

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING  
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGEN-  
CIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

JULY 24, 2003.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of  
the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL AND DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2861]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in  
explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the  
Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Develop-  
ment, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions,  
corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30,  
2004, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	<i>Page number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
Title I—Department of Veterans Affairs .....	2	3
Title II—Department of Housing and Urban Development .....	23	21
Title III—Independent Agencies .....	69	82
American Battle Monuments Commission .....	69	82
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board .....	70	83
Community Development Financial Institutions .....	71	84
Consumer Product Safety Commission .....	72	85
Corporation for National and Community Service .....	72	85
U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims .....	76	89
Department of Defense—Civil, Cemeterial Expenses, Army .....	77	89
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences .....	77	90
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry .....	78	90
Environmental Protection Agency .....	79	91
Office of Science and Technology Policy .....	88	128
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality .....	88	128

	<i>Page number</i>	
	<i>Bill</i>	<i>Report</i>
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation .....	89	129
Federal Citizen Information Center .....	89	129
National Aeronautics and Space Administration .....	90	130
National Credit Union Administration .....	94	140
National Science Foundation .....	95	141
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation .....	98	147
Selective Service System .....	99	147
Title IV—General Provisions .....	99	148

#### SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Committee recommends \$122,740,148,000 in new budget (obligational) authority for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and 19 independent agencies and offices.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the appropriations for fiscal year 2003 and budget estimates for fiscal year 2004.

#### OPERATING PLAN AND REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES

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

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

The Committee also directs that the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, as well as the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board shall submit operating plans, signed by the respective sec-

retary, administrator, or agency head, for the Committee's review within 120 days of the bill's enactment.

#### RELATIONSHIP WITH BUDGET OFFICES

Through the years, the Committee has channeled most of its inquiries and requests for information and assistance through the budget offices of the various departments, agencies, and commissions. The Committee has often pointed to the natural affinity and relationship between these organizations and the Committee which makes such a relationship workable. The Committee reiterates its longstanding position that while the Committee reserves the right to call upon all offices in the departments, agencies, and commissions, the primary conjunction between the Committee and these entities must normally be through the budget offices. The Committee appreciates all the assistance received from each of the departments, agencies, and commissions during the past year. The workload generated by the budget process is large and growing, and therefore, a positive, responsive relationship between the Committee and the budget offices is absolutely essential to the appropriations process.

#### TITLE I

#### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$60,720,955,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> 58,100,432,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	60,718,865,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+2,620,523,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+2,090,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes supplemental funding of \$100,000,000 for General operating expenses.

The Department of Veterans Affairs is one of the largest Federal agencies in terms of employment with an average employment of approximately 211,000. It administers benefits for more than 25,500,000 veterans, and 39,100,000 family members of living veterans and survivors of deceased veterans. Thus, close to 65,200,000 people, comprising about 22.2 percent of the total population of the United States, are potential recipients of veterans benefits provided by the Federal Government.

A total of \$60,720,955,000 in new budget authority is recommended by the Committee for the Department of Veterans Affairs programs in fiscal year 2004. The funds recommended provide for compensation payments to 2,860,347 veterans and survivors of deceased veterans with service-connected disabilities; pension payment for 553,553 non-service-connected disabled veterans, widows and children in need of financial assistance; education training, tuition assistance, and vocational assistance of 640,277 veterans, servicepersons, and reservists, and 59,128 eligible dependents of deceased veterans or seriously disabled veterans; housing credit assistance in the form of 270,000 guaranteed loans provided to veterans and servicepersons; administration or supervision of life insurance programs with 4,110,960 policies for veterans and active duty servicepersons providing coverage of \$703,970,770,000; inpatient care and treatment of beneficiaries in 162 hospitals; 43 domiciliaries, 137 nursing homes and 864 outpatient clinics which includes independent, satellite, community-based, and rural outreach

clinics involving 56,121,000 visits; and the administration of the National Cemetery Administration for burial of eligible veterans, servicepersons and their survivors.

The Department of Veterans Affairs submitted the 2004 budget in an alternative appropriations structure for consideration. The Committee did not suggest this budget restructuring and has appropriated funds for fiscal year 2004 using the standard appropriations structure. The Committee directs that should the Department decide to propose budget restructuring again, the Department must first submit a complete budget justification, complete with the traditional appropriations account structure with detailed information on the prior year, current year, and requested funding levels for each program, project, or activity funded within each account, and include a detailed narrative description of the proposed changes requested. A proposed restructured budget may also be submitted for Committee consideration at the same time, but not in lieu of, the appropriations structure contained in this report. The Committee reiterates that object classification displays are supplements, not substitutes, for detailed displays which funding for each program, project, or activity within each account. Further, the Committee directs the Department to refrain from incorporating "performance-based" budget documents in the 2005 budget justification submitted to the Committee, but keep the Performance Plan as a separate volume.

#### VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

#### COMPENSATION, PENSION AND BURIAL BENEFITS

#### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$29,845,127,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	28,949,000,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	28,845,127,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+896,127,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

This appropriation provides funds for service-connected compensation payments to an estimated 2,860,347 beneficiaries and pension payments to another 553,553 beneficiaries with non-service-connected disabilities. The average cost per compensation case in 2004 is estimated at \$9,401, and pension payments are projected at a unit cost of \$6,096. The estimated caseload and cost by program for 2003 and 2004 are included in the budget justification materials.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee is recommending the budget estimate of \$29,845,127,000 for compensation, pension and burial benefits. The bill also includes requested language not to exceed \$17,617,000 of reimbursements of which \$8,527,000 goes to the general operating expenses account and \$9,090,000 to the medical services for priority 1-6 veterans account for administrative expenses of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, Public Law 101-508, the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992, Public Law 102-568, and the Veterans' Benefits Improvements Act of 1994, Public Law 103-446. These cost savings provisions include verifying pension income against Internal Revenue Service and Social Security Administration (SSA) data; establishing a match with the SSA to obtain

verification of Social Security numbers; and the \$90 monthly VA pension cap for Medicaid-eligible single veterans and surviving spouses alone in Medicaid-covered nursing homes. The bill includes requested language permitting this appropriation to reimburse such sums as may be earned to the medical facilities revolving fund to help defray the operating expenses of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners.

The Administration has proposed to provide a cost-of-living adjustment, based on the change in the Consumer Price Index, to all compensation beneficiaries, including dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) for spouses and children. It is currently estimated at 2.0 percent. This is the same as the COLA that will be provided, under current law, to veterans pension and Social Security recipients. The increase would be effective December 1, 2003, and would cost an estimated \$355,150,000 during 2004. Funding for this COLA is reflected in the Compensation, Pensions and Burial Benefits obligations in the 2004 budget.

The Administration has proposed language that would provide indefinite 2004 supplemental appropriations for compensation and pension payments. The Committee believes the current funding procedures are adequate and has not included the requested language in the bill.

#### READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$2,529,734,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	2,264,808,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	2,529,734,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+264,926,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

The Committee recommends the budget estimates of \$2,529,734,000 for readjustment benefits in fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$264,926,000 over the current year funding level.

The Administration has proposed language that would provide indefinite 2004 supplemental appropriations for readjustment benefits because of legislative changes or year-end funding shortages. The Committee believes the current funding procedures are adequate and has not included the requested language in the bill.

## VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$29,017,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	27,530,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	29,017,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+1,487,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

The budget estimate of \$29,017,000 for veterans insurance and indemnities in fiscal year 2004 is included in the bill, an increase of \$1,487,000 over the current year funding level. The amount provided will enable VA to transfer more than \$21,167,000 to the service-disabled veterans insurance fund and transfer \$6,500,000 in payments for the 2,810 policies under the veterans mortgage life insurance program. These policies are identified under the veterans' insurance and indemnity appropriation since they provide insurance to service-disabled veterans unable to qualify under basic NSLI.

The Administration has proposed language that would provide indefinite 2004 supplemental appropriations for the insurance program. The Committee believes the current funding procedures are adequate and has not included the requested language in the bill.

## VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans for specially adapted housing loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$305,834,000	\$300,000	\$154,850,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	437,522,000	300,000	167,114,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	305,834,000	300,000	154,850,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 131,688,000	0	- 12,264,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0	0

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

VA loan guaranties are made to servicemembers, veterans, reservists and unremarried surviving spouses for the purchase of homes, condominiums, manufactured homes and for refinancing loans. The Department guarantees part of the total loan, permitting the purchaser to obtain a mortgage with a competitive interest rate, even without a down payment if the lender agrees. The De-

partment requires that a down payment be made for a manufactured home. With a Department guaranty, the lender is protected against loss up to the amount of the guaranty if the borrower fails to repay the loan.

The Committee recommends such sums as may be necessary (estimated to total \$305,834,000) for funding subsidy payments, \$300,000 for the limitation on direct loans for specially adapted housing loans, and \$154,850,000 for administrative expenses which is the budget request. The appropriation for administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the General Operating Expenses account.

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program ac- count	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$1,000	\$3,400	\$70,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	1,000	3,400	70,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	1,000	3,400	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0	0	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0	+70,000

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

The bill includes the budget requests of \$1,000 for funding subsidy program costs, \$3,400 as the limitation on direct loans, and \$70,000 for administrative expenses. The appropriation for administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the General Operating Expenses account.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program ac- count	Limitation on direct loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$52,000	\$3,938,000	\$300,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	55,000	3,626,000	287,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	52,000	3,938,000	300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	-3,000	+312,000	+13,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0	0

This appropriation covers the funding subsidy cost of direct loans for vocational rehabilitation of eligible veterans and, in addition, it includes administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program. Loans of up to \$896 (based on indexed chapter 31 subsistence allowance rate) are available to service-connected disabled veterans enrolled in vocational rehabilitation programs when the veteran is temporarily in need of additional assistance. Repayment is made in 10 monthly installments, without interest, through deductions from future payments of compensation, pension, subsistence allowance, educational assistance allowance, or

retirement pay. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 requires budgetary resources to be available prior to incurring a direct loan obligation. In addition, the Act requires all administrative expenses of a direct loan program to be funded through a program account.

The bill includes the budget requests of \$52,000 for funding subsidy program costs and \$300,000 for administrative expenses. The administrative expenses may be transferred to and merged with the General Operating Expenses account.

In addition, the bill includes requested language limiting program direct loans to \$3,938,000. It is estimated that VA will make 4,845 loans in fiscal year 2004, with an average amount of \$813.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Administrative expenses:

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$571,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	554,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	571,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+17,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

This program tests the feasibility of authorizing VA to make direct home loans to Native American veterans who live on U.S. trust land. This is a pilot program which began in 1993 and expires on December 31, 2005. The bill includes the budget request of \$571,000 for administration expenses, which may be transferred to and merged with the General Operating Expenses account.

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS FOR HOMELESS  
VETERANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Public Law 105-368, the Veterans Programs Enhancement Act of 1998, established this program. All funds authorized for this program were appropriated in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, no appropriation request has been included for fiscal year 2004. Bill language is included allowing the use of funds in Medical Services for Priority 1-6 Veterans and General Operating Expenses to administer this program.

