deer Valley, AZ
Broomfield, CO

ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee has not included the advance appropriations for fiscal years 2001 through 2007 requested by the administration.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000	$156,495,000
Budget estimate, 2001	184,366,000
Committee recommendation	183,343,000

This appropriation finances research, engineering, and development programs to improve the national air traffic control system by increasing its safety, security, productivity, and capacity. The programs are designed to meet the expected air traffic demands of the future and to promote flight safety. The major objectives are to keep the current system operating safely and efficiently; to protect the environment; and to modernize the system through improvements in facilities, equipment, techniques, and procedures in order to insure that the system will safely and efficiently handle the volume of aircraft traffic expected to materialize in the future.

The Committee directs the FAA to provide greater detail in the budget justification presentation of the Research, Engineering, and Development account similar to the detail provided in the Facilities and Equipment account. In particular, the justification should continue to provide cost breakouts for the individual initiatives within each budget item, and should provide cumulative prior years' appropriations for each initiative and anticipated future year funding requirement to achieve articulated program goals. The Committee appreciates the effort to cross reference the various initiatives with agency goals and looks forward to future development of performance measures where appropriate and meaningful.

The bill includes $183,343,000 for research, engineering, and development. The Committee recommendation provides the following allocation:

Program Name	Fiscal Year 2000 Enacted	Fiscal Year 2001 Estimate	Committee Recommendation
System Development and Infrastructure:			
System planning and resource management	$1,164,000	$1,350,000	$1,164,000
Technical laboratory facility	11,075,000	13,431,000	13,431,000
Center for Advanced Aviation System Development	4,900,000	5,000,000	.....
Information security	.....	5,500,000	.....
Subtotal	17,139,000	25,281,000	14,595,000
Weather:			
National laboratory program	11,000,000	16,398,000	16,648,000
In-house support	2,500,000	4,391,000	4,391,000
Center for Wind, Ice and Fog	700,000	700,000	700,000
Juneau, AK	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000

Program Name	Fiscal Year 2000 Enacted	Fiscal Year 2001 Estimate	Committee Recommendation
SOCRATES	2,000,000	3,200,000	.....
Subtotal	19,300,000	27,789,000	24,839,000
Aircraft Safety Technology:			
Aircraft systems fire safety	4,750,000	5,451,000	4,750,000
Advanced materials/structural safety	2,338,000	2,797,000	2,797,000
Propulsion and fuel systems	3,126,000	5,200,000	7,200,000
Flight safety/atmospheric hazards research	3,844,000	4,109,000	4,109,000
Aging aircraft	21,594,000	22,384,000	34,684,000
Aircraft catastrophic failure prevention research	1,981,000	2,782,000	2,782,000
Aviation safety risk analysis	6,824,000	6,657,000	6,657,000
Subtotal	44,457,000	49,380,000	62,979,000
System Security Technology:			
Explosives and weapons detection and aircraft hardening	42,606,000	37,460,000	42,606,000
Aircraft hardening	.....	4,307,000	4,307,000
Airport security technology integration	2,285,000	2,462,000	2,462,000
Aviation security human factors	5,256,000	5,145,000	5,145,000
Subtotal	50,147,000	49,374,000	54,520,000
Human Factors and Aviation Medicine:			
Flight deck/maintenance/system integration human factors	9,142,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
Air traffic control/airway facilities human factors	8,000,000	9,950,000	8,000,000
Aeromedical research	4,829,000	5,049,000	4,829,000
Subtotal	21,971,000	25,099,000	22,929,000
Environment and Energy	3,481,000	7,443,000	3,481,000
Total appropriation	156,495,000	184,366,000	183,343,000

The objectives of and Committee recommendations for the major activities in FAA's Research, Engineering, and Development Program are discussed below.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Objectives: To provide (1) a systems engineering approach and benefit/cost analyses to the development of a comprehensive research, engineering, and development program and (2) visibility, accountability, coordination, and control of the research, engineering, and development activities.

System planning and resource management.—The Committee recommends $1,164,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

FAA technical laboratory facility.—The administration's request was $13,431,000 for work at the FAA Technical Center. The Committee provides the full budget request.

Center for Advanced Aviation System Development.—The Committee provides the appropriation for the Center for Advanced Aviation System Development within the Facilities and Equipment appropriation.

Information Security.—The Committee recommendation deletes the funding for this activity due to budget constraints.

WEATHER

Objectives: To improve the timeliness and accuracy of weather forecasting in order to enhance flight safety, increase system capacity, improve flight efficiency, reduce air traffic control [ATC] and pilot workload, improve flight planning, and increase productivity.

National laboratory program.—The Committee recommends $16,648,000 for the National laboratory program including $250,000 to develop and test an aviation weather hazard characterization and depiction system at the University of Oklahoma College of Geosciences.

SOCRATES.—The Committee recommendation deletes the funding for this program due to budget constraints.

AIRCRAFT SAFETY TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To develop technologies, standards, and maintenance regulations that maintain or improve aircraft safety in an evolving, changing, and demanding aviation environment.

This research supports airborne data monitoring systems, advanced materials and crashworthiness research, the Center for Aviation Systems Reliability (CASR), and the Aging Aircraft Nondestructive Inspection Validation Center (AANC), which conduct research in the area of aircraft safety technology. The research initiatives in this area are a unique and comprehensive effort to improve the safety of aging aircraft by applying new technical capabilities in inspection, and drawing upon expertise in government, university and industry.

Aircraft systems fire safety.—The Committee recommends $4,750,000, the same level provided in fiscal year 2000.

Propulsion and fuel systems.—The Committee recommends $7,200,000 for the Propulsion and fuel systems program including $2,000,000 for the Specialty Metals Processing Consortium.

Aging Aircraft.—The Committee recommends $34,684,000 for this program, including an increase of $1,800,000 above the budget request for the Center for Aviation Systems Reliability (CASR). This funding represents a slight increase above the average commitment to the level of effort at CASR on enhancing the reliability of airframes and related initiatives and provides necessary funding to establish research efforts in fluorescent penetrant inspection. In addition, the recommended level includes $2,200,000 above the budget request for activities of the engine titanium consortium effort and $11,300,000 for the activities of the Airworthiness Assurance Center of Excellence including the research at the nondestructive inspection validation center.

SYSTEM SECURITY TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To enhance the security of passengers and crews in all aspects of aircraft, airports, and related ATC facilities by developing systems that prevent or deter terrorist activities.

Explosives and Weapon Detection.—The Committee recommends $42,606,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000. Of this amount $6,000,000 is to continue development of the pulsed fast neutron analysis (PFNA) cargo inspection system and $1,000,000 is for the Safe Skies initiative involving research and development of explosives and chemical or biological agents currently being conducted by the Institute of Biological Detection Systems. Further, the Committee directs that the FAA continue to fund dual use X-ray technology, which moves large amounts of palletized cargo through scanning systems with very high levels of contraband and threat detection.

HUMAN FACTORS AND AVIATION MEDICINE

Objectives: To establish ways to improve the effectiveness of human performance in the operation of the aviation system and to seek better methods for preventing human error, accidents, and incidents.

Flight deck, Maintenance, System Integration Human Factors.—The Committee provides $10,100,000, the requested budget level and directs the FAA to evaluate the need for a pilot training module designed to instruct pilots on how to respond to loss-of-control aircraft, the second leading cause of airline accidents.

Air traffic control/airway facilities human factors.—The Committee recommends $8,000,000 for this program, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

Aeromedical research.—The Committee recommends $4,829,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

Objectives: To protect the environment, conserve energy, and keep the U.S. air transportation industry strong and competitive. The Committee recommends $3,481,000, the same level appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000	$1,750,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	1,960,000,000
Committee recommendation	3,200,000,000

Chapter 471 of title 49, U.S.C. authorizes a program of grants to fund airport planning and development and noise compatibility planning and projects for public use airports in all States and territories.

The Committee recommends $3,200,000,000 in liquidating cash for grants-in-aid for airports. This is consistent with the Commit-

tee's obligation limitation on airport programs for fiscal year 2001 and for the payment of previous years' obligations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Obligation limitation, 2000 [1]	$1,950,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	1,950,000,000
Committee recommendation	[2] 3,200,000,000

[1] Reflects reduction of $54,362,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.
[2] Includes $120,000,000 available for air traffic services if necessary to maintain aviation safety.

The total program level recommended for fiscal year 2001 for grants-in-aid to airports is $3,200,000,000 and is intended to be sufficient to continue the important tasks of enhancing airport and airway safety, ensuring that airport standards can be met, maintaining existing airport capacity, and developing additional capacity. The amount provided includes $120,000,000 which may be available for air traffic services to maintain aviation safety.

The Committee notes that a sizable alternative source of funding is available to airports in the form of passenger facility charges [PFC's]. The first PFC charge began for airlines tickets issued on June 1, 1992. DOT data shows that as of March 1, 2000, 314 airports have been approved for collection of PFC's in the amount of $24,700,000,000. During calendar year 1999 airports collected $1,515,000,000 in PFC charges and $1,550,000,000 is estimated to be collected in calendar year 2000. Of the airports collecting PFC's, approximately one-fourth collected about 90 percent of the total, and all of these are either large or medium hub airports. Prior to the authorized increase in PFC charges, the DOT estimated that these airports will collect more than $1,400,000,000 in calendar year 2000, depending on the number of applications received and approved and assuming current statutory authority. Eventually, the funding to airports from the 50 percent nominal increase in authorized passenger facility charges will result in dramatically increased resources for airport improvements, expansions, and enhancements.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The bill includes a limitation on obligations of $3,200,000,000 for fiscal year 2001. This is $1,250,000,000 (64.1 percent) above the President's budget request and the same amount above the fiscal year 2000 level.

A table showing the distribution of these funds compared to the fiscal year 2000 levels and the President's budget request follows:

	Fiscal year 2000 enacted	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Entitlements	$1,100,434,505	$1,127,704,636	$1,943,417,033
Primary airports	556,348,911	566,769,374	1,056,383,909
Cargo airports (3 percent)	55,519,140	55,850,610	93,350,610
Alaska supplemental	10,672,557	10,672,557	21,345,114
States (20 percent)	342,368,030	344,412,095	622,337,400
Carryover entitlement	135,525,867	150,000,000	150,000,000
Small Airport Fund	142,204,990	146,461,513	274,936,625
Non hub	81,259,994	83,692,293	157,106,643
Non commercial service	40,629,997	41,846,147	78,553,321

	Fiscal year 2000 enacted	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Small hub	20,314,999	20,923,073	39,276,661
Discretionary Set Asides	231,039,432	223,257,924	345,362,670
Noise (34 percent of discretionary)	206,719,492	199,757,089	303,733,336
Reliever (0.66 percent of discretionary)	.....	.....	5,896,000
Military airport program (4 percent of discretionary)	24,319,940	23,500,835	35,733,334
Other Discretionary	376,959,073	364,262,927	583,280,675
Capacity/Safety/Security/Noise	282,719,305	273,197,195	410,978,004
Remaining discretionary	94,239,768	91,065,732	172,302,671
Administration	45,000,000	53,003,000	53,000,000
Airport Research	.....	7,380,000	.....
Essential Air Service	.....	27,900,000	.....
Total limitation on obligations	1,895,638,000	1,950,000,000	3,200,000,000

AIRPORT DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

Within the overall obligation limitation in this bill, $928,643,345 is available for discretionary grants to airports.

The Committee has carefully considered a broad array of discretionary grant requests that can be expected in fiscal year 2001. Specifically, the Committee expects the FAA to give priority consideration to applications for the projects listed below in the catergories of the AIP for which they are eligible. If funds in the remaining discretionary category are used for any projects in fiscal year 2000 that are not listed below, the Committee expects that they will be for projects for which FAA has issued letters of intent (including letters of intent the Committee recommends below that the FAA subsequently issues), or for projects that will produce significant aviation safety improvements or significant improvements in systemwide capacity or otherwise have a very high benefit/cost ratio.

Within the program levels recommended, the Committee directs that priority be given to applications involving the further development of the following airports:

Abbeville Airport, AL
Abilene Regional Airport, TX
Abrams Municipal Airport in Grand Ledge, MI
Akutan Airport, AK
Albany International Airport, NY
Anaconda/Deer Lodge County Airport, MT
Anchorage International Airport, AK
Arnold Palmer Regional Airport, PA
Atka Airport, AK
Augusta Regional Airport, GA
Austin Straubel International Airport, WI
Baltimore Washington International Airport, MD
Baton Rouge Metropolitan Airport, LA
Bay Bridge Airport, MD
Bay Minette Municipal Airport, AL
Beaver Head County Airport, MT
Benedum Airport, WV
Bennington Airport, VT
Billings-Logan International Airport, MT
Birmingham International Airport, AL
Bishop International Airport, MI
Boeing Field, WA
Braxton County Airport, WV
Brookhaven-Lincoln County Airport, MS
Bucyrus City Airport, OH
Buffalo Airport Center, NY
Butler County Airport, PA
Carroll County Airport, MD
Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport, VA
Cherry Capitol Airport New Airport, MI
Chignik Lagoon Airport, AK
Chippewa County International Airport, MI
Chippewa Valley Regional Airport, WI
Clayton Airport, AL
Cochran Municipal Airport, GA
Concord Regional Airport, NC
County Airport in Escanaba, MI
Cumberland Regional Airport, MD
DeKalb-Peachtree Airport, GA

Detroit City Airport, MI
Detroit Metroit, Oakland County International, MI
Dillingham Airport, AK
Dona Ana County Airport, NM
Eastern West Virginia Airport, WV
Edward F. Knapp Airport, VT
Elba Municipal Airport, AL
Elkins-Randolph County Airport, WV
Erie International Airport, PA
Fairhope Municipal Airport, AL
Fayette County Airport, PA
Felts Field, WA
Ford Airport, GA
Frederick Municipal Airport, MD
Freeport Alterbertus Airport, IL
Fulton County Airport, GA
Gadsen Airport, AL
Garrett County Airport, MD
Gary Airport, IN
George Bush Intercontinental Airport/ Houston, TX
Gerald R. Ford International Airport, MI
Glacier Park International Airport, MT
Golden Triangle Regional Airport, MS
Great Falls International Airport, MT
Greenville Municipal Airport, AL
Greenwood-Leflore Airport, MS
Gulfport-Biloxi Regional Airport, MS
Hagerstown Regional Airport, MD
Harrisburg International Airport, PA
Hawkins Field Airport, MS
Headland Municipal Airport, AL
Heart of Georgia Airport, Eastman, GA
Heber City Municipal Airport, UT
Helena Regional Airport, MT
Henry E. Rohlsen Airport on St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands
Henry Tift Meyers Airport, GA
Gladwin Airport, Gladwin, MI
Grant County Airport, WV
Greenbrier Valley, WV
Hoonah Airport, AK
Houghton County Memorial Airport, MI
Indiana County Airport, PA
Iuka Airport, MS
Jackson County Airport, WV
Jackson International Airport, MS
Juneau International Airport, AK
Kalamazoo-Battle Creek International, MI
Kalispell City Airport, MT
Kee Field Airport, WV
Kent County International Airport, MD
Key Field Airport, MS
Klawock Airport, AK
Knapp Airport, Berlin, VT
Lafayette Regional Airport, LA
Lanawee County Airport, MI
Lancaster Airport, PA
Lehigh Valley International Airport, PA
Lewistown Municipal Airport, MT
Livingston County Airport, Howell, MI
Logan County Airport, WV
Louisville International-Standiford Field (Jim DeLong-Regional Airport), KY
Madison County Executive Airport, AL
Mammoth Lakes Airport, CA
Marin County Airport (Goss Field), CA
Marshall City Airport, WV
Mason County Airport, WV
McAllen Miller International Airport, TX
Memphis International Airport, TN
Memphis-Shelby County Airport, TN
Mercer City Airport, WV
Mid-Delta Regional Airport, MS
Midland-Bay-Saginaw International Airport, MI
Mingo County Airport, WV
Minot International Airport, ND
Missoula International Airport, MT
Montgomery Regional Airport, AL
Moorehead Municipal Airport, MN
Morgantown Airport, WV
Mt. Washington Regional Airport, Whitefield, NH
Nashville International Airport, TN
Newport News/Williamsburg International Airport, VA
Oakland-Pontiac Airport, MI
Ogden-Hinckley Airport, UT
Ohio University Airport, OH
Olive Branch Airport, MS
Oscoda-Wurthsmith Airport, MI
Palmer Municipal Airport, AK
Palwaukee Municipal Airport, IL
Pease International Tradeport Airport, NH
Philadelphia Municipal Airport, MS
Phillips Army Air Field at the Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD
Picayune Municipal Airport, MS
Piedmont Triad International Airport, NC
Pittsburgh International Airport, PA
Ponca City Municipal Airport, OK
Port Columbus International Airport, OH
Prattville Autauga County Airport, AL
Provo Municipal Airport, UT
Pryor Field Regional Airport, AL
Quillayute Airport, WA
Raleigh City Memorial Airport, WV
Reading Municipal, General Carl A Spaatz Field, PA
Reynolds Airport, Jackson County, MI
Richard B. Russell Field, GA
Rickenbacker International Airport, OH
Roberts Field/Redmond Municipal Airport, OR
Rock County Airport, WI
Russellville Municipal Airport, AL
Rutland State Airport, VT
Salisbury/Wicomico Regional Airport, MD
Salt Lake City International Airport, UT
Sawyer Airport, MI
Southern Illinois Airport, IL
Southwest Georgia Regional Airport, GA
Southwest Michigan Regional Airport, MI
Spokane International Airport, WA
Springfield-Branson Regional Airport, MO

Statesboro Municipal Airport, GA
Stennis International Airport, MS
Summersville Airport,
Syracuse Hancock International, NY
Tishomingo County Airport, MS
Toledo Express Airport, OH
Tooele Valley Airport, UT
Tri-State Airport, WV
Troy Municipal Airport, AL
Tulip City Airport, MI
Tunica Municipal Airport, MS
Tupelo Municipal Airport, MS
University-Oxford Airport, MS
Vero Beach Municipal Airport, FL
Walker County Airport, AL
Waynesboro Municipal, MS
Wendover Airport, UT
Westmoreland County Airport, PA
Wheeling-Ohio City Airport, WV
Wilkes-Barre/Scranton International Airport, PA
William B. Hartsfield-Atlanta International, GA
Williamsport-Lycoming County Airport, PA
Will Rogers World Airport, OK
Wittman Regional Airport, WI
Wood County Airport, WV
Wright Army Airfield, GA
Yeager Airport, WV

Abbeville Airport, AL.—The FAA Administrator is urged to work with the Abbeville Airport and interested local officials to foster the inclusion of this important local aviation facility on the NPIAS. Upon inclusion, the airport safety and expansion projects should be given priority consideration by the FAA Administrator.

Ogden-Hinckley Airport, UT.—The Committee continues to be concerned about the adequacy of the security provided for the entire airport at Ogden-Hinckley Airport, not just the small, immediate area around the terminal. While security fencing of the immediate area of the terminal might address the security needs of the airport in its existing role as a weather divert airport, that fencing is inadequate to prepare properly for the airport's role during the Olympics or for anticipated growth. The Committee is concerned about the vulnerability of the runways, taxiways, hangars, tie-downs, the heli-pad, the de-icing area and other facilities outside the 650 feet of fencing immediately adjacent to the terminal. Notwithstanding the current lack of commercial traffic, the Committee directs the Administrator to give priority consideration to providing funding for the erection of a fence and gateways to provide physical security around the entire perimeter of the airport and which meets the antiterrorism plans of the Olympic Organizing Committee.

Lafayette Airport, Louisiana.—The Committee urges the FAA to give priority consideration to discretionary funding for runway, taxiway, landing and lighting system, and equipment improvements. There are critical runway upgrades that must be addressed immediately including rubber removal, seal-coating, groove and mark striping of runway 4R/22L as well as an extension of the north safety area of runway 4R/22L to 1,000 feet.

Jackson International Airport, Jackson, MS.—The Committee is aware that the Jackson Municipal Airport Authority has undertaken the phased construction of a new air cargo park at the Jackson International Airport, for which $7,000,000 in FAA, EDA and local funding has already been committed. In order to meet schedule requirements for final design and construction of Segment I of the project, the Committee encourages the FAA to give priority consideration to requests by the Jackson International Airport for discretionary funding to complete construction of the air cargo apron and related improvements, including the paving of the taxi connection to the runway.

Albany International Airport, New York.—The Committee urges the FAA to give priority consideration to a discretionary application for funding to extend Runway 10–28.

South Central Alaska float plane facility.—The Committee directs the FAA to work with the State of Alaska, local aviation officials, and interested aviation operators and float plane enthusiasts to study possible locations for a new float plane facility in South Central Alaska to minimize air traffic conflicts and to efficiently service the large float plane population. The Committee notes that Alaska has the highest rate of small plane ownership in the country and that Lake Hood in Anchorage is the busiest float plane base in the world. The FAA shall study possible locations for a new float plane base to address the backlog of slips at Lake Hood. Suitable locations should be less than 1 hour by road or marine link from Anchorage and Wasilla.

Syracuse Hancock International Airport, New York.—The Committee urges the FAA to give priority consideration to a request for discretionary funding to repair the aircraft rescue and fire fighting building at Syracuse Hancock International Airport.

Buffalo Niagara International Airport, New York.—The Committee directs the FAA Administrator to give priority consideration to two projects at the Buffalo Niagara International Airport to extend Runway 14–32 and other safety improvements. This first project provides for the extension of the airport's crosswind runway, Runway 14–32, by approximately 1,790 feet to accommodate carriers in the event that the airport's main runway, Runway 5–23, is disabled by weather or repair work. At present, air carrier operators may not use Runway 14–32 because of its inadequate length and because of its poor instrumentation. The project would improve those instrumentation deficiencies and remove a remote refueling station which is located in the prospective Taxiway Object Free Area (OFA) of the extended Runway 14–32. The second project is to expand the apron and to make east access improvements to the airport to facilitate the East Terminal expansion.

Rickenbacker International Airport, Columbus, OH.—The Committee is pleased to note the continued significant progress made in the transition of the former Rickenbacker Air Force Base to the Rickenbacker International Airport and Foreign Trade Zone No. 138. The Committee directs the FAA to give priority consideration to grant applications within available discretionary programs, including the Military Airports Program, that will support Rickenbacker's 5-year capital improvement plan to address essential infrastructure needs.

George Bush InterContinental Airport, TX.—The Committee directs the FAA Administrator to give priority consideration to the airport's $2,000,000 discretionary request for a fuel-cell demonstration project to evaluate an emergency airport vehicle technology to meet the power demands of airline ground service equipment while concurrently cutting air emissions at airports.

Port Columbus International Airport, OH.—The Committee directs the FAA Administrator to give priority consideration to a terminal apron reconstruction (pavement overlay) and a partial reconstruction of the terminal apron pavement. In addition, the airport is in need of a glycol retention and treatment system to meet Na-

tional Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting requirements.

Concord Regional Airport, NC.—The Committee directs that the Administrator give priority consideration to the airport improvement, expansion, and safety projects at the Concord Regional Airport. In addition, the Committee is concerned that the Concord Regional Airport, and other similarly situated airports not be penalized by the Block Grant Program policy as implemented by the FAA. An airport offered for priority consideration by the Congress should not be frustrated in the discretionary grant process by virtue of the host state's participation in the Block Grant Program. The operations at the Concord Regional Airport grew from 45,000 in 1998 to almost 67,000 in 1999, and are projected to exceed 80,000 by the end of calendar year 2000. Clearly, any blanket policy that effectively precludes an airport experiencing this type of operational growth from participating in the discretionary grant process is flawed and should either be revised or rescinded. The FAA is directed to respond to the Committee regarding the impact of this policy on airports such as Concord Regional, proposed safeguards to remedy the described impact on this airport, and a justification for continuing the policy, if warranted.

Baton Rouge, LA.—The Committee directs the FAA Administrator to give priority consideration to the noise mitigation program at Baton Rouge Airport in Louisiana and to a series of projects to reconstruct taxiway "F" and the east side apron, the perimeter road (phase I) project, construction of taxiway "C", pavement overlay for runway 13L–31R, and the reconstruction of runway 4L–22R.

Abilene Regional Airport, TX.—The Committee is aware of plans for essential infrastructure improvements to enhance competition, capacity and safety at the Abilene Regional Airport. Given the economic potential and immediate needs of this regional facility, the Committee encourages the FAA to give priority consideration to requests for discretionary funding that will assist the Abilene Regional Airport with various capital improvements such as terminal expansion, taxiway extension and emergency response vehicle procurement.

LETTERS OF INTENT

Congress authorized FAA to use letters of intent [LOI's] to fund multiyear airport improvement projects that will significantly enhance systemwide airport capacity. FAA is also to consider a project's benefits and costs in determining whether to approve it for AIP funding. FAA adopted a policy of committing to LOI's no more than about 50 percent of forecasted discretionary funds allocated for capacity, safety, security, and noise projects. The Committee viewed this policy as reasonable because it gave FAA the flexibility to fund other worthy projects that do not fall under a LOI. Both FAA and airport authorities have found letters of intent helpful in planning and funding airport development.

Current letters of intent assume the following fiscal year 2001 grant allocations:

Alaska: Anchorage International	$5,018,750
Arkansas: Fayetteville (northwest Arkansas)	7,000,000
California: Sacramento Metro	1,600,000

Florida:	
Fort Myers Southwest Florida International	4,000,000
Orlando International	6,473,591
Georgia: Hartsfield Atlanta International	9,998,300
Illinois:	
Mid-America, Belleville reliever	14,000,000
Chicago Midway	9,000,000
Kentucky:	
Greater Cincinnati	1,561,725
Louisville	3,525,000
Michigan: Detroit Metropolitan	16,850,000
Minnesota: Minneapolis-St. Paul International	10,000,000
Missouri: St. Louis Lambert International	13,910,000
Nevada:	
Reno/Tahoe International	7,600,000
Las Vegas-Henderson Sky Harbor	2,540,000
Rhode Island: Theodore F. Green State	1,100,000
Tennessee: Memphis International	6,800,000
Texas:	
New Austin at Bergstrom	6,775,188
Midland	1,194,207
Utah: Salt Lake City International	9,000,000
Virginia: Reagan Washington National	13,249,000
Washington: Seattle-Tacoma International	11,700,000
Total	162,895,761

In addition, applications are pending for capacity enhancement projects which would, if constructed, significantly reduce congestion and delay. These projects require multiyear funding commitments. The Committee recommends that the FAA enter into letters of intent for multiyear funding of such capacity enhancement projects.

Baltimore-Washington International Airport.—The Committee encourages the FAA to give full and immediate consideration to the application of Baltimore-Washington International Airport for a letter of intent for a major capital improvement program including expansion of existing piers, runway and taxiway rehabilitation projects, and a mid-field cargo complex.

Memphis International Airport, TN.—The Committee encourages the FAA to give full and immediate consideration to the Memphis International Airport's application for a letter of intent for the airport expansion and improvement projects described in the authority's application. The projects include the reconstruction of runway 18R–36L, the extension of taxiway N to the south end of runway 18R–36L, construction of an aircraft apron at the south end of taxiway N, reconstruction of taxiway M, and the equipping of taxiway M as a temporary runway. The Committee is informed that substantial safety, capacity and economic benefits will accrue from the completion of this project.

Anchorage International Airport, AK.—The Committee encourages the FAA to give full and immediate consideration to the Anchorage International Airport's application for a letter of intent for the North/South Runway Parallel taxiways, SAP taxiways, WAP taxiways, roads and utilities relocations, Runway extension, Apron construction and reconstructions. The Anchorage International Airport is a major passenger, international cargo, and float plane facility. The Committee is informed that substantial safety, system capacity, efficiency, and furtherance of the Gateway program will result from the planned improvements at the airport.

Piedmont Triad International Airport, NC.—The Committee encourages the FAA to give full and immediate consideration to the Piedmont Triad Airport Authority's application for a letter of intent for construction of a parallel runway (5L–23R), and related improvements described in the authority's application, which are necessary to integrate this new runway into existing facilities. The Committee is informed that substantial safety, capacity and economic benefits will accrue from the completion of this project.

George Bush Intercontinental Airport/Houston.—The Committee encourages the FAA to give full and immediate consideration to the George Bush Intercontinental Airport's request for a letter of intent for its proposed capital improvement program which includes terminal and airfield development, a new runway, and extension and widening of an existing runway. The Committee is informed that the airport improvement will have national capacity enhancing impacts and will increase the efficiency of the airport contributing to a reduction in congestion at the airport and throughout the system.

ADMINISTRATION

The bill provides that, within the overall obligation limitation, $53,000,000 is available for administration of the airports program by the FAA. Of those funds, $4,500,000 is only available for the development of GPS approaches at airports that experience capacity constraints and significant operational delays due to weather. The Committee is convinced that substantial individual airport capacity and system-wide benefits will accrue through the FAA's aggressive development of GPS approaches at selected airports. In this regard, the FAA should develop a GPS approach for Bert Mooney Airport and work with the State of Oregon to facilitate the development of GPS approaches within their State program. This effort can be accommodated within the substantial growth in the administrative funding for the airports program.

GENERAL PROVISION

FAA Facilities on Airport Property.—The bill contains a provision (sec. 340) concerning FAA facilities on airport property. In order to maintain the FAA's future ability to secure below-market financing of FAA facilities located on airport property, the Committee believes FAA should continue its decades-old practice of paying below-market rates for the construction of buildings, maintenance, utilities and expenses (including replacement costs of older buildings) to airport sponsors for space in airport buildings relating to ATC, FSS/FSDO, air navigation and ATC weather-reporting and communication activities. As local governmental entities, airport sponsors have saved FAA significant real estate expense by providing the Agency, at the sponsor's risk, below-market financing for buildings required for ATC facilities. The Committee continues to agree with the long-standing airport grant assurance, "Land for Federal Facilities," which specifies that airport sponsors shall furnish without cost to the FAA land for ATC facilities. However, that assurance also specifies that building expenses are permitted to be paid by the FAA, and the Committee agrees that it is in the best long-term economic interest of the FAA's current and future need for ATC building facilities to continue to pay reasonable rental

rates for FAA space occupied in airport sponsor-owned buildings. As such, the Committee believes that FAA should not pursue guidelines that would require airport sponsors to provide cost-free space. In addition, the Department of Transportation Inspector General should provide the Committee with a study assessing the cost to airport sponsors of changing the current practice.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The bill includes a rescission of $579,000,000 in contract authority. This budget authority was made available in Public Law 106–181 for obligation during fiscal year 2000. However, since such funds are above the obligation limitation for that year, they are not available for obligation and are therefore available for rescission. This recommendation will have no programmatic impact, since the funding is not currently available for use in the AIP program.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROGRAM

The principle missions of the Federal Highway Administration are: to provide Federal financial and technical assistance to the States to plan, construct, and improve the National Highway System, urban and rural roads, and bridges; to foster the development of a safe, efficient, and effective highway and intermodal system nationwide; and to provide access to and within National Forests, National Parks, Indian Lands and other public lands.

Under the Committee recommendations, a total program level of $30,701,382,000 would be provided for the activities of the Federal Highway Administration in fiscal year 2001. The following table summarizes the fiscal year 2000 program levels, the fiscal year 2001 program request and the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2000 program level	2001 budget estimate	
Federal-aid highways limitation [1] [2]	27,701,350	29,318,806	29,661,806
Limitation on administrative expenses [3]	(376,072)	(315,834)	(386,658)
Exempt Federal-aid obligations	1,206,702	1,039,576	1,039,576
Emergency relief supplemental obligations			
Ellsworth [4]	(3,000)		
Total	28,908,052	30,358,382	30,701,382

[1] Includes Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act program and in 2000 includes $76,000,000 in administrative expenses for motor carriers.

[2] Does not reflect reduction of $105,260,000 pursuant to 0.38 percent reduction in section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

[3] Does not reflect reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69; fiscal year 2000 includes $76,058,000 for administrative expenses of the Office of Motor Carriers.

[4] Pursuant to section 3029 of Public Law 106–31.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000	$376,072,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	315,834,000
Committee recommendation [1]	386,657,840

[1] In fiscal year 2001, funding for motor carrier administration expenses is included as a separate limitation in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

The limitation on administrative expenses controls spending for virtually all the salaries and expenses of the Federal Highway Administration. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century changed the funding source for the highway research accounts from the administrative takedown of the Federal-Aid Highway Program to individual contract authority provisions. The Committee recommends a limitation of $386,657,840. This limitation excludes funding for the operations of the office of motor carriers, which is now provided in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, consistent with the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999. The budget request included a number of legislative set-asides within this limitation. The Committee has not included these items legislatively in the bill.

The following table reflects the fiscal year 2000 level, the 2001 level requested by the administration, and the Committee's recommendation:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2000 level [1]	2001 budget estimate	
Administrative expenses:			
Salaries and benefits	202,756	210,748	210,748
Travel	9,473	9,473	9,473
Transportation	663	465	465
GSA rent	20,275	16,537	16,537
Communications, rent, and utilities	9,955	9,857	9,857
Printing	1,609	1,512	1,512
TASC	7,764	6,621	6,621
Supplies	2,079	2,021	2,021
Equipment	4,947	6,947	4,947
Sec. 1102(f) restorations	98,500	(2)	96,231
Other	44,834	51,653	28,246
Total	304,355	315,834	386,658

[1] Reflects reduction of $1,233,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.
[2] Administration requests for these programs were included elsewhere in Federal Highways.

Administrative expenses.—The Committee recommends $210,748,000 for this appropriation. The Committee recommendation for administrative expenses provides FHWA the flexibility to allocate the appropriation among such expenses as ADP, permanent change of station, travel, transportation, salaries and benefits consistent with the other recommendations in the report. The Committee notes that the on-board workforce is 200 FTE below authorized levels for fiscal year 2000 which should provide ample flexibility to execute the program within the appropriated level.

Information technology activities.—The Committee has deferred increases in information technology activities totaling $2,400,000 in

fiscal year 2001 pending a review of the need and compatibility by the Department of Transportation chief information officer of the proposed new systems and enhancements and a determination of outyear costs.

Workforce development.—The Committee recommendation includes the requested $4,330,000 for workforce development activities.

Rural transportation planning initiative.—The Committee recommendation deletes the requested funding for the new rural transportation planning initiative as potentially duplicative of the LTAP and RTAP efforts and encourages the FHWA to initiate with the FTA, within those programs, appropriate modules to identify or address the most pressing rural transportation deficiencies.

Climate change center.—The Committee recommendation deletes the request for funding to establish a climate change center, which would conduct and coordinate the Department of Transportation's research on environmental strategies. The Committee recommendation provides funds within the FHWA research and technology program for the conduct of environmental research and questions the necessity of establishing a new center to coordinate this specific research.

Delta initiative.—The Committee recommendation does not include funding for the Delta initiative as requested in the budget due to budget constraints, incomplete articulation of programmatic objectives, and the applicability of other authorized programs to address elements of the initiative. The Committee seeks greater understanding of the administration's goals in this regard and stands ready to work with the administration to identify available funding for these and other economically beneficial initiatives for rurally impoverished regions of the country.

Technology sharing and transfer activities.—The Committee recommendation does not include the funding requested to encourage greater sharing among the Department of Transportation various administrations and their research and technology constituencies. Sufficient funding is provided for training and education activities in the highway research and technology programs to further the goals of this initiative.

National personal transportation survey.—The Committee recommendation does not provide the request for a national personal transportation survey under this heading. The Committee has included funding for this activity within the Bureau of Transportation Statistics appropriation.

International trade data systems.—The Committee recommendation includes the requested funding for international trade data systems. Within the funding provided, the Committee directs the FHWA to conduct a study with the University of Texas at El Paso and Dowling College of Long Island, NY through the NAFTA Intermodal Transportation Institute on transportation issues emerging from NAFTA and to work with the Arctic Council to identify opportunities for international cooperation and development in the circumpolar region.

OIG audit reimbursement.—The Committee recommendation directs the FHWA to reimburse the Office of Inspector General

$10,000,000 for audit and other highway related review work conducted in that office.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Limitation, 2000	($27,701,350,000)
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	(29,318,806,000)
Committee recommendation [2]	(29,661,806,000)

[1] The budget request includes new obligations of $3,058,000,000 associated with revenue aligned budget authority, of which $598,000,000 is transferred to other modal administrations. The request also includes $255,000,000 in additional obligation authority.

[2] The Committee recommendation includes $26,603,806,000 in guaranteed obligations, and $3,058,000,000 in obligations resulting from revenue aligned budget authority, consistent with current law.

The accompanying bill includes language limiting fiscal year 2001 Federal-aid highways obligations to $29,661,806,000, an increase of $1,960,456,000 over the fiscal year 2000 enacted level and $343,000,000 over the budget request. The recommended level is the level assumed in TEA21.

The obligation limitation for the Federal-aid highways program included in this bill includes $3,058,000,000 in obligations resulting from revenue aligned budget authority. TEA21 provides for an automatic increase in the Federal-aid highways program budget authority and obligation authority in any budget year in which projected income to the highway account of the highway trust fund exceeds estimates of income to the trust fund that were made at the time TEA21 was enacted. Under law, a determination of the size of this increase in so-called "firewall" spending levels is made in the President's budget submission. TEA21 calls for any such increases in budget authority to be distributed proportionately among Federal-aid highways apportioned and allocated programs, and for the overall Federal-aid obligation limitation to be increased by an equal amount, and certain amounts to be distributed to the motor carrier safety grants program of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. In total, the estimate of increased income, and therefore, budget authority and obligations for fiscal year 2001 is $3,058,000,000.

The budget request—in contravention of provisions of TEA21—proposed to allocate this additional obligation authority in fiscal year 2001 to other programs, including NHTSA's operations and research program; FTA's job access and reverse commute program; high speed rail activities; and the commercial drivers license program.

In addition, the budget request included several proposals which are not included in the Committee's recommendation. These proposals included: (1) a set aside of $1,200,000 from funds made available for administrative expenses for training on Indian reservations; (2) an additional $25,000,000 for the transportation and community and system preservation program; (3) an additional $140,000,000 for the national corridor planning and border infrastructure program; (4) an additional $221,500,000 for transportation research programs; and (5) $398,000,000 to implement an emergency relief reserve fund. These proposals have not been ap-

proved by the Committee as they are unauthorized and if adopted would have required corresponding reductions in the States' apportionments and their obligation authority in fiscal year 2001.

The following table indicates estimated obligations by State within the $29,661,806,000 provided by this Act and in permanent law:

ESTIMATED FISCAL YEAR 2001 DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION AND REVENUE ALIGNED BUDGET AUTHORITY (RABA)

STATES	OBLIGATION LIMITATION [1]	RABA	TOTAL
Alabama	$478,393,294	$60,783,866	$539,177,160
Alaska	273,338,905	35,732,730	309,071,635
Arizona	386,599,345	49,704,732	436,304,077
Arkansas	312,654,965	39,628,622	352,283,587
California	2,211,981,611	281,962,890	2,493,944,501
Colorado	275,490,135	35,004,926	310,495,061
Connecticut	353,217,355	45,542,794	398,760,149
Delaware	103,731,809	13,268,662	117,000,471
District of Columbia	93,741,325	11,865,040	105,606,365
Florida	1,121,666,241	144,774,894	1,266,441,135
Georgia	832,178,590	106,971,898	939,150,488
Hawaii	121,240,964	15,525,466	136,766,430
Idaho	181,168,531	23,146,002	204,314,533
Illinois	795,299,213	101,421,628	896,720,841
Indiana	555,444,640	71,291,154	626,735,794
Iowa	283,379,331	36,047,704	319,427,035
Kansas	276,678,619	35,139,478	311,818,097
Kentucky	423,684,551	54,114,368	477,798,919
Louisiana	376,584,623	48,126,804	424,711,427
Maine	124,948,152	15,782,338	140,730,490
Maryland	386,612,173	49,395,874	436,008,047
Massachusetts	440,827,553	55,894,124	496,721,677
Michigan	770,487,758	98,736,704	869,224,462
Minnesota	352,733,729	44,961,774	397,695,503
Mississippi	295,425,345	37,695,966	333,121,311
Missouri	585,613,867	74,578,504	660,192,371
Montana	230,749,423	29,775,746	260,525,169
Nebraska	183,090,968	23,295,844	206,386,812
Nevada	169,145,618	21,736,264	190,881,882
New Hampshire	121,821,196	15,482,654	137,303,850
New Jersey	632,567,758	80,764,838	713,332,596
New Mexico	231,198,136	29,641,194	260,839,330
New York	1,211,655,529	154,826,540	1,366,482,069
North Carolina	662,205,968	84,939,008	747,144,976
North Dakota	153,765,807	19,650,708	173,416,515
Ohio	823,947,807	105,158,504	929,106,311
Oklahoma	364,937,744	46,417,382	411,355,126
Oregon	291,813,790	36,536,984	328,350,774
Pennsylvania	1,190,371,427	149,606,534	1,339,977,961
Rhode Island	139,958,730	17,867,894	157,826,624
South Carolina	393,474,564	50,215,418	443,689,982
South Dakota	171,367,488	21,439,638	192,807,126
Tennessee	544,746,298	69,511,398	614,257,696
Texas	1,785,645,239	229,230,738	2,014,875,977
Utah	190,699,752	24,332,506	215,032,258
Vermont	107,423,888	13,715,130	121,139,018
Virginia	615,042,972	78,633,412	693,676,384
Washington	421,802,708	53,606,740	475,409,448

ESTIMATED FISCAL YEAR 2001 DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION AND REVENUE ALIGNED BUDGET AUTHORITY (RABA)—Continued

STATES	OBLIGATION LIMITATION [1]	RABA	TOTAL
West Virginia	267,976,665	33,943,800	301,920,465
Wisconsin	465,112,354	59,725,798	524,838,152
Wyoming	163,917,007	20,846,386	184,763,393
Subtotal	23,947,561,460	3,058,000,000	27,005,561,460
Allocation Programs [2]	2,656,244,540	.....	2,656,244,540
Total	26,603,806,000	3,058,000,000	29,661,806,000

[1] Includes Special Limitation (Minimum Guarantee, Appalachian Development Highway, High Priority Projects).
[2] Includes Territorial High Priority Projects.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS PROGRAMS

Federal-aid highways and bridges are managed through a Federal-State partnership. States and localities maintain ownership and responsibility for maintenance, repair and new construction of roads. State highway departments have the authority to initiate Federal-aid projects subject to FHWA approval of plans, specifications, and cost estimates. The Federal Government provides financial support for construction and repair through matching grants, the terms of which vary with the type of road.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA21), the highway, highway safety, and transit authorization through fiscal year 2003 makes funds available in the following major categories:

National highway system.—The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 authorized the National Highway System (NHS), which was subsequently established as a 163,000-mile road system by the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995. This system serves major population centers, intermodal transportation facilities, national border crossings, and major destinations. It is comprised of all interstate routes, selected urban and principal rural arterials, defense highways, and major highway connectors carrying up to 75 percent of commercial truck traffic and 40 percent of all vehicle traffic. States may transfer up to half of its NHS funds to the Surface Transportation program (STP) and all NHS funds with the concurrence of the Secretary of Transportation. The Federal share of the NHS is an 80 percent match and funds remain available for 4 fiscal years.

Interstate maintenance.—The 46,000-mile Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways retains a separate identity within the NHS. This program finances projects to rehabilitate, restore, resurface and reconstruct the Interstate system. Reconstruction of bridges, interchanges, and over-crossings along existing interstate routes is also an eligible activity if it does not add capacity other than high occupancy vehicle (HOV) and auxiliary lanes.

All remaining Federal funding to complete the initial construction of the interstate system has been provided through previous highway legislation. The TEA21 provides flexibility to States in

fully utilizing remaining unobligated balances of prior Interstate Construction authorizations. States with no remaining work to complete the interstate system may transfer any surplus Interstate Construction funds to their interstate maintenance program. States with remaining completion work on Interstate gaps or open-to-traffic segments may relinquish interstate construction fund eligibility for the work and transfer the Federal share of the cost to their interstate maintenance program.

Surface transportation program.—The surface transportation program (STP) is a very flexible program that may be used by the states and localities for any roads (including NHS) that are not functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors. These roads are collectively referred to as Federal-aid highways. Bridge projects paid with STP funds are not restricted to Federal-aid highways but may be on any public road. Transit capital projects are also eligible under this program. The total funding for the STP may be augmented by the transfer of funds from other programs and by minimum guarantee funds under TEA21 which may be used as if they were STP funds. Once distributed to the states, STP funds must be used according to the following percentages: 10 percent for safety construction; 10 percent for transportation enhancement; 50 percent divided among areas of over 200,000 population and remaining areas of the State; and, 30 percent for any area of the state. Areas of 5,000 population or less are guaranteed an amount based on previous funding, and 15 percent of the amounts reserved for these areas may be spent on rural minor collectors. The Federal share for the STP program is 80 percent with a 4-year availability period.

Bridge replacement and rehabilitation program.—This program is continued by the TEA21 to provide assistance for bridges on public roads including a discretionary set-aside for high cost bridges and for the seismic retrofit of bridges. Fifty percent of a state's bridge funds may be transferred to the NHS or the STP, but the amount of any such transfer is deducted from the national bridge needs used in the program's apportionment formula for the following year.

National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation Program.—The Committee recommendation provides $10,000,000 for the covered bridge program elsewhere in the bill, $2,000,000 above the level provided in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill. The Committee directs the FHWA to provide priority consideration for bridges within this $10,000,000 that are in eminent danger of failure absent remedial attention. The Committee has been made aware of one such bridge, the Cambridge Junction Covered Bridge, which was included in last year's report but which the FHWA has, to date, failed to address.

Congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program.—This program provides funds to States to improve air quality in non-attainment and maintenance areas. A wide range of transportation activities are eligible, as long as DOT, after consultation with EPA, determines they are likely to help meet national ambient air quality standards. TEA21 provides greater flexibility to engage public-private partnerships, and expands and clarifies eligibilities to include programs to reduce extreme cold starts, mainte-

nance areas, and particulate matter (PM–10) nonattainment and maintenance areas. If a State has no non-attainment or maintenance areas, the funds may be used as if they were STP funds.

On-road and off-road demonstration projects may be appropriate candidates for funding under the CMAQ program. Both sectors are critical for satisfying the purposes of the CMAQ program, including regional emissions and verifying new mobile source control techniques.

Federal lands highways.—This program provides authorizations through three major categories—Indian reservation roads, parkways and park roads, and public lands highways (which incorporates the previous forest highways category)—as well as a new category for Federally-owned public roads providing access to or within the National Wildlife Refuge System. TEA21 also establishes a new program for improving deficient bridges on Indian reservation roads.

The Committee directs that the funds allocated for this program in this bill and in permanent law are to be derived from the FHWA's public lands discretionary program, and not from funds allocated to the National Park Service's regions. Funds provided for the Federal lands program in fiscal year 2001 shall be available for the following activities:

Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge access road	$1,900,000
NM Route 4 Jemez Pueble Bypass	1,000,000
Giant Springs Road relocation L&C Interpretive Center (Great Falls, MT)	1,600,000
Highway 323 between Elzada and Ekalaka	1,000,000
Highway 419 reconstruction	5,200,000
Charles M. Russell/Fort Peck Roads coalition access project	1,000,000
New River Gorge National River road and safety improvements	3,500,000
Natchez Trace Parkway multi-use trail	675,000
Acadia National Park trails and road projects	500,000
Rampart Road Eureka connector	1,000,000
Sawtooth National Forest access (phase 2)	550,000
Delaware Water Gap Recreational Area	2,000,000
Teton Trail Pass (phase 3)	1,000,000
Cedar Pass landslide stabilization, Badlands National Park	1,750,000
James Campbell National Wildlife Refuge, Haleakala National Park, Maui, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Hakalau Forest National Refuge, Puuhonua Honaunau National Historic Park, and Hanalei National Wildlife Refuge	2,150,000
Forest Highway 26	1,300,000
Western Canal-Arena Reach Walkway	500,000
Boyer Chute NWR paving project	3,000,000
Hoover Dam bypass 4-lane bridge	11,000,000
Lake Cumberland access road and improvements	1,250,000
US 95 Widening Between Laughlin Cutoff and Railroad Pass	2,500,000
Milford lake replacement bridge (Corps of Engineers lake)	500,000
Old Lock I Park access road	1,600,000
Chugach Road	500,000
Iditarod (Millenium trail)	1,900,000
Metlakatla/Walden Point Road	2,000,000
Pasagshak Road Realignment and improvement	700,000
U.S. 26 Upgrade	500,000
Silvio Conte National Wildlife Refuge public roads	1,000,000

Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge access road.—The Committee has allocated $1,900,000 for the construction of an access road to the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge in Box Elder County, Utah. The Committee directs the FHWA to manage and oversee the environmental work, design, engineering and final construction of this

access road using funds appropriated for this project as well as any local matching funds. Local funding may include contributions of right of way by both private and public entities. The Committee further directs FHWA to work cooperatively with local county and State governments in moving this project forward.

REVENUE ALIGNED BUDGET AUTHORITY

Beginning in fiscal year 2000, TEA21 provides that guaranteed funding levels for the Federal-aid highways and highway safety programs are adjusted to reflect revised receipt estimates for the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund. In conjunction with this adjustment, section 110 of Title 23, entitled the Revenue Aligned Budget Authority (RABA), authorizes contract authority in an amount equal to the additional obligation limitation. This follows through on the TEA21 philosophy that highway program funding levels are linked to receipts to the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund.

In fiscal year 2001, the RABA adjustment is $3,058,000,000. The budget request proposes to reallocate a portion of the RABA to Administration priorities. Of the $3,058,000,000 adjustment, $741,000,000 would be transferred to these initiatives, and $2,317,000,000 would be distributed to Federal-aid and motor carrier programs as described by TEA21 and amended by the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999.

The following table presents the State-by-State allocation revenue aligned budget authority:

REVENUE ALIGNED BUDGET AUTHORITY

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Admin. distr.	TEA21 distr.	Full RABA committee recommendation
ALABAMA	41,620	56,296	60,784
ALASKA	24,403	33,019	35,733
ARIZONA	33,982	45,989	49,705
ARKANSAS	27,252	36,857	39,629
CALIFORNIA	192,556	260,472	281,963
COLORADO	23,972	32,437	35,005
CONNECTICUT	31,060	42,018	45,543
DELAWARE	9,079	12,289	13,269
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	8,094	10,950	11,865
FLORIDA	98,866	133,774	144,775
GEORGIA	72,971	98,720	106,972
HAWAII	10,580	14,312	15,525
IDAHO	15,797	21,359	23,146
ILLINOIS	69,077	93,428	101,422
INDIANA	48,609	65,756	71,291
IOWA	24,576	33,244	36,048
KANSAS	23,951	32,399	35,139
KENTUCKY	36,905	49,925	54,114
LOUISIANA	32,778	44,332	48,127
MAINE	10,896	14,739	15,782
MARYLAND	33,696	45,585	49,396
MASSACHUSETTS	38,389	51,919	55,894
MICHIGAN	67,305	91,044	98,737
MINNESOTA	30,608	41,395	44,962

REVENUE ALIGNED BUDGET AUTHORITY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Admin. distr.	TEA21 distr.	Full RABA committee recommendation
MISSISSIPPI	25,698	34,763	37,696
MISSOURI	50,947	68,911	74,579
MONTANA	20,374	27,577	29,776
NEBRASKA	15,929	21,557	23,296
NEVADA	14,846	20,089	21,736
NEW HAMPSHIRE	10,601	14,335	15,483
NEW JERSEY	55,014	74,409	80,765
NEW MEXICO	20,219	27,353	29,641
NEW YORK	105,420	142,576	154,827
NORTH CAROLINA	57,943	78,390	84,939
NORTH DAKOTA	13,438	18,187	19,651
OHIO	71,674	96,952	105,159
OKLAHOMA	31,735	42,934	46,417
OREGON	25,248	34,140	36,537
PENNSYLVANIA	102,976	139,222	149,607
RHODE ISLAND	12,276	16,612	17,868
SOUTH CAROLINA	34,553	46,751	50,215
SOUTH DAKOTA	14,918	20,176	21,440
TENNESSEE	47,385	64,099	69,511
TEXAS	156,693	212,010	229,231
UTAH	16,581	22,429	24,333
VERMONT	9,372	12,682	13,715
VIRGINIA	53,715	72,671	78,633
WASHINGTON	36,508	49,378	53,607
WEST VIRGINIA	23,057	31,172	33,944
WISCONSIN	40,737	55,111	59,726
WYOMING	14,316	19,373	20,846

Minimum guarantee.—Under TEA21, after the computation of funds for major Federal-aid programs, additional funds are distributed to ensure that each State receives an additional amount based on equity considerations. This minimum guarantee provision ensures that each State will have a return of 90.5 percent on its share of contributions to the highway account of the Highway Trust Fund. To achieve the minimum guarantee each fiscal year, $2,800,000,000 nationally is available to the States as though they are STP funds (except that requirements related to set-asides for transportation enhancements, safety, and sub-State allocations do not apply), and any remaining amounts are distributed among core highway programs.

Emergency relief.—This program provides for the repair and reconstruction of Federal-aid highways and Federally-owned roads which have suffered serious damage as the result of natural disasters or catastrophic failures. TEA21 restates the program eligibility specifying that emergency relief (ER) funds can be used only for emergency repairs to restore essential highway traffic, to minimize the extent of damage resulting from a natural disaster or catastrophic failure, or to protect the remaining facility and make permanent repairs. If ER funds are exhausted, the Secretary of Transportation may borrow funds from other highway programs.

High priority projects.—TEA21 includes 1,850 high priority projects specified by the Congress. Funding for these projects totals $9,500,000,000 over the 6 year period with a specified percentage of the project funds made available each year. Unlike demonstration projects in the past, the funds for TEA21 high priority projects are subject to the Federal-aid obligation limitation, but the obligation limitation associated with the projects does not expire.

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 TEA21, and this bill, funding totalling $450,000,000 will be available for fiscal year 2001 and will be distributed based on the latest available cost-to-complete estimate. The committee is supportive of a strong Federal commitment to complete these overdue safety and economic development infrastructure improvements within the timeframe anticipated by TEA21.

National corridor planning and border infrastructure programs.—TEA21 created a new national corridor planning and development program that identifies funds for planning, design, and construction of highway corridors of national significance, economic growth, and international or interregional trade. Allocations may be made to corridors identified in section 1105(c) of ISTEA and to other corridors using considerations outlined in legislation. The coordinated border infrastructure program is established to improve the safe movement of people and goods at or across the U.S./Mexico and U.S/Canada borders.

Ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities.—Section 1207 of TEA21 reauthorized funding for the construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities. The Committee notes that $20,000,000 of the funds in this program have been statutorily reserved and directs the FHWA to work with the State of Alaska to develop fast ferries for Southeast Alaska. Of the remaining appropriation, funds shall be available for the following projects:

Dorena Ferry Mississippi River Crossing	$500,000
Vallejo Baylink	500,000
SANDAG Highspeed ferry service	500,000
Providence and New Port ferry	500,000
Savannah Water Taxi	500,000
Alabama ferry docks	1,000,000
Curtis Vessel replacement for Rockland and Vinal Haven	1,000,000
State of Ohio ferries	1,000,000
New London, CT ferry expansion and improvement	1,000,000
Treasure Island Ferry Service initiation	500,000
Port of Corpus Christi (North Harbor) Ferry facility	1,000,000
Champlain Ferry Terminals	1,000,000
Provincetown Terminal Improvements	800,000
Gees Bend Ferry	1,000,000
Penns Landing Dock improvements	800,000

The Committee has provided substantial funding in this bill and in previous appropriations Acts to improve waterborne transportation systems for commuters throughout U.S. cities and ports. The Committee is concerned that existing regulations regarding the chartering of passenger vessels may have the effect of allowing foreign corporations to operate commuter ferries in the United States, which the Committee believes is contrary to the intent of laws re-

serving these and similar transportation operations for U.S. owned and controlled companies.

Transportation and community and system preservation pilot program.—TEA21 created a new transportation and community and system preservation program that provides grants to States and local governments for planning, developing, and implementing strategies to integrate transportation and community and system preservation plans and projects. These grants may be used to improve the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce transportation externalities and the need for future infrastructure investment, and improve transportation efficiency and access consistent with community character. Funds provided for this program for fiscal year 2001 shall be available for the following activities:

Auburn, AL transportation facilities improvement project	$800,000
Bangor, ME intermodal hub facility, crossing improvements, bike/pedestrian trails	600,000
Bedford, NH corridor planning study	250,000
Billings, MT open space improvement project	575,000
Bowling Green, KY Riverfront Development transportation enhancements	800,000
Burlington, VT North Street and Church Street Marcketplace community planning and improvements	1,100,000
Charleston, WV Kanawha Boulevard Walkway project	2,000,000
Claiborne County, MS access road for new port facility	400,000
Concord, NH 20/20 vision project	500,000
Dayton, OH Huffman Prairie Flying Field multimodal gateway entrance	700,000
Fairbanks, AK downtown transit/cultural integration planning	750,000
Flint, MI transportation planning and origin and destination shipping study	150,000
Heritage Corridor Project study, IL	200,000
Houston, TX Main Street connectivity project	750,000
GM&O intermodal center track alignment	500,000
Hudson River Waterfront Walkway, NJ	1,500,000
Jackson, MS traffic congestion mitigation project	600,000
Johnstown, PA pedestrian and streetscape improvements	450,000
Kansas City, MO Illus Davis Mall enhancements	350,000
Las Cruces, NM railroad and transportation museum	200,000
Marked Tree, AR U.S. Highway 63 improvements	600,000
Mobile, Alabama State Docks	1,500,000
Montana DOT/Western Montana College statewide geological sign project	400,000
Montana statewide rail grade separation study and environmental review	500,000
North Metro, MN trunk highway 610/10 improvement project	775,000
Olympic Discovery Trail, WA	500,000
Omaha, NE access and redevelopment project	300,000
Palmer, AK urban revitalization	200,000
Pittsburgh, PA Roberto Clemente Park pedestrian improvements	600,000
Portland, OR Pioneer Courthouse Square renovation project	400,000
Quincy, IL 18th Street Bridge project	300,000
Raton, NM rail depot/intermodal center redevelopment	750,000
Roseville, CA historic district revitalization project	500,000
Saddle Road, HI improvements	1,000,000
Soldotna, AK East Redoubt Avenue improvements	750,000
Springfield, MO center city plan	750,000
Talkeetna, AK parking lot/pedestrian underpass	400,000
Utah-Colorado "Isolated Empire" Rail Connector	500,000
Virginia Beach, VA bike trail	400,000
Wheeling, WV Victorian Village transportation initiative	500,000
City of New Bedford, MA North Terminal Project	200,000

LIMITATION ON TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH

Limitation, 2000 [1]	.....
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	.....
Committee recommendation [1]	($437,250,000)

[1] Resources available in fiscal year 2000 and requested in fiscal year 2001 are assumed within the Federal-aid highways obligation limitation.

The limitation controls spending for the transportation research and technology programs of the FHWA. This limitation includes the intelligent transportation systems, surface transportation research, technology deployment, training and education, and university transportation research. The Committee recommendation provides an obligation limitation for transportation research of $437,250,000 for the following programs:

Surface transportation research	$98,000,000
Technology deployment program	45,000,000
Training and education	18,000,000
Bureau of transportation statistics	31,000,000
ITS standards, research, operational tests, and development	100,000,000
ITS deployment	118,000,000
University transportation research	27,250,000
Subtotal	437,250,000

Surface Transportation Research.—Within the funds provided for surface transportation research and development, the accompanying bill provides funding for the following activities in the specified amounts consistent with the provisions of TEA21:

Technology assessment and deployment	$14,000,000
International activities	500,000
Research and technology support	7,500,000
Highway research and development	66,000,000
LTPP	10,000,000
Subtotal	98,000,000

Within the funds provided for highway research and development, the Committee recommends that $66,000,000 be allocated for the following activities in the specified amounts:

Safety	$15,000,000
Pavements	15,000,000
Structures	15,000,000
Environment	6,200,000
Policy	4,600,000
Planning and real estate	4,100,000
Advanced research	900,000
Highway operations and asset management	5,200,000
Total	66,000,000

The Committee has allocated the surface transportation research and development account in the same manner as it has historically, rather than in the new configuration proposed by FHWA. This allocation will not interfere with the performance-based approach required under GPRA, but will ensure that the flow of Federal investments can be monitored easily. The Committee's allocation concentrates funds in the three foundations of FHWA's research and development program: safety, pavements, and structures. To respond to the pressing challenges of today's highway environment, increased funds also have been made available for highway operations and asset management.

The Committee also seeks to ensure that FHWA continues to focus on research and development, and therefore, does not approve the use of any funds specified under highway research and development to support technology deployment, assessment, or other programmatic purposes as proposed by FHWA. Instead, under the surface transportation research and development subaccount, the Committee directs that $14,000,000 be allocated for technology deployment and assessment activities to expedite the transfer of advanced technologies to state and local governments. Next year, FHWA should be prepared to show how funds to advance research and development were tracked separately from funds spent on technology deployment and assessment functions.

In the fiscal year 2002 budget justification, the Committee expects FHWA to delineate the proposed allocation of surface transportation research and development funds using the same categorical basis displayed in this report. The FHWA should document how it proposes to allocate the technology assessment and deployment funds by specific projects or activities to be conducted by the core business units, state division offices, or resource centers. The justification will include a separate discussion of how the technology deployment program funds will be integrated with the surface transportation R&D funds.

The Committee deletes funding for various administrative activities from the surface transportation R&D account and notes that funding under the general operating expense account (LAE) are available for many of these activities.

Safety Research.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for safety research and development activities. The Committee commends FHWA for the development of various safety-oriented technologies and its assistance to States to reduce run-off-the road crashes, increase pedestrian and bicycle safety, improve roadside design and hardware, reduce hazards in work zones, advance safety and speed management systems, and further highway safety information systems.

The Committee has increased funds above the requested amount to allow FHWA to expand its efforts to improve traffic safety at various types of intersections. Almost 25 percent of all fatal motor vehicle crashes are intersection-related. Intersection safety is a concern in both rural and urban areas—44 percent of intersection-related fatal crashes occur in rural areas and 56 percent in urban areas. Providing increased funds for this area of research is consistent with the AASHTO Strategic Highway Safety Plan, which identifies improving the design and operation of highway intersections as 1 of its 22 strategies to reduce highway deaths and injuries. FHWA should identify the most common and severe safety problems at intersections and compile information on effective applications and design of innovative infrastructure configurations and treatments at both signalized and unsignalized intersections and interchanges. Within the funds provided, up to $500,000 is to explore traffic striping technology improvements which enhance reflectivity in heavy rain. The Committee recommendation provides up to $2,000,000 is available for research into the Freezefree anticing system initiative. In addition, up to $2,000,000 may be used for cooperative research at the Western Washington University Ve-

hicle Research Institute for safety and related initiatives and $500,000 is for rural bridge safety research in cooperation with the Vermont Agency of Transportation.

Pavements.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for pavements research and development, including work on asphalt, Portland cement concrete pavements, and recycled materials. This increase in funding above the fiscal year 2000 appropriation, along with the funds provided for the LTPP, will allow FHWA to undertake research projects to improve the Nation's infrastructure. In the effort to identify and develop better asphalt pavements, the FHWA should not overlook the significance of high quality initial asphalt products before the application of additives or the introduction of composites. The Committee has been informed that the introduction of additives or composites may simply restore the durability and performance specifications of high quality asphalt products that actually cost less than the compound hybrid products. The FHWA should seek the lowest cost, highest quality products in the research effort regardless of whether that solution involves composites, polymers, additives, or simply better quality concretes or asphalts. Within the recommended appropriation, up to $750,000 is for the Portland cement concrete pavement research at the Iowa State University Center for Transportation Research and Education Center, up to $2,000,000 is for alkali silica reactivity research with lithium based technologies, $2,500,000 is for the National Center for Asphalt Technology Pavement Research at Auburn University, up to $2,000,000 is for the cooperative polymer additive demonstration involving the South Carolina Department of Transportation, South Carolina State University, and Clemson University, up to $2,000,000 is for further research into the GSB–88 emulsified sealer/binder treatment, and up to $1,000,000 is for geosynthetic material pavement research at the Western Transportation Institute.