The Committee is concerned about the activities in this program. The program status report submitted as requested the fiscal year 2003 statement of managers did not describe a truly successful program. The Committee has received inquiries from potential participants of the program seeking to earmark section 8 funds under the Department of Housing and Urban Development in addition to a guaranteed transitional home loan. The Committee views the financing of one Federal loan program by the subsidy provided in another Federal program to be contrary to the intent of creating the guaranteed transitional home loan program in VA. Therefore, the Committee has limited the administration expenses of this program to \$350,000 in fiscal year 2004.



VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION  
MEDICAL CARE

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$0
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	23,889,304,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	25,218,080,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 23,889,304,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 25,218,080,000

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

The Committee does not recommend funds for this account in 2004, and instead recommends an alternative account structure for the Veterans Health Administration, which will provide a better accounting of appropriated and receipt funds and will lead to better oversight of the costs and expenditures of VHA. As of 2003, the Committee and the Congress have provided a 38% increase in funding for medical care since 1999, and still there are stories of waiting lists and a lack of health care in some parts of the country. Even worse, the VA reports that priority 1-6 veterans, the core mission and patient population of the VA, those veterans that the VA was created to serve, are not getting care in a timely manner. The Committee places these veterans as the priority and need to ensure their timely access to health care.

In addition to concerns about availability of care, the Committee is interested in the capital asset costs of the VA. The Department is on the verge of making decisions related to results achieved in the CARES study and the Committee needs a full accounting of exactly how much VA is currently spending on capital infrastructure and how much could be saved and instead invested in medical services by realigning VA facilities. GAO estimated that VA was spending \$1 of every \$4 dollars on capital assets.

Another component of the old medical care account is the cost associated with administration of the health care system. While the Medical Administration and Miscellaneous Operating Expenses account captured the costs associated with the operation of the headquarters administration, there was no clear way to account for information technology initiatives or administration costs in the VISNs, the facilities, and the various administration centers across the country or the costs associated with legal services and billing offices. The Committee views some administration costs as necessary to operate the system, but not actual medical services.

To address these concerns, the Committee recommends the creation of four new accounts in VHA, and retaining the Medical and Prosthetic Research account. The Committee has created separate accounts to provide funding specifically for medical services for priority 1-6 veterans (which includes mandated care for non-veterans such as CHAMPVA beneficiaries), medical services for priority 7-8 veterans, medical administration, and medical facilities. The Committee directs VA to start planning for the new account structure immediately for implementation beginning in fiscal year 2004 and to submit the fiscal year 2005 budget justification using the format created below. In order to track costs, the Committee sug-

gests that VHA should standardize and require system utilization of the DSS system, created and implemented using hundreds of millions of medical care funds, across all VISNs and use that system as the cost accounting tool was meant to be. Further, the Committee recommends transferring receipts from the Medical Care Collection Fund into the Medical Services for Priority 7–8 Veterans account.

#### MEDICAL SERVICES FOR PRIORITY 1–6 VETERANS

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$15,779,220,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+15,779,220,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+15,779,220,000

This Medical Services for Priority 1–6 Veterans appropriation provides for medical services of eligible veterans and beneficiaries except non service connected veterans exceeding the income threshold in VA medical centers, nursing homes, domiciliaries, and outpatient clinic facilities, contract hospitals, State domiciliaries, nursing homes and hospitals, contract community nursing homes, and outpatient programs on a fee basis. Hospital and outpatient care is also provided by the private sector for certain dependents and survivors of veterans under the civilian health and medical programs for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Committee recommendation includes \$15,779,220,000 for medical services for priority 1–6 veterans and eligible dependents in fiscal year 2004. The bill includes language delaying the availability of \$200,000,000 of funds requested for the equipment object classification until August 1, 2004, and two-year availability of \$700,000,000. The Committee emphasizes that the two-year funding provision is not meant to create “emergency funds” and that all resources should be spent in a timely and responsible manner addressing veterans health needs.

The bill also includes requested language in the Compensation, Pension, and Burial Benefits appropriation transferring \$9,090,000 for administrative expenses of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and the Veterans’ Benefits Act of 1992.

The Committee is hopeful that an agreement can be reached between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Health and Human Services to establish a Medicare Choice-type program at the VA to provide reimbursable medical care services at the VA to Medicare-eligible veterans. The Committee directs the implementation of such plan in fiscal year 2004 and expects the Secretary to testify on the development of such plan at the 2005 budget hearing.

The Committee strongly urges the Secretary to examine the feasibility of creating a prescription drug only benefit for veterans currently on the waiting list to be enrolled in the VA health care system. The Committee requests that the Secretary report by December 1, 2003 to the Committees on Appropriations on the number of veterans who would benefit from such proposal, the costs to the VA of implementing such proposal—both in terms of cost avoidance and pharmacy increases, and a proposed fee structure for such benefit.

The Committee is greatly frustrated with reports from the Office of Inspector General regarding the lack of time and attendance compliance of VA's part-time and specialty doctors. The Committee has provided increased funding over the years to meet the demand of waiting lists and to reduce the patient backlog in specialty clinics. The Committee directs the Secretary to provide at the time of the budget submission a plan to address and correct this issue.

The Committee directs the establishment of no less than two new Mental Illness Research Education and Clinic Centers (MIRECC) in VISNs which currently do not have a MIRECC and have a hospital with an already strong mental health care program.

The Committee strongly urges the Department to continue to increase the number of Mental Health Intensive Case Management (MHICM) teams and to fully staff existing teams. Further, the Committee directs the VA to ensure that any savings derived from the closure of inpatient psychiatric beds be transferred into community-based treatment services for veterans with severe mental illness and not to programs serving lower priority veterans.

The Committee directs the VA to ensure that each VISN follow through on plans to implement mental health services in each Community Based Outpatient Clinic (CBOC). The Committee is concerned that many CBOCs provide only the minimal levels of basic mental health services. The Committee recommends that the VA expedite their ability to provide better care by increasing the mental health capacity of CBOCs.

The Committee is aware of new psoriasis treatments that have been proven significantly more effective than conventional treatments used by VHA in the past. Therefore, the Committee urges VHA to explore use of these therapies to treat veterans who suffer from psoriasis.

The Committee encourages the VA to consider ultrasound medical tracking technology and its ability to prevent theft and promote safety in VA hospitals without interfering with sensitive electronic equipment. The Committee requests the VA to report back on the effectiveness of such technology, costs and compatibility by March 1, 2004.

The Committee directs all monies collected by the Department of Veterans' Affairs should remain in the current VA system, and not returned to the U.S. Treasury. Further, the Committee directs that all funds collected as the result of increased co-payments and fees authorized under the Veterans Millennium Health Care Act, as associated legislation, remain in the VA system to provide veterans medical care.

The Committee directs the continuation of the long-employed Joslin Vision Network at no less than the current level.

The Committee reiterates its concern for veterans with hepatitis C, and applauds the Department for the progress made so far, including establishing screening and testing services that have reached an estimated 40% of VA health care users, funding a prevalence study to better define risk factors among veterans, and creating a National hepatitis C registry to better track and manage patients. The Committee recommends that the Department do more to improve screening and testing for hepatitis C among all Vietnam veterans; provide tests to other veterans in the VA system who have risk factors for hepatitis C; and participate in a national

outreach effort to inform all veterans about the disease. The Committee urges increased efforts and resources be devoted to the treatment and effective disease management of veterans with hepatitis C and notes that failure to do so will lead to more end-stage liver disease, liver transplantation and morbidity.

The Committee encourages the VA to consider Patient Health Monitoring Technology which could improve the quality of care in Coronary Bypass Graft units. The Committee requests the VA to report back on the effectiveness of the technology, costs and compatibility by March 1, 2004.

The Committee strongly recommends the establishment of CBOCs in the Saltville area of Virginia, and the Montrose area of Pennsylvania.

The Committee encourages the pilot chiropractic initiative underway at the Buffalo, New York VAMC.

MEDICAL SERVICES FOR PRIORITY 7-8 VETERANS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$2,164,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+2,164,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+2,164,000,000

This Medical Services for Priority 7-8 Veterans appropriation provides for medical services to non service-connected veterans and veterans exceeding the income threshold in VA medical centers, outpatient clinic facilities, contract hospitals, State homes, and outpatient programs on a fee basis.

The Committee recommendation provides \$2,164,000,000 for medical services for priority 7 and 8 veterans. Bill language is included which transfers \$1,500,000,000 from the Medical Care Collections Funds into this account, to be available until expended, for the purposes of providing medical services to this population.

The Committee has watched with great interest the Department's development and proposed implementation of a new automated financial management system for VHA. For the last two years the Committee directed and provided funds for the Department to undertake a third party billing demonstration using a commercially available health care financial management system as a tool to gain experience in this area while planning for and development of a VA-wide system was being undertaken. The Department neglected to accomplish any demonstration, instead concentrating on system development. Now, the Department is on the verge of acquiring and testing commercially available software as the first phase of its system wide plan without the benefit of any knowledge gained through a demonstration.

The Committee does not want to belabor this lost opportunity or slow down the implementation of a new financial management system. On the contrary, the Committee is very interested in urging the Department to speed up the timetable for implementation of the new system and views the implementation of such system as the key to the VA's ability to continue to provide medical services to priority 7-8 veterans. While the private and public health care industry and the DOD health care system have embraced commercially available software for health care financial management, the

VA has apparently not gained confidence in the commercial sector and is proceeding extremely slowly. In the implementation of the proposed system-wide plan, it will take the VA until 2008 to achieve Department wide implantation, at the earliest. This is because of lengthy testing of the selected system, followed by installation and lengthy testing at one hospital, followed by installation and lengthy testing in one state, followed by installation system-wide. The VA will lose hundreds of millions of dollars in this time.

The Committee strongly urges the Department to shorten the trial periods at the various implementation levels. While a phased approach is reasonable, having so many phases with such lengthy tests seems unnecessary to document success or identify problems.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$408,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	397,400,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	408,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+10,600,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

The Committee recommends \$408,000,000 for medical and prosthetic research in fiscal year 2004. This funding level is \$10,600,000 over the fiscal year 2003 appropriation and equal to the budget request.

The Committee is interested in the Department's proposal to shift research priorities for medical and prosthetic research. The Committee places a high priority on the Medical Research Service for its focus on health care issues of special concerns to veterans. Encouraging physicians in veterans' medical centers to engage in research contributes to the highest possible quality of care for veterans. The Committee commends the Department for its efforts to accelerate the translation of basic research into clinical applications. At the same time the Committee believes that a wide range of research, including basic research, will yield benefits to veterans over the long term. The Committee urges the Secretary to submit an explanation of its research priorities for medical and prosthetic research, including any changes in relative priority of basic and clinical research in a report due 90 days after enactment. The report should also explain any changes to the peer review system

used to evaluate research proposals within the Medical Research Service.

The Committee supports research endeavors in the area of bio-artificial kidney development as a relevant program in the VA Rehabilitation Service to maximize functional recovery of veterans suffering from end-stage renal disease.

The Committee encourages research in the area of neurodegenerative diseases and regeneration.

The Committee directs \$1,000,000 for the continuation of VA's partnership with the National Technology Transfer Center.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$4,854,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+4,854,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+4,854,000,000

The Medical Administration appropriation provides funds for the expenses of management and administration of VHA. Included under this heading are provisions for costs associated with operation of VHA headquarters (formerly funded under the Medical Administration and Miscellaneous Operating Expenses), plus the costs of VISN offices and facility director offices, all information technology hardware and software, legal services, billing and coding activities, and procurement.