Structures.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for structures research and development. These funds will help FHWA make progress towards its performance goal to reduce deficiencies on NHS bridges from 25 percent to 20 percent and reduce deficiencies on all bridges from 31.4 percent to 25 percent by 2007. This funding will ensure continued progress on high performance materials and engineering applications to efficiently design, repair, rehabilitate, and retrofit bridges. Of the funds provided, up to $2,000,000 is available for research at the Center for Advanced Bridge Engineering at Wayne State University, up to $2,000,000 is for the continuing destructive testing research at the Utah Transportation Center, up to $1,500,000 is for advanced sensor and inspection research at the New Mexico State University Bridge Research Center, up to $2,000,000 is for earthquake hazards mitigation research at University of Missouri-Rolla, up to $2,000,000 is for research into composite structure and related engineering research at West Virginia University, up to $2,000,000 is for polymer matrix composite research for wood structures at the University of Maine, up to $2,000,000 is for completion of the rust proofing and paint technology transfer project using the I–110 bridge from I–10 to U.S. 90, and up to $1,500,000 is for cooperative work with the

Transportation Research Center (TRAC) at the Washington State University.

The Committee is aware of the critical need for addressing bridge safety requirements at the Delaware Memorial Bridge. With the deepening of the shipping channel for the Delaware River from 40 feet to 45 feet to facilitate the transit of supertankers, the need exists to protect the base of the Delaware Memorial Bridge by installing a state-of-the-art, composite materials bridge fendering system. Noting that the Delaware Valley has the largest complex of oil refineries on the East Coast and that the Delaware Memorial Bridge is the major route for traffic between the Washington D.C.-Baltimore area and the New York City-New England area, the Committee is concerned for the severe impact both on the economy and the defense posture of our Nation should the Delaware Memorial Bridge be struck by a supertanker run errant while transiting the Delaware River. The Committee encourages the Federal Highway Administration to enter into discussions with the DRBA with a view to including funding for this bridge fendering system in the FHWA's budget request for fiscal year 2002.

Policy Research.—The Committee recommends $4,600,000 for policy research. Additional funds to complete the NPTS should be obtained from the Bureau of Transportation Statistics. Because of budgetary constraints, the Committee has deleted funds for research cooperation with various international organizations and requests to be consulted before future international agreements are consummated that are likely to require financial support.

Planning and Real Estate Research.—The Committee recommends $4,100,000 for planning and real estate research, including an increase of $100,000 in the real estate services portion of the planning R&D budget above the amount specified last year. These additional funds will help FHWA respond to requests from AASHTO and other groups for increased research in the real estate service area.

Highway Operations and Asset Management.—The Committee recommends $5,200,000 for highway operations and asset management. Funds provided under this category support a variety of research projects seeking to improve highway operations, including work to improve the manual of uniform traffic control devices, work zone operations, technologies that facilitate operational responses to changes in weather conditions, and freight management operations. Of the $600,000 provided for asset management, the Committee has not included any funds for statistical analysis of the National Quality Initiative. Such analysis shall be performed by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics. Of the funds provided, up to $800,000 is to support the innovative infrastructure financing best practices research ongoing at the University of Southern California and up to $1,000,000 is for the road life research program at New Mexico Highway 44.

Environment Research.—The Committee recommends $6,200,000 for research on environmental issues affecting highway operations and construction. Within the appropriated funds, up to $1,000,000 is for the Sustainable Transportation Systems Lab and the National Center for Transportation Technology (NIATT) for mitigation effort research for heavily trafficked national parks, $1,500,000 is

for a dust and persistent particulate abatement demonstration study at Kotzebue, Alaska and $1,000,000 is to facilitate the work at the National Environmental Respiratory Center on air quality. The Committee is aware that the Department has not been responsive to the National Environmental Research Center in its efforts to establish a collaborative relationship as was encouraged in the fiscal year 2000 conference agreement, and directs FHWA to provide a letter report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the agency's efforts to work with NERC before November 30, 2000.

R&T Technical Support.—The Committee has limited funds for R&T technical support to $7,500,000. Funding for other agency-wide initiatives requested under the category "Agency R&T Programs" have not been approved, unless otherwise specified under the limitation on general operating expenses.

R&D Partnership Initiative.—The Committee continues to support FHWA's participation in the National R&T Partnership Initiative. As part of this partnership, five working groups have been formed to advance a national research agenda in the areas of safety, infrastructure renewal, operations and mobility, planning and environment, and policy analysis and systems monitoring. Key partners and stakeholders, including, State DOTs, academia, local governmental officials, and private sector representatives, are participating along with FHWA as part of this effort. The products of this initiative will provide input to the FHWA and other participants in shaping R&D directions and priorities, and increase opportunities for collaborative approaches to conducting high-priority R&T activities. The Committee notes that the Transportation Research Board (TRB) has taken a significant role in facilitating this effort, and that the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) has voiced strong support and participates actively in this effort. The Committee encourages FHWA's continued support of this partnership initiative and appreciates the involvement of TRB, AASHTO, and others to advance the overall highway R&T program.

ITS Standards, Research, Operational Tests, Development, and Deployment.—The Committee recommends that the $218,000,000 authorized in TEA21 for ITS research and associated activities in fiscal year 2001 be allocated in the following manner:

Research and Development	$48,680,000
Operational Tests	11,820,000
Evaluation/Program Policy Assessment	7,750,000
Architecture and Standards	13,750,000
Program Support	9,000,000
Integration Support	9,000,000
ITS Deployment Incentive Program	118,000,000

The Committee commends the ITS program office on the detailed and exhaustive justification for the ITS Standards, Research, Operational Tests, and Development justification. In future justifications, the Committee requests that the justification spending plan summary table (pp. 1–5) also include the immediately prior 2 fiscal years' funding levels for the individual activity or project.

ITS rail-highway crossing.—The Committee has included $500,000 to initiate the design, engineering and installation of intelligent transportation systems at railroad-highway crossings on rail corridors that are being equipped with positive train control

systems. These funds will be used to perform the preliminary engineering needed to determine the costs to equip those corridors to improve safety by providing warnings to motorists of arriving trains and by providing warnings to trains that are blocked by obstacles in the crossings. This project should be viewed by the Joint Program Office as a multi-year effort to advance this technology. The Federal Railroad Administration had included this new program in its railroad research and development request, but would have contracted with the FHWA JPO to manage the research program.

IVI Research.—The Committees's allowance includes $30,000,000 for the Intelligent Vehicle Program. The Committee notes that the focus of the IVI program is divided between truck and light vehicle initiatives. The Committee's recommendation provides adequate resources for the FHWA to pursue an additional operational test and encourages the FHWA to develop an additional operational test on advanced collision avoidance technologies on the light vehicle platform to maximize the future safety benefits and to maintain a relative balance in the program.

Specified ITS Deployment Projects.—It is the intent of the Committee that the following projects contribute to the integration and interoperability of intelligent transportation systems in metropolitan and rural areas as provided under section 5208 of the TEA21 and promote deployment of the commercial vehicle intelligent transportation system infrastructure as provided under section 5209 of the TEA21. Funding for deployment activities are to be available as follows:

Calhoun County, MI	$500,000
Wayne County, MI	1,500,000
Southeast Michigan	1,000,000
Indiana Statewide (SAFE–T)	1,500,000
Salt Lake City (Olympic Games)	2,000,000
State of New Mexico	1,500,000
Santa Teresa, NM	1,000,000
State of Missouri (Rural)	1,000,000
Springfield-Branson, MO	1,500,000
Kansas City, MO	2,500,000
Inglewood, CA	1,200,000
Lewis & Clark trail, MT	1,250,000
State of Montana	1,500,000
Fort Collins, CO	2,000,000
Arapahoe County, CO	1,000,000
I–70 West project, CO	1,000,000
I–81 Safety Corridor, VA	1,000,000
Aquidneck Island, RI	750,000
Hattiesburg, MS	1,000,000
Jackson, MS	1,000,000
Grand Forks, ND	1,000,000
Moscow, ID	1,750,000
State of Ohio	2,500,000
State of Connecticut	3,000,000
Illinois Statewide	2,000,000
Charlotte, NC	1,250,000
Nashville, TN	1,000,000
State of Tennessee	2,600,000
Spokane, WA	1,000,000
Bellingham, WA	700,000
Puget Sound Regional Fare Coordination	2,000,000
Bay County, FL	1,000,000
Iowa statewide (traffic enforcement)	3,000,000
State of Nebraska	2,600,000

State of North Carolina	3,000,000
South Carolina statewide	2,000,000
San Antonio, TX	200,000
Beaumont, TX	300,000
Corpus Christi, TX (vehicle dispatching)	1,500,000
Williamson County/Round Rock, TX	500,000
Austin, TX	500,000
Texas Border Phase I Houston, TX	1,000,000
Oklahoma statewide	2,000,000
Vermont statewide	1,000,000
Vermont rural ITS	1,500,000
State of Wisconsin	3,600,000
Tucson, AZ	2,500,000
Cargo Mate, NJ	1,000,000
New Jersey regional integration/TRANSCOM	4,000,000
State of Kentucky	2,000,000
State of Maryland	4,000,000
Sacramento to Reno, I–80 corridor	200,000
Washoe County, NV	200,000
North Las Vegas, NV	1,800,000
Delaware statewide	1,000,000
North Central Pennsylvania	1,500,000
Delaware River Port Authority	3,500,000
Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission	3,000,000
Huntsville, AL	2,000,000
Tuscaloosa/Muscle Shoals	3,000,000
Automated crash notification system, UAB	2,000,000
Oregon statewide	1,500,000
Alaska statewide	4,200,000
South Dakota commercial vehicle ITS	1,500,000

NATIONWIDE DIFFERENTIAL GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM

Appropriations, 2000	($5,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2001	(18,700,000)
Committee recommendation [1]	.....

[1] Funding for NDGPS provided within FAA "facilities and equipment" account.

The administration has requested that $18,700,000 be provided for the fiscal year 2001 nationwide differential global positioning system (NDGPS) within the Federal Highway Administration's highway research and development program, using transferred revenue aligned budget authority. The Committee does not concur in the proposed RABA transfer, but has provided the requested NDGPS program funding within the Federal Aviation Administration's facilities and equipment account under the landing and navigational aids sub-account.

Of the recommended funding level of $18,700,000, $13,200,000 will be utilized for capital costs, and $5,500,000 will be spent for operating expenses. By the end of this calendar year, 23 decommissioned U.S. Air Force ground wave emergency network (GWEN) transmitting sites will have been converted to a differential GPS system and integrated into the nationwide network. DOT plans to establish an additional 28 sites in fiscal year 2001, and the remaining 16 sites to complete the national system will be established in fiscal year 2002. There is an estimated annualized operating cost of $6,900,000 for operating and maintaining the NDGPS.

The Committee has expressed concern over the last 2 years that, while system benefits directly accrue to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and many other Federal, State and local agencies have public safety and mapping needs that will be indirectly aided by the availability of a differential GPS system,

DOT is the only Federal agency that requests appropriated funds for the development and operation of the NDGPS system. The Committee directs that a cost-sharing plan involving at least both DOT and the Department of Commerce be developed and conveyed to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than July 31, 2000, and that this cost-sharing plan be reflected in these two departmental budget requests for fiscal year 2002. The Committee will not support an ongoing commitment to annual operating costs for the NDGPS system if DOT remains the only Federal entity which directly supports those operations.

MAGNETIC LEVITATION TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000	($20,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2001	(25,000,000)
Committee recommendation (section 1218 funds)	(25,000,000)
Committee recommendation (section 3015(c) funds)	(5,000,000)

Section 1218 of TEA21 provides $25,000,000 in highway trust funds contract authority for Maglev preconstruction activities in fiscal year 2001. Additionally, Section 3015(c) of TEA21 provides $5,000,000 from FHWA's technology deployment program for the development of low speed magnetic levitation technology in fiscal year 2001, bringing the total guaranteed contract authority available for maglev activities to $30,000,000.

The high speed maglev program is administered by the Federal Railroad Administration; the low speed maglev program is administered by the Federal Transit Administration. A total of $5,000,000 of the funds provided between fiscal year 1999 and 2001 in Section 1218 of TEA21 must be made available for research and development of low speed magnetic levitation for urban public transportation purposes. Thus far, $2,000,000 of the high speed maglev program funds have been transferred to FTA for the low speed urban maglev program. Therefore, in fiscal year 2001, FTA will receive directly or be transferred a total of $8,000,000 for low speed maglev development ($3,000,000 from Section 1218 and $5,000,000 from Section 3015(c)). The Federal Railroad Administration will be transferred $22,000,000 for the deployment of high speed maglev projects. This is the final year of guaranteed contract authority funding for the high speed maglev program under the TEA21 authorization cycle.

High-speed maglev deployment program.—The administration has requested that $2,000,000 of the Section 1218 funds be made available for FRA's administration of the high speed maglev program. The Committee recommendation provides $25,000,000 for the high speed magnetic levitation technology deployment program, of which not more than $1,000,000 shall be available to the Federal Railroad Administration for administrative expenses and technical assistance. Within the high speed maglev program funds made available for fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends the fol-

lowing amounts be made available for preconstruction planning and environmental impact assessments:

Port Authority of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh International Airport link	$7,000,000
Maryland Department of Transportation: Baltimore-Washington International Airport-Washington, D.C. link	4,000,000
California-Nevada super speed train commission, Las Vegas, NV to Anaheim, CA	4,000,000
Georgia/Atlanta Regional Commission, Atlanta to Chattanooga	3,000,000
Southern California Association of Governments: Los Angeles International Airport to March Air Force Base	3,000,000

Low-speed maglev program.—Within the $8,000,000 total low speed maglev program funds made available for fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends the following amounts be made available for research and development of low speed magnetic levitation for urban public transportation purposes:

Segmented rail phased induction electric magnetic motor (SERAPHIM) project	$2,000,000
Colorado Intermountain Fixed Guideway Authority airport link project	2,000,000
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania airborne shuttle system (PASS)	2,000,000

BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	($31,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2001	(31,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(31,000,000)

[1] Excludes reduction of $182,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.

The Bureau of Transportation Statistics [BTS] was established in section 6006 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA], to compile, analyze, and make accessible information on the Nation's transportation systems, collect information on intermodal transportation, and enhance the quality and effectiveness of the statistical programs of the Department of Transportation. For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends a funding level of $31,000,000.

BTS offices include the Director, Statistical Programs and Services, Transportation Studies, and the Office of Airline Information [OAI]. In addition, effective January 1, 1996, the responsibility to collect motor carrier financial data was transferred to the BTS after the sunset of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Office of Airline Information collects and compiles financial and traffic (passenger and cargo) data. This information provides the Government with uniform and comprehensive economic and market data on individual airline operations. This program includes a small field office located in Anchorage, AK, which provides consumers and the Government with airline data related to essential air service and the intra-Alaskan mail rate program. The statistical aviation data compiled by OAI includes: airline passenger traffic statistics, ontime performance data by carrier, financial performance and certification data, fuel purchase and consumption, and other business and consumer directed statistics. These statistics are vitally important to the Federal Government and the aviation industry. In some cases, it is statutorily required that these statistics be used by the Federal Aviation Administration and the

Office of the Secretary of Transportation in allocation of trust funds, aviation bilateral negotiations, and other Federal transportation policy decisionmaking.

National Quality Initiative.—Of the funds provided, $600,000 is for statistical analysis of the National Quality Initiative.

National Passenger Transportation Survey (NPTS).—Of the funds provided to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, up to $5,000,000 may be used for the NPTS.

Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel project, Boston, Massachusetts.—Originally estimated to cost $2,500,000,000 in 1985, the Project is now estimated to top over $13,100,000,000.

In May 1999, the Inspector General (IG) questioned the Project's use of an $826,000,000 credit that it planned to obtain by overpaying for insurance and investing the excess until 2017. The Project was carrying the credit as an offset to current costs. In October 1999, the IG issued a draft report which identified $142,000,000 of cost overruns and suggested that the cost could increase by another $942,000,000. The IG also identified that the Project's finance plans did not adequately disclose costs on the Project. Both FHWA and Project management officials disagreed with the IG's warning that Project's costs could rise.

In January 2000, Project officials submitted a revised finance plan to the FHWA. Ignoring the IG's earlier warnings that costs could rise and finance plans were incomplete, FHWA approved the revised finance plan on February 1, 2000. Later that same day, the Project surprised FHWA by announcing a $1,400,000,000 cost increase. Project officials have since acknowledged that they were well aware of cost escalation when they replied to the IG. Project management withheld that information from the Federal government.

The withholding of information by Project officials, however egregious, does not excuse FHWA. FHWA had not performed its oversight duties and was unaware of the cost increases until they were announced by the Project. The Secretary of Transportation later termed the actions "unconscionable" and promised to reform FHWA's major project oversight. The Committee accepts the conclusions and recommendations of the department's task force but remains skeptical that they will be implemented effectively. FHWA's long established approach to "partnering" on all large highway projects must include strong and effective verification mechanisms to prevent the recurrence of situations similar to those on the Central Artery.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000	($26,000,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2001	(28,000,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(28,000,000,000)

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $28,000,000,000.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROGRAM

In November 1999, the Congress passed the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act (Public Law 106–159), which established the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) within the Department of Transportation. Prior to this legislation, motor carrier safety responsibilities were housed within the Federal Highway Administration.

The preeminent mission of the FMCSA is to improve the safety of commercial vehicle operations on the nation's highways. A primary goal of the agency is to reduce the number of accidents and fatalities due to truck accidents. FMCSA resources and activities contribute to safety in commercial vehicle operations through enforcement, safety regulation, technological innovation, improvements in information systems, training, and improvements to commercial driver's license testing, record keeping, and sanctions. To achieve these goals, the FMCSA works with Federal, State, and local enforcement agencies, the motor carrier industry, and highway safety organizations.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The office of motor carrier safety provides for most of the salaries, expenses and research funding for the FMCSA. The Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 (MCSIA) amended Section 104(a)(1) of title 23 to provide one-third of one percent to be made available to administer motor carrier safety programs and motor carrier research.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	($76,058,000)
Budget estimate, 2001	(92,194,000)
Committee recommendation	(92,194,000)

[1] Provided under FHWA's limitation on administrative expenses in fiscal year 2000. This amount includes funding for administrative expenses and research and technology initiatives.

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $92,194,000 for operating expenses and research for the FMCSA consistent with the budget request. Of the funds provided, $82,344,000 is for operating expenses and $9,850,000 is for research and technology initiatives. The recommendation provides the following adjustments to the budget request:

High-risk, intrastate carrier information	−$500,000
Personnel adjustments	−460,483
Motor Carrier Safety Advisory Committee	+100,000
Travel and transportation expenses	−500,000
Contract to administer vision exemption program	−638,000
Uniform carrier registration	+1,000,000
Motor carrier research	+200,000
Net	−798,483

High risk, intrastate carrier information.—The Committee deletes GOE funds for the high-risk, intrastate carrier information initiative and recommends funding this activity under the MCSAP

program because of its direct relevance to state motor carrier safety.

Personnel Adjustments.—The Committee has added 2 FTEs for MCSAP implementation, 1 FTE for an information systems analyst, and 3 FTEs for vision exemption specialists. The Committee deletes funds for 4 FTEs for the executive secretariat, 1 FTE for an international specialist, 1 FTE, for a technology specialist, and 10 FTEs for motor carrier inspectors.

MCSAP Implementation.—The Committee has added two additional staff to ensure that the FMCSA conducts proper oversight over a substantially expanded MCSAP, responds to concerns and questions of the states in a timely manner, and assists FMCSA field staff in program implementation.

Safety Investigators.—The Committee has approved 42 FTEs for new safety investigators. Consistent with the intent of the MCSIA, those personnel will target their activities to motor carriers with poor compliance records or high crash rates. FMCSA is urged to maintain an adequate number of safety specialists who are conducting compliance reviews on a full-time basis. The Committee would like to be notified in the future whenever there are less than 300 safety specialists (including trainees) conducting this function on a full-time basis.

Technology and Information Specialists.—The Committee has approved the addition of three technology specialists, instead of the four requested. The Committee notes that there are currently more than 7 employees working to advance the CVO and PRISM programs. The Committee also has added 1 FTE to assist in the development of the improved information systems and to provide technical assistance to field operations on new computer systems.

Border Personnel.—FMCSA has requested funds for 20 additional employees to inspect vehicles at the border. However, the Committee notes that the base program already includes sufficient funds to support 40 Federal personnel conducting border inspections. Furthermore, additional funds authorized by the MCSIA will allow border States to increase substantially the number of State inspectors. The Committee seeks to ensure that there is an appropriate balance of inspectors serving the needs of safety at the border relative to the number of investigators focusing on high-risk motor carriers that operate throughout the Nation. The Committee's allowance includes funds for 10 of the 20 additional FTEs and positions which FMCSA requested to be employed at the border as safety inspectors. The Committee, however, directs that these personnel be employed as safety investigators conducting compliance reviews and that they be assigned to locations throughout the country, including the borders, based on need. The FMCSA is directed to submit an analysis to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that assesses the safety contributions that these 10 personnel are likely to make as safety investigators compared to their expected contributions that might be anticipated if these personnel served as safety inspectors at the border. The analysis should also take into account workload considerations of both Federal and State personnel conducting inspections and investigations (or audits). After consideration of the analysis, the House

and Senate Appropriations Committees will make a determination on the permanent assignment of those personnel.

Motor Carrier Advisory Committee.—ISTEA, TEA21, and the MCSIA specify numerous regulatory requirements that will be promulgated by the FMCSA. To expedite progress on the development of cost effective regulations, the Committee's allowance includes $100,000 to provide support for the Motor Carrier Safety Advisory Committee (MCSAC), which is authorized in the MCSIA. The MCSAC will bring together diverse elements of the motor carrier, shipper, insurance, and highway safety communities to formulate improved regulations and to offer recommendations to improve relevant safety activities and information systems. In addition to helping the FMCSA with its regulatory agenda, MCSAC members will offer recommendations designed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this agency.

Vision Exemption.—The Committee deletes funding for the administration of the vision exemption program for commercial drivers. Processing applications will be a continuing function that should only be conducted by Federal officials trained in the motor carrier safety regulations associated with the exemption program. The three new positions recommended by the Committee will monitor and review the 50 to 55 applications that FMCSA typically receives each month under this program and will assist the agency in developing improved regulations that set the minimum medical standards for commercial drivers.

Uniform Carrier Registration.—The Committee has increased funding for the Uniform Carrier Registration Program by $1,000,000.

Motor Carrier Research.—The Committee recommends $9,850,000 for motor carrier safety research. The additional funding above the request permits an increased effort on the "Share the Road" initiative, the "No-zone" initiative, and to facilitate a cooperative effort with the Army to develop safer, more efficient trucks.

Although the Committee notes that the fiscal year 2001 budget justification for motor carrier research is more useful than previous presentations, there remain additional opportunities to improve the budget justification. Last year, consistent with TRB recommendations, the Department was directed to ensure that ". . . the justification for new projects will include an analysis of the possible impacts of the proposed research to crash reduction." This recommendation was not reflected in the budget request, and consequently, FMCSA is directed to provide that analysis and consult with both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before initiating any new project. Future budget requests should provide the recommended analysis to assist the Committee in ascertaining how each current and proposed R&D project is expected to reduce the frequency of crashes involving commercial motor vehicles. The Committee would view favorably efforts to relate proposed research projects to possible improvements in FMCSA activities.

The Committee expects that not less than $1,000,000 will be used to improve the "share the road" campaign and associated activities. Working in conjunction with NHTSA, this initiative will be used to develop and test innovative approaches to encourage the

motoring public to drive safely in the vicinity of commercial vehicles. The FMCSA shall enter into cooperative agreements with two or more states to conduct demonstration projects to accomplish these objectives.

The Committee's allowance includes sufficient funds for FMCSA to develop a safety performance and cost model that could be used to evaluate the expected safety benefits and economic impacts of proposed regulatory initiatives, new enforcement strategies, technology advances, or incentive programs on commercial motor vehicle and driver safety. The computer model should be designed to easily incorporate new knowledge gained in the area of crash causation and new crash data obtained through improved information systems.

GENERAL PROVISION

Hours of service.—The Committee recommendation includes a general provision (sec. 335) that prohibits the use of funds to finalize the rulemaking under docket No. FMCSA–97–2350–953.

NATIONAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY PROGRAM

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

	(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(Limitation on obligations)
Appropriations, 2000	($105,000,000)	($105,000,000)
Budget estimate, 2001	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(177,000,000)	(177,000,000)

The FMCSA's national motor carrier safety program was authorized by TEA21 and amended by the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999. This program consists of two major areas: the motor carrier safety assistance program (MCSAP) and the information systems and strategic safety initiatives (ISSSI). MCSAP provides grants and project funding to States to develop and implement national programs for the uniform enforcement of Federal and State rules and regulations concerning motor safety. The major objective of this program is to reduce the number and severity of accidents involving commercial motor vehicles. Grants are made to qualified States for the development of programs to enforce the Federal motor carrier safety and hazardous materials regulations and the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986. The basic program is targeted at roadside vehicle safety inspections of both interstate and intrastate commercial motor vehicle traffic. ISSSI provides funds to develop and enhance data-related motor carrier programs.

The Committee recommends $177,000,000 in liquidating cash for this program. This is an increase of $72,000,000 above the level enacted in fiscal year 2000.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The Committee recommends a $177,000,000 limitation on obligations for motor carrier safety grants. This is the level authorized

under the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999, which amended TEA21. None of this funding is derived from revenue aligned budget authority due to lack of authorization.

The Committee recommends the following allocation of motor carrier safety funds:

Basic motor carrier safety grants	$130,000,000
Performance-based incentive grant program	10,000,000
Border assistance	5,500,000
Priority initiatives	8,000,000
State training and administration	1,500,000
Crash causation	5,000,000
Information systems and strategic safety initiatives	17,000,000

The Department has invested substantial sums developing the ASPEN, SAFER, Mailbox, and Inspection Selection Systems to assist MCSAP officers so that they can maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of their inspection and audit activities. The Committee encourages FMCSA to provide increased technical assistance to each of the States to maximize the potential benefits that could be derived from deploying these technologies. The additional funds authorized by the MCSIA provide substantial funds to purchase and maintain these technologies and associated communication systems.

CDL Improvements.—The funds specified above shall be used to help the States implement those provisions of the MCSIA that pertain to the CDL program, and to implement the 5-Year Strategic Plan to Improve the Effectiveness of the Commercial Driver's License Program. These additional funds will be used to address numerous opportunities to improve the CDL program that have been identified by the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) and others. The FMCSA is directed to work with the AAMVA, the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, lead MCSAP agencies, and lead driver licensing agencies to improve all aspects of the CDL program. In addition to reviewing the management and operation of the CDL program and underpinning information systems at both the Federal and State level, FMCSA shall sponsor two or more pilot projects involving law enforcement and driver licensing agencies to explore new and innovative ways to ensure that drivers that have been convicted of a disqualifying offense do not operate during the period of suspension or revocation. The budget justification for the fiscal year 2002 request should summarize the efforts in this regard to improve the CDL program.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROGRAM

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] was established as a separate organizational entity in the Department of Transportation in March 1970, to reduce the escalating number of deaths, injuries, and economic costs resulting from traffic crashes on the Nation's highways. The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act provides for the establishment and enforcement of Federal safety standards for motor vehicles and associated equipment and research, including the operation of required testing facilities and the National Driver Register. The Motor Vehi-

cle Information and Cost Savings Act initially provided for the establishment of low-speed, collision bumper standards, consumer information activities, diagnostic inspection, and odometer regulations and was later amended to incorporate responsibility for the administration of Federal automotive fuel economy standards.

The Highway Safety Act provides for a coordinated highway safety grant program to be carried out by the States, together with supporting research, development, and demonstration programs. Under section 403 of title 23, United States Code, technical assistance is provided to the States in the conduct of their highway safety programs, and research and demonstration projects are conducted to develop and show the effectiveness of new techniques and countermeasures to address highway safety problems.

Grants are provided to the States under title 23, United States Code, section 402 to assist in the establishment and improvement of highway safety programs designed to reduce traffic crashes, deaths, and injuries. Alcohol incentive grants are allocated to the States for alcohol-impaired driver safety programs. The occupant protection incentive grants program is separated into two parts: Section 405 rewards States that implement strong laws and programs to increase safety belt and child safety seat use; section 2003(b) of TEA21, the child passenger protection education grant program, encourages the States to implement child passenger protection and education programs such as proper installation of child restraints, restraint design, placement, and training in all aspects of child restraint use.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

Program	Fiscal year 2000 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 2001 estimate [2]	Committee recommendation
Operations and research	$161,400,000	$286,475,000	$181,876,000
National driver register (HTF)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
Highway traffic safety grants (firewall)	206,800,000	213,000,000	213,000,000
Total	368,200,000	499,475,000	394,876,000

[1] Excludes reductions of $1,328,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–64.
[2] Includes $70,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For fiscal year 2001, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA21), as amended, authorizes $181,876,000 of budget resources for the operations and research account of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). TEA21 authorizes $72,000,000 of contract authority from the highway trust fund to finance operations and research activities eligible under title 23 U.S.C. 403. This funding is included within the firewall guarantee for highway spending and is not subject to appropriation. The act also includes an authorization, subject to appropriations, from the highway trust fund of $2,000,000 to maintain the National Driver Register. Public Law 106–39, which was enacted last year, amends TEA21 by increasing the authorization for operations and research

activities related to sections 30104 and 32102 of title 49 to $107,876,000. This funding is derived from the general fund and is subject to appropriations.

The Administration is proposing to fund the agency substantially above the authorized level and has submitted a budget request of $286,475,000 for NHTSA's operations and research account. The budget request consists of $72,000,000 from the highway trust fund guarantee for highway safety and research and analysis programs and $2,000,000 from the highway trust fund for the National Driver Register. The Administration also has requested an additional $142,475,000 in trust funds and to transfer $70,000,000 of revenue aligned budget authority (RABA).

The Administration has again requested to augment NHTSA's operations and research by transferring $70,000,000 of highway construction funds from RABA even though Congress summarily rejected this approach last year. Disregarding a core provision of TEA21 highlights the pitfalls of managing programs through budgetary firewalls. Firewalls predetermine funding levels which expose unprotected programs to excessive budgetary pressure and impede the Administration's and Congress's flexibility to annually assess the balance between infrastructure investment, safety programs, and other priorities. Second, the Administration request exceeds the general fund authorization for NHTSA's operations and research by $34,599,000. Together with the $70,000,000 diverted from RABA, these additional sources of funding would boost NHTSA's operations and research account 58 percent above the increased authorization level that Congress enacted less than a year ago. The compilation of a wish list of new programs is not a substitute for responsible budgeting and program management. The additional funds would finance new programs, including the flagship initiatives, that duplicate efforts that are ongoing in the core safety and vehicle programs and have not been appropriately justified.

To comply with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, the Committee has consulted extensively with NHTSA to revise its budget request. The Committee recommends fully funding the authorized level, and the accompanying bill provides appropriations totaling $181,876,000 to be distributed as follows:

Program	*Committee recommendation*
Salaries and benefits	$55,880,000
Travel	1,166,000
Operating expenses	19,810,000
Contract Programs:	
Safety performance	7,366,000
Safety assurance	11,377,000
Highway safety	42,174,000
Research and analysis	54,108,000
General administration	645,000
Grant administration reimbursement	−10,650,000
Total	181,876,000

SALARIES AND BENEFITS

Staffing level.—The Committee recommends $55,880,000 for salaries and benefits, which is $2,005,080 below the request and $3,237,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The Com-

mittee denies the request to increase the number of authorized full time positions from 621 to 650 because the existing FTE ceiling is sufficient. The Committee is mindful that there are a number of vacancies at the NHTSA and that the agency has experienced difficulty in staffing these positions.

OPERATING EXPENSES

The Committee recommendation is $4,454,000 lower than the requested amount due an increase above the budget request for grant reimbursement and overall budget constraints. Even though lower than the budget request, the amount is 16 percent above what was provided in fiscal year 2000. The Committee asserts that this level of funding is manageable and gives NHTSA the flexibility to allocate the recommendation through such means as limiting the growth for computer support, administrative support, training, printing, and workforce planning and development. Within the funding provided for computer support, sufficient resources are available to provide for computer-related expenses for all administrative functions, including civil rights public affairs, counsel, plans and policy, and administration. The Committee expects NHTSA to focus the increased funding provided for operating expenses on program delivery.

SAFETY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

New car assessment program.—The Committee recommends $5,456,000, the same as the Administration's request, to evaluate vehicle performance in crash tests and provide vehicle safety and crash test information to the public. The Committee expects NHTSA to conduct enough crash tests to provide consumers with frontal and side impact information on 80 to 90 percent of new vehicles. The Committee denies the request to expand NCAP by using small size dummy in crash tests. The Committee believes that test devices should be required for use in safety standards compliance testing before being considered for inclusion in NCAP.

SAFETY ASSURANCE

Safety defects investigation.—The Committee defers the $145,000 requested to monitor and investigate recreational, transit, and emergency vehicles. While the Committee is not opposed to investigations of this nature, NHTSA has failed to provide a compelling justification for this work, and the Committee believes that the agency would benefit from documenting that there is a significant problem with defective safety-related parts and equipment installed on small population vehicles that demands its attention in this area. If NHTSA can demonstrate a significant defects problem, the Committee would entertain reprogramming funds for this purpose from within the additional funds to the base level for the Safety Assurance Program.

Auto safety hotline.—The Committee recommendation deletes $268,000 from the budget request due to concern with the management of the hotline. The Committee is confident that the agency can improve customer service and continue its outreach program without a 38 percent growth for contract personnel.

Occupant protection.—The Committee acknowledges the dedication of NHTSA's staff to promote seat belt usage and efforts to achieve the Department's worthy goal of 85 percent seat belt usage by 2000 and 90 percent by 2005. Despite the combined effort of Federal and State safety officials, and law enforcement, as well as the strong support and resources of private organizations and industry, the seat belt usage rate remains relatively constant over the past few years. The mini-National Occupant Protection Use Survey (NOPUS), conducted in December, 1999 revealed the average seat belt use rate declining to 67 percent; preliminary analysis of another observational State survey indicates a modest increase in the use of seat belts to 70 percent. In light of this, the Committee believes it would be worthwhile to explore whether NHTSA's efforts could be improved.

The Committee directs the Department's Inspector General to analyze the effectiveness and efficiency of the occupant protection program managed by NHTSA's Office of Traffic Safety Programs. This review should consider the scope and direction of NHTSA's efforts to increase seat belt use rates and whether the agency is allocating funds to partnerships, demonstration projects, and other activities that are most likely to achieve the Department's performance goals. The review also should consider the quality and nature of the technical assistance provided by NHTSA's regional staff to States and local governments that benefit from highway traffic safety grant programs.

Seat belt innovative demonstration program.—The Committee recommends $11,000,000 for the national occupant protection program, which is $1,258,000 more than last year's enacted level.

The Committee does not expect much progress in increasing the seat belt use rate unless more resources are directed to developing programs to reach high risk groups. NHTSA has initiated work in this area, but its efforts have been limited. The Committee directs NHTSA to allocate $1,000,000 to implement an innovative demonstration program whereby the agency will award grants of up to $50,000 to municipal, county, and other local governmental entities to promote seat belt usage. The grants should conduct an assessment of local challenges to increasing seat belt use and encourage widespread community and business participation in locally-developed initiatives. The Committee expects NHTSA to provide technical assistance and relevant research, and to coordinate with the Governors' Highway Safety Representatives to ensure that the new demonstration grants complement state-wide campaigns and supplement resources provided to States through highway traffic safety grants.

Section 157 program.—The Section 157 program was established to provide grants to States as an incentive to increase seat belt use. Because the funding is based on qualification and not on entitlement, some funds may remain unobligated, which NHTSA is allowed to distribute to States as grants to conduct innovative strategies to increase seat belt usage statewide. The Committee has received complaints from several States concerning the agency's management of the innovative aspect of the program. Although the

States were required to submit their applications for innovative grants by March 1, 1999 and asked to respond to additional questions in August, NHTSA did not award the grants until February 25, 2000—almost 1 year after the application deadline. The Committee directs the NHTSA Administrator to conduct a review of the procedures and processes used to administer the innovative grants provision of the Section 157 program and to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that details how the administration of these grants will be improved and expeditiously awarded within the time constraints of existing law. The report is requested by December 1, 2000.

Emergency medical services.—The Committee recommends $2,500,000 for emergency medical services (EMS), $657,000 more than the requested amount and $1,075,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The Committee has included $1,000,000 to continue training EMS personnel in delivering pre-hospital care to patients with traumatic brain injuries. The Committee urges NHTSA to continue collaborating with the Brain Trauma Foundation and the University of Alabama in Birmingham in delivering this training to EMS personnel in as many States as possible.

Safe Communities.—The Committee has deleted funding for the safe communities program. The program has not been funded since completion of the three-year pilot program, and the Committee asserts that the program duplicates other agency programs and safety grants.

Aggressive driving research.—The Committee continues to be concerned with the frequent occurrence of aggressive driving by motorists, especially in the Washington capital region. To address this issue, the Committee has included $750,000 for the Maryland Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to continue the regional education and driver modification program to combat aggressive driving in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The Committee directs NHTSA to cooperate with the Maryland DMV in developing methods to evaluate the various components of the program, such as raising public awareness and enforcement techniques, and to disseminate successful strategies developed in this program with other States so they may benefit from this program.

Rural accidents.—The Committee continues to be concerned about treatment of trauma victims from automobile accidents in rural areas who are remote from specialized medical centers. Within the funds provided for highway safety research, the Committee has included $250,000 for the University of Vermont's College of Medicine and Fletcher Allen Health Care to determine if the survival rate of rural vehicular accidents could be improved through the application of advanced mobile video telecommunications links between a Level 1 trauma center and ambulance crews. This will demonstrate if virtual instant access to specialized physicians and surgeons at the accident scene and during ambulance transportation improves patient care and reduces mortality. The Committee recommendation also includes $500,000 to continue research being conducted at the University of South Alabama to improve the prehospital care of rural vehicular trauma patients and evaluate methods to ensure timely access to the appropriate medical trauma center.

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Safety systems.—The Committee recommendation provides $8,926,000 for safety systems, which is $68,000 more than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The Committee encourages NHTSA to enhance its efforts to test and evaluate advanced air bags and side impact protection systems. It is essential to minimize any adverse impact to ensure that these systems benefit all vehicle occupants. Not only must NHTSA ensure that these technologies meet its regulatory standards, but NHTSA research should also serve as a catalyst to developing safer advanced systems. The research and evaluations should be designed to minimize any unanticipated adverse consequences associated with the deployment of such systems.

School bus occupant protection.—The Committee continues to be concerned about child passenger protection in school bus crashes, which results in injuries to approximately 8,500 children annually. The revision of school bus safety standards in 1977 greatly improved school bus occupant protection, but these standards do not reflect advances in materials science and manufacturing technology. Accordingly, the Committee's recommendation for safety systems includes $250,000 for Mercer University Research Center to support a research initiative on school bus safety. In coordination with school bus manufacturers, the research should analyze alternative safety restraints and seating systems, dynamic computer models of large and small buses, and potential design changes to improve occupant protection.

Biomechanics.—The Committee recommends that funding for the Crash Injury Reduction and Engineering Network (CIREN) should be at least as much as last year's enacted level. The Committee remains very supportive of the effort to study the cause, effects and results of crashes by linking trauma centers to vehicle engineers.

State Data Program.—Since fiscal year 1999, the Congress has provided funds for a new program to obtain State crash data that NHTSA could use to improve highway safety and reduce deaths, injuries, and medical costs associated with vehicle crashes. The new program is intended to complement other data improvement efforts among the States by expediting the availability of the data. The data targeted by the new program reside in the electronic files produced by State governments based on motor vehicle crash reports collected from police departments. The program was to be implemented and tested among 17 selected States before it becoming a national program. Although the budget request indicates that the program is ongoing, the Committee is aware that little progress has been made.

The agency has expended more than $276,000 in Maryland, but since August 1999, the program has been stalled and no further work on the project has been completed. The Committee understands that some issues have been raised regarding internet security but knows of no substantive reason for the delay in completing the work in Maryland and making the project ready for implementation in the other 16 selected States. Therefore, the Committee directs NHTSA to either proceed with the program as planned or provide the Committee with a revised schedule and cost estimate for completing the work in Maryland in fiscal year 2001, including

resolving the internet security issues and extending the program to other States.

BILL LANGUAGE

NCAP vehicle acquisition.—The accompanying bill includes a new provision prohibiting NHTSA from purchasing a vehicle for NCAP testing at a price that exceeds the manufacturer's suggested retail price.

Rollover rating system.—The Committee is troubled by NHTSA's proposal that would add a rating of a vehicle's propensity to rollover based on a static stability measurement to the New Car Assessment Program (NCAP). The same static stability factor that NHTSA is now proposing was rejected by the agency more than 10 years ago. The Committee questions the utility of a static stability factor in providing useful information to consumers because it does not take into consideration other driving conditions that induce rollover events, vehicle features to prevent rollover, or the application of technologies to protect occupants during this type of crash. Also, the Committee believes that the proposed rating system could confuse, and even mislead, consumers because the highest possible score varies among different vehicles types thereby biasing comparative analysis between vehicle classes.

Considering the degree of uncertainty about the validity and adequacy of NHTSA's proposal, the Committee has included a provision that prohibits the agency from finalizing or implementing the proposed regulation until the Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences has reported to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that the measurement to determine static stability factor is scientifically valid and benefits consumers by presenting practical, useful information. The National Academy of Sciences shall also compare the proposed static stability factor with dynamic tests that replicate driving conditions and determine whether it is appropriate to expand rollover rating information from the NHTSA website to other means. The study commission may include representatives of consumers and victims of rollover crashes. The Committee has included $500,000 from the Safety Performance Standards Program for the National Academy of Sciences to conduct the study.

Uniform tire quality grading standards.—The Committee has included a prohibition that has been included in previous appropriations acts, on any rulemaking which would require that passenger car tires be labeled to indicate their low rolling resistance, or fuel economy characteristics. The Committee has included this provision because the need for such labels has not been adequately justified and the additional costs associated with this proposal would likely be prohibitive.

Native American set-aside.—Due to budget constraints, the Committee has deleted language requested by the administration that aside $1,000,000 for Native American programs.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The National Driver Register [NDR] is a central repository of information on individuals whose licenses to operate a motor vehicle have been revoked, suspended, canceled, or denied. The NDR also contains information on persons who have been convicted of serious traffic-related violations such as driving while impaired by alcohol or other drugs. State driver licensing officials query the NDR when individuals apply for a license, for the purpose of determining whether driving privileges have been withdrawn by other States. Other organizations such as the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration also use NDR license data in hiring and certification decisions in overall U.S. transportation operations.

The bill includes $2,000,000 for the NDR from the highway trust fund.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000	$206,800,000
Budget estimate, 2001	213,000,000
Committee recommendation	213,000,000

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century authorized the following State grant programs: Highway Safety Program, the Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grant Program, the Occupant Protection Incentive Grant Program, and the State Highway Safety Data Grant Program. Under the Highway Safety Program, grant allocations are determined on the basis of a statutory formula established under 20 U.S.C. 402. Individual States use this funding in national priority areas established by Congress which have the greatest potential for achieving safety improvements and reducing traffic crashes, fatalities, and injuries. Also, the national occupant protection survey shall be funded from within this amount. The Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grant Program encourages States to enact stiffer laws and implement stronger programs to detect and remove impaired drivers from the roads. The occupant protection program encourages States to promote and strengthen occupant protection initiatives. The State Highway Safety Data Grants Program encourages States to improve their collection and dissemination of important highway safety data.

The Committee recommends an appropriation for liquidation of contract authorization of $213,000,000 for the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of these grant programs.

The Committee has included a provision 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.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The bill includes language limiting the obligations to be incurred under the various highway traffic safety grants programs. Separate obligation limitations are included in the bill with the following funding allocations:

	Fiscal year 2000 enacted	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Highway safety programs	$152,800,000	$155,000,000	$155,000,000
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000
Occupant protection incentive grants	10,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Child passenger protection education grants	[1] (7,500,000)	[2] (7,500,000)	.....
State highway safety data grants	8,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Total	206,800,000	213,000,000	213,000,000

[1] From Federal Highway Administration.
[2] From revenue aligned budget authority transferred to NHTSA operations and research.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROGRAM

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

The Committee recommends new appropriations and obligation limitations totaling $725,015,000 for the activities of the Federal Railroad Administration for fiscal year 2001. This is $468,471,500 less than the budget request.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2000 enacted [1]	2001 budget estimate	
Safety and operations [1 2]	$94,288,000	$103,210,500	$99,390,000
Railroad research and development [3]	22,464,000	26,800,000	24,725,000
Next generation high-speed rail [4]	27,200,000	22,000,000	24,900,000
Alaska railroad rehabilitation [4]	10,000,000	.....	20,000,000
West Virginia Rail Development	.....	.....	15,000,000
Rhode Island rail development [4]	10,000,000	17,000,000	.....
Capital grants to National Railroad Passenger Corporation	571,000,000	521,476,000	521,000,000
Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Project	.....	20,000,000	20,000,000

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2000 enacted [1]	2001 budget estimate	
Amtrak Reform Council [5]	(750,000)	(980,000)	(495,000)
Expanded Intercity Rail Passenger Service Fund [6]		468,000,000	
Total budgetary resources	734,952,000	1,178,486,500	725,015,000

[1] Excludes reduction of $436,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.
[2] Fiscal year 2001 includes $77,300,000 proposed rail safety user fees.
[3] Fiscal year 2001 includes $25,500,000 proposed rail safety user fees.
[4] Does not reflect reductions pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.
[5] The Amtrak Reform Council is an independent oversight commission. Funding is provided through a general provision, and is not part of the FRA budget.
[6] Proposed to be funded from revenue aligned budget authority.

User fees.—Consistent with the Committee's position outlined in the Office of the Secretary chapter of the report, the administration's legislative proposal to impose user fees on rail safety and research services has not been included.

Office of Inspector General audit reimbursement.—The bill includes a provision to transfer $1,500,000 to the Department of Transportation Inspector General. The transferred funding will reimburse the OIG for audits and investigations of rail-related issues and programs.

SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$94,288,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [2]	103,210,500
Adjusted budget estimate, 2001 (including proposed transfer of $1,500,000 from Public Law 105–178 section 1218 Maglev funding)	104,710,500
Committee recommendation	99,390,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction for TASC.
[2] Includes $77,300,000 proposed rail safety user fees.

The Safety and Operations account provides support for FRA rail safety activities and all other administrative and operating activities related to staff and programs. The Committee recommendation makes the following adjustments to the administration's budget request:

Deny additional staffing request	−$564,000
Deny travel increase above base	−500,000
Deny program evaluation increase above base	−500,000
Provide partial funding for requested increase in IT initiative, web site support, email security	−1,190,500
Southeast transportation safety center	+350,000
Deny employee development program increase above base	−660,000
Increase funding for new fatigue countermeasures program	+200,000
Reduce funding for ATIP	−200,000
Deny requested inflation/vendor increases	−1,556,000
Reduction of proposed increases above base in salaries and expenses	−700,000

Proposed Offset of Administrative Costs with Maglev Funds.—The budget proposes to pay for Operation Lifesaver contract support ($600,000), Alaska Railroad liability reimbursements to the Department of Labor ($763,000), and part of the agency's automated track inspection program ($137,000) with magnetic levita-

tion transportation technology deployment program funds. The maglev program is authorized in section 1218 of TEA21, and is a guaranteed firewall program funded by highway trust funds. It is inappropriate to transfer these funds to pay for activities which have always been part of the administrative and safety budgets of FRA, and such a transfer masks the true size of the requested increase in funding from the current fiscal year (a requested increase of $10,422,500, or 11 percent).

Highway-rail grade crossing safety outreach program.—The Committee has approved new program funding of $500,000 for highway-rail grade crossing safety efforts. These new funds shall be provided to Operation Lifesaver for deployment of the national public service campaign initiated in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations Act, which will increase awareness of highway-rail grade crossing safety and trespass prevention. The Committee continues to stress the importance of implementing a unified campaign that has the financial and technical support of the railroad industry, FRA, and the law enforcement industry, and directs the FRA Administrator to provide a letter report to the Committees on Appropriations by July 31, 2000 on the progress of the national public service campaign, delineating the contracts and associated funding that have been approved thus far in this effort and outlining the program benchmarks and funding schedule for the entire Operation Lifesaver PSA campaign. In addition to the PSA follow-on funds, the Committee recommendation includes the administration's requested funding level of $600,000 for Operation Lifesaver contract support.

Fatigue countermeasures.—The Committee supports the fatigue countermeasures campaign proposed in the budget request, and has provided $500,000 of new funding to support these efforts. Of these funds, $250,000 shall be used to develop and implement educational and training programs which are designed to increase the awareness of the dangers of fatigue throughout the rail industry, and to develop criteria with which to evaluate the effectiveness of fatigue countermeasures. The remaining $250,000 shall be used to perform in-the-field controlled light eye reaction testing. Testing and measuring fatigue is necessary to the development of fatigue countermeasures. Measurement technologies that are operationally practical, non-invasive and not disruptive are needed to conduct in-the-field testing for the purposes of gathering data and gauging the effectiveness of fatigue countermeasures.

Staffing increases.—The FRA has requested 10 new positions in fiscal year 2001. The Committee recommendation denies funding for these requested staff increases.

Information technology initiative.—FRA requested $2,161,000 for hardware and software for new information technology systems. The Committee has partially funded this request, providing $970,500 for IT infrastructure, internet/intranet, data management system development and remote access services.

Southeastern transportation safety center.—The Committee has included $350,000 for the establishment of an intermodal emergency response training center for the Southeast region of the United States, to be located in Meridian, MS. These funds shall be used for equipment and program costs associated with establish-

ment of the center, to include rail passenger equipment and track, a functional rail-highway grade crossing, rail and motor carrier hazardous materials vehicles and containers, and other passenger rescue and hazardous materials training facilities. Federal funds provided for the center shall be matched with funding and in-kind contributions from industry, local governments, and other organizations.

Grade crossings in Northeastern Illinois.—The Committee is aware of an effort by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) to improve safety at rail-grade crossings. The State of Illinois, and, in particular, Northeastern Illinois have the largest number of rail-grade crossings and quiet zones in the country. The Committee recognizes Illinois' efforts to reduce accidents. The Committee urges the FRA to work with the affected communities including offering technical assistance, identifying Federal funding sources, and establishing Federal-State-local task forces in order to improve rail-grade crossing safety and reduce accidents. The Committee expects the FRA to pay particular attention to enforcement enhancements and improved educational outreach in its efforts to help reduce the risks to motorists and pedestrians.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2000	$22,464,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	26,800,000
Committee recommendation	24,725,000

[1] Includes $25,500,000 proposed rail safety user fees.

The Federal Railroad Administration's Railroad Research and Development Program provides for research in the development of safety and performance standards for high-speed rail and the evaluation of their role in the Nation's transportation infrastructure. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $24,725,000 for railroad research and development, $2,075,000 less than the administration's requested level.

TRB R&D review panel.—The Committee notes the recent improvement in the design and conduct of FRA's research and development and next generation high-speed rail programs. Some of these modifications have been implemented in response to recommendations of the Transportation Research Board Committee for Review of the FRA Research and Development Program. The Committee recognizes the contributions of this review panel, and expects FRA to continue its support.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the following funding levels for the Railroad research and development programs:

Equipment, operation, and hazardous materials	$11,200,000
Track and vehicle track interaction	7,950,000
Railroad systems safety	4,650,000
R&D facilities and equipment	925,000

Equipment, operation, and hazardous materials.—The Committee recommends a program funding level of $11,200,000, which is $1,050,000 less than the administration's request. Within this amount, $2,400,000 shall be for a full-scale crash test of rail pas-

senger equipment at the Transportation Test Center [TTC] near Pueblo, CO. This testing will include dynamic and static tests using donated passenger car equipment. The overall objectives of these tests are to demonstrate the effectiveness and crashworthiness of cab car and coach car structural designs and the effectiveness of occupant protection strategies. The Committee does not approve the requested increases above current services for hazardous materials transportation or human factors research.

Track and vehicle-track interaction.—The Committee recommends a program funding level of $7,950,000, $350,000 less than the administration's request. The Committee's recommendation includes the requested increases for track and components safety research in material and rail inspection and bridge safety and for vehicle/track interaction safety standards research ($650,000 above current services). The funding for grade crossings infrastructure research has been provided within the Federal Highway Administration's ITS research program and funding for train control research has been provided with the other positive train control development and deployment programs under FRA's Next Generation High-Speed Rail account. The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 in continued support for the Marshall University/University of Nebraska safety research project to develop and test a track stability data processing and feedback system.

Railroad systems safety.—The Committee recommends a program funding level of $4,650,000, $250,000 less than the administration's request. This funding level provides half of the administration's request for a new research program to evaluate methods for developing performance-based regulations for their applicability to FRA's regulatory safety process.

Research and development facilities and equipment.—The Committee recommends a funding level of $925,000 for R&D facilities and equipment, $425,000 less than the administration's request. This funding level allows for continued baseline support for the T–6 track research vehicle, which is used to assess and develop new technologies for automated track inspection, and provides half the requested increase for refurbishment and replacement of facilities and equipment at the Pueblo, CO Transportation Technology Center.

Research and development cost sharing.—The Committee is concerned that the level of industry cost-sharing has been decreasing in some areas of the research and development program. The Committee encourages FRA to reinvigorate its efforts to secure cost-sharing from the railroads and supporting industries, and notes that future budget decisions will be affected by the agency's success in these efforts.

Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program

Section 502 of Public Law 94–210, as amended authorizes obligation guarantees for meeting the long-term capital needs of private railroads. Railroads utilize this funding mechanism to finance major new facilities and rehabilitation or consolidation of current facilities. No appropriations or new loan guarantee commitments are proposed in fiscal year 2001.

The Rail Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program, as established in section 7203 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century [TEA21], will enable the Secretary of Transportation to provide loans and loan guarantees to State and local governments, Government-sponsored authorities and corporations, railroads and joint ventures to acquire, improve, or rehabilitate intermodal or rail equipment or facilities, including track, bridges, yards, and shops.

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$27,200,000
Budget estimate, 2001	22,000,000
Committee recommendation	24,900,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $103,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

The Committee has provided $24,900,000 in general fund appropriations for the High-Speed Ground Transportation [HSGT] Program. The amount provided is $2,900,000 more than the administration's request.

The Committee first provided funding for the Next Generation High-Speed Rail [NGHSR] Program in fiscal year 1995. The program funds high-speed rail research, development, and technology programs that are aimed at demonstrations to foster high-speed passenger service on corridors throughout the country.

The Committee recommends the following funding levels for the Next generation high-speed rail programs:

Train control systems	$9,500,000
High-speed non-electric locomotives	6,800,000
Grade crossing hazard mitigation	4,600,000
Track/structures technology	1,200,000
Corridor planning	2,800,000

Train control systems.—The Committee has provided a total of $9,500,000 for positive train control (PTC) systems and demonstration projects. Of these funds, $2,000,000 shall be for the Transportation Safety Research Alliance (TSRA) advanced integrated technology system, which will provide continuous direction, movement, and highway crossing controls for rail freight optimized dispatching using PTC-generated information. Additionally, $3,000,000 shall be for the Michigan incremental train control system (ITCS) high-speed passenger rail demonstration project, the same amount as requested by the administration. Partners in this project are Michigan DOT, Amtrak, and Harmon Industries, which is supplying the system's hardware. The requested funding will allow this system to be adapted to the industry's new PTC modular onboard platform standards, making the ITCS approach more widely available for other developing high-speed rail corridors. No less than $500,000 shall be for the installation of a digital radio network vehicle tracking system at the Transportation Technology Center (TTC) in Pueblo, Colorado, giving the TTC the capability to test and validate various positive train control architectures and components. This funding was requested in the FRA research and development budget. The Committee recommendation also includes $4,000,000 for the North American joint positive train control program, $3,000,000 less than the level requested by the administration. The Committee concurs with concerns expressed by the TRB R&D re-

view panel, which issued an April 28, 2000 report stating that, "the project has become more expensive and complicated than is necessary. The complexity of the project appears to stem from an effort to specify standards and design details well beyond the minimum required to achieve interoperability for a train of one railroad operating on the tracks of another." The Committee notes that building industry consensus on PTC-related issues is difficult and that any PTC system placed in service must satisfy safety requirements, including the emerging FRA PTC rulemaking. Therefore, slowing the pace of Federal investment in this project will not have an adverse effect on an already slow and complex process.

High-speed nonelectric locomotives.—The Committee has provided a total of $6,800,000 for the high-speed, nonelectric locomotive program, the level requested by the administration. The funds for these programs focus on the demonstration of a high-speed, lightweight fossil fuel locomotive that will be able to facilitate the testing of an advanced locomotive propulsion system [ALPS]. The Committee recommends $3,000,000 for the prototype locomotive demonstration and $3,800,000 for the ALPS program. Each of these two related development and deployment programs are proceeding well, and extensive high-speed and operational testing will begin on the high-speed non-electric passenger demonstration locomotive in late 2000 at the TTC. Final assembly of the ALPS flywheel-turbine propulsion system is planned for November 2000, which will then be integrated into the non-electric locomotive to maximize speed, acceleration, and fuel economy.

Grade crossing hazard mitigation.—The Committee recommends $4,600,000 for grade crossing hazard mitigation initiatives, $600,000 more than the level requested by the administration. The low-cost innovative technologies and grade crossing hazard mitigation programs are funded at the current services level. However, the Committee recommends an increase above the baseline for the North Carolina sealed corridor initiative, for a total of $1,000,000. FRA is directed to provide a report by January 31, 2001 to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and to the TRB R&D review panel that documents the success of the sealed corridor project, including a scientifically valid estimate of the lives saved by the improvements that have been installed and an evaluation of whether the resulting reduction in accidents is sustainable. Up to $200,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation may be used to prepare this report.

Track/structures technology.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 for the track/structures technology program, the same level as the administration's request. Within the funds provided, $100,000 shall be used for analysis in preparing a letter report which addresses the safety impacts resulting from operation of passenger trains on freight rail trackage at up to five inches of cant deficiency for speeds between 80 mph and 110 mph. FRA shall perform an analysis of the specific criteria it would use to determine compliance with applicable track standard at locations where trains would operate at five inches of cant deficiency and whether any flexibility should be permitted in enforcing those standards to facilitate the highest possible speeds at these locations that can be achieved at five inches of cant deficiency. The report shall be pro-

vided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by November 30, 2000.

Corridor planning.—The Committee recommends $2,800,000 for passenger rail corridor planning activities authorized by section 26101 of title 49, United States Code. These funds shall be distributed as follows:

Midwest Regional Rail Initiative preliminary engineering and design and eligible right-of-way improvements	$2,000,000
Wilkes-Barre, PA to Scranton, PA—New York corridor extension study	300,000
Boston, MA to Burlington, VT: high-speed corridor feasibility study	300,000
Southeast corridor extension from Charlotte, NC to Macon, GA via Atlanta	200,000

Rail-highway crossing hazard eliminations.—Under section 1103 of TEA21, an automatic set-aside of $5,250,000 a year is made available for the elimination of rail-highway crossing hazards. A limited number of rail corridors are eligible for these funds. Of these set-aside funds, the following allocations are made:

Georgia high-speed rail corridor between Atlanta and Macon	$1,000,000
High-speed rail corridor between Mobile, AL and New Orleans, LA	2,000,000
Wisconsin high-speed rail corridor between Madison and Milwaukee	750,000
Keystone high-speed rail corridor, between Harrisburg and Philadelphia, PA	1,000,000
Pacific Northwest high-speed corridor, crossing improvements in Salem, OR	500,000

ALASKA RAILROAD REHABILITATION

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	.....
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $38,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

The Committee has included a total of $20,000,000 for rail safety and infrastructure improvements benefiting passenger operations of the Alaska railroad. This railroad extends 498 miles from Seward through Anchorage, the largest city in Alaska, to the city of Fairbanks, and east to the town of North Pole and Eielson Air Force Base. It carries both passengers and freight, and provides a critical transportation link for passengers and cargo traveling through difficult terrain and harsh climatic conditions.

The funds provided are available until expended and will be used for the following capital projects:

Track rehabilitation.—The Committee continues its ongoing support for capital rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad's existing track bed and lines used by passenger trains to improve safety and decrease running time. Congress has appropriated $10,000,000 annually since fiscal year 1996 for tie, track and ballast replacement and rehabilitation.

Signalized automated siding access.—This capital investment project responds to increased rail traffic density on the railroad's main line corridor and helps prepare the track between Wasilla and Palmer for implementation of commuter rail service. Automated siding access will improve operational running times, en-

hance safety, and reduce delays along the most congested 50 mile corridor on the railroad's system.

Track relocation/highway crossing elimination.—This capital project will reroute the existing line along the Richardson Highway between Fort Wainwright and North Pole, eliminating 25 highway-rail crossings.

WEST VIRGINIA RAIL DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2000	.....
Budget estimate, 2001	.....
Committee recommendation	$15,000,000

The Committee has provided $15,000,000 for capital costs associated with track, signal, and crossover rehabilitation and improvements on the MARC Brunswick line in West Virginia. These funds shall remain available until expended.

RHODE ISLAND RAIL DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	17,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $38,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

The Committee recommendation does not provide any fiscal year 2001 funding for the Rhode Island Rail Development project, a dedicated freight track paralleling the Northeast Corridor's newly-electrified passenger tracks between Quonset Point/Davisville and Central Falls, RI. This freight line will provide sufficient clearance to accommodate double-stack freight cars, and will enhance safety by avoiding mixing freight traffic and high-speed passenger rail service. In July 1999, the Rhode Island Department of Transportation (RI DOT) undertook a comprehensive review of construction cost estimates to complete the freight rail improvement project. It was evident from this analysis that actual costs of construction were likely to be significantly higher than originally estimated. As a result of this review, as well as delays caused by Amtrak's North End electrification project, the date that RI DOT expects to get freight traffic off the main line and on to the third track has been postponed from Fall 2001 to July 2002.

Total costs for the project are expected to exceed the original estimate, however, the Committee notes that Federal funding for the project is capped by law at $55,000,000 (of which $38,000,000 has been appropriated to date). In addition, the State of Rhode Island has committed to funding any costs that would exceed the original Federal-State cost estimate for the project.

CAPITAL GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK)

Appropriations, 2000	$571,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	521,476,000
Committee recommendation	521,000,000

For fiscal year 2001, the administration has requested an appropriation of $521,476,000 for Amtrak capital funding with the same flexibility in spending its capital grant as provided to transit grantees.

Amtrak appropriations history—1971–2000

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	*Annual total*
1971–72	40.0
1973	170.0
1974	149.1
1975	276.5
1976	471.2
Transition quarter (fiscal year change)	180.0
1977	800.7
1978	1,116.0
1979	1,234.0
1980	1,223.4
1981	1,246.3
1982	905.0
1983	815.0
1984	816.4
1985	707.6
1986	602.7
1987	618.5
1988	608.3
1989	603.6
1990	629.1
1991	798.9
1992	861.2
1993	846.1
1993 supplemental appropriations	45.0
1994	922.2
1995	972.0
1996	750.0
1997	760.0
Omnibus consolidated appropriations 1997	82.5
1998 Taxpayer Relief Act	1,091.8
1998 Appropriations, Amtrak operations and Northeast corridor improvement program	594.0
1999 Taxpayer Relief Act	1,091.8
1999 Appropriations	609.2
2000	571.0
Total	23,209.1

SOURCE.—Federal Railroad Administration.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $521,000,000 for Amtrak capital grants in fiscal year 2001. This is the so-called "glidepath" level of Federal funding agreed to by the administration and Amtrak, which called for $5,011,000,000 of Federal support over 5 years (fiscal years 1998 through 2002). This agreed-to level of Federal funding included both general fund appropriations ($2,828,000,000) and Taxpayer Relief Act funds ($2,183,000,000).

Amtrak's current financial situation remains precarious. According to FRA, the railroad ended fiscal year 1999 with a net operating loss of $702,000,000. The railroad's financial future is equally uncertain. The DOT Office of Inspector General, which has analyzed Amtrak's strategic business plan to determine whether the railroad's projections for achieving operational self-sufficiency by the end of fiscal year 2002 are reasonable, determined that the funding shortfall between total capital needs and expected Federal funding is, at a minimum, $500,000,000 over the remainder of this authorization cycle. Under the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–134), the Amtrak Reform Council

(ARC) has the authority to submit a "sunset trigger" action plan to Congress for the restructuring and rationalization of the national intercity passenger rail system if the ARC makes a finding that Amtrak will not meet its financial goal of operating without Federal operational subsidies. It is uncertain at this time what the Federal funding role will be in supporting passenger rail services beyond the end of fiscal year 2002.