The Committee recommends \$4,854,000,000 for Medical Administration in fiscal year 2004. Bill language is included allowing the Secretary to transfer funds from this account to Medical Services as necessary after notifying the Committees on Appropriations.

In light of the recent research-related deaths at the Albany VAMC, the Committee directs that of the funds provided under this heading, not less than \$5,000,000 shall be for the creation of a research oversight board, reporting jointly to the Secretary and the Undersecretary for Health, to implement research protocols related specifically to patient protections. The VA is to consult with the National Institutes of Health in this area, and comprise a system appropriate to VA, but offering the same, if not better, oversight of VA research and patients. The Committee expected that the VA would have instituted a more stringent oversight board after the Albany deaths, rather than dismantling the existing oversight board.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$4,000,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+4,000,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+4,000,000,000

The Medical Facilities appropriation provides funds for the operation, maintenance and security of VHA's vast capital infrastructure. Included under this heading are provisions for costs associated with utilities, engineering, capital planning, leases, laundry

and food services, grounds keeping, garbage, housekeeping, security, facility repair, and property disposition and acquisition.

The Committee recommendation provides \$4,000,000,000 for Medical Facilities. Bill language is included which delays \$80,000,000 of the requested funds for the land and structures object classification until August 1, 2004, and language allowing the Secretary to transfer funds from this account to Medical Services after notifying the Committees on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$1,283,272,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> 1,245,849,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	1,283,272,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+37,423,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

<sup>1</sup>Does not include a supplemental appropriation of \$100,000,000 in Public Law 108-11.

The General Operating Expenses appropriation provides for the administration of non-medical veterans benefits through the Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) and top management direction and support. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 changed the accounting of Federal credit programs and required that all administrative costs associated with such programs be included within the respective credit accounts. Beginning in fiscal year 1992, costs incurred by housing, education, and vocational rehabilitation programs for administration of these credit programs are reimbursed by those accounts. The bill includes the budget requests totaling \$156,813,000 in other accounts for these credit programs. In addition, \$7,966,000 is transferred from the compensation and pensions account for administrative costs of implementing cost saving provisions required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992. Section 107 of the administrative provisions provides requested language which permits excess revenues in three insurance funds to be used for administrative expenses. The VA estimates that \$38,922,000 will be utilized for such purposes in fiscal year 2004. Prior to fiscal year 1996, such costs were included in the general operating expenses appropriation. Thus, in total, \$1,833,979,000 is requested in fiscal year 2004 for administrative costs of non-medical benefits.

The Committee recommends \$1,283,272,000 for General Operating Expenses. This amount represents an increase of \$37,423,000 above the current level, and equal to the budget request. The bill includes requested language allowing \$66,000,000 of the funds appropriated to be available for obligation for two years, the purchase of two motor vehicles for the VBA office in Manila, Philippines, and a travel limitation of \$17,082,000. The bill also includes language directing the VBA to be funded at not less than \$1,005,000,000.

The Committee has not provided any funds for a new Assistant Secretary of Operations, Security and Preparedness and does not recommend funding for such office, other than a coordinator, at the Department. The Committee is very concerned with the Department's ability to simply fulfill the basic requirements of providing benefits and medical services in a correct and timely manner and feels that the Department should concentrate on meeting the basic mission of the VA rather than looking to expand its portfolio of re-

sponsibilities into the homeland security area. The Committee feels confident that other agencies and departments specifically responsible for homeland security and defense activities are adequately managing and funding those initiatives.

The Committee strongly urges the Department to retain consolidation of the Department's information technology initiatives in the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO). The Committee directs that all cyber-security and enterprise architecture activities be managed by the CIO.

The Committee is pleased with the Department's initiatives to modernize its computing infrastructure and supports the continued implementation of the One-VA Enterprise Architecture Plan. Similar models used by the commercial sector have resulted in significantly reduced operating costs and improved overall performance. The Committee directs the VA to proceed with information technology initiatives, including the acquisition of data replication technologies, to provide continuity of operations capability for corporate data centers through the Corporate Data Center Infrastructure initiative. Further, the Committee also directs the VA to proceed with the acquisition of data replication technologies in order to provide continuity of operations for messaging consolidation, office automation, and other necessary applications at the VA's regional computing centers. The Committee has allocated \$25,000,000 Department-wide for these activities.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$144,223,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	132,284,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	144,203,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+11,939,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+20,000

The National Cemetery Administration was established in accordance with the National Cemeteries Act of 1973. It has a four-fold mission: to provide for the interment in any national cemetery with available grave space the remains of eligible deceased servicepersons and discharged veterans, together with their spouses and certain dependents, and to permanently maintain their graves; to mark graves of eligible persons in national and private cemeteries; to administer the grant program for aid to States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans' cemeteries; and to administer the Presidential Memorial Certificate Program. This appropriation provides for the operation and maintenance of 157 cemeterial installations in 39 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

The Committee recommends \$144,223,000 for the National Cemetery Administration in fiscal year 2004. This funding level is \$11,919,000 over the 2003 level and \$20,000 over the budget request. The Committee is providing funds to meet needs associated with new cemeteries and the increased workload projected by the Department.

The Committee recommends not more than \$24,500 for the exhumation of American soldiers buried under a roadway outside the Johnson's Island Cemetery in Sandusky, Ohio, which is under the jurisdiction of the VA; their re-internment in the cemetery; and a



marker with the corrected names of the Confederate soldiers buried at Johnson’s Island Cemetery.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$61,750,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	57,623,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	61,750,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+4,127,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

The Committee has provided \$61,750,000 for the Office of Inspector General in fiscal year 2004. This amount is an increase of \$4,127,000 above the current year appropriation and equal to the budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$274,690,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	99,128,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	272,690,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+175,562,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+2,000,000

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

The bill provides \$274,690,000 for construction, major projects, in fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the budget justification, and an increase of \$175,562,000 over last year’s funding level. Also, the bill includes \$173,000,000 for CARES and \$10,000,000 for the Judgment Fund.

The Committee directs that of the funds provided under VHA Advance Planning Fund, \$9,000,000 is for the preliminary planning and design of the Denver VAMC relocation to the Fitzsimmons campus; a unique opportunity for the VA to enter into a sharing agreement with the Department of Defense and the University of Colorado to replace aging and outdated facilities with a shared campus design which will be cost efficient to all parties and beneficial to veterans. The Committee is looking to the Fitzsimmons project as a model for future shared Federal health care facility construction projects.

Also under the VHA Advance Planning Fund, \$500,000 is for preliminary planning of a new ambulatory clinic at the Defense Supply Center (DSC) campus in Columbus, Ohio. CARES market data show that the workload in Columbus will remain constant over time and the current facility is inadequate to meet the demand.

The Committee strongly urges the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue negotiations with the Secretary of Defense to determine a suitable site on the DSC campus for clinic construction.

The Committee is fully supportive of the CARES initiative and applauds the Department for moving forward with the implementation of the VISN 12 plan and Phase II of the study. The Committee directs VA to dispose expeditiously with the Lakeside VAMC at full market value in order to commence construction at the West Side VAMC.

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

The Committee directs the CARES study to examine the possibility where, in some markets, the best recommendation, both in terms of economics and service delivery, is to build a new facility in full cooperation with another entity such as the Department of Defense or the state, such as the Committee is recommending at the Fitzsimmons campus. In these instances, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs must actively consult with non-VA public entities to plan for a new, jointly held and funded facility.

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

Of the amounts recommended under the NCA Advance Planning Fund, \$2,000,000 is for advance planning of a national cemetery on land transferred to the Department of Veterans Affairs at the Miramar Naval Air Station.

The specific amounts recommended by the Committee are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Location and description	Available through 2003	2004 request	House recommenda- tion
Veterans Health Administration (VHA):			
CARES Project—TBD .....	0	183,000	173,000
Subtotal, CARES .....	0	183,000	173,000
Advance Planning Fund: Various stations .....	0	15,000	25,000
Asbestos abatement: Various stations .....	0	5,000	5,000
Claims Analyses: various locations .....	0	2,000	2,000
Judgement Fund: Various locations .....	0	10,000	10,000
Hazardous Waste: Various locations .....	0	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Other line items .....	0	33,000	43,000
Subtotal, VHA .....	0	216,000	226,000
Veterans Benefits Administration .....	0	271	271
National Cemetery Administration (NCA):			
Detroit, MI Area, Phase I Development .....	0	8,700	8,700
Cemetery Expansion and Improvements:			
Fort Snelling, MN, gravesite expansion and cemetery improvements .....	0	24,800	24,800

(In thousands of dollars)

Location and description	Available through 2003	2004 request	House recommenda- tion
Barrancas, FL gravesite expansion and cemetery im- provements .....	0	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, Construction .....	0	45,500	45,500
Design Fund: Various locations .....	0	6,000	6,000
Advance Planning Fund: Various locations .....	0	2,919	4,919
Subtotal, Other line-items .....	0	8,919	10,919
Total NCA construction, major projects .....	0	54,419	56,419
Staff Offices: Various locations .....	0	2,000	2,000
Total construction, major projects .....	0	272,690	274,690

## CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$252,144,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	224,531,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	252,144,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+27,613,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

The construction, minor projects appropriation provides for constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department, including planning, CARES activities, assessment of needs, architectural and engineering services, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is less than \$4,000,000.

The Committee recommends \$252,144,000 for the construction, minor projects appropriation in fiscal year 2004, equal to the budget request and an increase of \$27,613,000 over the fiscal year 2003 appropriation. The Committee directs that \$25,000,000 of the funds provided be used specifically to address quality and safety issues in VA research facilities.

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

## GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$102,100,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	99,350,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	102,100,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+2,750,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

This program provides grants to assist States to construct State home facilities, for furnishing domiciliary or nursing home care to veterans, and to expand, remodel or alter existing buildings for fur-

nishing domiciliary, nursing home or hospital care to veterans in State homes. A grant may not exceed 65 percent of the total cost of the project.

The Committee recommends \$102,100,000 for grants for construction of State extended care facilities in fiscal year 2004. This amount is equal to the budget request.

The Committee encourages the Department to work with the State of New Jersey as that state applies for a grant to expand the Paramus facility.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$32,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	31,792,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	32,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+208,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

This program provides grants to assist States with the establishment, expansion, and improvement of State veterans' cemeteries which are operated and permanently maintained by the States. Grants under this program fund up to 100 percent of construction costs and the initial equipment expenses when the cemetery is established. The states remain responsible for providing the land and for paying all costs related to the operation and maintenance of the state cemeteries, including the costs for subsequent equipment purchases.

The Committee recommends the budget request of \$32,000,000 for grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries in fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$208,000 over the current year's funding level.

The Committee encourages the Department to work with the State of California as that State applies for a grant to establish a State cemetery on 156 acres of the former Fort Ord in California.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The bill continues the first fourteen administrative provisions from title I contained in Public Law 108-7, the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bill, with revised dollar figures, and four new provisions.