Bill language.—Consistent with first-year spending patterns of capital rail funds and with action taken last year, the Committee has included bill language that prohibits Amtrak from obligating more than $208,400,000 prior to September 30, 2001.

South End infrastructure improvements.—In January 2000, Amtrak released a report in response to a request from the Committees on Appropriations that described in detail the planned infrastructure improvements along the south end of the Northeast corridor between New York City and Washington, D.C. The report describes the work needed on the fixed capital plant (track, structures, communications and signalization, electric traction, facilities, yards and stations), which is owned by Amtrak and over which approximately 60 percent of the railroad's ridership is carried. In addition to Amtrak's own intercity service on this corridor, six public commuter rail systems operate on the south end, totaling more than 100 million person trips per year. Over the past two decades, growth in intercity and commuter service on the corridor has created operational challenges and congestion. Additionally, Amtrak has deferred many maintenance projects on the south end, which has led parts of the corridor, particularly around the Penn Station New York tunnel complex, to fall below modern standards of design and building code requirements. In the South End report, Amtrak laid out short term (5-year) and long term (20-year) investment plans which would address life safety issues, operational reliability, and enhancement activities. Amtrak will enter into cost-sharing agreements with other corridor stakeholders, including the commuter railroads, State departments of transportation, and freight railroads to protect the Federal Government's investment in this part of the railroad's infrastructure. At the time of the report's release, cost sharing arrangements had not been discussed with Amtrak's partners and no commitments from other stakeholders had been made. The Committee directs Amtrak to provide a quarterly letter report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Senate Commerce Committee, and the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, beginning on September 30, 2000, which outlines the cost-sharing arrangements among the corridor stakeholders, as well as ongoing implementation of the South End corridor infrastructure improvement plan.

Northeast corridor high-speed rail service.—Amtrak currently anticipates beginning its Acela express high speed passenger service in the Northeast corridor in July 2000, about 7 months later than originally planned. Time is growing short to meet the new start-up date, and according to the DOT Inspector General, service may either be further delayed or start with a lower maximum speed and longer running times. There is a financial impact to this delay in inaugurating the new service. Amtrak estimates that if Acela service begins in July 2000 as currently planned, the lost passenger

revenues in fiscal year 2000 associated with the delayed start-up would total $142,000,000. Amtrak plans to mitigate this revenue loss with operating expense savings, interest savings, and contractor penalties for late equipment delivery. The revenue loss will be higher if delays extend beyond July, and the the delayed start-up will in turn affect the delivery schedule for the 20 new Acela trainsets, which were scheduled to be delivered and in service by December 2000, but which Amtrak now estimates will be pushed back to March 2001. Successful implementation of express high-speed passenger service in the Northeast corridor is a cornerstone of Amtrak's strategic business plan, and is indispensable to achieving the mandate of operating self-sufficiency by the end of 2002. If Amtrak will not be able to meet its own internal timetables for establishing this service, the railroad must develop a financial mitigation plan to delineate how they will make up the lost revenue and still live within the "glidepath" agreement.

Express freight and mail services.—In fiscal year 1999, Amtrak revenues from U.S. mail service were $80,600,000 and a net profit of $4,200,000 was realized from the new express freight services. Amtrak projects fiscal year 2000 revenues from mail and express freight to be $103,800,000 and $9,900,000, respectively. Changes to services on several of Amtrak's existing routes were recommended as part of Amtrak's market based network analysis to capitalize on express freight opportunities. Amtrak is directed to provide a letter report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations no later than August 31, 2000, which outlines potential express freight opportunities on the Empire Builder route, and which addresses en route hubbing connections for these services in the State of Montana.

Los Angeles to Las Vegas service.—Amtrak plans to initiate a new service between Los Angeles, CA and Las Vegas, NV in late calendar year 2000. Amtrak's fiscal year 1998 and 1999 capital budgets included a total of $14,000,000 to prepare for this service, and the Corporation entered into an agreement with Union Pacific to share the costs of double tracking a 20-mile segment between Cima and Kelso, CA. Since last year, the cost estimates for the double tracking increased, and Amtrak committed the remainder of its previously budgeted funding for this program to cover these increases. Subsequently, Amtrak's fiscal year 2000 strategic budget plan includes an additional $6,202,000 from Taxpayer Relief Act funds to build a station platform and layover track at the Las Vegas terminus, to enable the service to begin by the end of the year.

AMTRAK REFORM COUNCIL

Appropriations, 2000	$750,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	980,000
Committee recommendation	495,000

[1] The Council is an independent entity. Its funding is presented within the FRA for display purposes only.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $495,000 for necessary expenses of the Amtrak Reform Council [ARC]. Initial funding for the ARC was provided in the fiscal year 1998 supplemental appropriations bill, Public Law 105–174; in the fiscal years 1999 and 2000 transportation appropriations acts, $450,000 and

$750,000, respectively, was appropriated for the Council. For fiscal year 2001, the administration has requested an appropriation of $980,000; the ARC itself has requested $1,400,000. Because the Council is an independent commission, the Committee's appropriation is not provided within the FRA's budget, but is provided in a general provision (sec. 328) of the bill. These funds are available for two years, through September 30, 2002.

The ARC was established by the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 [ARAA]. The Council consists of 11 members, including four Senate appointees, four House appointees, two Presidential appointees, and the Secretary of Transportation. Under the ARAA, the responsibilities of the ARC include evaluating Amtrak's performance and making recommendations to Congress and Amtrak for achieving further cost containment, productivity improvements, and financial reforms. In addition, fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill language expanded the Council's statutory responsibilities to include its views on any routes or services that Amtrak's route analysis data indicate should be closed or realigned.

As a practical matter, the ARC is a temporary commission. By the end of fiscal year 2002, the Council must make a determination on whether or not Amtrak can meet the financial goals outlined in the ARAA (though the Council may make a finding before the end of the current authorization). If the ARC determines these goals cannot be met, they must then submit a restructuring plan, and Amtrak must submit a liquidation plan.

PENNSYLVANIA STATION REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Appropriations, 2000	.....
Budget estimate, 2001	$20,000,000
Committee recommendations	20,000,000

In 2000, an advance appropriation of $20,000,000 was provided for each fiscal year 2001, 2002, and 2003. These funds support the redevelopment of the Pennsylvania Station in New York City, including the renovation of the James A. Farley Post Office building as a train station and commercial center, and basic upgrades to Pennsylvania Station.

EXPANDED INTERCITY RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE FUND

Appropriations, 2000	.....
Budget estimate, 2001[1]	$468,000,000
Committee recommendation	.....

[1] Proposed to be funded from revenue aligned budget authority.

The administration is proposing a new grant program to improve intercity passenger rail service nationwide to be funded from revenue aligned budget authority. The budget proposal includes $468,000,000, of which $1,000,000 is for administrative expenses related to mandatory Environmental Impact Statements and other analyses. The proposed grants would be available to Amtrak and/or a partner State or State consortium to implement capital projects which enhance intercity rail service.

Funding for the intercity rail passenger service fund has been denied. Since Amtrak is currently the only intercity rail provider in the continental United States, these additional funds should be viewed as an additional Federal subsidy to Amtrak above the ad-

ministration's glidepath agreement with the railroad. Additionally, the Committee categorically opposes the transfer of revenue aligned budget authority (RABA) to other non-highway uses. Congress has been clear and emphatic in its opposition to diversions of RABA funds. The administration has put forth a number of proposed RABA diversions in its fiscal year 2001 budget request; none of them have been approved in this legislation.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROGRAM

The Federal Transit Administration was established as a component of the Department of Transportation by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, effective July 1, 1968, which transferred most of the functions and programs under the Federal Transit Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 302; 49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The missions of the Federal Transit Administration are: to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods; to encourage the planning and establishment of urban and rural transportation services needed for economical and desirable development; to provide mobility for transit dependents in both metropolitan and rural areas; to maximize productivity of transportation systems; and to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such services and systems.

The current authorization for the programs funded by the Federal Transit Administration is contained in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. In addition to the guaranteed level of funds under the mass transit discretionary budget category, the administration proposes funding of $50,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

Under the Committee recommendation, a total program level of $6,271,000,000 would be provided for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration for fiscal year 2001, which is the same obligation limitation authorized under the mass transit category in TEA21. This funding is comprised of $1,254,000,000 in direct appropriations of general funds and $5,016,600,000 in limitations on contract authority.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations compared to fiscal year 2000 and the administration's request:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	2000 enacted [1]	2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Administrative expenses	60,000	64,000	64,000
Formula grants [2]	3,048,000	3,345,000	3,345,000
University transportation research	6,000	6,000	6,000
Transit planning and research	107,000	110,000	110,000
Capital investment grants [2 3]	2,507,000	2,646,000	2,646,000
Job access and reverse commute grants [4]	75,000	150,000	100,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	2000 enacted [1]	2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Total	5,803,000	6,321,000	6,271,000

[1] Does not reflect reductions totaling $18,085,200 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69 and for the 0.38 percent reduction pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.
[2] Fiscal year 2000 reflects transfer of $50,000,000 from Formula grants to Capital investment grants pursuant to Public Law 106–69.
[3] Fiscal year 2000 includes $6,000,000 direct appropriation pursuant to section 225 of Public Law 106–113.
[4] The budget proposal includes $50,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$12,000,000	$48,000,000	$60,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [2]	12,800,000	51,200,000	64,000,000
Committee recommendation	12,800,000	51,200,000	64,000,000

[1] Excludes reduction of $438,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.

The Committee recommends a total of $64,000,000 in budget resources funds for administrative expenses.

The Appropriations Committees have directed the DOT Inspector General (OIG) to track the progress of all fixed guideway projects of national significance and perform audits of those experiencing cost, schedule, or financing problems. To continue this work in fiscal year 2001, the administration proposes reimbursing the OIG $1,500,000 from FTA's administrative expenses account. The Committee has increased this transfer to $3,000,000, and has included bill language making these funds available to the OIG.

Full-time equivalent (FTE) staff years.—The Committee has not provided an increase of 10 FTE in fiscal year 2001, but anticipates that the requested fiscal year 2000 reprogramming to hire 20 positions (+10 FTE) above the enacted staff ceiling of 485 will be approved before the end of the current fiscal year. Therefore, the fiscal year 2001 staff ceiling will be 495 FTE instead of the requested 505 FTE, and salaries and benefits are decreased by −$835,000.

Information technology and other administrative expenses.—The Committee anticipates that the requested fiscal year 2000 reprogramming request for $2,500,000 in information technology initiatives will be approved before the end of the current fiscal year. However, the requested increase above baseline IT programs for fiscal year 2001 may exceed the agency's ability to implement projects in a timely and effective manner. The Committee approves the requests for IT infrastructure data protection (+$250,000), continued implementation of the Transportation Electronic Award and Management (TEAM) application program (+$250,000) and annual electronic procurement life cycle maintenance, licenses and core operations (+$150,000). Funding is denied for the remaining IT requests (−$291,000). The Committee directs FTA to use these savings to provide regional and state-based grantee workshops that will better familiarize grantees (especially those who are making a grant application with FTA for the first time) with regional planning, transit program development and eligibility, transit program management, and federally mandated requirements, as well as with the TEAM electronic application process.

TRANSIT FUNDING EQUITY AMONG STATES

Transit funding made available to public transit authorities, state departments of transportation, non-profit organizations, cities, and other public entities is made available through four mechanisms: formula grants (49 U.S.C. sections 5307, 5310, and 5311); capital investment grants (49 U.S.C. section 5309), which include bus and bus facilities grants, fixed guideway modernization grants, and new fixed guideway capital grants; job access and reverse commute grants (49 U.S.C. section 3037); and some planning and research funding. Of the total $6,271,000,000 in transit funding, $5,991,000,000 is in section 5307, 5310, 5309, and 5311 funds. Of this subtotal, the formula program funds and the fixed guideway modernization program funds go out to public transit agencies by formulas set in TEA21. The bus and bus facilities grants and new fixed guideway capital grants have traditionally been designated by Congress in the annual appropriations process.

The following table reflects fiscal year 2000 allocations to States for formula and capital investment grant programs.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION FISCAL YEAR 2000 APPORTIONMENT FOR FORMULA PROGRAMS (BY STATE)

State	Section						State total selected FTA programs	State percentage of total
	5307 Urbanized area	5311 Non-urbanized area	5310 Elderly and persons with disability	5309 new starts	5309 fixed quideway modernization	5309 bus allocation		
Alabama	$12,090,034	$4,603,405	$1,263,045	$2,943,236	.....	$25,567,342	$46,467,062	0.8
Alaska	[1] 7,242,172	686,467	191,890	14,912,397	.....	15,378,058	38,410,984	0.7
American Samoa	.....	97,843	52,634	.....	.....	.....	150,477	.....
Arizona	30,821,282	2,015,250	1,112,627	4,905,394	$1,526,094	6,867,664	47,248,311	0.9
Arkansas	4,743,949	3,680,231	880,019	.....	.....	5,062,451	14,366,650	0.3
California	447,473,782	8,982,245	6,878,982	191,310,350	95,431,731	37,459,014	787,536,104	14.3
Colorado	34,418,914	1,917,350	861,153	38,262,070	1,219,287	9,688,315	86,367,089	1.6
Connecticut	48,519,170	1,739,218	987,989	981,079	36,897,367	6,622,392	95,747,215	1.7
Delaware	5,673,422	433,893	293,852	981,079	755,391	2,452,737	10,590,374	0.2
District of Columbia	25,177,344	.....	291,611	.....	46,383,358	7,211,050	79,063,363	1.4
Florida	135,953,170	5,774,183	4,639,244	20,112,114	13,823,587	14,471,154	194,773,452	3.5
Georgia	47,474,147	6,730,668	1,640,232	45,268,939	17,521,698	21,338,818	139,974,502	2.5
Guam	.....	278,536	133,760	.....	.....	.....	412,296	.....
Hawaii	23,889,547	755,415	376,045	5,101,609	625,993	4,169,654	34,918,263	0.6
Idaho	2,846,734	1,524,027	385,025	.....	.....	.....	4,755,786	0.1
Illinois	190,899,623	6,175,012	2,996,023	31,394,518	114,500,000	8,682,692	354,647,868	6.4
Indiana	30,462,808	5,964,922	1,568,010	4,905,394	7,661,248	9,075,130	59,637,512	1.1
Iowa	8,673,972	3,836,697	946,671	.....	.....	10,384,893	23,842,233	0.4
Kansas	7,410,228	3,051,970	792,307	981,079	.....	6,651,826	18,887,410	0.3
Kentucky	15,875,261	5,038,137	1,210,112	.....	.....	5,886,573	28,010,083	0.5
Louisiana	25,638,155	4,166,904	1,214,053	981,079	2,709,022	4,905,476	39,614,689	0.7
Maine	2,042,136	2,010,694	483,465	490,539	.....	.....	5,026,834	0.1
Maryland	70,400,537	2,510,254	1,219,834	11,481,577	22,632,029	11,282,593	119,526,824	2.2
Massachusetts	106,769,422	2,690,230	1,760,613	54,837,393	63,234,326	12,148,410	241,440,394	4.4
Michigan	58,043,917	7,285,603	2,562,126	.....	440,130	26,980,100	95,311,876	1.7
Minnesota	27,237,043	4,192,444	1,237,149	44,933,405	2,874,132	23,804,862	104,279,035	1.9
Mississippi	4,279,789	4,091,281	854,719	.....	.....	5,101,696	14,327,485	0.3
Missouri	31,073,608	4,883,117	1,590,250	51,506,633	1,882,830	14,422,098	105,358,536	1.9
Montana	2,154,127	1,234,582	352,572	.....	.....	588,657	4,329,938	0.1
Nebraska	7,485,607	1,862,828	556,193	.....	.....	988,700	10,893,328	0.2
Nevada	17,331,409	608,185	411,680	3,433,775	.....	5,346,969	27,132,018	0.5
New Hampshire	3,018,110	1,610,315	388,463	981,079	.....	2,943,286	8,941,253	0.2
New Jersey	165,120,584	2,302,409	2,115,374	112,333,507	85,635,781	10,693,937	378,201,592	6.9

New Mexico	6,248,659	1,810,042	488,168	9,810,787	.....	8,584,582	26,942,238	0.5
New York	474,107,838	8,104,755	4,912,556	6,377,011	316,773,720	26,680,885	836,956,765	15.2
North Carolina	24,485,967	8,609,644	1,866,530	11,772,945	.....	7,192,409	53,927,495	1.0
North Dakota	2,099,863	913,029	298,904	.....	.....	981,096	4,292,892	0.1
Northern Marianas	.....	90,672	52,406	.....	.....	.....	143,078	.....
Ohio	79,851,933	8,765,216	3,127,059	5,395,934	15,542,858	13,500,115	126,183,115	2.3
Oklahoma	10,090,378	3,747,039	1,043,154	.....	.....	4,905,476	19,786,047	0.4
Oregon	24,257,325	2,975,182	969,236	11,343,237	2,868,068	8,290,255	50,703,303	0.9
Pennsylvania	130,035,687	9,777,689	3,750,831	23,055,350	96,624,465	28,345,805	291,589,827	5.3
Puerto Rico	39,304,948	2,921,881	919,030	31,394,519	1,968,870	588,657	77,097,905	1.4
Rhode Island	9,319,486	374,298	429,419	.....	1,446,893	3,231,728	14,801,824	0.3
South Carolina	10,155,824	4,309,170	1,008,050	2,452,697	.....	8,604,204	26,529,945	0.5
South Dakota	1,514,777	1,112,911	323,437	.....	.....	1,471,643	4,422,768	0.1
Tennessee	20,372,484	5,562,645	1,492,836	3,924,315	71,083	3,433,833	34,857,196	0.6
Texas	146,831,843	11,744,291	3,874,080	106,221,373	5,138,282	16,040,909	289,850,778	5.3
Utah	18,137,338	843,648	454,360	47,021,140	.....	14,029,660	80,486,146	1.5
Vermont	761,283	995,038	265,950	.....	.....	4,169,654	6,191,925	0.1
Virgin Islands	.....	212,971	136,122	.....	.....	.....	349,093	.....
Virginia	56,373,968	4,931,824	1,553,327	27,666,420	987,183	10,483,004	101,995,726	1.9
Washington	76,640,808	3,455,667	1,392,260	31,394,519	15,232,451	19,425,683	147,541,388	2.7
West Virginia	3,670,219	2,938,313	734,389	.....	.....	21,093,544	28,436,465	0.5
Wisconsin	32,888,049	5,077,060	1,421,596	981,079	639,123	19,867,176	60,874,083	1.1
Wyoming	1,051,862	710,084	224,993	.....	.....	.....	1,986,939	.....
Subtotal	2,768,440,542	192,717,384	72,986,415	961,849,571	973,047,000	537,096,865	5,506,137,777	100
Oversight	13,888,701	968,065	.....	7,353,000	7,353,000	4,096,500	33,659,266	.....
Total	[2] 2,782,329,243	[3] 193,685,449	[4] 72,986,415	[5] 969,202,571	980,400,000	[6] 541,193,365	5,539,797,043	.....
Over-the-Road Bus Accessibility	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,700,000	.....
Grand Total	2,782,329,243	193,685,449	72,986,415	969,202,571	980,400,000	541,193,365	5,543,497,043	.....

[1] Includes funds appropriated for the Alaska Railroad improvements to passenger operations
[2] Includes $4,589,012 in reapportioned recoveries.
[3] Includes $72,481 in reapportioned recoveries.
[4] Includes $39,614 in reapportioned recoveries.
[5] Includes a reduction of $11,197,429 as part of Public Law 106–113.
[6] Includes $1,199,750 of reallocated bus funds as part of Public Law 106–69; and a net reduction of $6,206,385 as part of Public Law 106–113.

FORMULA GRANTS

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$569,600,000	$2,478,400,000	$3,048,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	669,000,000	2,676,000,000	3,345,000,000
Committee recommendation	669,000,000	2,676,000,000	3,345,000,000

[1] Reflects $50,000,000 transferred to capital investment grants.

Formula grants to States and local agencies funded under this heading fall into four categories: urbanized area formula grants (U.S.C. sec. 5307); clean fuels formula grants (U.S.C. sec. 5308); formula grants and loans for special needs of elderly individuals and individuals with disabilities (U.S.C. sec. 5310); and formula grants for non-urbanized areas (U.S.C. sec. 5311). In addition, setasides of formula funds are directed to: a grant program for intercity bus operators to finance Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] accessibility costs; and the Alaska Railroad for improvements to its passenger operations.

Within the total funding level of $3,345,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, the statutory distribution of these formula grants is allocated among these categories as follows:

Urbanized areas (sec. 5307)	$2,997,316,081
Clean fuels (sec. 5308)	50,000,000
Elderly and disabled (sec. 5310)	78,850,801
Nonurbanized areas (sec. 5311)	209,283,168
Over-the-Road Bus Program	4,700,000
Alaska railroad	4,849,950

Section 3007 of TEA21 amends U.S.C. 5307, urbanized formula grants, by striking the authorization to utilize these funds for operating costs, but includes a specific provision allowing the Secretary to make operating grants to urbanized areas with a population of less than 200,000. Generally, urbanized formula grants may be used to fund capital projects, and to finance planning and improvement costs of equipment, facilities, and associated capital maintenance used in mass transportation. All urbanized areas greater than 200,000 in population are statutorily required to use 1 percent of their annual formula grants on enhancements, which include landscaping, public art, bicycle storage, and connections to parks.

The following table displays the State-by-State distribution of the formula program funds within each of the program categories:

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, FISCAL YEAR 2001 GUARANTEED LEVEL APPORTIONMENT FOR FORMULA PROGRAMS (BY STATE)

State	Section 5307 urbanized area	Section 5311 nonurbanized area	Section 5310 elderly and persons with disabilities	Total formula programs
Alabama	$13,046,848	$4,974,114	$1,363,957	$19,384,919
Alaska	[1] 7,433,414	741,748	197,821	8,372,983
American Samoa	.....	105,722	52,867	158,589
Arizona	33,260,503	2,177,536	1,200,201	36,638,240
Arkansas	5,119,390	3,976,597	946,967	10,042,954
California	482,887,208	9,705,577	7,477,863	500,070,648
Colorado	37,142,854	2,071,753	926,429	40,141,036
Connecticut	52,359,019	1,879,275	1,064,511	55,302,805
Delaware	6,122,420	468,834	308,825	6,900,079

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, FISCAL YEAR 2001 GUARANTEED LEVEL APPORTIONMENT FOR FORMULA PROGRAMS (BY STATE)—Continued

State	Section 5307 urbanized area	Section 5311 nonurbanized area	Section 5310 elderly and persons with disabilities	Total formula programs
District of Columbia	27,169,899	.....	306,385	27,476,284
Florida	146,712,613	6,239,173	5,039,527	157,991,313
Georgia	51,231,289	7,272,683	1,774,590	60,278,562
Guam	.....	300,966	134,536	435,502
Hawaii	25,780,183	816,248	398,306	26,994,737
Idaho	3,072,028	1,646,756	408,081	5,126,865
Illinois	206,007,568	6,672,281	3,250,600	215,930,449
Indiana	32,873,659	6,445,272	1,695,963	41,014,894
Iowa	9,360,438	4,145,662	1,019,530	14,525,630
Kansas	7,996,681	3,297,743	851,478	12,145,902
Kentucky	17,131,642	5,443,854	1,306,330	23,881,826
Louisiana	27,667,179	4,502,461	1,310,621	33,480,261
Maine	2,203,751	2,172,613	515,251	4,891,615
Maryland	75,972,090	2,712,403	1,316,914	80,001,407
Massachusetts	115,219,238	2,906,872	1,905,644	120,031,754
Michigan	62,637,557	7,872,306	2,778,229	73,288,092
Minnesota	29,392,604	4,530,057	1,335,764	35,258,425
Mississippi	4,618,496	4,420,748	919,424	9,958,668
Missouri	33,532,798	5,276,351	1,720,175	40,529,324
Montana	2,324,606	1,334,002	372,751	4,031,359
Nebraska	8,078,023	2,012,840	594,428	10,685,291
Nevada	18,703,029	657,162	437,100	19,797,291
New Hampshire	3,256,965	1,739,992	411,825	5,408,782
New Jersey	178,188,359	2,487,820	2,291,863	182,968,042
New Mexico	6,743,181	1,955,803	520,371	9,219,355
New York	511,629,104	8,757,424	5,337,074	525,723,602
North Carolina	26,423,807	9,302,971	2,020,953	37,747,731
North Dakota	2,266,047	986,554	314,324	3,566,925
Northern Marianas	.....	97,974	52,619	150,593
Ohio	86,171,474	9,471,071	3,393,254	99,035,799
Oklahoma	10,888,938	4,048,785	1,124,568	16,062,291
Oregon	26,177,070	3,214,771	1,044,095	30,435,936
Pennsylvania	140,326,812	10,565,079	4,072,337	154,964,228
Puerto Rico	42,415,576	3,157,178	989,437	46,562,191
Rhode Island	10,057,038	404,440	456,412	10,917,890
South Carolina	10,959,566	4,656,183	1,086,351	16,702,100
South Dakota	1,634,658	1,202,532	341,032	3,178,222
Tennessee	21,984,782	6,010,601	1,614,124	29,609,507
Texas	158,452,230	12,690,049	4,206,514	175,348,793
Utah	19,572,743	911,586	483,564	20,967,893
Vermont	821,531	1,075,168	278,448	2,175,147
Virgin Islands	.....	230,121	137,109	367,230
Virginia	60,835,448	5,328,980	1,679,979	67,844,407
Washington	82,706,220	3,733,949	1,504,629	87,944,798
West Virginia	3,960,684	3,174,933	788,425	7,924,042
Wisconsin	35,490,834	5,485,912	1,536,567	42,513,313
Wyoming	1,135,107	767,267	233,859	2,136,233
Subtotal	2,987,155,201	208,236,752	78,850,801	3,274,242,754
Oversight	15,010,830	1,046,416	.....	16,057,246
Total	3,002,166,031	209,283,168	78,850,801	3,290,300,000
Clean Fuels	.....	.....	.....	50,000,000

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, FISCAL YEAR 2001 GUARANTEED LEVEL APPORTIONMENT FOR FORMULA PROGRAMS (BY STATE)—Continued

State	Section 5307 urbanized area	Section 5311 nonurbanized area	Section 5310 elderly and persons with disabilities	Total formula programs
Over-the-Road Bus Accessibility ..	.....	.....	.....	4,700,000
Grand Total	.....	.....	.....	3,345,000,000

[1] Includes $4,849,950 for the Alaska Railroad improvements to passenger operations.

Over-the-road buses.—The Committee has included bill language that increases, through the current authorization period, the federal share of the incremental capital and training costs for the over-the-road bus accessibility program from the current level of 50 percent to 90 percent. A similar change in the Federal share for 1 year only was enacted last year. Section 3038(g) of TEA21 provides a total of $4,700,000 for the over-the-road bus accessibility program costs in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee has also included bill language which expands the exemption from Federal axle weight restrictions presently applicable only to public transit passenger buses to all over-the-road buses. Over-the-road buses (OTRBs), like urban transit buses, have been carrying progressively more weight on each axle due to government mandates relating to safety, the environment and access for the mobility impaired. Consequently, fully loaded OTRBs now approach and sometimes may exceed the federal axle weight restrictions of 34,000 pounds on the tandem axle, with no single axle allowed to carry more than 20,000 pounds. New emission standards going into effect in 2002 will only worsen the problem, because engine weight will be increased by 300 to 800 pounds. The transit bus exemption was enacted shortly after Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements were imposed on the transit industry in 1991. The ADA requirements were extended to OTRBs in 1999. Both transit buses and OTRBs are subject to the same safety, environmental, and accessibility requirements. It is inconsistent to exempt only one part of the industry and not the other. In addition, a study on the applicability of maximum axle weight limitations to both OTRBs and public transit vehicles is directed to be submitted to Congress no later than 18 months after enactment of this Act.

UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 2000	$1,200,000	$4,800,000	$6,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	1,200,000	4,800,000	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,200,000	4,800,000	6,000,000

Section 5505 of TEA21 provides authorization for the university transportation research program. The purpose of the university transportation research program is to become 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 university transportation research program are transferred to and managed by the Research and Spe-

cial Programs Administration (RSPA), combined with a transfer from the Federal Highway Administration of $27,250,000. The transit university transportation research program funds are statutorily available only to the following universities: University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Morgan State University, and North Carolina State University.

The Committee action provides $6,000,000 for the university transportation research program, the same level as provided in fiscal year 2000.

TRANSIT PLANNING AND RESEARCH

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 2000	$21,000,000	$86,000,000	$107,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	22,200,000	87,800,000	110,000,000
Committee recommendation	22,200,000	87,800,000	110,000,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $243,386 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

The Committee action provides $110,000,000 for transit planning and research. The bill contains language specifying that $52,113,600 shall be available for the metropolitan planning program; $5,250,000 for the rural transit assistance program; $29,500,000 for the national planning and research program; $10,886,400 for the State planning and research program; $8,250,000 for transit cooperative research; and $4,000,000 for the National Transit Institute at Rutgers University.

TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM

Within the funds provided for the transit cooperative research program, the bill contains language directing that $3,000,000 is available for research conducted by the Great Cities Universities research consortium, a coalition of 17 urban public research universities. This research shall be a collaborative effort to develop and enhance software and other technologies that can be applied directly to transportation issues in the urban areas in which the institutions are located, and to work with local government planners and managers to apply these transportation planning and problem-solving tools and to evaluate their performance. The institutions that comprise the Great Cities Universities research consortium are: University of Alabama at Birmingham, University of Cincinnati, Cleveland State University, Georgia State University, University of Houston, University of Illinois at Chicago, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, University of Massachusetts Boston, University of Memphis, University of Missouri-Kansas City, University of Missouri-St. Louis, University of New Orleans, City University of New York/City College, Portland State University, Virginia Commonwealth University, Wayne State University, and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendation:

	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation
	2000 program level	2001 budget estimate	
Metropolitan planning	$49,632,000	$52,113,600	$52,113,600
Rural transit assistance program	5,250,000	5,250,000	5,250,000
State planning and research program	10,368,000	10,886,400	10,886,400
Transit cooperative research program	8,250,000	8,250,000	8,250,000
National Transit Institute	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
National planning and research program [1]	29,500,000	29,500,000	29,500,000
Total	107,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000

[1] Fiscal year 2000 does not reflect reduction of $243,386 pursuant to section 310 of Public Law 106–113.

NATIONAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation includes transit planning and research grants from the national program that were authorized in section 3012 of the Transportation Equity Act for Fiscal Year 2001:

Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority advanced propulsion control system	$3,000,000
Project ACTION	3,000,000

Support in fiscal year 2001 is also provided for a number of important initiatives and Federal Transit Administration priorities, including:

Mid-America Regional Council coordinated transit planning, Kansas City metro area	$750,000
Sacramento Area Council of Governments regional air quality planning and coordination study	250,000
Salt Lake Olympic Committee multimodal transportation planning	1,200,000
West Virginia University fuel cell technology institute propulsion and ITS testing	1,000,000
University of Rhode Island, Kingston traffic congestion study	150,000
Georgia Regional Transportation Authority regional transit study	350,000
Trans-lake Washington land use effectiveness and enhancement review	450,000
State of Vermont electric vehicle transit demonstration	500,000
Center for Composites Manufacturing	950,000
Acadia Island, Maine explorer transit system experimental pilot program	150,000
Southern Nevada air quality study	800,000
Fairbanks extreme temperature clean fuels research	800,000
National Transit Database	2,500,000
Safety and security	6,100,000
National rural transit assistance program	750,000
Mississippi State University bus service expansion plan	100,000
Bus Rapid Transit administration, data collection and analysis	1,000,000

National transit database (NTD).—The NTD is FTA's national database for statistics for the transit industry, and provides for the national collection and dissemination of a uniform system of transit system financial accounts and operating data. These data are in turn used in the national allocation of Section 5307, 5310 and 5311 formula funding and section 5309 rail modernization funding according to TEA21 formulas. The Committee supports FTA's request of $2,500,000 for ongoing NTD activities from the national planning and research program. In response to direction from the conferees in the Fiscal Year 2000 Transportation Appropriations Act and in compliance with the Government Performance and Results

Act, FTA is revising and redesigning the NTD to provide more meaningful and timely data for State and local governments, transit industry personnel, and academic institutions. The FTA has submitted a phase I report on the NTD redesign effort to the Committees on Appropriations, and is requesting $1,515,000 from project management oversight funds for phase II (prototype development, systems testing, and software integration) for fiscal year 2001. The Committee concurs with this request.

Fuel cell bus research and development.—The Committee has not provided direct transit planning and research funding for development of either phosphoric acid fuel cell or proton exchange membrane fuel cell bus development. Through fiscal year 2000, over $50,000,000 has been provided in Federal research and deployment funding for the development of this technology. Fuel cell vendors and automotive and transit vehicle manufacturers are currently working together to integrate fuel cell technology with bus platforms. The Committee understands that several transit agencies have expressed interest in procuring service vehicles which employ fuel cell technology. The Committee notes that both section 5307 formula funds and section 5309 bus and bus facilities funds can be used for such procurements.

TRUST FUND SHARE OF EXPENSES

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000	$4,929,270,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	5,066,600,000
Committee recommendation	5,016,600,000

[1] Includes $50,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

For fiscal year 2001, the Committee has provided $5,016,600,000 in liquidating cash for the trust fund share of transit expenses associated with the following programs: administrative expenses, formula grants, university transportation research, transit planning and research, job access and reverse commute grants, and capital investment grants. This level of funds is equal to the total budget authority from the highway trust fund inside the transit firewall as outlined in the transportation discretionary spending guarantee subtitle of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

	General funds	Trust funds	Total
Appropriations, 2000 [1 2]	$540,200,000	$1,966,800,000	$2,507,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	529,200,000	2,116,800,000	2,646,000,000
Committee recommendation	529,200,000	2,116,800,000	2,646,000,000

[1] Includes $50,000,000 transferred from formula grants pursuant to Public Law 106–69; also includes $6,000,000 Trust Fund direct appropriation pursuant to section 225 of Public Law 106–113.
[2] Does not reflect reduction of $17,403,414 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

Section 5309 of 49 U.S.C. authorizes discretionary grants or loans to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof to be used in financing mass transportation investments. Investments may include construction of new fixed guideway systems and exten-

sions to existing guideway systems; major bus fleet expansions and bus facility construction; and fixed guideway expenditures for existing systems.

The Committee action provides a level of $2,646,000,000. Within this total, $2,116,800,000 is from the "Mass transit" account of the highway trust fund, and no more than $529,200,000 shall be appropriated from general funds. The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

	2000 program level	Fiscal year 2001 budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Bus and bus facilities	$546,200,000	$529,200,000	$529,200,000
Fixed guideway modernization	980,400,000	1,058,400,000	1,058,400,000
New systems and new extensions	980,400,000	1,058,400,000	1,058,400,000
Total	2,507,000,000	2,646,000,000	2,646,000,000

Three-year availability of section 3 discretionary funds.—Unobligated discretionary bus and new starts funds from projects funded in the fiscal year 1998 Transportation appropriations bill (Public Law 105–66) and previous acts are available for reallocation in fiscal year 2001. As in previous years, a general provision (sec. 316) is included which limits funding availability for fiscal year 2001 capital investment funds, except fixed-guideway modernization funds, to 3 years from enactment.

Under the 3-year availability rule, FTA has indicated that fiscal year 1998 funds provided for the following bus and bus facilities projects are in danger of lapsing before the end of fiscal year 2000.

	Remaining unobligated funds
Burlington, VT multimodal center	$1,465,794
Wilkes Barre, PA intermodal facility	1,465,794
Columbia, SC buses and facilities	1,954,393
Florence, SC Pee Dee RTA intermodal facilities	1,143,908
San Joaquin, CA buses and bus facilities	1,954,393

FTA has also indicated that fiscal year 1998 funds provided for the following new fixed guideway systems projects are in danger of lapsing before the end of fiscal year 2000.

	Remaining unobligated funds
Burlington to Gloucester Line, New Jersey	$1,488,750
Jackson, Mississippi intermodal corridor	2,990,300
New Orleans Canal Street Corridor project (fiscal years 1998 and 1997 funds)	13,924,777

Extensions of discretionary funds for projects beyond 3-year availability.—It has come to the Committee's attention that the FTA interprets Congressional extensions of funding availability beyond the statutory 3-year term as a renewal for another full 3-year period of availability. The Committee strongly objects to this interpretation, and stresses that the intent in matters of extending funding availability is to give project sponsors a limited amount of time to complete the process of obligating funds. The grant application process, legal certifications and assurances, and environmental clearances are assumed to be complete or well underway. The Committee directs the FTA to submit a legal opinion to the Transpor-

tation Subcommittee chairmen and ranking members of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on the implementation of Congressional funding extensions of discretionary grants beyond 3 years, immediately upon Senate passage of the fiscal year 2001 Transportation Appropriations bill.

The Committee directs the FTA not to reallocate funds provided in the fiscal year 1996 and the fiscal year 1997 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for the Buffalo, New York crossroads intermodal center. Additionally, the Committee directs the FTA not to reallocate funds provided in the Fiscal Year 1998 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for the New Rochelle, New York intermodal facility.

The Committee directs the FTA not to reallocate funds provided in the Fiscal Year 1998 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for the following new starts projects:

—Burlington-Essex commuter rail, Vermont

—Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Airport Busway

—Cleveland, Ohio Berea Red Line extension to Hopkins International Airport

—Galveston, Texas rail trolley system project

—Colorado Roaring Fork Valley Rail project (Aspen to Glenwood Springs)

Additionally, the bill contains a provision reprogramming funds provided in previous fiscal years from the following two projects for the purposes specified:

—North Front Range corridor feasibility study (fiscal year 1999)—to be made available for the Eagle Airport to Avon, Colorado light rail system feasibility study and preliminary engineering.

—Gees Bend Ferry facilities, Wilcox County and Jefferson State Community College/University of Montevallo pedestrian walkway (fiscal year 2000)—to be made available for State of Alabama buses and bus facilities.

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES

The Committee recommendation for bus and bus facilities funding is $529,200,000, which is 20 percent of the total made available for capital investment grants. These funds may be used to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities. Within the allocation of funds for discretionary bus and bus facilities, the budget proposes the following specific funding: $3,000,000 for the Altoona, PA, bus testing facility; $50,000,000 for grants that meet the 49 U.S.C. section 5308 Clean Fuels Formula Grant Program standards; $4,850,000 for the Georgetown University fuel cell bus program; $50,000,000 for the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority (LACMTA) bus program; $15,000,000 for projects benefiting the Mississippi Delta Region; and, $35,000,000 for transit projects related to the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. TEA21 requires that the Altoona bus testing facility and Georgetown University fuel cell bus program be allocated funds in the above-specified amounts. However, the Committee does not approve the non-authorized set-asides from the bus and bus facilities program requested by the administration.

The Committee has included bill language that delineates a number of eligible bus and bus facilities projects. These projects have been brought to the Appropriations Committee's attention as being meritorious and in need of Federal assistance. The bill includes language that directs the Federal Transit Administrator to submit to the congressional appropriations and authorizing committees, on or before February 1, 2001, a grant recommendation list choosing from among the projects listed in the appropriations bill.

—1000 Oaks Community transportation project, California
—AC Transit zero-emissions fuel cell bus deployment demonstration project, California
—Alabama A&M University buses and bus facilities
—Alabama State Docks intermodal passenger and freight facility
—Alameda-Contra Costa County bus project, California
—Alaska State Fair park and ride and passenger shuttle system
—Albany bus purchase, Linn-Benton transit system, Oregon
—Albany-Rensselaer train station redevelopment, New York
—Albuquerque automatic vehicle monitoring system (SOLAR), New Mexico
—Albuquerque bus replacement, New Mexico
—Albuquerque West Side Transit Facility, New Mexico
—Alexandria and Arlington bus facilities, Virginia
—Altoona bus testing facility, Pennsylvania
—Ames maintenance facility, Iowa
—Anaheim Resort Transportation project, alternative and electric transit, California
—Angel Fire Bus and Bus Facilities, New Mexico
—Area Transportation of North Central Pennsylvania buses and bus facilities
—Atlanta MARTA CNG buses, Georgia
—Attleboro Intermodal Mixed-Use Garage Facility, Massachusetts
—Auburn, AL parking/intermodal facility
—Auburn Transit hub park and ride, Washington
—Austin Capital Metro buses, Texas
—Bangor intermodal transportation center, Maine
—Basin Transit System buses, Oregon
—Beaver County Transit Facility, Pennsylvania
—Bellows Falls Multimodal, Vermont
—Ben Franklin Transit buses and bus facilities, Washington
—Berks Area Reading intermodal facility, Pennsylvania
—Bethlehem intermodal facility, Pennsylvania
—Billings buses and intermodal facility, Montana
—Binghamton Intermodal Transit Terminal, New York
—Birmingham-Jefferson County Transit Authority buses and bus facilities, Alabama
—Blackfoot Indian Reservation bus facility, Montana
—Brattleboro multimodal center, Vermont
—Brazos Transit District buses and bus facilities, Texas
—Brea shuttle buses, California
—Bridgeport intermodal facility, Connecticut
—Brockton Intermodal transportation Center, Massachusetts
—Brookhaven multimodal transportation center, Mississippi
—Buffalo intermodal transportation center, New York

—Burbank/Glendale—San Fernando Road bus facilities, California
—Burlington Multimodal Center, Vermont
—Burlington Special Services Transportation Agency buses and vans, Vermont
—Camden subway and bus intermodal center renovation, New Jersey
—Campbell County intermodal facility, Kentucky
—Carlsbad bus facility, New Mexico
—Cedar Rapids intermodal facility, Iowa
—Central Arkansas Transit Authority bus replacement, Arkansas
—Central Contra Costa Transit Authority buses, California
—Central New York Regional Transit Authority CNG buses
—Central Vermont Transit Authority buses and bus facilities
—Charlotte bus and bus facilities, North Carolina
—Chatham Area Transit ADA compliant buses and facility, Georgia
—Chester intermodal transportation center, Pennsylvania
—Cheyenne transit and operation facility, Wyoming
—Chittenden County Transit Authority, Vermont
—Cincinnati Riverfront Transit Center, Ohio
—Cincinnati, Ohio intermodal improvements
—Clark County bus passenger intermodal facility, Henderson, Nevada
—Clark County regional transportation commission clean fuel fleet expansion, Nevada
—Clark County RTC Las Vegas Bus Rapid Transit, Nevada
—Clinton facility expansion, Iowa
—Clovis Bus and Bus Related Facilities, New Mexico
—Coast Transit Authority multimodal facility and shuttle service, Mississippi
—Columbia bus and bus facilities, Missouri
—Columbia County ADA buses, Oregon
—Columbus Near East transit center, Ohio
—Community Transit buses and bus facilities—Snohomish County, Washington
—Compton Renaissance transit system project, California
—Coos County buses, Oregon
—Corpus Christi Adart ITS project, Texas
—Corpus Christi Regional Transit Authority buses and bus facilities, Texas
—Corvallis Transit System operations facility, Oregon
—C–TRAN bus facility, transit ITS and I–5 park and ride facility, Washington
—Dallas Area Rapid Transit buses and bus facilities, Texas
—Davis/Sacramento clean air buses and bus fueling faciity, California
—Dayton, Ohio Second and Main Multimodal Transportation Center
—Denali Depot intermodal facility, Alaska
—Des Moines park and ride, Iowa
—Dothan—Wiregrass Transit Authority buses and bus facilities, Alabama

—Durham Area Transit Authority buses and bus facilities, North Carolina
—East Palo Alto intermodal transit center, California
—El Dorado County bus fleet expansion, California
—El Paso buses and bus facilities, Texas
—El Segundo Douglas Street gap closure project, California
—Elizabeth Ferry Project, New Jersey
—Essex Junction multimodal station, Vermont
—Everett Transit buses and bus facilities, Washington
—Excelsior Springs bus replacement, Missouri
—Fairbanks clean fuel buses and fueling facilities
—Fairbanks Bus/Rail Intermodal Facility, Alaska
—Fairbanks parking garage and intermodal center, Alaska
—Fairfax County Metrorail intermodal expansion program, Virginia
—Fairfield/Siusun Transit buses, California
—Fishers Island ferry terminal expansion, New York
—Folsom Railroad Block multimodal transportation hub, California
—Foothill Transit clean air bus and bus fueling facility, California
—Fresno Community Medical Centers' intermodal transportation facility, California
—Fort Worth Transit Authority Buses and Bus Facilities, Texas
—Fort Worth Independent Transportation Network for elderly and mobility impaired needs, Texas
—Gainesville Joint Communications Technology Project, Florida
—Gary, Adam Benjamin intermodal center, Indiana
—Galveston buses and bus facilities, Texas
—Galveston Intermodal Terminal, Texas
—Georgetown University fuel cell bus program
—Georgia DOT bus and bus facilities
—Georgia Regional Transportation Authority CNG buses
—Glacier Park Red Bus fleet, Montana
—Great Falls Transit district buses and bus facilities, Montana
—Greater Lafayette Public Corporation—Wabash Landing buses and bus facilities, Indiana
—Greater New Haven electric trolleys, Connecticut
—Greater Minnesota Transit Authorities buses and bus facilities
—Hampton Roads transit bus and bus facilities, Virginia
—Harrison County multimodal project, Mississippi
—Hartford/New Britain busway, Connecticut
—Hershey intermodal transportation center, Pennsylvania
—Highbridge pedestrian walkway, New York
—Hillsborough Transit Authority bus tracking system, Florida
—Homer, Alaska Maritime Wildlife Refuge intermodal and welcome center
—Honolulu bus and bus facility improvements, Hawaii
—Hood River County bus and bus facility, Oregon
—Hot Springs, Arkansas national park intermodal parking facility
—Houston Main Street Liveable Communities Initiative, Texas
—Huntsville Intermodal Transit Facility, Alabama
—Huntsville Space & Rocket Center intermodal center, Alabama

—I–5 Joint Powers Authority transit centers project, California
—Indianapolis communications system and passenger amenities upgrades, Indiana
—Indianapolis Public Transportation Corporation bus and bus facilities, Indiana
—Inglewood Market Street transit center and buses, California
—Iowa City intermodal facility, Iowa
—Jackson JATRAN buses, Mississippi
—Jefferson City van and equipment purchase, Missouri
—Johnstown intermodal transportation center, Pennsylvania
—Kansas City Area Transit Authority radio system replacement, Missouri
—Kennedy Center public access project, Washington, DC
—King County Eastgate Park and Ride, Washington
—King County Metro buses and bus facilities, Washington
—King County Metro transit security enhancements, Washington
—King County transit corridor improvements, Washington
—King County transit oriented development projects/transit amenities, Washington
—Lafayette multi-modal facility, Louisiana
—Lake Tahoe CNG buses and fleet conversion, Nevada
—Lakeview buses, Oregon
—Lamar County vans, Alabama
—Lane Transit District buses and bus facility, Oregon
—Larkspur transit park and ride, Marin County, California
—Las Cruces/New Mexico State University bus purchase
—Lawrence bus and bus facilities, Kansas
—Little Rock Rivermarket/College Station livable communities, Arkansas
—Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority bus and maintenance facilities, California
—Livermore intermodal transfer facility, California
—Long Beach Central Bus Garage, New York
—Los Angeles buses, California
—Los Angeles Municipal Transit Operators' Coalition buses, California
—Los Lunas Buses and Bus Facilities, New Mexico
—Lowell Regional Transit Authority bus service hub relocation, Massachusetts
—Macon intermodal facility at Union Station, Georgia
—MARC midday storage facility in Washington Terminal, Maryland
—Maryland Statewide buses and bus facilities
—Mason City maintenance facility, Iowa
—Merrimack Valley Regional Transit Authority buses and bus facilities, Massachusetts
—Mesa bus maintenance facility, Regional Public Transportation Authority, Arizona
—Metropolitan Tulsa Transit Authority pedestrian and streetscape improvements, Oklahoma
—Miami Beach electrowave facility/intermodal transit system, Florida
—Minneapolis Metro Transit Uptown Transit Hub, Gateway Garage Annex, and bus shelters, Minnesota

—Mississippi County bus replacement, Missouri
—Mississippi River ferry reconstruction, Bellches, Louisiana
—Missoula Ravalli Transportation Management Association buses, Montana
—Missouri River pedestrian crossing, Omaha, Nebraska
—Mobile waterfront terminal complex, Alabama
—Modesto bus maintenance facility, California
—Monroe Center bus facility, New Jersey
—Monrovia trolley system, California
—Montana statewide bus service coordination computer-aided dispatch equipment
—Monterey-Salinas Transit Buses and bus facility, California
—Monterey-Salinas Transit marina transit station, California
—Montgomery County farebox technology, Maryland
—Montgomery, Moulton Street Intermodal Facility, Alabama
—Mukilteo multimodal terminal project preliminary engineering, Washington
—Napa multimodal train station, California
—New Haven trolley cars and related equipment, Connecticut
—New Jersey Transit alternative fuel buses
—New Jersey Transit bus terminal renovation
—New London park and ride pedestrian access and high-speed rail/ferry facility, Connecticut
—New Orleans Union Passenger Terminal renovation, Louisiana
—Newark Arena bus improvements, New Jersey
—Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority buses, New York
—Norfolk buses, Virginia
—North Carolina statewide buses and bus facilities
—Norwich bus terminal and pedestrian access, Connecticut
—OATS buses and vans, Missouri
—Occupational Center for Central Kansas bus maintenance facility
—Oceanside parking transit facility, California
—Oklahoma City bus transfer center, Oklahoma
—Oklahoma Transit Association bus and bus facilities
—Olympia Intercity Transit radio system equipment, Washington
—Orlando Lynx bus maintenance facility, Florida
—Paducah area transit system bus and bus facilities, Kentucky
—Palmdale multimodal facility, California
—Park City, Salt Lake City, Ogden City, West Valley City, Provo City, and Orem City intermodal facilities, Utah
—Pasadena Blue Line intermodal centers, California
—Philadelphia SEPTA Paoli Bus Transportation Center, Pennsylvania
—Philadelphia, Frankford Transportation Center, Pennsylvania
—Philadelphia, SEPTA Callowhill Bus Garage, Pennsylvania
—Philomath buses, Oregon
—Phoenix area Regional Public Transportation Authority bus fleet advanced ITS, Arizona
—Phoenix Regional Public Transportation Authority bus replacement, Arizona
—Phoenix South Central Avenue transit facility, Arizona
—Picayune multimodal center, Mississippi

—Pierce Transit base expansion, Washington
—Pittsfield intermodal transportation center, Massachusetts
—Placer County CNG bus program, California
—Port Authority of Allegheny County Bus and Bus Facilities, Pennsylvania
—Port Ayers Transit Station improvements, Texas
—Port McKenzie intermodal facilities, Alaska
—Prince William County and Potomac Rappahannock bus replacement, Virginia
—Ray County bus and bus facilities, Missouri
—Redmond buses, Oregon
—Reno County Bus and Bus facilities, Kansas
—Reno/Sparks bus transfer facilities, Nevada
—Renton/Port Quendall transit project, Washington
—Reston East Park and Ride project, Virginia
—Rhode Island Public Transit Authority buses and bus facilities
—Richmond Downtown Transit Plaza, Virginia
—Ripley County buses and bus facilities, Missouri
—Rogue Valley buses, Oregon
—Rushline Corridor Transit improvements, Minnesota
—Sacramento buses and bus facilities, California
—Salem Area Transit District buses, Oregon
—Salt Lake City 2002 Winter Olympics transit bus loan program, Utah
—Salt Lake City 2002 Winter Paralympics Games equipment and operating assistance, Utah
—Salt Lake City 2002 Winter Olympics park and ride lots, Utah
—Salt Lake City 2002 Winter Olympics spectator bus facilities, Utah
—Salt Lake City hybrid electric vehicle acquisition, Utah
—San Bernardino OmniTrans transit center planning and construction, California
—San Bernardino-Santa Fe depot restoration, California
—San Diego East Village Intermodal Transit improvements, California
—San Fernando Valley east-west bus rapid transit project, California
—San Francisco Larkspur park and ride, California
—San Francisco Midday Bus storage facility, California
—San Fransisco MUNI buses, equipment and facilities, California
—San Joaquin Regional Transit District buses and bus facilites, California
—San Joaquin Regional Transit District expansion of Wilson Way/Lindsay Street facility, California
—San Joaquin Regional Transit District ITS, California
—Sandy buses, Oregon
—Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority bus procurement, California
—Santa Clarita transit maintenance facility, California
—Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District MetroBase project bus consolidation facility, California
—Santa Fe buses and bus facilities, New Mexico
—Scott County bus and bus facilities, Missouri

—Sequim, Challam Transit systems facilities, Washington
—Shelby County vans for elderly, Alabama
—Ship Creek pedestrian and bus facilities and intermodal center/parking garage, Alaska
—Silver Spring Intermodal Center (MARC), Maryland
—Sioux City multimodal ground transportation center, Iowa
—Sioux City Trolley system, Iowa
—Sonoma County Transit bus facility expansion, California
—Sound Transit buses, Washington
—South Amboy Regional Intermodal Transportation Initiative, New Jersey
—South Bend Public Transit (TRANSPO) bus fleet replacement, Indiana
—South Clackamas Transportation District bus, Oregon
—South Corridor Transit Center and park and ride facilities in Clackamas County, Oregon
—South Metro Area Rapid Transit maintenance/operations facility, Oregon
—Southeast Missouri Transportation Service bus and bus facilities
—Southern Coalition for Advanced Transportation clean fuels bus purchase and technical assistance, Georgia and Alabama
—Springfield Intermodal Center, Massachusetts
—St. Bernard Parish intermodal facilities, Louisiana
—St. Cloud Metropolitan Transit Commission replacement of buses, Minnesota
—St. George Ferry Terminal, New York
—St. Joseph bus replacement, Missouri
—St. Louis Bi-State Development Authority bus and bus facilities, Missouri
—St. Louis Care Cab elderly and disabled vehicles, Missouri
—State of Alabama buses and bus facilities
—State of Arkansas rural and small transit bus and van replacements
—State of Colorado buses and bus facilities
—State of Delaware buses and bus facilities
—State of Florida buses and bus facilities
—State of Idaho buses and bus facilities
—State of Illinois buses and bus facilities
—State of Iowa buses and bus facilities and rural special needs buses
—State of Louisiana buses and bus facilities
—State of Maine bus and bus facilities
—State of Michigan buses and bus facilities
—State of Mississippi rural transit vehicles and regional transit centers
—State of Missouri bus and bus facilities
—State of New Mexico buses and bus facilities
—State of North Carolina buses and bus facilities
—State of North Dakota buses and bus facilities
—State of Ohio buses and bus facilities
—State of Oklahoma buses and bus facilities
—State of South Carolina buses and bus facilities
—State of Tennessee buses and bus facilities

—State of Utah regional park and ride lots
—State of Washington combined small transit system request, bus and bus facilities
—State of West Virginia buses and bus facilities
—State of Wisconsin buses and bus facilities
—Staten Island Ferry Whitehall intermodal ferry terminal, New York
—SunLine Transit fuel cell buses, California
—Sunset Empire Transit District improvements to Clatsop County Intermodal Facility, Oregon
—Sunset Interchange HOV ramp construction, Washington
—Tahoe Regional Planning Authority CNG buses, California
—Temecula bus shelters, California
—Texas Rural Transit Vehicle Fleet Replacement Program
—Tillamook County District transit facilities, Oregon
—Topeka Transit Off-street transfer center, Kansas
—Towamencin Township Multimodal Transportation Center, Pennsylvania
—Transit Authority of River City buses, Kentucky
—Triskett Bus Garage rehabilitation, Cleveland, Ohio
—Tucson intermodal transportation center at Union Pacific Depot, Arizona
—Tucson Sun Tran buses and bus facilities, Arizona
—Tuscaloosa interdisciplinary science building parking and intermodal facility, Alabama
—Twin Cities Metro Bus Program, Minnesota
—Union County bus, Oregon
—University of Alabama Birmingham fuel cell buses
—University of North Alabama buses and bus facilities
—University of South Alabama buses and bus facilities
—Upland commuter rail station, California
—Utah Transit Authority and Park City Transit bus fleet replacement
—Vacaville bus transfer center, California
—Vacaville-Bella Vista park and ride, California
—Vermont Statewide paratransit
—Waco Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility, Texas
—Wasco County buses, Oregon
—Washoe County buses and bus Facilities, Nevada
—Waterloo multimodal project, Iowa
—West Lafayette bus and bus related projects, Indiana
—West Side Manhattan Ferry Terminal, New York
—Wichita Transit replacement buses, Kansas
—Wilkes-Barre intermodal transportation center, Pennsylvania
—Williamsburg natural gas buses, Virginia
—Ybor City streetcar intermodal station, Florida
—Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority replacement buses, California

State of Michigan buses and bus facilities.—Despite unanimously supported agreements among the Michigan Public Transit Association (MPTA), its members, and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) that Section 5309 bus funds to Michigan transit agencies be distributed through MDOT, designations of funds to individual transit agencies continue to be sought and proposed apart from that agreement. The Committee directs that any fiscal year

2001 discretionary bus funds for projects in Michigan be distributed through MDOT in accordance with the MPTA–MDOT agreement.

FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION

The Committee recommends a total of $1,058,400,000 for the modernization of existing rail transit systems. Under TEA21 all of the funds are distributed by formula. The following table itemizes the fiscal year 2001 rail modernization allocations by State:

Fiscal year 2001 section 5309 fixed guideway modernization

State	*Fiscal year 2001 budget*
Arizona	$1,647,509
California	103,024,219
Colorado	1,316,293
Connecticut	39,832,898
Delaware	815,489
District of Columbia	50,073,588
Florida	14,923,383
Georgia	18,915,713
Hawaii	675,797
Illinois	123,609,547
Indiana	8,270,772
Louisiana	2,924,550
Maryland	24,432,619
Massachusetts	68,265,209
Michigan	475,146
Minnesota	3,102,796
Missouri	2,032,627
New Jersey	92,448,909
New York	341,976,036
Ohio	16,779,438
Oregon	3,096,250
Pennsylvania	104,311,846
Puerto Rico	2,125,512
Rhode Island	1,562,007
Tennessee	76,738
Texas	5,547,080
Virginia	1,065,723
Washington	16,444,335
Wisconsin	689,971
Total	1,050,462,000
Three-quarter percent oversight	7,938,000
Total appropriation	1,058,400,000

NEW STARTS

The bill provides $1,058,400,000 for new starts. These funds are available for major investment studies, preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, project management, oversight, and construction for new systems and extensions. Under section 3009(g) of TEA21, there is an 8-percent statutory cap on the amount made available for activities other than final design and construction—that is, alternatives analysis, environmental impact statements, preliminary engineering, major investment studies, and other predesign and preconstruction activities. Within the total of $1,058,400,000 for new systems, no more than $84,672,000 may be allocated for these activities.

The Committee has included bill language that delineates a number of eligible new fixed guideway system projects under both of these funding categories, and directs the Federal Transit Administrator to submit to the congressional appropriations and authorizing committees, on or before February 1, 2001, a grant recommendation list choosing from among the projects listed in the appropriations bill. The Committee is aware that the administration's budget request includes a list of requested projects, but believes that the Department should reassess its recommendations in light of the number of authorized projects which have been deemed eligible for funding, both in TEA21 and this appropriations legislation.

The following new fixed guideway systems and extensions to existing systems are eligible to receive funding for final design and construction:

2002 Winter Olympics spectator transportation systems and facilities

Alaska or Hawaii ferry projects

Atlanta—MARTA North Line extension completion

Austin Capital Metro Light Rail

Baltimore Central Light Rail Double Tracking

Boston North-South Rail Link

Boston—South Boston Piers Transitway

Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail line

Charlotte North-South Transitway project

Chicago METRA commuter rail consolidated request

Chicago Transit Authority Ravenswood Brown Line capacity expansion

Chicago Transit Authority Douglas Blue Line

Clark County, Nevada RTC fixed guideway project

Cleveland Euclid Corridor improvement project

Dallas Area Rapid Transit North Central light rail

Denver Southeast corridor project

Denver Southwest corridor project

Fort Lauderdale Tri-County commuter rail project

Fort Worth Railtran corridor commuter rail project

Galveston Rail Trolley extension

Girdwood to Wasilla, Alaska commuter rail project

Houston Metro Regional Bus Plan

Kansas City Southtown corridor

Little Rock, Arkansas river rail project

Long Island Rail Road East Side access project

Los Angeles Mid-city and Eastside corridors

Los Angeles North Hollywood extension

MARC expansion projects—Penn-Camden lines connector and midday storage facility

MARC-Brunswick line in West Virginia, signal and crossover improvements

Memphis Medical Center extension project

Minneapolis—Twin Cities Transitways corridor projects

Nashua, New Hampshire to Lowell, Massachusetts commuter rail

Nashville regional commuter rail

New Jersey Hudson-Bergen Light Rail

New Orleans Canal Street Streetcar corridor project
New Orleans Desire Street corridor project
Newark-Elizabeth rail link
Oceanside-Escondido, California light rail
Orange County, California transitway project
Philadelphia-Reading SEPTA Schuylkill Valley metro project
Phoenix metropolitan area transit project
Pittsburgh North Shore-central business district corridor project
Pittsburgh Stage II Light Rail transit
Portland Interstate MAX light rail transit
Raleigh, Durham and Chapel Hill regional rail service
Rhode Island—Pawtucket and T.F. Green commuter rail/maintenance facility
Sacramento south corridor light rail extension
Salt Lake City—University light rail line
Salt Lake City North/South light rail project
Salt Lake-Ogden-Provo regional commuter rail
San Bernardino MetroLink
San Diego Mission Valley East light rail
San Francisco BART extension to the airport project
San Jose Tasman West light rail project
San Juan-Tren Urbano
Seattle-Sound Transit Central Link light rail project
Seattle-Puget Sound RTA Sounder commuter rail project
Spokane-South Valley Corridor light rail project
St. Louis Metrolink Cross County connector
St. Louis/St. Clair County Metrolink light rail extension
Stamford Urban Transitway, Connecticut
Tampa Bay regional rail project
Washington Metro Blue Line—Largo extension
West Trenton, New Jersey rail project

The following new fixed guideway systems and extensions to existing systems are eligible to receive funding for alternatives analysis and preliminary engineering:
Albuquerque/Greater Albuquerque mass transit project
Atlanta—MARTA West Line extension study
Ballston, Virginia Metro access improvements
Baltimore regional rail transit system
Birmingham, Alabama transit corridor
Boston Urban Ring
Burlington-Bennington, Vermont commuter rail project
Calais, Maine Branch Line regional transit program
Colorado/Eagle Airport to Avon light rail system
Colorado/Roaring Fork Valley rail project
Columbus-Central Ohio Transit Authority north corridor
Dallas Area Rapid Transit Southeast Corridor Light Rail
Des Moines commuter rail
Detroit Metropolitan Airport light rail project
Draper, West Jordan, West Valley City & Sandy City, Utah light rail extensions
Dulles Corridor, Virginia innovative intermodal system
El Paso/Juarez People mover system
Fort Worth trolley system

Harrisburg-Lancaster capital area transit corridor 1 regional light rail
Hollister/Gilroy Branch Line extension
Honolulu bus rapid transit
Houston advanced transit program
Indianapolis Northeast-Downtown corridor project
Johnson County, Kansas I–35 Commuter Rail Project
Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee commuter rail extension
Los Angeles San Fernando Valley Corridor
Los Angeles San Diego LOSSAN corridor project
Massachusetts North Shore Corridor project
Miami south busway extension
New Orleans commuter rail from Airport to downtown
New York City 2nd Avenue Subway study
Northern Indiana south shore commuter rail
Northwest New Jersey-Northeast Pennsylvania passenger rail project
Potomac Yards, Virginia transit study
Philadelphia SEPTA Cross County Metro
Portland, Maine marine highway program
San Francisco BART to Livermore extension
San Francisco MUNI 3rd Street light rail extension
Santa Fe-Eldorado rail project
Stockton, California Altamont commuter rail project
Vasona light rail corridor
Virginia Railway Express commuter rail
Whitehall ferry terminal project
Wilmington, Delaware downtown transit connector
Wilsonville to Beaverton commuter rail

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

There is a total of $1,058,400,000 available for transit new starts funding in fiscal year 2001. The administration's request includes $744,293,000 for projects with current or pending FTA full funding grant agreements with FTA, 70 percent of the total available funds. Additionally, the administration's request proposes allocating $211,174,990 for 12 new starts projects that are currently in preliminary engineering or final design. The administration expects these projects to complete the engineering and environmental review process by the start of fiscal year 2001. FTA anticipates signing full funding grant agreements with these projects some time during fiscal year 2001. The estimated federal share over the life of these new projects is $2,955,230,000. If Congress follows the administration's fiscal year 2001 budget request, the entire commitment authority amount provided in TEA21 for the new starts program will be committed. There will be no further room under the TEA21 guaranteed program level for any new full funding grant agreements beyond those outlined in the budget request. The Committee objects to closing off the new starts pipeline two full years before the expiration of the authorizing period; to do so is unresponsive to changing project conditions and to the expressed needs of the transit community and their elected representatives.