Section 115 allows the Secretary to create a priority system based on service connection or income for veterans seeking medical services. Section 116 directs the Secretary to conduct cost-recovery audits. Section 117 allows funds for medical services to be used to furnish veterans with recreational supplies and to provide funeral and burial for eligible beneficiaries. Section 118 allows for the transfer of balances as of August 1, 2004 in the Medical Care Collections Fund to the Medical Services for Priority 7-8 Veterans account. Section 119 allows for the transfer of up to 10 percent of the funds between the Medical Services for Priority 1-6 Veterans account and the Medical Services for Priority 7-8 Veterans account as needed. Section 120 renames the Houston VAMC as the "Michael E. DeBakey Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center."

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN  
DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation:	
Program Level .....	\$36,995,306,000
Fee Collections .....	-3,464,000,000
Rescissions .....	-1,705,000,000
Net Appropriation <sup>1</sup> .....	31,826,306,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation:	
Program Level .....	36,052,908,000
Fee Collections .....	-3,336,000,000
Rescissions/Offsets .....	-1,708,000,000
Net Appropriation .....	31,008,908,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request:	
Program Level .....	36,898,612,000
Fee Collections .....	-3,464,000,000
Rescissions/Offsets .....	-1,705,000,000
Net Appropriation <sup>1</sup> .....	31,729,612,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation:	
Program Level .....	+942,398,000
Fee Collections .....	-128,000,000
Rescissions/Offsets .....	+3,000,000
Net Appropriation <sup>1</sup> .....	+817,398,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2004 budget request:	
Program Level .....	+96,694,000
Fee Collections .....	0
Rescissions/Offsets .....	0
Net Appropriation <sup>1</sup> .....	+96,694,000

<sup>1</sup>The fiscal year 2004 totals do not reflect a legislative proposal assumed in the budget transferring the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Emergency Food and Shelter Program to the Department.

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

In carrying out the mission of serving the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and of the people who live and work in them, HUD administers mortgage and loan insurance programs, rental and homeownership subsidy programs for low-income families, neighborhood rehabilitation programs, and community development programs.

The Committee recommends a total program level of \$36,995,306,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a \$942,398,000 increase above the fiscal year 2003 level, and \$96,694,000 above the request. The recommendation reflects the Committee desire to invest resources in a manner which best ensures that funds provided can be used to provide safe, decent and affordable housing and to promote economic development in communities across the country.

## PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

## HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$18,430,606,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	17,111,613,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> 0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+1,318,993,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> +18,430,606,000

<sup>1</sup>The fiscal year 2004 budget proposed to eliminate this account and instead fund activities previously included in the Housing Certificate Fund account in a new Housing Assistance for Needy Families account and a new Project-Based Rental Assistance account.

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

The Committee recommendation continues funding for the Section 8 program in the Housing Certificate Fund (HCF) account rather than funding the program through the proposed Housing Assistance for Needy Families account and the proposed Project-Based Rental Assistance account. The Committee recommendation provides the same total level of resources requested in the budget for the Section 8 programs. As proposed in the budget, the Committee recommendation assumes \$1,072,000,000 is available from fiscal year 2001 and prior year recaptures to offset fiscal year 2004 requirements. However, the Committee has increased the direct appropriation by this amount and increased the rescission by a corresponding amount to reflect this one-time savings. Consistent with the budget request, the Committee recommends \$4,200,000,000 in advance appropriations.

The recommendation provides a direct appropriation of \$18,430,606,000 for the HCF, an increase of \$1,318,993,179 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003. This represents a 7 percent increase over the amount provided in fiscal year 2003. In addition, \$1,000,000,000 is available from unobligated carryover balances in program reserve accounts and up to \$721,000,000 is available from unobligated balances in administrative fee reserve accounts to support Section 8 activities which will provide a total program level of up to \$20,151,606,000.

The Committee recommendation includes the amount necessary to fully fund all authorized vouchers requiring renewal assuming a total average leasing rate of 96 percent in 2004 based on the most recent estimate of national average per unit rental subsidy cost based on verified cost data.

The recommendation continues the budget reforms enacted in fiscal year 2003 for the Section 8 voucher program, as requested. Prior to these reforms, budgeting practices failed to accurately reflect a realistic estimate of the funding necessary to support the total authorized voucher level. Prior budgeting practices failed to take into account fluctuations in leasing rates over the course of the year as well as the significant under-utilization of authorized

voucher by some public housing authorities. With the enactment of the reforms in fiscal year 2003 and continued in fiscal year 2004, the Committee has eliminated the likelihood of huge amounts of Section 8 funds not being spent and later recaptured.

The recommendation includes the following:

—Renewal of expiring Section 8 contracts: \$16,295,578,000 for renewals of Section 8 vouchers and project-based contracts, an increase of \$1,304,448,179 over the fiscal year 2003 level, and \$205,709,996 over the request. This represents a 7 percent increase over the level provided for renewals in fiscal year 2003. These amounts are provided as follows:

*Section 8 Vouchers.*—The Committee recommends \$11,575,181,100 for the estimated renewal costs of Section 8 voucher renewals, an increase of \$633,811,100 over the fiscal year 2003 level and \$193,565,100 above the request.

The recommendation assumes a 92 percent average leasing rate for authorized vouchers requiring renewal in fiscal year 2004 as assumed in the budget. When combined with amounts provided in the Central Fund, the recommendation will support a 96 percent national average leasing rate in fiscal year 2004.

The Committee has provided a \$195,565,100 increase above the request for renewals to reflect re-estimates of the national average per unit rental subsidy cost, exclusive of administrative fees, based upon the most recent verified cost data. The original budget request, which was submitted prior to the availability of complete verified 2002 cost data, assumed a national average per unit rental subsidy cost of \$5,880. The Committee has provided funding assuming a \$5,980 national average per unit rental subsidy cost, the most recent estimate based on the verified actual 2002 cost data adjusted for inflationary cost increases.

*Section 8 Quality Assurance Division.*—The Committee appreciates that the reforms included in the fiscal year 2003 appropriations Act required a significant overhaul in the way the budget for the Section 8 voucher program is formulated and executed. The Committee commends the Department for the initiative it has shown and the tremendous amount of work it has done to expeditiously implement these reforms. The Committee believes that the reforms implemented provide a framework for making continued refinements to improve the accuracy and timeliness of current and future Section 8 funding requirements.

The Committee notes that while the Department currently requires public housing authorities to report on their monthly leasing rates and costs, such data is not currently verified and reconciled with funding levels provided. The Committee believes that more timely verification of voucher use and spending will enable the Department and the Congress to better monitor current Section 8 spending and project future budget requirements. Therefore, the recommendation includes \$10,000,000 and 75 FTE within the Salaries and Expenses account for the Office of Public and Indian Housing to establish a Quality Assurance Division for the Section 8 Voucher program to provide more timely validation of PHA program and financial information and ensure compliance with voucher program requirements.

Language is included in the bill, identical to language carried in fiscal year 2003, setting forth the distribution of funds provided for Section 8 voucher renewals.

*Project-Based Section 8.*—The recommendation assumes \$4,720,396,900 for renewals of project-based Section 8 contracts (including moderate rehabilitation contracts), the full amount requested. Pursuant to the budget request, no new funding is provided for project-based Section 8 contract amendments for fiscal year 2004, and instead assumes that amendment requirements will be met through recaptures.

—Central Reserve Fund: \$568,503,000 to be allocated by the Secretary to address significant increases in the lease up rate or per unit costs above the amounts provided to a public housing authority (PHA) for renewals and replenishment of PHA one-month program reserves as necessary. The Committee notes that an additional \$1,000,000,000 will be available to PHAs through their program reserves, in addition to amounts provided in the bill for estimated renewal requirements, to address additional leasing and per unit rental subsidy cost increases. Language is continued, identical to language carried in fiscal year 2003, requiring a PHA to use at least 50 percent of its program reserves prior to requesting funds from the central fund.

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

Language is continued, identical to language included in fiscal year 2003, setting forth the allowable uses.

Language is also continued directing the Secretary to provide quarterly reports to the Committee on the use of funds from the central reserve fund in accordance with the following direction: such report shall include, at a minimum, the amount of funding distributed for additional renewal costs, delineated by PHA; the amount of funding used to replenish program reserves, delineated by PHA; the amount of additional voucher assistance provided to eligible PHAs, delineated by PHA; the amount of any recaptures, delineated by PHA; and the total balance remaining in the fund. The Secretary is directed to provide the first quarterly report no later than January 31, 2004.

—Tenant Protection: \$206,495,000 for tenant protection activities to replace lost project-based section 8 with Section 8 vouchers; for conversion of section 202 and section 23 projects to section 8 vouchers; for the family unification program; and for the witness protection program. Again this year, funding for new vouchers under the HOPE VI program is to be provided within the Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI) account. Funding included for tenant protection is only to be used for rental subsidies. Funding for associated administrative expenses is provided separately within this account.

—Family Self-Sufficiency Coordinators: \$48,000,000 for service coordinator staff in each eligible public housing agency.

—Administrative Costs: Section 8 Voucher Program: not to exceed \$1,209,020,000 for PHA administrative costs and other expenses to administer the Section 8 program, as requested and \$136,763,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2003.



The recommendation provides an 11 percent increase over the amount PHAs reported being spent in fiscal year 2002 to administer the Section 8 voucher program. While the Committee does not recommend language proposed in the budget to limit administrative fees based upon the total amount of funding provided for rental subsidy payments, the Committee recommends language to limit administrative fee payments in fiscal year 2004 to not more than the total amount appropriated for administrative costs. The Committee notes that absent such limitation, the amount of administrative fees paid would increase by \$332,647,000, a 30 percent increase above the amount actually spent by PHAs to administer their programs in 2002. The Committee recommendation ensures that PHA administrative funding needs are met, while also ensuring that the necessary resources are available to meet the rental subsidy needs of families who rely on Section 8.

The allocation of administrative funds is to be determined by the Secretary. The Department is expected to consult with the Committee as it makes this determination.

—Administrative Costs—Project-Based Section 8 Program: \$100,000,000 for contractors to administer the project-based section 8 program, the full amount requested.

—Working Capital Fund: not less than \$3,010,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems.

The recommendation does not include \$36,000,000 requested for new incremental vouchers for non-elderly disabled persons impacted by the designation of public housing as elderly only. Language is included in the bill requiring public housing authorities to continue to reserve incremental vouchers funded in previous year for persons with disabilities upon turnover.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$0
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	12,535,201,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 12,535,201,000

The Committee does not adopt the budget proposal to fund the section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (tenant-based assistance) program as a separate new account but instead has continued funding for these activities in the Housing Certificate Fund as provided for in previous years.

Proposed language is not included to designate fiscal year 2004 funds for activities related to the implementation of the Administration's legislative proposal to block grant the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program to the States. The Committee notes that this proposal is currently under consideration by the relevant authorization committees and therefore defers any changes to the funding structure of the program until further congressional action on the legislative proposal.

PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$0
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	4,823,405,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	-4,823,405,000

The Committee does not adopt the budget proposal to fund section 8 project-based assistance and related activities as a separate new account but instead has continued funding for these activities in the Housing Certificate Fund as provided for in previous years.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$2,712,255,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	2,712,255,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	2,641,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+71,255,000

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

The Committee recommendation includes \$2,712,255,000 for this program, an increase of \$71,255,000 above the request and the same amount provided in fiscal year 2003.

The Committee appreciates the need to modernize public housing and continues to believe that the residents of public housing deserve timely facilities improvements. Congressional concerns over delays in the expenditure of public housing capital funds led to the enactment of provisions in the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act (QHWRA) of 1998 to compel more timely completion of needed repair and modernization work to the public housing stock. Because of delays in implementation of these provision, the fiscal year 2002 and 2003 appropriations Act included interim provisions to ensure that backlog reduction funding was provided to those PHAs which were able to spend their funds in a timely fashion as required under QHWRA. The recommendation retains language, similar to language carried in previous Acts, continuing these interim measures. However, the Committee understands that the Department plans to fully implement the timeliness provisions of QHRWA later this year, therefore language is also included to allow all funds to be distributed in accordance with QHWRA rather than in accordance with the interim measures should the Department fully implement the timeliness requirements of QHRWA in fiscal year 2004.

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

The Committee recommendation does not include funding, or the necessary authorization language, for the Public Housing Reinvestment Initiative proposed by the Administration. The Committee understands that under existing statutory authorities, a number of PHAs have in fact successfully pursued approximately \$1 billion in public-private financing partnerships. While the Committee is interested in exploring additional mechanisms to leverage private sector financing for capital improvements for public housing, the Committee believes that such proposals need to be more fully examined before significant statutory and funding changes are made.

The recommendation does not designate \$40,000,000 for costs associated with the demolition of severely distressed public housing and instead includes \$50,000,000 under the HOPE VI program for these activities.

The recommendation also includes funding for the following activities, as proposed in the budget: \$51,000,000 for technical assistance activities; \$500,000 for section 23 lease adjustments; \$55,000,000 for the Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency program; up to \$40,000,000 for emergency and natural disaster needs; and no less than \$10,610,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund to support the development of and modifications to information technology systems which support Public and Indian Housing programs and activities. As requested, the recommendation does designate a separate set-aside for the Neighborhood Networks grants because such activities are already an eligible use of capital funds.

The recommendation includes language making a technical correction to the fiscal year 2003 Appropriations Act clarifying that PHAs that have remedied their non-compliance with obligation and expenditure deadlines are eligible to receive backlog reduction funding in fiscal year 2003.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$3,600,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> 3,576,600,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	3,574,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> +23,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+26,000,000

<sup>1</sup>The fiscal year 2003 Appropriations Act provided \$3,326,600,000 for fiscal year 2003 payments and \$250,000,000 for additional fiscal year 2002 payments to certain PHAs.

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

The Committee recommends \$3,600,000,000 to subsidize PHAs' fiscal year 2004 operating costs, an increase of \$23,400,000 above the fiscal year 2003 payment level, and \$26,000,000 above the request. Continues language, proposed for deletion, designating

\$10,000,000 for transfer to the Department of Justice to be allocated by the Attorney General through existing programs, such as Weed and Seed, to those areas where additional assistance is needed to augment Federal, State and local efforts to effectively fight crime and drugs in public housing. In addition, the Committee notes that PHAs are authorized to use their operating and capital funds for anti-crime and anti-drug activities. All activities previously authorized under the public housing drug elimination program (PHDEP) are permissible activities under the operating and capital fund accounts.

The recommendation does not adopt the proposal to fund a portion of the Resident Opportunity and Self Sufficiency (ROSS) program under this account, but instead has continued funding for this program under the Public Housing Capital Fund account.

Includes language, as proposed in the budget, restating fundamental principles of appropriations law which prohibits funds appropriated in this Act for fiscal year 2004 payments from being used to supplement a prior year appropriation for prior year payments.

Continues language, carried in prior years, prohibiting funds from being used for section 9(k) activities. Proposed language is not included making funds available for two years.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$50,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	570,269,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 520,269,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+50,000,000

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

The Committee recommends funding HOPE VI at \$50,000,000, of which \$500,000 is for technical assistance. The budget did not request any funding for this program.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$661,600,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	644,782,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	646,600,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+16,818,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+15,000,000

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

The Committee recommends \$661,600,000 for this account, an increase of \$15,000,000 above the budget request, and \$16,818,000 above the fiscal year 2003 level.

The recommendation includes the following: \$1,000,000 for the section 601 Loan Guarantee program to guarantee a total loan volume of \$8,049,000; \$5,000,000 for inspections, training, travel costs, and technical assistance; \$2,200,000 for the National American Indian Housing Council to conduct training programs and to provide technical assistance; no less than \$2,720,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund for information technology systems development and modifications; and \$150,000 for transfer to the HUD salaries and expenses account for administrative expenses.

Proposed language is not included regarding the use of funds to address mold problem because such language is duplicative of existing statute.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$5,300,000	\$197,243,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	5,266,000	197,243,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	1,000,000	27,473,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+34,000	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+4,300	+169,770,000

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

The Committee recommends \$5,300,000 for the section 184 Loan Guarantee program to guarantee a total loan volume of \$197,243,000, an increase of \$4,300,000 above the request and an increase of \$34,000 above the level provided in fiscal year 2003. Language is included transferring \$250,000 to the HUD salaries and expenses account for administrative expenses.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	<sup>1</sup> 0
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> 0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	10,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> - 10,000,000

<sup>1</sup>In fiscal year 2003, funding for this program was provided under the Community Development Fund.

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

The Committee does not recommend funding this program as a separate account as proposed in the budget, but instead continues

funding for this program under the Community Development Fund as provided in fiscal year 2003.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM  
ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program account	Limitation on direct loans
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$1,000,000	\$35,348,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	1,028,000	39,712,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	1,000,000	35,348,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	-28,000	-4,364,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0

The Hawaiian Homelands Homeownership Act of 2000 created the Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund program to provide loan guarantees for native Hawaiian individuals and their families, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and private nonprofit organizations experienced in the planning and development of affordable housing for Native Hawaiians for the purchase, construction, and/or rehabilitation of single-family homes on Hawaiian Home Lands. This program provides access to private sources of financing that would otherwise not be available because of the unique legal status of Hawaiian Home Lands.

The Committee recommends \$1,000,000 for this program to guarantee a total loan volume of \$35,348,000, the full amount requested. Language is included transferring \$35,000 to the HUD salaries and expenses account for administrative expenses.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$297,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	290,102,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	297,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+6,898,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee recommends \$297,000,000, an increase of \$6,898,000 above the fiscal year 2003 level, and the full amount requested. The increase will allow funding for new jurisdictions expected to become eligible for funding in fiscal year 2004, while maintaining funding for existing jurisdictions. Within

the total amount provided, \$2,000,000 is for technical assistance, training and oversight as requested.

The Committee believes that creating new housing opportunities for persons with AIDS should be the priority for HOPWA funding. The Committee is concerned over the prioritization of HOPWA funding to create new housing versus providing services that can be provided by other Federal agencies, including the Department of Health and Human Services. The Committee requests that the Department provide a report no later than August 31, 2003, on the distribution of HOPWA funds in each of the last three fiscal years for hard housing versus service and care expenses in both the formula and national programs. Such report should identify the distribution of funding among various categories of services and care and should specifically identify the amount spent on case management. Such report shall include a specific definition of the types services allowable for funding under the term "case management".

Language is included making funds available for two years. Language is also included, carried in fiscal year 2003, which requires the Secretary to renew expiring permanent supportive housing contracts previously funded under the national competition which meet all program requirements before awarding new competitive grants.

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$25,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	24,837,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+163,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+25,000,000

This account provides funding to rural non-profit organizations, community development corporations, Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State economic development and/or Federally recognized community development agencies.

The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for the Rural Housing and Economic Development program, an increase of \$163,000 above the level provided in fiscal year 2003. The fiscal year 2004 budget proposed to eliminate funding for this program.

Modified language is included, similar to language carried in previous years, requiring the Department to award funds for this program no later than June 30, 2004.

The Committee does not repeat language carried in previous years under this and several other accounts regarding the competitive award of funds because such language is duplicative of existing statutory requirements pursuant to the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 and an administrative provision carried under title II year in the appropriations Act (section 206 of this Act) that require all funds provided to the Department to be competitively awarded unless explicitly authorized otherwise.

EMPOWERMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$15,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	29,850,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 14,850,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+15,000,000

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

The statute that created Round II EZ/ECs did not authorize discretionary grant funding for these communities, but instead authorized tax incentives to stimulate revitalization efforts in these communities. However, since fiscal year 1999, discretionary grant funds have been provided under this account. Therefore, the Committee recommends \$15,000,000 in continued grant funding for the 15 urban Round II EZ/ECs.

Language is included making these funds available for obligation for three years, consistent with the funds availability provided for other community development activities funded within the Department.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$4,959,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	4,904,909,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request <sup>1</sup> .....	4,716,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+54,091,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+227,000,000

<sup>1</sup>The total does not include a legislative proposal assumed in the budget request for a Colonias Gateway Initiative.

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

The Committee recommends a total of \$4,959,000,000 for the Community Development Fund account, a \$54,091,000 increase above the amount provided in fiscal year 2003. Funding under this account is allocated as follows:

- \$4,538,650,000 for Community Development Block Grant formula grants;
- \$72,000,000 for Native American Community Development Block Grants;
- \$33,250,000 for the National Community Development Initiative (NCDI), as follows:
  - \$5,000,000 for Habitat for Humanity capacity building activities, of which \$750,000 is to be used to expand the ability of Indian tribes to participate in the Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity program and other Habitat for Humanity efforts; and
  - \$28,250,000 for the Enterprise Foundation and LISC capacity building activities, including \$5,000,000 for activities in rural areas;
- \$43,000,000 for section 107 activities, as follows:
  - \$7,000,000 for insular areas;
  - \$10,000,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, of which up to \$2,000,000 may be used for technical assistance;
  - \$3,000,000 for Community Development Work Study;
  - \$6,500,000 for Hispanic Serving Institutions;
  - \$7,000,000 for Community Outreach Partnerships; and
  - \$9,500,000 for the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program



- \$3,300,000 for the Housing Assistance Council;
- \$2,400,000 for the National American Indian Housing Council;
- \$5,000,000 for the National Housing Development Corporation (NHDC), for continuation of its program of acquisition, rehabilitation and preservation of at-risk affordable housing;
- \$5,000,000 for the National Council of La Raza, for its national HOPE Fund to leverage additional investments in affordable housing and community development projects;
- \$28,000,000 for the Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity (SHOP) program, a 12 percent increase over the fiscal year 2003 level;
- \$65,000,000 for Youthbuild, including \$2,000,000 for capacity building activities, an 8 percent increase over the fiscal year 2003 level;
- \$137,500,000 for economic development initiatives. Language is included in the bill prohibiting funds from being used for operating expenses of a facility, program or organization, and limiting costs associated with grant and project administration to no more than 20 percent of the total grant award. The Committee notes projects receiving funding must comply with the environmental review requirements set forth in section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 3547); the Committee will not entertain waivers of this requirement. In addition, funds may not be used for reimbursement of expenses incurred prior to the enactment of the Act providing funding for an economic development initiative. Targeted grants shall be provided as follows:
  1. \$25,000 to the 21st Century Council Impact Learning Center in Jackson County, Alabama for completion of facility build out;
  2. \$50,000 to the Huntsville Achievement School in Huntsville, Alabama for completion of facility renovations;
  3. \$75,000 to the Children's Museum of the Shoals in Florence, Alabama for planning and design of a Native American exhibit;
  4. \$75,000 to the Birmingham, Alabama YMCA for construction of a youth center;
  5. \$100,000 to Boaz, Alabama for construction and renovation for the Boaz Community Activities Center;
  6. \$100,000 to the City of Luverne, Alabama for sidewalks, street furniture and façade improvements;
  7. \$100,000 to the Madison County Commission for construction of the Woody Anderson Library in Monrovia, Alabama;
  8. \$200,000 to the City of Opelika, Alabama for rehabilitation of the historic Dallas Armory;
  9. \$200,000 to the Burritt Center in Huntsville, Alabama for building construction;
  10. \$250,000 to Lamar County, Alabama for Industrial Park site development;
  11. \$250,000 to Guntersville, Alabama for renovation of the Community Cultural Arts Center;