Full funding grant agreements.—The Committee has a strong inclination to honor the FTA's full funding grant agreements with

new starts grantees, provided that there are not dramatic cost, scope, or schedule changes that would have a negative impact on the grantee's ability to meet its responsibilities under the FFGA schedule. The Committee takes an active interest in the progress and status of all new starts projects, most particularly in the FFGA projects, since they represent such a large proportion of the total discretionary funding stream. The annual oversight responsibility of the Appropriations Committee is to protect present and anticipated federal investments.

Central Florida commuter rail.—The Committee directs that the balance of previously appropriated funds for the Orlando light rail project shall be made available for the Central Florida commuter rail project, which is part of the Central Florida Light Rail system as authorized in Public Law 105–178, section 3030(a)(60). This recently-proposed project for commuter rail in the I–4 corridor would use diesel multiple unit technology, which is an eligible fixed guideway technology.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND, MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT)

Appropriations, 2000	$1,500,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001	350,000,000
Committee recommendation	350,000,000

The bill includes $350,000,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority previously provided in section 5338(b) of 49 U.S.C.

JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE GRANTS

	General fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 2000	$15,000,000	$60,000,000	$75,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	20,000,000	130,000,000	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000	80,000,000	100,000,000

[1] Includes $50,000,000 from revenue aligned budget authority.

The Committee recommends $100,000,000 for the Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants program, the level guaranteed under the TEA21 transit category firewall. This program is meant to help welfare reform efforts succeed by providing enhanced transportation services for low-income individuals, including former welfare recipients, traveling to jobs or training centers.

The program makes competitive grants to qualifying metropolitan planning organizations, local governmental authorities, agencies, and nonprofit organizations in urbanized areas with populations greater than 200,000. Grants may not be used for planning or coordination activities.

The Committee does not approve the request for $50,000,000 additional job access and reverse commute grant program funds, to be provided by a transfer from the revenue aligned budget authority funds. The Committee does not approve bill language proposed by the department that would have set aside $5,000,000 each for tribal governments and the Mississippi Delta region within this

program. Indian tribes and transit providers in the Mississippi Delta region are currently eligible for this program.

The Committee recommends the following allocations of job access and reverse commute grant program funds in fiscal year 2001:

Alameda and Contra-Costa Counties, California	$500,000
Archuleta County, Colorado	75,000
Broome County Transit, New York	250,000
Capital District Transit Authority, New York	250,000
Central Kenai Peninsula public transportation	500,000
Central Ohio Transit Authority	1,000,000
Corpus Christi RTA, Texas	550,000
Des Moines, Dubuque, Sioux City, and rural areas 3, 4, 9, and 12, Iowa	1,600,000
Dona Ana County, New Mexico	250,000
Easter Seals West Alabama work transition programs	850,000
Greater Erie Community Action Committee, Pennsylvania	400,000
Indianapolis Public Transportation Corporation, Indiana	1,000,000
Las Cruces, New Mexico	260,000
Matanuska-Susitna borough, M.A.S.C.O.T	60,000
Meramec Community transit programs, Missouri	150,000
Mobile, Alabama	250,000
Monterey, California	150,000
North Oakland County, Michigan	250,000
OATS job access programs, Missouri	750,000
Paterson-New Jersey Community Development Corporation	762,000
Philadelphia SEPTA, Pennsylvania	3,000,000
Pittsburgh Port Authority of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania	2,000,000
Rhode Island Public Transit Authority	1,000,000
Rhode Island Community Food Bank transportation	100,000
Santa Clara County, California	500,000
Sitka, Alaska transit expansion program	400,000
Southern Illinois RIDES	150,000
State of New Mexico	1,000,000
State of Illinois	1,000,000
State of Alabama	1,500,000
State of Maryland	2,400,000
State of Oklahoma	3,000,000
State of Washington WorkFirst transportation initiative	2,000,000
State of West Virginia	1,500,000
State of Wisconsin	3,000,000
State of Vermont	1,500,000
Portland Tri-Met, Oregon	1,840,000
Troy State University, Alabama—Rosa Parks Center	2,000,000
Tysons/Dulles Corridor, Virginia	500,000
Washoe County, Nevada	1,000,000
Ways to Work family loan program, Southeastern United States	2,000,000
York County, Maine	900,000

OTHER GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee has included the following general provisions affecting transit programs:

SEC. 311. This general provision has been carried in the appropriations bill for many years. It allows FTA to update account names and transfer the associated funds to the new account structure. This bookkeeping authority is necessary, given that the Transportation Equity Act has restructured the mass transit program.

SEC. 321. This general provision expands the eligible uses of funds made available for Alaska or Hawaii ferry boats or ferry terminals pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 5309(m)(2)(B). Section 3009(k)(3) of TEA21 makes $10,400,000 available for Alaska or Hawaii ferry boat systems for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003. The last

two years' appropriations acts have honored this set-aside. However, none of these funds have been obligated to date and this general provision, which is similar to a provision included in last year's appropriations act, will increase the flexibility of these funds so they can be utilized for their intended purpose.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (the Corporation) is a wholly owned Government corporation established by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Act of May 13, 1954. The Corporation is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and development of the United States portion of the Saint Lawrence Seaway between Montreal and Lake Erie. The Corporation's major priorities include: safety, reliability, trade development, and management accountability.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 2000[1]	$12,042,000
Budget estimate, 2001[2] (mandatory)	13,004,000
Committee recommendation	12,400,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $25,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69; also excludes reduction of $46,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.
[2] Assumes enactment of authorizing legislation.

The administration has proposed to restructure the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation as a performance-based organization (PBO). In 1996, the National Performance Review first identified the Corporation as one of nine PBO candidates. As a PBO, the Corporation's funding mechanism would change from annual appropriations to a mandatory formula-based payment that primarily is determined by a five-year average of international tonnage moved through the Seaway. Consequently, the administration did not seek appropriated funds for the Seaway and instead is requesting a mandatory payment of $13,004,000 from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The bill includes an appropriation of $12,400,000 instead of the mandatory payment that was requested. Although the Administration submitted a legislative proposal and financial plan that would establish the Corporation as a performance-based organization (PBO) during the 106th Congress, the Congress has not taken action on this legislation. Until enactment of legislation authorizing the Seaway as a PBO, the Committee will continue to fund the Corporation according to current law.

The Committee recommendation includes $12,004,000 to fully fund the operations and maintenance of the Corporation. The Administration also requested $1,000,000, as well as $900,000 in offsetting collections, for capital improvements. The Committee defers $604,000 due to budgetary constraints. The Committee recommendation provides sufficient funding for the Corporation's highest capital priorities and the projects recommended by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers after its survey and evaluation of the

Corporation's lock and maintenance practices. The Committee notes, however, that the capital plan for fiscal year 2001 is significantly greater than previous years' appropriations and the projected costs for the remaining four years of the five-year capital plan.

Although the Committee finds merit in the PBO proposal, the committee remains concerned about certain provisions of the legislation to establish the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation as a PBO. As an organization funded through a mandatory funding mechanism, Congress would no longer have a direct role in determining the level of funding for the Corporation or directing the use of its funds. This would severely undermine Congress' ability to exercise its responsibility to conduct oversight over the agency and allocate funding within broader policy and fiscal goals, such as balancing the Federal budget. Therefore, the Committee directs the administration to submit future Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation budget requests consistent with current law until Congress takes action on PBO authorization legislation.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

The Research and Special Programs Administration [RSPA] was established by the Secretary of Transportation's organizational changes dated July 20, 1977, and serves as a research, analytical, and technical development arm of the Department for multimodal research and development, as well as special programs. Particular emphasis is given to pipeline transportation and the transportation of hazardous cargo by all modes. In 2001, resources are requested for the management and execution of the Offices of Hazardous Materials Safety, Emergency Transportation, Pipeline Safety, program and administrative support. Funds are also requested for the emergency preparedness grants program. RSPA's two reimbursable programs—Transportation Safety Institute [TSI] and the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center [VNTSC]—support research safety and security programs for all modes of transportation.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2000[1]	$32,061,000
Budget estimate, 2001[2]	42,531,000
Committee recommendation	34,370,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $296,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.

[2] Does not includes reduction of $4,722,000 in proposed user fees.

The Committee has provided a total of $34,370,000 for the "Research and special programs" account, $8,161,000 less than the administration's request.

Consistent with the Committee's views on the administration's new user fee proposals contained in the fiscal year 2001 budget submission expressed in the Office of the Secretary portion of this report, the Committee does not approve the proposed new user fees and associated funding offsets for the hazardous materials safety program.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

	Fiscal year 2000 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 2001 estimate	Committee recommendation
Hazardous materials safety	$17,710,000	$18,773,000	$18,620,000
(FTE)	(125.5)	(129)	(129)
Emergency transportation	$1,378,000	$2,375,000	$1,801,000
(FTE)	(7)	(9.5)	(8)
Research and technology	$3,397,000	$9,416,000	$3,740,000
(FTE)	(11)	(10)	(9)
Program and administrative support	$9,576,000	$11,967,000	$10,209,000
(FTE)	(45)	(47)	(47)
Total, research and special programs	$32,061,000	$42,531,000	$34,370,000

[1] Does not reflect $296,000 reduction for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

The Office of Hazardous Materials Safety [OHMS] administers a nationwide program of safety regulations to fulfill the Secretary's duty to protect the Nation from the risks to life, health, and property that are inherent in the transportation of hazardous materials by water, air, highway, and railroad. OHMS plans, implements, and manages the hazardous materials transportation program consisting of information systems, research and analysis, inspection and enforcement, rulemaking support, training and information dissemination, and emergency procedures.

The Committee recommends $18,620,000 for hazardous materials safety, which is $153,000 less than the administration's request. The Committee recommendation for the OHMS includes funding to annualize costs associated with 7 new hazardous materials safety positions approved in fiscal year 2000 (+3.5 full time equivalents). Administrative expenses and PC&B total $12,670,000; adequate funds are provided for cost of living and locality pay adjustments and merit increases. The Committee has decreased the funding for the international standards program $23,000 below the request, which is a slight increase above the program's current services funding level. The following shows the Committee's recommended funding levels for each of the hazardous materials office activities:

Personnel compensation and benefits	$11,400,000
Administrative expenses	1,270,000
Contract programs	3,680,000
Registration program	1,070,000
Research and development	1,200,000
Total, Office of Hazardous Materials Safety	18,620,000

EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION

Emergency transportation [ET] programs provide support to the Secretary of Transportation for his statutory and administrative responsibilities in the area of transportation civil emergency preparedness and response. This program develops and coordinates the Department's policies, plans, and programs, in headquarters and the field to provide for emergency preparedness.

ET is responsible for implementing the Transportation Department's National Security Program initiatives, including an assessment of the transportation implications of the changing global threat. The Office also coordinates civil emergency preparedness

and response for transportation services during national and regional emergencies, across the entire continuum of crises, including natural catastrophes such as earthquakes, hurricanes and tornados, and international and domestic terrorism. The Office of Emergency Transportation develops crisis management plans to mitigate disasters and implements these plans nationally and regionally in an emergency.

The Committee recommends $1,801,000 for emergency transportation, which is $574,000 less than the administration's request. The administration has requested 5 new positions for the Emergency Transportation office (+2.5 FTE, one-half year funding for each requested position). The Committee recommendation includes funding for one FTE, or 2 new positions, a regional emergency transportation manager and an operations chief. The office's crisis management response program has been increased $270,000 above the current services level, to support emergency response training and exercises based at headquarters and the 13 regional coordinators' offices. The following shows the Committee's recommended funding distribution for the Office of Emergency Transportation.

Personnel compensation and benefits	$936,000
Administrative expenses	100,000
Contract programs	530,000
Research and development	235,000
Total, Office of Emergency Transportation	1,801,000

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommends $3,740,000 for the Office of Research and Technology, $5,676,000 less than requested by the administration. The funds provided will help the Department coordinate and strengthen its responsibilities under TEA21, and will help support the R&T corporate management strategy specified in the Department's strategic plan, allow RSPA to support the intergovernmental transportation research coordination responsibilities of the National Science and Technology Council, and support a limited intermodal research program. The following shows the Committee's recommended funding distribution for the Office of Research and Technology:

Personnel, compensation, and benefits	$1,100,000
Administrative expenses	105,000
Research and development	2,535,000
Advanced vehicle technologies program (reimbursable from FHWA)	.....
University Transportation Center grants (from FHWA and FTA)	(33,250,000)
Total	3,740,000

Personnel, compensation and benefits.—The Committee does not approve the two new requested positions to support the university marine transportation research grants program, but approves the new FHWA reimbursable position to support human-centered systems research in the fatigue area, and confirms that an agency-wide reorganization moved two Transportation Safety Institute positions formerly in the Office of Research and Technology to the Office of Program Support. Therefore, the FTE level within the R&T office has gone down from 11 to 9, and PC&B funding is $107,000 less than the fiscal year 2000 enacted level.

Research and development program initiatives.—The National Transportation Safety Board has recommended to the Department of Transportation that research be conducted on the role of fatigue in the transportation industry. Consistent with that recommendation, the Committee has provided $300,000 more than the level requested for R&D planning and management to support long-term, cross-cutting research on transportation operator fatigue management. The Committee denies the Office of Research and Technology's request to initiate two new programs for transportation infrastructure assurance research and a university marine transportation research grant program.

Advanced vehicle technologies program.—The administration has proposed funding the advanced vehicle technologies program (AVTP), a Department of Defense offshoot, from FHWA research and technology program funds at a level of $20,000,000. The Committee does not approve this proposed funding, on the grounds that the program is not within the TEA21 funding firewall, which would necessitate taking the funds from some other guaranteed program or out of scarce general funds in order to provide Department of Transportation support for the program.

PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The program support function provides legal, financial, management, and administrative support to the operating offices within RSPA. These support activities include executive direction (Office of the Administrator), program and policy support, civil rights and special programs, legal services and support, and management and administration.

The Committee has provided $10,209,000 for program and administrative support, $1,758,000 less than the adminstration's request. The following shows the Committee's recommended funding distribution for RSPA program support:

Personnel compensation and benefits	$5,219,000
Administrative expenses	3,560,000
Contract programs	1,430,000
Total, program and administrative support	10,209,000

Contract program adjustments.—The Committee does not approve the requested increases for employee development or for the Garrett Morgan Technology and Transportation Futures program. However, the Committee recommendation provides $1,200,000 for information resource management and business modernization, a $393,000 increase above current service levels.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OILSPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

	Pipeline safety fund	Trust fund	Total
Appropriations, 2000 [1] [2]	$31,400,000	$5,479,000	$36,879,000
Budget estimate, 2001	42,874,000	4,263,000	47,137,000
Committee recommendation [3]	34,394,000	8,750,000	43,144,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $198,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.
[2] Pipeline safety funding includes $1,400,000 from reserve fund balances.
[3] Pipeline safety funding includes $2,500,000 from reserve fund balances.

The Research and Special Programs Administration is responsible for the Department's Pipeline Safety Program. Funding for the Office of Pipeline Safety is made available from two primary sources: the pipeline safety fund, comprised of user fees assessed on interstate pipeline operators; and the oil spill liability trust fund, a revolving fund comprised of an environmental tax on petroleum and oil spill damage recovery payments. The Pipeline Safety Program promotes the safe, reliable, and environmentally sound transportation of natural gas and hazardous liquids by pipeline. This national program regulates the design, construction, operation, maintenance, and emergency response procedures pertaining to gas and hazardous liquids pipeline systems and liquefied natural gas facilities. Also included is research and development to support the Pipeline Safety Program and grants-in-aid to State agencies that conduct a qualified pipeline safety program and to others who operate one-call programs. The Committee recommendation for distribution of OPS funds by funding source is displayed below:

Budget activity	Pipeline safety fund	Oil spill liability trust fund	Reserve fund	Total
Operating expenses:				
Personnel compensation and benefits	$8,950,000	$800,000		$9,750,000
Administrative expenses	3,941,000	545,000		4,486,000
Contract Programs:				
Information and analysis	800,000	400,000		1,200,000
Risk assessment and technical studies	650,000	600,000		1,250,000
Compliance	200,000	100,000		300,000
Training and information dissemination	571,000	400,000		971,000
Emergency notification	100,000			100,000
Damage prevention/public education campaign	300,000	200,000		500,000
Implementing the Oil Pollution Act		2,443,000		2,443,000
Research and Development	2,494,000	650,000		3,144,000
Grants:				
State safety grants	12,888,000	1,112,000		14,000,000
One call grants	1,000,000			1,000,000
Damage prevention grants		1,500,000	$2,500,000	4,000,000
Totals	31,894,000	8,750,000	2,500,000	43,144,000

Pipeline safety reserve fund.—The Committee recommends $2,500,000 to be derived from amounts previously collected in pipeline user fees from interstate liquid and natural gas transmission companies, which are maintained in a reserve fund by RSPA. The current balance of the pipeline safety reserve fund (as of March 5) is $15,461,000. The fund takes in user fee collections, pays program costs, and also makes adjustments to collections due to over or underpayments, so the balance varies over the course of each fiscal year. RSPA maintains that a reserve fund balance that is sufficient to sustain Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS) operations through the second quarter, when the agency collects user fees to replenish the fund, is necessary to prevent disruption of OPS programs and services. RSPA estimates that level to be approximately 34 percent of the office's total program funding. However, the Committee is confident that RSPA can manage its programs to allow for a larger drawdown of the reserve fund, and directs the Administrator to perform a detailed analysis of the pipeline safety fund billing and collections cycle and OPS program disbursements, in order to allow the maximum use of reserve funds without triggering the Anti-Deficiency Act. This analysis shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before August 4, 2000 and a copy of the report shall be forwarded to the U.S. General Accounting Office. The Committee further directs the Comptroller General to review RSPA's pipeline safety user fee reserve fund analysis, and to prepare a response to the report that verifies the accuracy of the financial analysis and makes recommendations to the Department of Transportation and to the Appropriations Committee on improvements to the billing, collections, and disbursement cycle that would support a more efficient use of these previously collected funds. This review, with departmental comments, shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations by October 31, 2000, at which time the Committee expects DOT to expeditiously initiate a rulemaking for the fiscal year 2002 user fee collections cycle.

Oil spill liability trust fund.—The Committee recommends $8,750,000 to be derived from the oil spill liability trust fund for implementation of OPS responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 [OPA], $4,487,000 more than the administration's request.

According to RSPA, the total amount within the budget request that could legally be associated with OPA program requirements in $11,473,000. The Committee is dismayed that the administration has chosen in its budget presentation to increase user fees by $12,874,000—43 percent—over the current year, while utilizing so little of the allowable OPA environmental program funds.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation [3]
	2000 enacted [1 2]	2001 estimate	
Operating expenses	$12,821,000	$14,059,000	$14,236,000
Contract Programs	4,221,000	4,922,000	4,321,000
Implementing the Oil Pollution Act	2,443,000	2,443,000	2,443,000
Research and Development	1,894,000	2,144,000	3,144,000

Program	Fiscal year—		Committee recommendation [3]
	2000 enacted [1 2]	2001 estimate	
Grants	15,500,000	23,569,000	19,000,000
Totals	36,879,000	47,137,000	43,144,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $198,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69.
[2] Includes $1,400,000 from uncommitted balances in the reserve fund.
[3] Includes $2,500,000 from uncommitted balances in the reserve fund.

Operating expenses.—The Committee recommendation approves two of the four new requested pipeline inspector positions at one-half work year per position. This will bring the total number of field inspectors to 54. The Committee recommendation also provides adequate funding for the requested fiscal year 2000 and 2001 cost of living and locality pay adjustments and merit increases. Within these funds, $800,000 shall be provided to Washington State to match the State legislature's supplemental appropriation for pipeline safety activities. These Federal funds shall be used to supplement State funding for pipeline safety activities and may not be used to supplant State funding.

Contract programs.—The Committee recommendation holds OPS contract programs at the current services level, due to budget constraints and increases in other areas of the program. However, the requested increase for the damage prevention public education campaign is approved, from $400,000 to $500,000. The Committee commends OPS on the Dig Safely campaign and on the report pertaining to damage prevention best practices, entitled "Common Ground." Dig Safely is a national campaign to educate excavators, facility operators, public works employees and the general public about the importance of damage prevention for underground facilities. The Committee supports the OPS budget request to provide seed money to help establish a non-profit organization that will foster a shared responsibility for the protection of underground facilities, develop and conduct public awareness and education programs, and pursue the study and publication of damage prevention best practices.

Research and development.—The Committee recommendation supports a continued current services OPS research program, and approves the proposed $250,000 increase to adapt "smart pig" technology to detect axially oriented mechanical damage. The Committee has also provided an additional $1,000,000 for airborne environmental laser mapping technology research and engineering to support improved leak detection, analysis and response by Federal, State and industry pipeline safety officials.

Grants.—The OPS manages four different grants programs: State pipeline safety grants, risk management grants, one call grants, and damage prevention grants. The administration requested a significant increase for the State pipeline safety grants, from an enacted level of $13,000,000 to a requested level of $17,519,000. RSPA and the States have agreed to attempt to provide 50 percent of the States' pipeline safety program funding from the Federal Government, but in the fiscal year 1999 distribution of State grants, the average Federal grant represented 44 percent of total State hazardous liquids and natural gas program costs. The Com-

mittee has increased the State pipeline safety grant program level to $14,000,000 in an effort to close the gap between the current Federal grant share of States' costs and the 50 percent goal. The risk management grants program was established to fund a pipeline industry risk management pilot program. In fiscal year 2001, OPS will be in a monitoring stage of the risk management demonstration and has requested only $50,000 for this effort. The Committee recommends that the agency perform these monitoring activities within available operating expenses. One call grants are funded at the requested level of $1,000,000; and funding for the broad-based damage prevention grants, which address third-party damage to not only pipelines, but all underground utilities, is provided at a level of $4,000,000, $1,000,000 less than the level requested by the administration.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

Appropriations, 2000	$200,000
Budget estimate, 2001	200,000
Committee recommendation	200,000

The hazardous materials transportation law (title 49 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) requires RSPA to: (1) develop and implement a reimbursable emergency preparedness grants program; (2) monitor public sector emergency response training and planning and provide technical assistance to States, territories, and Indian tribes; and (3) develop and update periodically a national training curriculum for emergency responders. These activities are financed by receipts received from the hazardous materials shipper and carrier registration fees, which are placed in the emergency preparedness fund. The hazardous materials transportation law provides permanent authorization for the emergency preparedness fund for planning and training grants, monitoring and technical assistance, and for administrative expenses. An appropriation of $200,000 in budget authority, also from the emergency preparedness fund, provides for the training curriculum for emergency responders.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

Bill language is included that limits the obligation of emergency preparedness training grants to $13,227,000 in fiscal year 2001. The Committee's recommendation reflects the State grants total funding that would be represented if the administration's fiscal year 2000 requested level was met. This recommended level provides the following:

State grants (a 48 percent increase above fiscal year 1999 allocations)	$12,127,000
Public sector training grants	250,000
Monitoring/technical assistance	150,000
Administrative support	200,000
North American Emergency Response Guidebook	500,000
Total	13,227,000

GAO evaluation of Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) grants program.—In November 1999, the chairmen of the House and Senate Transportation Appropriations Subcommittees

requested a GAO report on the extent to which the Department of Transportation's HMEP grants duplicate private sector initiatives which provide training for responding to hazardous materials emergencies. This report will be issued by July 31, 2000. However, while the GAO study was ongoing, RSPA promulgated a final rulemaking which substantially increases hazardous materials registration fees and greatly expands the number of new hazardous materials registrants who have never before had to pay such a registration fee (from a current 26,000 registrants to an expanded program of 44,000 registrants). The Committee is dismayed that the Department expedited its rulemaking process in order to release a final rule increasing these fees, while the underlying issues of how much of an increase is required and whether duplicative private sector services exist were still being studied by the GAO. The effective date of the final rule was May 1, 2000. The general registration requirements provide that all registrants, both current and new, must submit a registration statement and accompanying fee not later than June 30. The bill includes a provision which delays this deadline until September 30, to allow Congress and the Department of Transportation to review the results of the pending GAO report.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$44,840,000
Budget estimate, 2001	48,050,000
Committee recommendation	[2] 49,000,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $224,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69; also does not reflect reduction of $170,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113. Does not include reimbursements of $3,500,000 from the FHWA and FTA pursuant to Public Law 106–69.

[2] Includes transfers.

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.

OIG is divided into two major functional units: the Office of Assistant Inspector General for Auditing and the Office of Assistant Inspector General for Investigations. The assistant inspectors general for auditing and investigations are supported by headquarters and regional staff.

The Committee recommends $49,000,000. The recommended level includes funding for the inspector general to conduct their oversight mission mandated under the Inspector General Act, support the Department's priorities in the areas of safety, strategic investment in transportation infrastructure, and commonsense government, to provide an objective and credible voice on other issues of modal and Departmentwide concern and to respond to emerging issues of congressional concern.

The Inspector General is to be commended for the timeliness and quality of the Office of Inspector General work product. Unlike most of the agencies in the Department, the OIG delivers reports and communications by the requested time, addresses the questions or issues concerned, and generally illuminate issues for congressional, public, or executive branch consideration. The Committee recommendation reflects the value the Committee places on the OIG contribution.

FAA personnel reform.—In fiscal year 1996, Congress exempted the FAA from most provisions of Title 5 of the United States Code and other Federal personnel rules and regulations. This "personnel reform" gave the FAA the unprecedented opportunity to develop and implement a new personnel management system unique to the demands of the FAA. In providing this reform, Congress mandated that the new system, at a minimum, provide greater flexibility in the hiring, training, compensation, and location of personnel. Now, four years later, the FAA's success in meeting those requirements and the effectiveness of those changes is unknown. However, the costs of the FAA's operations continues to rise and shows no signs of subsiding. Accordingly, the Committee requests that the Department of Transportation Inspector General review and report to the Committee on the agency's success in meeting the mandated requirements of personnel reform and determine if those efforts should be continued.

Defense Contract Audit Agency Audits.—In 1996, the Department of Transportation (DOT) required 397 audits of contractors doing work for the DOT. The work was performed primarily by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) under a reimbursable agreement. This was the last year that the audits were funded by the DOT Office of the Inspector General. Because of the increasing demand for such audits and the resulting burden this placed on the budget of the Inspector General's office, the responsibility for funding and requesting such audits was shifted to the DOT operating administrations by the Congress. Since that time reliance on DCAA audits has dropped as evidenced by the diminishing number of audits performed. In 1999, DCAA issued only 68 audit reports related to DOT contractors. To properly protect the government's interest, audits of contractors performing work for the DOT must be performed at a level representing a reasonable subset of the Department's contracted activity. These audits aid in determining the reasonableness of proposed prices prior to award and the appropriateness of charges on cost-type contracts. The Committee expects that the operating administrations will get the need contract audit support to maintain the Committee's confidence in the operating administrations' oversight of contractor activities. The Committee directs the OIG to assist in the monitoring of this situation during fiscal year 2001.

Audit of Flight Delays.—Last year, the Committee requested the Department of Transportation Office of Inspector General (OIG) to review the causes of flight delays to help the Department, the air carriers, and the Congress better understand, address, and communicate the nature, causes, and, ultimately, potential mitigating actions to improve utilization of system capacity, the consumer's understanding of delays, and to better focus the FAA's, air carriers',

and the Congress' investments in all aspects of the aviation system. The audit, released in June 2000, sheds a great deal of light on some of the troubling aspects of the current delay reporting systems, the lack of commonality between reporting parameters, the shortcomings of current information on the causes of delays.

Although the Bureau of Transportation Statistics reporting focus (beginning and end points of a flight) and the FAA Operations Network (OPSNET) reporting focus (aircraft delayed for more than 15 minutes after coming under FAA's control) differ, both reporting regimes record increasing flight delays and increasing duration of those delays.

The OIG audit found that most delays took place on the ground in the form of longer taxi-out and taxi-in times and that the incidence of taxi-out time of 2 hours or more increased substantially. The OIG found that much of that increase in delays is masked within the increase in the air carriers' flight schedule times—and estimated that these masked delays added almost 130 million minutes of travel time for passengers. In addition, the OIG found that the rate of flight cancellations was increasing. Significantly, the OIG found that causal data for delays varied between the BTS and OPSNET systems, with neither system or the carriers' data providing a comprehensive picture of the cause of delays and cancellations. The OIG identified six key factors influencing the number of delays and cancellations. The Committee anticipates engaging in a dialogue with the FAA, the OIG, and the carriers to foster increased attention to the causes of delays and envisions a follow-on effort to address the recommendations made in the OIG audit.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

	Appropriation	Required offsetting collections	Allowed offsetting collections	Total potential funding
Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$15,400,000		$1,600,000	$17,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001		($17,954,000)		(17,954,000)
Committee recommendation	17,000,000	(954,000)		17,954,000

[1] Does not reflect reduction of $12,000,000 for TASC pursuant to section 319 of Public Law 106–69; also does not reflect reduction of $58,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

The Surface Transportation Board was created on January 1, 1996, by Public Law 104–88, the Interstate Commerce Committee Termination Act of 1995. Consistent with the continued trend toward less regulation of the surface transportation industry, the act abolished the ICC, eliminated certain functions that had previously been implemented by the ICC, transferred core rail and certain other functions to the Board, and transferred motor licensing and certain other motor functions to the FHWA. The Board is specifically responsible for the regulation of the rail and pipeline industries and certain nonlicensing regulation of motor carriers and water carriers. Moreover, the Board, through its exemption authority, is able to promote deregulation administratively on a case-by-case basis. Rail reforms made by the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 also have been continued.

The administration's fiscal year 2001 program request is $17,954,000 to perform key functions under the ICCTA, including rail rate reasonableness oversight; the processing of rail consolidations, abandonments, and other restructuring proposals; and the resolution of motor carrier undercharge matters. Under the administration's proposal this amount would be derived solely from user fees collected pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9701 from the beneficiaries of the Board's activities. However, such a proposal would require enactment of legislation and promulgation of new rules that are unlikely to be in place in time to ensure undisrupted funding for the Board. A possible legislative vehicle for such a user fee-based structure would be the reauthorization legislation which the authorizing committees may consider later this year or next year.

The Committee has provided $17,000,000 for activities of the Board. This amount will be augmented by the collection of $954,000 in user fees. The Board anticipates collecting up to $900,000 from these fees.

The Committee's recommendation will fund a total of 143 full-time staff equivalent (FTE) positions, if the Board collects the full $954,000 in user fees. This increase in FTE above the current level of 140 will provide the Board with the discretion to hire staff in specific offices to replace tenured, retirement-eligible staff prior to their anticipated retirement date. Between now and September 30, 2002, 34 percent of the Board's employees will be eligible for voluntary retirement. The Committee believes that it is important to allow this FTE ceiling increase to give the Board flexibility to fill positions before the anticipated retirement dates of these more senior staff.