12. \$300,000 to Wallace Community College in Dothan, Alabama for facilities construction and renovations for the Southeast Alabama Nursing Initiative;
13. \$300,000 to the City of Huntsville, Alabama for streetscape, beautification and greenways improvements;
14. \$400,000 to Arab, Alabama for construction of a senior center;
15. \$500,000 to the National Children's Advocacy Center in Huntsville, Alabama for facilities planning and improvements;
16. \$900,000 to Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama for construction of a new library;
17. \$75,000 to Arkansas State University Mountain Home for construction of the Vada Sheid Community Development Center;
18. \$75,000 to the Old Independence Regional Museum in Arkansas for facilities renovation;
19. \$75,000 to Arkansas State University Newport for facilities construction at the commercial driver training range;
20. \$75,000 to the Camden Boys and Girls Club in Camden, Arkansas for construction of recreational facilities;
21. \$75,000 to the City of Conway, Arkansas for building and façade renovation in the downtown;
22. \$75,000 to the Bryant Youth Association in Bryant, Arkansas for land acquisition and construction of a Boys and Girls club facility;
23. \$150,000 to North Arkansas College in Harrison, Arkansas for construction of the Conference and Training Center;
24. \$175,000 to the City of Phoenix, Arizona for design and construction of the Rio Salado Audubon Nature Center;
25. \$200,000 to the Marc Center in Mesa, Arizona for the construction of a day treatment and training center for persons with severe developmental disabilities;
26. \$200,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Scottsdale, Arizona for facilities construction in Fountain Hills, Arizona;
27. \$200,000 to the Town of Guadalupe, Arizona for construction and renovation to the Mercado shopping center;
28. \$900,000 to the Dunbar Coalition, Inc. for renovation of facilities for the African-American Historical Museum and Cultural Center;
29. \$75,000 to the East Valley YMCA in North Hollywood, California for facilities renovation;
30. \$75,000 to the Valley Family Center in the San Fernando Valley, California for facilities construction;
31. \$75,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of San Fernando Valley, California for facilities renovation;
32. \$75,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Oxnard and Port Hueneme in California for structural facility improvements;
33. \$75,000 to the City of Oxnard, California for design and construction of an addition to the public library;
34. \$75,000 to Daguhoy Lodge in Stockton, California for facility restoration;
35. \$75,000 to De Anza College in California for planetarium renovation;

36. \$75,000 to the City of Long Beach, California for renovation of the Museum of Latin American Art;
37. \$75,000 to the City of Alhambra, California for renovation of recreational facilities;
38. \$75,000 to the City of Covina, California for renovation of a facility for the homeless;
39. \$75,000 to the City of West Covina, California for construction of a regional community center;
40. \$75,000 to the East San Gabriel Valley Japanese Community Center in California for construction of a social hall;
41. \$90,000 to the City of Fontana, California for acquisition and construction needs at Jack Bulik Park;
42. \$100,000 to the City of Simi Valley, California for build-out and upgrades for the Simi Valley Senior Citizens Center;
43. \$100,000 to North County Solutions for Change for the Futures for Families project to construct regional transitional housing in San Diego, California;
44. \$100,000 to Search to Involve Pilipino Americans in Los Angeles, California for facilities renovation at the Royal Morales Pilipino American Community and Cultural Center;
45. \$100,000 to the Valley Economic Development Center, Inc. in Los Angeles, California for building renovation as part of the Highland Park Commercial Revitalization project;
46. \$100,000 to Santa Clara University in California for planning and design for construction of the "Information Commons";
47. \$100,000 to the City of Palo Alto, California for childrens library renovations;
48. \$100,000 to the City of La Puente, California for construction to expand the city's youth learning center;
49. \$100,000 to the County of Los Angeles, California for planning and construction of a cultural and performing arts center at the El Pueblo de Los Angeles State Historic Park;
50. \$100,000 to the City of Huntington Park, California for development of a downtown redevelopment master plan;
51. \$100,000 to ONEgeneration in the San Fernando Valley, California for construction of an intergenerational daycare center;
52. \$100,000 to the City of Oakley, California for construction of a civic center and town square park;
53. \$100,000 to the City of West Sacramento, California for construction of the Collins Teen Center;
54. \$100,000 to the City of Woodland, California for parking construction;
55. \$125,000 to the City of San Jose, California for construction of a youth facility;
56. \$125,000 to the City of Anaheim, California for land acquisition to expand the La Palma Park;
57. \$150,000 to Food Share, Inc. for facilities expansion and construction for a community kitchen in Ventura County, California;
58. \$150,000 to the City of Oceanside, California for construction of a senior citizens center;
59. \$150,000 to the City of Lancaster, California for development of a Regional Youth Baseball Complex;

60. \$150,000 to the City of San Diego, California for streetscape improvements along Rio Drive in the Skyline-Paradise Hills neighborhood;

61. \$150,000 to the Spanish Speaking Unity Council in Oakland, California for design and construction of a parking facility at Fruitvale Transit Village;

62. \$150,000 to the City of Long Beach, California for construction of multi-use facilities at the Steams Park Community Center;

63. \$150,000 to the East Los Angeles YMCA in Los Angeles, California for facilities renovation;

64. \$150,000 to the City of Inglewood, California for design and construction of a senior center;

65. \$150,000 to the City of Lawndale, California for design and construction of a library;

66. \$175,000 to the Rio Linda Union School District in North Highlands, California for construction of the Oakdale Community Center;

67. \$175,000 to Goodwill Industries of Sacramento, California for construction of a community training center;

68. \$200,000 to the City of San Francisco, California for facility renovation to house emancipated foster children;

69. \$225,000 to the City of Corona, California for construction of the Corona Community Center;

70. \$225,000 to the City of Redding, California for property acquisition and site preparation for the Stillwater Business Park;

71. \$225,000 to the City of Adelanto, California for construction of a retail shopping center;

72. \$225,000 to the City of Lancaster, California for construction of public recreation facilities, parking facilities and property acquisition for the North Downtown Transit Village Project;

73. \$225,000 to the City of Diamond Bar, California for construction of a senior center;

74. \$225,000 to the City of Citrus Heights, California for streetscape improvements along the Auburn Boulevard Commercial Corridor;

75. \$225,000 to the Town of Groveland, California for purchase of a youth center;

76. \$225,000 to the Mission Preservation Foundation in San Juan Capistrano, California for the Great Stone Church restoration project;

77. \$225,000 to Sonoma State University in California for construction of the Green Music Center;

78. \$275,000 to the City of Westminster, California for construction of a community cultural and education center;

79. \$275,000 to Kern County, California for infrastructure improvements for the Imperial Way Industrial Park;

80. \$300,000 for Shelter from the Storm, Inc. in Palm Desert, California for facilities renovations and improvements;

81. \$300,000 to the City of Lincoln, California for the design and construction of a Cultural and Business Center;

82. \$300,000 to the City of Santa Monica, California for renovation of a historic structure for use as a visitors center;

83. \$325,000 to the City of Salinas, California for construction of a swimming pool;
84. \$350,000 to the Palomar YMCA in Escondido, California for construction of an aquatics facility;
85. \$350,000 to the International Agri-Center in Tulare, California for improvements to the Heritage Complex Learning Center and to continued construction of a new exhibit pavilion;
86. \$400,000 to the City of Atascadero, California for construction of a Youth Recreation Center;
87. \$450,000 to the City of Monrovia, California site preparation at the Santa Anita and Sawpit Channels for economic development activities;
88. \$450,000 to Los Angeles County, California for the construction of a new library;
89. \$450,000 to the City of La Mesa, California for facilities construction for the La Mesa PARKS Project;
90. \$450,000 to the City of Desert Hot Springs, California for facilities construction for a civic and community center;
91. \$450,000 to the City of Tracy, California for construction of the Tracy Youth Sports Facility;
92. \$1,000,000 to the California Academy of Sciences in San Francisco, California for renovation of its facility;
93. \$275,000 to the City of Aurora, Colorado for facilities renovation and construction for the Fitzsimmons Commons;
94. \$350,000 to the City of Pueblo, Colorado for the Historic Arkansas Riverwalk Project for facilities construction and improvements for "Gateway Park";
95. \$90,000 to the University of Hartford in Hartford, Connecticut for building renovation to house the Hartt School Performing Arts Center;
96. \$90,000 to the Wadsworth Athenaeum Museum of Art in Hartford, Connecticut for facility renovation and expansion;
97. \$100,000 to Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut for facilities renovation of a former school;
98. \$100,000 to the Town of North Haven, Connecticut for streetscape improvements in the Montowese area;
99. \$100,000 to the City of West Haven, Connecticut for streetscape improvements along Campbell Avenue;
100. \$200,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of the Lower Naugatuck Valley in Ansonia, Connecticut for facilities renovation;
101. \$225,000 to the Town of Enfield, Connecticut for construction of the Family Resource Center;
102. \$300,000 to the City of Waterbury, Connecticut for demolition and removal of abandoned buildings;
103. \$450,000 to the Charles D. Smith, Jr. Foundation for facilities construction for the Stratfield Avenue Redevelopment Project in Bridgeport, Connecticut;
104. \$200,000 to Arena Stage in Washington, D.C. for design and construction of a new facility;
105. \$275,000 to the Good Samaritan Foundation in the District of Columbia for acquisition and construction of the Anacostia Training and Outreach Center;
106. \$300,000 to Gonzaga High School in Washington, District of Columbia for facilities renovation and construction;

107. \$225,000 to Easter Seals, Delaware and Maryland's Eastern Shore for construction of a new facility in Georgetown, Delaware;
108. \$75,000 to the City of Safety Harbor, Florida for streetscape improvements;
109. \$100,000 to the Sebring Airport Authority, Florida for planning for the development of a light industrial/commercial business park;
110. \$1,000,000 for facilities construction for Tampa Bay Watch in Florida;
111. \$100,000 to the City of St. Petersburg, Florida for facilities expansion for the Museum of History;
112. \$100,000 to Lake Mary, Florida for a downtown development improvement program;
113. \$100,000 to the City of St. Petersburg, Florida for restoration of the Jordan School;
114. \$125,000 to the George Washington Carver Community Center in Crystal River area, Florida for facilities construction;
115. \$150,000 to Mainstreet Fort Pierce, Inc. for the restoration and renovation of the Sunrise Theatre building in Fort Pierce, Florida;
116. \$200,000 to the City of Ocoee, Florida for construction of a senior citizen/veterans services facility;
117. \$200,000 to the City of Clearwater, Florida for the Homeless Intervention Project;
118. \$225,000 to the City of Clearwater, Florida for property acquisition for the Clearwater Homeless Intervention Program, Inc. transitional housing project;
119. \$225,000 to the Bishop Planetarium in Bradenton, Florida for facilities reconstruction and restoration;
120. \$250,000 to Osceola County, Florida for construction of a homeless shelter to be operated by Transition House in Kissimmee, Florida;
121. \$250,000 to St. Cloud, Florida for a special needs evacuation, senior, multipurpose center;
122. \$300,000 to the Mainstreet DeLand Association in DeLand, Florida for the Athens Theatre Renovation project;
123. \$300,000 for facilities expansion of the Dali Museum in St. Petersburg, Florida;
124. \$300,000 for the expansion of Ruth Eckerd Hall in Clearwater, Florida;
125. \$325,000 to Orange County, Florida for construction of a senior center;
126. \$350,000 to Central Florida Community College in Ocala, Florida for construction for an Information Technology Center;
127. \$350,000 to Pinellas County, Florida for the renovation of an aviation high technology facility;
128. \$350,000 to Pinellas County, Florida for facilities construction for a folk cultural center;
129. \$450,000 to the City of Boca Raton, Florida for streetscape improvements for the implementation of the Pearl City Master Plan;
130. \$450,000 to the City of Clearwater, Florida for waterfront facilities construction of the 'Beach by Design Initiative';

131. \$500,000 to the City of St. Petersburg, Florida for land acquisition, relocation, demolition and conveyance for the Mid-town retail redevelopment project;
132. \$500,000 to the City of St. Petersburg, Florida for Dome Industrial Park facilities renovation and construction;
133. \$800,000 for facilities construction for the Stetson University College of Law, Tampa, Florida campus;
134. \$900,000 to South Florida Goodwill in Miami, Florida for facilities renovations and upgrades;
135. \$900,000 for construction and redevelopment of the Historic Carlington (Roosevelt) Hotel in Jacksonville, Florida to include residential and commercial property;
136. \$900,000 for Eckerd College in St. Petersburg, Florida for the expansion of the Youth Opportunity and Development Center;
137. \$1,400,000 to the City of Dunedin, Florida for construction of recreation center facilities;
138. \$75,000 to the Bishop State Community College in Mobile, Alabama for construction of a business technology center;
139. \$75,000 to the Town of Lumpkin, Georgia for Westville Village's History Alive building restoration;
140. \$75,000 to the City of Richland Downtown Development Authority in Richland, Georgia for renovation of the Old Richland Hotel;
141. \$75,000 to Thomasville, Georgia for Historic Douglas High School Alumni Association Complex renovation;
142. \$75,000 to the University of Georgia for facility buildout to support a program to support southwest Georgia value-added product development;
143. \$75,000 to DeKalb County, Georgia for planning and construction of a senior center;
144. \$75,000 to the City of Macon, Georgia for renovation of the historic Coca-Cola building;
145. \$75,000 to the Tubman Museum, in Macon, Georgia for building construction;
146. \$75,000 to the Clayton County, Georgia Board of Commissioners for planning and construction of a senior center in Jonesboro;
147. \$100,000 to the City of Plains, Georgia for the construction and facilities buildout at the Rural History Resource Center;
148. \$100,000 to Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital in Dougherty County, Georgia for building renovation;
149. \$100,000 to Morehouse School of Medicine in Atlanta, Georgia for land acquisition;
150. \$100,000 to Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia for construction of facilities to house the African American Archival Program;
151. \$100,000 to Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia for construction of a performing arts center;
152. \$100,000 to Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee for facilities construction,
153. \$115,000 to Albany, Georgia for renovation and construction at Faith Community Outreach Center, Inc. and ren-

ovation of the kitchen at the SOWEGA Council on Aging's Site One Senior Center;

154. \$150,000 to the Joint Development Authority of Ben Hill and Irwin Counties, Georgia for parkland enhancements for Fitzgerald Millennium Technology Pointe;

155. \$160,000 for the Pine Mountain Beautification and Economic Development project in Harris County, Georgia for streetscape improvements;

156. \$225,000 to the City of Monticello, Georgia for recreational facilities improvements and pedestrian pathways for the development of Funderburg Park;

157. \$225,000 to Cobb County, Georgia for construction of the South Cobb Regional Library;

158. \$275,000 to the City of Powder Springs, Georgia for refurbishment of the Coach George E. Ford Center;

159. \$325,000 to the Golden Harvest Food Banks in Augusta, Georgia for facilities construction and improvements for the "Feed the People" campaign;

160. \$360,000 to Columbus, Georgia for land acquisition for the Wilson Camp project;

161. \$525,000 to the City of Moultrie, Georgia for demolition and initial construction of the Swift property;

162. \$130,000 to the Waianae, Hawaii YMCA for facilities construction;

163. \$75,000 to the Family Violence Center in Des Moines, Iowa for facilities renovation;

164. \$75,000 to the Town of Grinnell, Iowa for restoration and rehabilitation of downtown buildings;

165. \$150,000 for the North Central Iowa Regional Solid Waste to Energy Facility in Fort Dodge, Iowa for facilities construction;

166. \$450,000 to Systems Unlimited, Inc. located in Iowa City, Iowa for facilities construction;

167. \$225,000 for construction for the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial project in Idaho;

168. \$300,000 to Franklin County, Idaho for the moving, renovation, restoration of the Oneida Stake Academy building in Preston, Idaho;

169. \$700,000 to Idaho State University for facilities construction for the L.E. and Thelma E. Stephens Performing Arts Center;

170. \$100,000 to the University of Idaho for planning and design of the Lionel Hampton Center;

171. \$75,000 to Lawrence Hall Youth Services in Chicago, Illinois for facility construction;

172. \$100,000 for the Tazewell-Woodford Head Start program in East Peoria, Illinois for the continued construction of a new facility;

173. \$100,000 to the Southeast Chicago Development Commission in Chicago, Illinois for building construction for a shopping center;

174. \$125,000 to Knox College in Galesburg, Illinois for Alumni Hall renovations;

175. \$125,000 to Western Illinois University for facility renovation at the Quad City Campus;



176. \$150,000 to the Canal Corridor Association for the Port of LaSalle Project in LaSalle, Illinois including construction of an outdoor interpretive center, a replica mule barn, and construction of a lock-tender's house;

177. \$175,000 to the Chicago Children's Choir Academy in Illinois for facility construction;

178. \$175,000 to the Rebirth of Englewood Community Development Corporation in Chicago, Illinois for purchase and renovation of a building to serve as a community center;

179. \$200,000 to the Dupage County Convalescent Center in Wheaton, Illinois for facilities renovations and improvements;

180. \$200,000 to the Northfield Park District, Illinois for facilities renovation and rehabilitation;

181. \$200,000 to the National Great Rivers Research and Education Center in Illinois for facilities construction;

182. \$225,000 for the Morton Arboretum in Lisle, Illinois for construction of a new visitor center;

183. \$225,000 to Eastern Illinois University for construction of a textbook storage and rental facility;

184. \$225,000 for the Rialto Square Theater in Joliet, Illinois for facilities restoration and improvements;

185. \$250,000 for Lincoln Christian College in Lincoln, Illinois for the restoration of the Earl C. Hargrove Auditorium;

186. \$250,000 to the Village of Homewood, Illinois for purchase and renovation of the Canadian National Railroad Depot;

187. \$250,000 to the Village of Western Springs, Illinois for construction of a storage facility and park amphitheater;

188. \$300,000 to the Marklund Children's Home in Glendale, Heights, Illinois for facilities construction and renovation;

189. \$375,000 to the Ray Graham Association for People with Disabilities located in Downers Grove, Illinois for facilities improvements;

190. \$650,000 to Bradley University in Peoria, Illinois for renovation of Bradley Hall;

191. \$700,000 to the City of DeKalb, Illinois for revitalization of East Lincoln Highway including building rehabilitation, streetscape improvements and beautification;

192. \$1,300,000 to Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois for facilities construction;

193. \$100,000 to the City of Jeffersonville, Indiana for renovation of the Carnegie Library;

194. \$175,000 to the City of Anderson, Indiana for facilities construction of the Anderson Business Development Center;

195. \$175,000 to the City of Indianapolis, Indiana for façade restoration and streetscape along the East Tenth Street corridor;

196. \$200,000 to the African American Achievers Youth Corporation in Gary, Indiana for renovation of the Glen Theater;

197. \$300,000 to the University of Saint Francis in Fort Wayne, Indiana for construction and buildout of the proposed Professional Development Center;

198. \$400,000 to the City of South Bend, Indiana for site acquisition and demolition for the Studebaker Corridor redevelopment initiative;

199. \$500,000 to the James Whitcombe Riley Hospital for Children in Indianapolis, Indiana for the expansion and renovation of the Children's Emergency and Trauma Center;
200. \$600,000 to North Township, Indiana for renovation and construction of recreational facilities, parking, lighting and landscaping improvements at Wicker Memorial Park;
201. \$120,000 to the City of Topeka, Kansas for development of the Shawnee County Industrial Park;
202. \$150,000 to Catholic Housing of Wyandotte County, Kansas for renovation of the St. Mary's Church for reuse as part of the St. Peter/Waterway Redevelopment Project;
203. \$175,000 to the Wichita Art Museum in Wichita, Kansas for facilities renovation, construction and improvements for the second Art Investigation Gallery;
204. \$200,000 to Sedan, Kansas for renovation of the historic Bradford Hotel;
205. \$275,000 to the Smokey Hill Education Service Center in Salina, Kansas for technology upgrades;
206. \$275,000 to the City of Topeka, Kansas for land acquisition, facilities improvements and pedestrian trails for the Great Overland Station Riverfront Park;
207. \$75,000 to the Louisville Jefferson County Metropolitan Government, Kentucky for the renovation of the Sun Valley Community Center;
208. \$100,000 to the LaRue County Fiscal Court, Kentucky to study the feasibility of creating a visitors center for the area;
209. \$100,000 to the Fivco Area Development District in Kentucky for construction of a multipurpose facility at EastPark;
210. \$100,000 for North Star Productions, Inc. in Bracken County, Kentucky for construction of an amphitheater;
211. \$200,000 to the City of Renfro Valley, Kentucky for construction of a municipal conference and civic center;
212. \$225,000 for the Trinity Family Life Center in Louisville, Kentucky for continued facilities construction;
213. \$225,000 to Cumberland College in Williamsburg, Kentucky for construction of a campus technology facility;
214. \$225,000 to the London-Laurel County Tourism Committee, Kentucky for construction of the Blue-Gray Civil War Theme Park;
215. \$225,000 to Casey County, Kentucky for development and engineering for the Agricultural and Exposition Center;
216. \$450,000 to the Center for Rural Development in Somerset, Kentucky for facilities renovation and expansion;
217. \$700,000 to the Louisville Medical Center Development Corporation for property acquisition for development of a research park in Louisville, Kentucky;
218. \$50,000 to St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana for construction of a veterans memorial;
219. \$75,000 to the Downtown Development District in New Orleans, Louisiana for sidewalk replacements and enhancements;
220. \$75,000 to the Town of Ferriday, Louisiana for Main Street streetscape work;

221. \$75,000 to Alexandria and Pineville, Louisiana for an economic revitalization study focused on the Red River waterfront;

222. \$200,000 to the Amistad Research Center at Tulane University in New Orleans, Louisiana for facilities restoration of the Tilden Library to house Center records;