March 2000 hearings.—On March 7–10, 2000, the Surface Transportation Board (STB) held a series of public hearings about major rail consolidations and the future of the rail network. The hearings focused on the STB's merger policy and the downstream service effects which Class I railroad mergers have had on rail service. The Committee directs the STB to prepare a report which: (1) identifies the concerns that were raised in the March 2000 hearings, (2) details the actions that the STB will undertake to address these concerns, and (3) indicates where the STB lacks statutory authority to effectively address these concerns. This report shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Senate Commerce Committee, and the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee before April 1, 2001.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000 [1]	$4,633,000
Budget estimate, 2001	4,795,000
Committee recommendation	4,795,000

[1] Does not include reduction of $18,000 pursuant to section 301 of Public Law 106–113.

The Committee recommends $4,795,000 for the operations of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, the funding level requested by the administration.

The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (the Access Board) is the lead Federal Agency promoting accessibility for all handicapped persons. The Access Board was reauthorized in the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1992, Public Law 102–569. Under this authorization, the Access Board's functions are to ensure compliance with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, and to develop guidelines for and technical assistance to individuals and entities with rights or duties under titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The Access Board establishes minimum accessibility guidelines and requirements for public accommodations and commercial facilities, transit facilities and vehicles, State and local government facilities, children's environments, and recreational facilities. The Access Board also provides technical assistance to Government agencies, public and private organizations, individuals, and businesses on the removal of accessibility barriers.

The Committee's recommendation provides adequate funding to support 32.8 FTE, 2 FTE more than the fiscal year 2000 staffing level, consistent with the Board's budget request.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000	$57,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 [1]	62,942,000
Committee recommendation	59,000,000

[1] Excludes the President's budget request for $10,000,000 in new user fees.

The Independent Safety Board Act of 1974 established the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB] as an independent Federal agency to promote transportation safety by conducting independent accident investigations. In addition, the act authorizes the Board to make safety recommendations, conduct safety studies, and oversee safety activities of other Government agencies involved in transportation. The Board also reviews appeals of adverse actions

by the Department of Transportation with respect to airmen and seamen certificates and licenses.

The Board has no regulatory authority over the transportation industry. Thus, its effectiveness depends on its reputation for impartial and accurate accident reports, realistic and feasible safety recommendations, and on public confidence in its commitment to improving transportation safety.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The bill includes $59,000,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board. The Committee recommendation is $2,000,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2000 and $3,942,000 below the budget request. The Committee does not approve the $2,708,000 that was requested for partial year funding for 25 new positions. The remaining $1,234,000 is reduced from the budget estimate without prejudice due to budgetary constraints. The Committee is confident the Safety Board can manage to the level of funding recommended herein by adjusting non-pay inflation, restraining travel that is not incidental to accident investigations, and implementing a variety of management initiatives. Also, the Committee has included in other appropriations bills $24,739,000 in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2000 to provide immediate financial relief for the Safety Board.

User Fees.—The Committee denies the request to collect $10,000,000 in user fees. It is the Committee's understanding that the Safety Board does not have the authority or the resources to collect user fees. Furthermore, the Committee is concerned that requiring the NTSB to levy fees on the industries it investigates will undermine industry confidence in the independence of the Safety Board. The Committee, however, would entertain proposals to seek reimbursement from foreign governments for the costs incurred during investigations conducted at the request of that government, if consistent with U.S. foreign policy goals.

NIOSH study.—Within available funds, NTSB should continue its participation in the interagency initiative on aviation safety in Alaska with the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), and other Federal, State, and private parties at existing levels.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee concurs with the general provisions that apply to the Department of Transportation and related agencies as proposed in the budget, with some changes, deletions, and additions. These are noted below:

SEC. 305. Modifies a requested provision to prohibit the use of funds for the salaries and expenses of more than 104 political and Presidential appointees to the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 309. Retains a provision prohibiting the release of 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. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 310. This provision regarding the allocation of Federal-aid Highway Program funds is continued with modifications to reflect the passage of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century [TEA21].

SEC. 315. Retains provision prohibiting the use of funds to award multiyear contracts for production end items that include certain specified provisions. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 318. Retains provision prohibiting funds to compensate in excess of 320 technical staff years under the federally funded research and development center contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 319. Includes provision which the administration had requested be deleted that reduces the funds provided for the Transportation Administrative Service Center and provides additional funds for programs authorized under section 1069(y) of Public Law 102–240.

SEC. 321. Includes with modification a provision from fiscal year 2000 Act which expands the eligible uses of funds made available for Alaska and Hawaii ferry boats or ferry terminals. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 322. Includes with modification provision allowing the Bureau of Transportation Statistics to credit the Federal-aid highway account with proceeds from the sale of data products. The administration had requested that this provision be made permanent law.

SEC. 323. Includes provision that prohibits the use of funds in this act for activities designed to influence Congress on legislation or appropriations except through proper, official channels. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 324. Includes a provision requiring compliance with the Buy American Act. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 325. Includes provision which the administration had requested be deleted that limits the amount available for advisory committees to $1,500,000.

SEC. 326. Modifies a requested provision regarding rebates, refunds, incentive payments, and minor fees received by the Department from travel management centers, charge card programs, and other sources, making such funds available until December 31, 2001.

SEC. 328. Modifies provision requested by the administration relating to funding for the Amtrak Reform Council.

SEC. 329. Includes provision which the administration had requested be deleted, which was carried in previous appropriations acts, providing a limitation on transfers of funds among the offices of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

SEC. 331. Retains a provision to increase the Federal share for Americans with Disabilities Act-related equipment for over-the-road buses. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 332. Includes a provision which allows the Department of Transportation to enter into a fractional aircraft ownership demonstration.

SEC. 333. Includes a provision from the fiscal year 2000 appropriations act which prohibits the use of funds in this Act unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any discretionary grant agreement totaling $1,000,000 or more is announced by the Department or its modal administrations. The administration proposed deleting this provision.

SEC. 334. Includes a provision which amends section 3030(b) of Public Law 105–178 to authorize the Wilmington Downtown transit corridor and Honolulu Bus Rapid Transit projects.

SEC. 335. Includes a provision which prohibits the use of funds in this act to finalize the rulemaking proposed in Docket No. FMCSA–97–2350–953.

SEC. 336. Includes a provision which expands the exemption from Federal axle weight restrictions presently applicable only to public transit buses to all over-the-road buses and directs that a study and report concerning applicability of maximum axle weight limitations to over-the-road buses and public transit vehicles be submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 337. Includes a provision which prohibits the use of funds in this act from being used to implement the Kyoto Protocol prior to its ratification.

SEC. 338. Includes a provision which prohibits the submission of a budget request that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the President's Budget unless additional spending reductions are identified in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of a committee of conference for fiscal year 2001 appropriations act.

SEC. 340. Prohibits funds to be used to adopt guidelines or regulations requiring airport sponsors to provide Federal Aviation Administration "without cost" buildings, maintenance, or space for FAA services. However, the prohibition does not apply to negotiations concerning "below-market" rates for those items.

SEC. 341. Includes a provision which requires the Coast Guard to submit a quarterly report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on major Coast Guard acquisition projects.

SEC. 342. Includes a provision which requires States to adopt a .08 blood alcohol content law, and which outlines highway funding sanctions beginning in fiscal year 2004 for States that are not in compliance.

SEC. 343. Includes a provision that allows FAA to waive restrictive terms in a deed of conveyance so that an Oklahoma university may make use of revenues derived from certain airport land only for weather-related and educations purposes that include benefits for aviation.

SEC. 344. Includes a provision which clarifies the alignment of the Ports-to-Plains corridor facility in the States of Texas and Oklahoma.

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."

United States Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	$3,039,460,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	407,748,000
Environmental compliance and restoration	16,700,000
Retired pay	778,000,000
Reserve training	80,371,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation	21,320,000
Federal Railroad Administration: Railroad safety	99,390,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	13,004,000
Research and Special Programs Administration: Research and Special Programs	75,214,000
Surface Transportation Board	17,000,000
National Transportation Safety Board	59,000,000

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee ordered, an original fiscal year 2001 Transportation Appropriations bill, subject to amendment and subject to the section 302 budget allocation, by a recorded vote of 28–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Stevens	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. Craig	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Kyl	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Hollings	

Mr. Leahy
Mr. Lautenberg
Mr. Harkin
Ms. Mikulski
Mr. Reid
Mr. Kohl
Mrs. Murray
Mr. Dorgan
Mrs. Feinstein
Mr. Durbin

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.

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1991

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1023. GROSS VEHICLE WEIGHT RESTRICTION.

* * * * * * *

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(h) *OVER-THE-ROAD BUSES AND* PUBLIC TRANSIT VEHICLES.—

(1) TEMPORARY EXEMPTION.—The second sentence of section 127 of title 23, United States Code, relating to axle weight limitations for vehicles using the Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways, shall not apply, for the period beginning on October 6, 1992, and ending on October 1, 2003, [to any vehicle which] *to*—

(A) any over-the-road bus; or

(B) any vehicle that

is regularly and exclusively used as an intrastate public agency transit passenger bus.

[(2) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study on the maximum axle weight limitations on the Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways established under section 127 of title 23, United States Code, or under State laws, as they apply to public transit vehicles. The study shall determine whether or not public transit vehicles should

be exempted from the requirements of section 127 or State laws or if such laws should be modified with regard to public transit vehicles. In making such determination, the Secretary shall consider current transit vehicle design standards, the implications of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Clean Air Act requirements on such design standards, and the potential impact of revised design standards on transit ridership capacity, operating and replacement costs, air quality concerns, and highway wear and tear.

[(3) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the result of the study conducted under paragraph (2), together with recommendations.]

(2) STUDY AND REPORT CONCERNING APPLICABILITY OF MAXIMUM AXLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS TO OVER-THE-ROAD BUSES AND PUBLIC TRANSIT VEHICLES.—

(A) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than July 31, 2002, the Secretary shall conduct a study of, and submit to Congress a report on, the maximum axle weight limitations applicable to vehicles using the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways established under section 127 of title 23, United States Code, or under State law, as the limitations apply to over-the-road buses and public transit vehicles.

(B) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABILITY OF VEHICLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The report shall include—

(I) a determination concerning how the requirements of section 127 of that title should be applied to over-the-road buses and public transit vehicles; and

(II) short-term and long-term recommendations concerning the applicability of those requirements.

(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making the determination described in clause (i)(I), the Secretary shall consider—

(I) vehicle design standards;

(II) statutory and regulatory requirements, including—

(aa) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(bb) the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.); and

(cc) motor vehicle safety standards prescribed under chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code; and

(III)(aa) the availability of lightweight materials suitable for use in the manufacture of over-the-road buses;

(bb) the cost of those lightweight materials relative to the cost of heavier materials in use as of the date of the determination; and

(cc) any safety or design considerations relating to the use of those materials.

(C) ANALYSIS OF MEANS OF ENCOURAGING DEVELOPMENT AND MANUFACTURE OF LIGHTWEIGHT BUSES.—The report shall include an analysis of, and recommendations concerning, means to be considered to encourage the development and manufacture of lightweight buses, including an analysis of—

(i) potential procurement incentives for public transit authorities to encourage the purchase of lightweight public transit vehicles using grants from the Federal Transit Administration; and

(ii) potential tax incentives for manufacturers and private operators to encourage the purchase of lightweight over-the-road buses.

(D) ANALYSIS OF CONSIDERATION IN RULEMAKINGS OF ADDITIONAL VEHICLE WEIGHT.—The report shall include an analysis of, and recommendations concerning, whether Congress should require that each rulemaking by an agency of the Federal Government that affects the design or manufacture of motor vehicles consider—

(i) the weight that would be added to the vehicle by implementation of the proposed rule;

(ii) the effect that the added weight would have on pavement wear; and

(iii) the resulting cost to the Federal Government and State and local governments.

(E) COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.—The report shall include an analysis relating to the axle weight of over-the-road buses that compares—

(i) the costs of the pavement wear caused by over-the-road buses; with

(ii) the benefits of the over-the-road bus industry to the environment, the economy, and the transportation system of the United States.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) OVER-THE-ROAD BUS.—The term "over-the-road bus" has the meaning given the term in section 301 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12181).

(B) PUBLIC TRANSIT VEHICLE.—The term "public transit vehicle" means a vehicle described in paragraph (1)(B).

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1105. HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS ON NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) * * *

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(38) The Ports-to-Plains Corridor from the Mexican Border via I–27 to Denver, Colorado.**]**

(38) The Ports-to-Plains Corridor from Laredo, Texas to Denver, Colorado as follows:

(A) In the State of Texas the Ports-to-Plains Corridor shall generally follow—

(i) I–35 from Laredo to United States Route 83 at Exit 18;

(ii) United States Route 83 from Exit 18 to Carrizo Springs;

(iii) United States Route 277 from Carrizo Springs to San Angelo;

(iv) United States Route 87 from San Angelo to Sterling City;

(v) From Sterling City to Lamesa, the Corridor shall follow United States Route 87 and, the corridor shall also follow Texas Route 158 from Sterling City to I–20, then via I–20 West to Texas Route 349 and, Texas Route 349 from Midland to Lamesa;

(vi) United States Route 87 from Lamesa to Lubbock;

(vii) I–27 from Lubbock to Amarillo; and

(viii) United States Route 287 from Amarillo to the Oklahoma border.

(B) In the State of Oklahoma, the Ports-to-Plains Corridor shall generally follow United States Route 287 from the Texas border to the Colorado border. The Corridor shall then proceed into Colorado.

* * * * * * *

TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY, PUBLIC LAW 105–178

AN ACT To authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3030. PROJECTS FOR NEW FIXED GUIDEWAY SYSTEMS AND EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING SYSTEMS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(71) Dane County Corridor—East-West Madison Metropolitan Area.

(72) Wilmington Downtown transit corridor.

(73) Honolulu Bus Rapid Transit project.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 3038. RURAL TRANSPORTATION ACCESSIBILITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) FEDERAL SHARE OF COSTS.—The Federal share of costs under this section shall be provided from funds made available to carry out this section. The Federal share of the costs for a project shall not exceed **[**50**]** *90* percent of the project cost.

* * * * * * *

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 First Concurrent Resolution 2001: Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies:				
General purpose discretionary	641	641	573	[1] 573
General purpose non-defense discretionary	12,640	12,640	15,400	15,090
Highways	.....	.....	26,920	26,920
Mass transit	.....	.....	3,852	3,852
Mandatory	739	739	737	737
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2000	.....	.....	.....	[2] 19,224
2001	.....	.....	.....	17,920
2002	.....	.....	.....	7,723
2003	.....	.....	.....	3,639
2004 and future year	.....	.....	.....	3,852
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2001 in bill	NA	740	NA	8,437

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2000 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses:					
Immediate Office of the Secretary	1,867	2,031	1,800	−67	−231
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	600	587	500	−100	−87
Office of the General Counsel	9,000	11,172	9,000	.....	−2,172
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy	2,824	3,132	2,500	−324	−632
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs	7,650	7,702	7,000	−650	−702
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	6,870	7,241	6,500	−370	−741
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	2,039	2,176	2,000	−39	−176
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	17,767	20,139	17,800	+33	−2,339
Office of Public Affairs	1,800	1,714	1,500	−300	−214
Executive Secretariat	1,102	1,181	1,181	+79	.....
Board of Contract Appeals	520	496	496	−24	.....
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	1,222	1,192	1,192	−30	.....
Office of Intelligence and Security	1,454	3,494	.....	−1,454	−3,494
Office of the Chief Information Officer	5,075	6,929	6,000	+925	−929
Office of Intermodalism	1,062	.....	.....	−1,062	.....
Subtotal	60,852	69,186	57,469	−3,383	−11,717
Office of Civil Rights	7,200	8,726	8,000	+800	−726
Transportation planning, research, and development	3,300	5,258	5,300	+2,000	+42
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−10	.....	.....	+10	.....

Net subtotal	3,290	5,258	5,300	+2,010	+42
Transportation Administrative Service Center	(148,673)	(163,811)	(173,278)	(+24,605)	(+9,467)
Minority business resource center program	1,900	1,900	1,900	.....	.....
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(13,775)	(13,775)	(13,775)	.....	.....
Minority business outreach	2,900	3,000	3,000	+100	.....
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−18	.....	.....	+18	.....
Net subtotal	2,882	3,000	3,000	+118	.....
Total, Office of the Secretary	76,152	88,070	75,669	−483	−12,401
ATB rescissions	−28	.....	.....	+28	.....
Net total	76,124	88,070	75,669	−455	−12,401
Coast Guard					
Operating expenses	2,481,000	2,858,000	2,398,460	−82,540	−459,540
Defense function	300,000	341,000	641,000	+341,000	+300,000
Subtotal	2,781,000	3,199,000	3,039,460	+258,460	−159,540
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:					
Vessels	134,560	257,180	145,937	+11,377	−111,243
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−1,478	.....	.....	+1,478	.....
Net subtotal	133,082	257,180	145,937	+12,855	−111,243
Aircraft	44,210	43,650	41,650	−2,560	−2,000
Other equipment	51,626	60,313	54,304	+2,678	−6,009
Shore facilities and aids to navigation facilities	63,800	61,606	68,406	+4,606	+6,800
Personnel and related support	50,930	55,151	55,151	+4,221	.....
Integrated Deepwater Systems	44,200	42,300	42,300	−1,900	.....
Subtotal, A C and I (excl rescissions)	389,326	520,200	407,748	+18,422	−112,452
Environmental compliance and restoration	17,000	16,700	16,700	−300	.....
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−65	.....	.....	+65	.....

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2000 appropriation	Budget estimate
Net subtotal	16,935	16,700	16,700	−235	
Alteration of bridges (highway trust fund)	15,000		15,500	+500	+15,500
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−57			+57	
Net subtotal	14,943		15,500	+557	+15,500
Retired pay	730,327	778,000	778,000	+47,673	
Reserve training	72,000	73,371	80,371	+8,371	+7,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation	19,000	21,320	21,320	+2,320	
Total, Coast Guard	4,023,653	4,608,591	4,359,099	+335,446	−249,492
ATB rescissions	−1,600			+1,600	
Net total	4,022,053	4,608,591	4,359,099	+337,046	−249,492
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	5,900,000	6,592,235	6,350,250	+450,250	−241,985
Air traffic services	(4,648,907)	(5,210,434)	(5,039,391)	(+390,484)	(−171,043)
Aviation regulation and certification	(640,162)	(691,979)	(691,979)	(+51,817)	
Civil aviation security	(131,474)	(144,328)	(138,462)	(+6,988)	(−5,866)
Research and acquisitions	(174,083)	(196,497)	(182,401)	(+8,318)	(−14,096)
Commercial space transportation	(6,560)	(12,607)	(10,000)	(+3,440)	(−2,607)
Regional coordination	(95,321)		(99,347)	(+4,026)	(+99,347)
Human resources	(52,809)		(49,906)	(−2,903)	(+49,906)
Financial services	(38,981)		(43,000)	(+4,019)	(+43,000)
Staff offices	(73,093)	(336,390)	(95,764)	(+22,671)	(−240,626)

Essential air service	(32,000)	.....	.....	(−32,000)	.....
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	2,075,000	2,495,000	2,656,765	+581,765	+161,765
Rescission	(−30,000)	.....	.....	(+30,000)	.....
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	156,495	184,366	183,343	+26,848	−1,023
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,750,000)	(1,960,000)	(3,200,000)	(+1,450,000)	(+1,240,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(1,950,000)	(1,950,000)	(3,200,000)	(+1,250,000)	(+1,250,000)
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	(−54,362)	.....	.....	(+54,362)	.....
Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	−579,000	−579,000	−579,000
Net subtotal	(1,895,638)	(1,950,000)	(2,621,000)	(+725,362)	(+671,000)
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	8,131,495	9,271,601	9,190,358	+1,058,863	−81,243
(Limitations on obligations)	(1,950,000)	(1,950,000)	(3,200,000)	(+1,250,000)	(+1,250,000)
Total budgetary resources	(10,081,495)	(11,221,601)	(12,390,358)	(+2,308,863)	(+1,168,757)
ATB rescissions	(−54,362)	.....	.....	(+54,362)	.....
Rescission	−30,000	.....	−579,000	−549,000	−579,000
Net total	(9,997,133)	(11,221,601)	(11,811,358)	(+1,814,225)	(+589,757)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses [1]	(376,072)	(315,834)	(386,658)	(+10,586)	(+70,824)
Limitation on transportation research	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Limitation on obligations)	(26,245,000)	(26,603,806)	(26,603,806)	(+358,806)	.....
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	(−105,260)	.....	.....	(+105,260)	.....
Net subtotal	(26,139,740)	(26,603,806)	(26,603,806)	(+464,066)	.....
(Revenue aligned budget authority) (RABA)	(1,456,350)	(3,058,000)	(3,058,000)	(+1,601,650)	.....
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(−598,000)	.....	.....	(+598,000)
(Adjustment)	.....	(255,000)	.....	.....	(−255,000)
Subtotal, limitation on obligations	(27,701,350)	(29,318,806)	(29,661,806)	(+1,960,456)	(+343,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,148)	(1,039,148)	(−167,554)	.....

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2000 appropriation	Budget estimate
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(26,000,000)	(28,000,000)	(28,000,000)	(+2,000,000)	
Total, Federal Highway Administration					
(Limitations on obligations)	(27,701,350)	(29,318,806)	(29,661,806)	(+1,960,456)	(+343,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,148)	(1,039,148)	(−167,554)	
Total budgetary resources	(28,908,052)	(30,357,954)	(30,700,954)	(+1,792,902)	(+343,000)
ATB rescissions	(−105,260)			(+105,260)	
Net total	(28,802,792)	(30,357,954)	(30,700,954)	(+1,898,162)	(+343,000)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor carrier safety (limitation on administrative expenses)[2]		(92,194)	(92,194)	(+92,194)	
National motor carrier safety program (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(105,000)	(187,000)	(177,000)	(+72,000)	(−10,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(105,000)	(177,000)	(177,000)	(+72,000)	
(RABA transfer under Title III)		(10,000)			(−10,000)
Subtotal, limitation on obligations	(105,000)	(187,000)	(177,000)	(+72,000)	(−10,000)
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Admin					
(Limitations on obligations)	(105,000)	(279,194)	(269,194)	(+164,194)	(−10,000)
Total budgetary resources	(105,000)	(279,194)	(269,194)	(+164,194)	(−10,000)

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research (highway trust fund)	87,400	142,475	107,876	+20,476	−34,599
Operations and research (highway trust fund):					
(Limitation on obligations)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)		
(RABA transfer under Title III)		(70,000)			(−70,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(72,000)	(142,000)	(72,000)		(−70,000)
National Driver Register (highway trust fund)	2,000	2,000	2,000		
Subtotal, Operations and research	(161,400)	(286,475)	(181,876)	(+20,476)	(−104,599)
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(206,800)	(213,000)	(213,000)	(+6,200)	
(Limitation on obligations):					
Highway safety programs (Sec. 402)	(152,800)	(155,000)	(155,000)	(+2,200)	
Occupant protection incentive grants (Sec. 405)	(10,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	(+3,000)	
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (Sec. 410)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)		
State Highway safety data grants (Sec. 411)	(8,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)	(+1,000)	
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin	89,400	144,475	109,876	+20,476	−34,599
(Limitations on obligations)	(278,800)	(355,000)	(285,000)	(+6,200)	(−70,000)
Total budgetary resources	(368,200)	(499,475)	(394,876)	(+26,676)	(−104,599)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and operations	94,288	103,211	99,390	+5,102	−3,821
Offsetting collections (user fees)		−77,300			+77,300
Railroad research and development	22,464	26,800	24,725	+2,261	−2,075
Offsetting collections (user fees)		−25,500			+25,500
Rhode Island Rail Development	10,000	17,000		−10,000	−17,000
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−38			+38	
Net subtotal	9,962	17,000		−9,962	−17,000
Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment project (advance appropriations, fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003)	(60,000)			(−60,000)	
Next generation high-speed rail	27,200	22,000	24,900	−2,300	+2,900

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2000 appropriation	Budget estimate
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−103			+103	
Net subtotal	27,097	22,000	24,900	−2,197	+2,900
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation	10,000		20,000	+10,000	+20,000
West Virginia Rail development			15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−38			+38	
Net subtotal	9,962		35,000	+25,038	+35,000
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	571,000	521,476	521,000	−50,000	−476
Expanded intercity rail passenger service fund (RABA transfer under Title III):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization)		(468,000)			(−468,000)
(Limitation on obligations)		(468,000)			(−468,000)
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	734,952	587,687	705,015	−29,937	+117,328
(Limitations on obligations)		(468,000)			(−468,000)
Total budgetary resources	(734,952)	(1,055,687)	(705,015)	(−29,937)	(−350,672)
ATB rescissions	−179			+179	
Net total	734,773	1,055,687	705,015	−29,758	−350,672
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses	12,000	12,800	12,800	+800	

Administrative expenses (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(48,000)	(51,200)	(51,200)	(+3,200)	
Subtotal, Administrative expenses	(60,000)	(64,000)	(64,000)	(+4,000)	
Formula grants	619,600	669,000	669,000	+49,400	
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund): (Limitation on on obligations)	(2,478,400)	(2,676,000)	(2,676,000)	(+197,600)	
Subtotal, Formula grants	(3,098,000)	(3,345,000)	(3,345,000)	(+247,000)	
University transportation research	1,200	1,200	1,200		
University transportation research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Acct) (limitation on obligations)	(4,800)	(4,800)	(4,800)		
Subtotal, University transportation research	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)		
Transit planning and research (general fund)	21,000	22,200	22,200	+1,200	
Transit planning and research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account): (Limitation on obligations)	(86,000)	(87,800)	(87,800)	(+1,800)	
Subtotal, Transit planning and research	(107,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(+3,000)	
Rural transportation assistance	(5,250)	(5,250)	(5,250)		
National Transit Institute	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)		
Transit cooperative research	(8,250)	(8,250)	(8,250)		
Metropolitan planning	(49,632)	(52,114)	(52,114)	(+2,482)	
State planning and research	(10,368)	(10,886)	(10,886)	(+518)	
National planning and research	(29,500)	(29,500)	(29,500)		
Subtotal	(107,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(+3,000)	
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	(−243)			(+243)	
Net subtotal	(106,757)	(110,000)	(110,000)	(+3,243)	
Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,929,270)	(5,016,600)	(5,016,600)	(+87,330)	
Capital investment grants (general fund)	490,200	529,200	529,200	+39,000	

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2000 appropriation	Budget estimate
Capital investment grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations) [1]	(1,966,800)	(2,116,800)	(2,116,800)	(+150,000)	.....
Subtotal, Capital investment grants	(2,457,000)	(2,646,000)	(2,646,000)	(+189,000)	.....
Fixed guideway modernization	(980,400)	(1,058,400)	(1,058,400)	(+78,000)	.....
Buses and bus-related facilities [3]	(496,200)	(529,200)	(529,200)	(+33,000)	.....
New starts	(980,400)	(1,058,400)	(1,058,400)	(+78,000)	.....
Subtotal	(2,457,000)	(2,646,000)	(2,646,000)	(+189,000)	.....
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	(−17,404)	.....	.....	(+17,404)	.....
Net subtotal	(2,439,596)	(2,646,000)	(2,646,000)	(+206,404)	.....
Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,500,000)	(350,000)	(350,000)	(−1,150,000)	.....
Job access and reverse commute grants (general fund)	15,000	20,000	20,000	+5,000	.....
(Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(60,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)	(+20,000)	.....
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(50,000)	.....	.....	(−50,000)
Subtotal, Job access and reverse commute grants	(75,000)	(150,000)	(100,000)	(+25,000)	(−50,000)
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,159,000	1,254,400	1,254,400	+95,400	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(4,644,000)	(5,066,600)	(5,016,600)	(+372,600)	(−50,000)
Total budgetary resources	(5,803,000)	(6,321,000)	(6,271,000)	(+468,000)	(−50,000)

ATB rescissions	(−17,647)			(+17,647)	
Net total	(5,785,353)	(6,321,000)	(6,271,000)	(+485,647)	(−50,000)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	12,042		12,400	+358	+12,400
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−46			+46	
Mandatory proposal		(13,004)			(−13,004)
Net total	11,996	13,004	12,400	+404	−604
Research and Special Programs Administration					
Research and special programs:					
Hazardous materials safety	17,710	18,773	18,620	+910	−153
Emergency transportation	1,378	2,375	1,801	+423	−574
Research and technology	3,397	9,416	3,740	+343	−5,676
Program and administrative support	9,576	11,967	10,209	+633	−1,758
Subtotal, research and special programs	32,061	42,531	34,370	+2,309	−8,161
Offsetting collections (user fees)		−4,722			+4,722
Pipeline safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund	30,000	42,874	31,894	+1,894	−10,980
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	5,479	4,263	8,750	+3,271	+4,487
Pipeline safety reserve	(1,400)		(2,500)	(+1,100)	(+2,500)
Subtotal, Pipeline safety program (incl reserve)	(36,879)	(47,137)	(43,144)	(+6,265)	(−3,993)
Emergency preparedness grants:					
Emergency preparedness fund	200	200	200		
Limitation on obligations (emergency preparedness fund)			(13,227)	(+13,227)	(+13,227)
Total, Research and Special Programs Administration	67,740	85,146	75,214	+7,474	−9,932
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses	44,840	48,050	10,500	−34,340	−37,550
(By transfer)			(38,500)	(+38,500)	(+38,500)

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				2000 appropriation	Budget estimate
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−170			+170	
Net total	44,670	48,050	10,500	−34,170	−37,550
Total, program funding	44,670	48,050	49,000	+4,330	+950
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and expenses	17,000	17,954	17,000		−954
Offsetting collections	−1,600	−17,954	−954	+646	+17,000
Across the board (0.38 percent) rescission	−58			+58	
Net total	15,342		16,046	+704	+16,046
General Provisions					
Transportation Administrative Service Center reduction (Sec. 319)	−15,000		1,533	+16,533	+1,533
Amtrak Reform Council (Sec. 326)	750	980	495	−255	−485
Net total, title I, Department of Transportation	14,368,343	16,089,000	15,231,605	+863,262	−857,395
Current year, fiscal year 2001	(14,308,343)	(16,089,000)	(15,231,605)	(+923,262)	(−857,395)
Appropriations	(14,340,424)	(16,089,000)	(15,810,605)	(+1,470,181)	(−278,395)
Rescissions	(−32,081)		(−579,000)	(−546,919)	(−579,000)
Advance appropriations	(60,000)			(−60,000)	
(By transfer)			(38,500)	(+38,500)	(+38,500)
(Limitations on obligations)	(34,679,150)	(37,437,600)	(38,432,600)	(+3,753,450)	(+995,000)
(Rescissions of limitations on obligations)	(−177,269)			(+177,269)	

(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,148)	(1,039,148)	(−167,554)	.....
Net total budgetary resources	(50,076,926)	(54,565,748)	(54,703,353)	(+4,626,427)	(+137,605)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board					
Salaries and expenses	4,633	4,795	4,795	+162	.....
National Transportation Safety Board					
Salaries and expenses	57,000	62,942	59,000	+2,000	−3,942
Offsetting collections	.....	−10,000	.....	.....	+10,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies	61,633	57,737	63,795	+2,162	+6,058
Grand total	14,429,976	16,146,737	15,295,400	+865,424	−851,337
Current year, fiscal year 2001	(14,369,976)	(16,146,737)	(15,295,400)	(+925,424)	(−851,337)
Appropriations	(14,402,057)	(16,146,737)	(15,874,400)	(+1,472,343)	(−272,337)
Rescissions	(−32,081)	.....	(−579,000)	(−546,919)	(−579,000)
Advance appropriations	(60,000)	.....	.....	(−60,000)	.....
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(38,500)	(+38,500)	(+38,500)
(Limitation on obligations)	(34,679,150)	(37,437,600)	(38,432,600)	(+3,753,450)	(+995,000)
(Rescissions of limitation on obligations)	(−177,269)	.....	.....	(+177,269)	.....
(Exempt obligations)	(1,206,702)	(1,039,148)	(1,039,148)	(−167,554)	.....
Net total budgetary resources	(50,138,559)	(54,623,485)	(54,767,148)	(+4,628,589)	(+143,663)

[1] Fiscal year 2000 enacted includes $76,058 for motor carrier safety, limitation on administrative expenses.
[2] Provided under FHWA limitation on administrative expenses in fiscal year 2000.
[3] $6,000,000 provided in Title II—Other Appropriations Matters in Public Law 106–113.

NOTE: Fiscal year 2000 rescissions included in Net total lines.

○