223. \$200,000 to the City of DeQuincy, Louisiana for building renovation, land acquisition, streetscape and facade improvements;

224. \$225,000 to the Town of New Roads, Louisiana facilities construction and renovation, and sidewalks, street furniture and facade improvements;

225. \$450,000 to the National Center for Community Renewal for facilities renovation and expansion in Shreveport, Louisiana;

226. \$450,000 to the Audubon Nature Institute for facilities construction in Baton Rouge and New Orleans, Louisiana;

227. \$50,000 to the Chelsea Green Space and Recreation Committee in Massachusetts for construction of a park, including a boardwalk and benches;

228. \$75,000 to the Town of Randolph, Massachusetts for the rehabilitation of the historic Stetson Town Hall;

229. \$100,000 to the Roxbury Boys and Girls Club in Roxbury, Massachusetts for renovation of the Roxbury Clubhouse;

230. \$100,000 to Salem State College in Salem, Massachusetts for construction of a theatre;

231. \$100,000 to the Essex National Heritage Commission for Community Resource in Massachusetts for development of a plan for a visitors services and archives center;

232. \$135,000 to the City of Worcester, Massachusetts for land acquisition and building renovations in the Gardner-Kilby-Hammond neighborhood;

233. \$175,000 to the Lawrence, Massachusetts Boys and Girls Club for recreational facilities renovations;

234. \$200,000 to the City of Springfield, Massachusetts for design development and renovation of an existing public market;

235. \$200,000 to Springfield College, in Springfield, Massachusetts for planning and construction of a field house;

236. \$200,000 to North Adams, Massachusetts for renovation of the North Adams Armory into a community center;

237. \$200,000 to Greenfield, Massachusetts for renovation of the First National Bank Building;

238. \$350,000 to the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences in Worcester, Massachusetts for construction of new multi-use education facilities;

239. \$75,000 to the City of Rockville, Maryland for construction of a park at King Mill;

240. \$90,000 to the Melwood Horticultural Training Center in Prince Georges County, Maryland for facilities renovation;

241. \$100,000 to the City of District Heights, Maryland for facade and building renovation in the city's commercial area;

242. \$100,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Washington in Silver Spring, Maryland for purchase of the D.C. Metropolitan Police Boys and Girls Club facility;

243. \$150,000 to the Olney Theatre for the Arts in Olney, Maryland for construction of a theater;

244. \$160,000 to the Bowie Regional Arts Vision Association in Bowie, Maryland for construction of a new community theater;

245. \$175,000 to the 20th Street H.O.P.E. House in Baltimore, Maryland for facilities expansion and renovation;

246. \$200,000 to Mt. Ranier, Maryland for facilities rehabilitation in the Gateway Arts District;

247. \$350,000 for the National Federation of the Blind Research and Training Institute in Baltimore, Maryland for facilities construction;

248. \$75,000 to the Maine Environmental Research Institute (MERI) in Blue Hill, Maine for facilities renovation;

249. \$75,000 to Rumford Hospital in Maine for facility renovation;

250. \$150,000 to the People's Regional Opportunity Program in Portland, Maine for construction of a community center in the Parkside neighborhood;

251. \$100,000 for St. Mary's College in Orchard Lake, Michigan for renovation of library and dormitory facilities;

252. \$125,000 for Lawrence Tech in Southfield, Michigan for facilities renovation and enhancements for the Center for Innovative Materials for Infrastructure Security;

253. \$125,000 for the Michigan Jewish Institute for construction, buildout, and equipment for the College Academic Center;

254. \$125,000 to Genesee County, Michigan for land acquisition in support of the Genesee County Land Reutilization Plan, in collaboration with the City of Flint;

255. \$175,000 to the City of Detroit, Michigan for demolition of abandoned housing stock;

256. \$175,000 to the City of Detroit, Michigan for design and construction of the Belle Isle Natural Zoo;

257. \$200,000 for Boyssville of Michigan for renovations and upgrades at various locations;

258. \$200,000 to the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences in Ann Arbor, Michigan for facilities improvements and buildout related to the development and deployment of advanced technologies to the manufacturing base;

259. \$200,000 to Focus: HOPE in Detroit, Michigan for renovation of the New Central Warehouse;

260. \$200,000 to the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services in Dearborn, Michigan for construction of an Arab American National Museum and Cultural Center;

261. \$225,000 to Cleary University in Howell, Michigan for construction of the Center for Business and Community Excellence;

262. \$225,000 to the City of Menominee, Michigan for renovation of recreational facilities;

263. \$300,000 to Mercy Hospital Cadillac in Cadillac, Michigan for facilities construction and renovations for the Healthcare Improvement and Access Initiative;

264. \$450,000 for Automotion Alley for facilities construction, improvements and buildout for a Technology Center in Troy, Michigan;

265. \$75,000 to Chicanos Latinos En Servicio (CLUES) in St. Paul, Minnesota for facility construction;

266. \$100,000 to the Audubon Center of the North Woods in Minnesota for facilities construction and renovation;

267. \$100,000 to Leech Lake Tribal College in Minnesota for planning and site development for establishment of a new campus;

268. \$125,000 to Fond Du Lac Tribal and Community College in Minnesota for design and construction of a multi-use facility;

269. \$150,000 to the Minneapolis American Indian Center in Minneapolis, Minnesota for facility renovation and construction;

270. \$150,000 to the Greater Minneapolis Council of Churches in North Minneapolis, Minnesota for construction of the Center for Families;

271. \$150,000 to the Northside Residents Redevelopment Council in Minneapolis, Minnesota for building construction;

272. \$150,000 to the Labor Interpretive Center in Minnesota for construction of a memorial;

273. \$225,000 to the Redwood County Agricultural Society in Minnesota for fairground grandstand renovation and construction of facilities;

274. \$275,000 to Dakota County, Minnesota for land acquisition for open space preservation;

275. \$60,000 to the City of Joplin, Missouri for a feasibility study and facilities improvements for the restoration of the Joplin Union Depot;

276. \$75,000 to the City of St. Louis, Missouri for restoration of the Eugene Field House;

277. \$100,000 to the City of St. Louis, Missouri for streetscape improvements;

278. \$100,000 to St. Louis County, Missouri for streetscape improvements;

279. \$100,000 to Jefferson County, Missouri for streetscape improvements along Jeffco Boulevard;

280. \$100,000 to the Liberty Memorial Museum in Kansas City, Missouri for museum renovation;

281. \$100,000 to the City of Kansas City, Missouri for streetscape improvements in the Union Hill District;

282. \$175,000 to the City of Cape Girardeau, Missouri for the painting of a mural on the Cape Girardeau, Missouri flood wall;

283. \$225,000 to the Show-Me Aquatics and Fitness Center in O'Fallon, Missouri for land acquisition and facilities construction;

284. \$225,000 to the Missouri Soybean Association for the purchase of a building for use as an Incubation Center in Kansas City, Missouri;

285. \$900,000 to the City of Springfield, Missouri for construction of a community multipurpose facility;

286. \$100,000 to the Town of Bolton Development Corporation in Bolton, Mississippi for acquisition and renovation of a multipurpose community facility;
287. \$150,000 to Harrison County, Mississippi for construction of waterfront facilities;
288. \$325,000 to the City of Meridian, Mississippi for renovation of the Grand Opera House;
289. \$325,000 to the Yoknapatawpha Arts Council in Oxford, Mississippi for facilities renovation;
290. \$300,000 to the Yellowstone Boys and Girls Ranch in Billings, Montana for facilities construction and renovations;
291. \$75,000 to CAARE, Inc. in Durham County, North Carolina for construction, renovation and buildout of a one-stop service center for individuals affected by HIV/AIDS;
292. \$100,000 to the City of Greenville, North Carolina for building demolition and building renovation in the West Greenville neighborhood;
293. \$100,000 to the North Carolina Institute of Minority Economic for restoration, renovation and buildout of a building in downtown Durham, North Carolina;
294. \$125,000 to North Carolina Community Development Initiative Capital, Inc. for capitalization of a loan fund;
295. \$125,000 to the Food Bank of North Carolina for renovation and buildout of a food bank facility;
296. \$125,000 to Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina for renovation of residence halls;
297. \$135,000 to Bladen's Bloomin' Agri-Industrial, Inc. in Bladen County, North Carolina for construction of a business incubator;
298. \$150,000 to the North Carolina Community Development Initiative for acquisition of property;
299. \$175,000 to the City of Raleigh, North Carolina for reuse planning for the Fayetteville Street Mall and for streetscape improvements, pedestrian benches, street lights, tree planting, entertainment space construction and water fountain construction;
300. \$200,000 to the Town of Wadesboro, North Carolina for facilities renovations to the Ansonia Theatre;
301. \$200,000 to the City of Durham, North Carolina for revitalizing Historic Parrish Street, including facilities construction/renovation and buildout; economic development planning assistance; sidewalks, street furniture, and façade improvements; and land acquisition;
302. \$200,000 to the Grape Arbor Development Corporation for construction and buildout of a Youth Enhancement Center;
303. \$200,000 to North Carolina Central University for construction, buildout, and equipment for a bioprocessing research institute;
304. \$225,000 to Mayland Community College in Spruce Pine, North Carolina for facilities renovations for the Lexington project;
305. \$225,000 to the Graveyard of the Atlantic Museum in Hatteras, North Carolina for facilities construction;

306. \$250,000 to the Central Piedmont Community College American Academy of Applied Forensics in Charlotte, North Carolina for facilities construction;

307. \$275,000 to the Town of Troy, North Carolina for a pilot program for the construction of affordable housing;

308. \$675,000 to the Pisgah Forest Institute at Brevard College in Brevard, North Carolina for facilities construction;

309. \$175,000 to Sitting Bull College on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in North Dakota for facilities planning and construction;

310. \$325,000 to Girls and Boys Town of Boys Town, Nebraska for the national priority projects of Girls and Boys Town USA;

311. \$450,000 for Falls City, Nebraska for the development of infrastructure for an industrial park;

312. \$450,000 to the Boys and Girls Home of Nebraska for renovation of the Columbus Community Hospital in Columbus, Nebraska;

313. \$80,000 for the Lancaster Main Street Program in Lancaster, New Hampshire for facilities renovations and improvements for the Great North Woods Welcome Center;

314. \$225,000 for the Nashua Senior Activity Center in Nashua, New Hampshire for facilities expansion and renovation;

315. \$75,000 to Ujima Ministries, Inc. in Mercer County, New Jersey for facilities construction;

316. \$75,000 to the County of Hunterdon, New Jersey for design and construction of a senior center;

317. \$100,000 to Rowan University in Mantua, New Jersey for facilities construction and renovation for the Southern Jersey Technology Park;

318. \$125,000 to the Essex County Environmental Center in Roseland, New Jersey for renovation and construction to accommodate facilities expansion;

319. \$175,000 to the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey for facilities expansion to support the Geriatric Research Center;

320. \$200,000 to the City of North Wildwood, New Jersey for facilities improvements for the beach, boardwalk and entertainment district;

321. \$200,000 to Hamilton Township, New Jersey for building demolition and renovations for the American Metro Center;

322. \$200,000 to Brookdale Community College in Wall Township, New Jersey for rehabilitation and remodeling of buildings at the New Jersey Coastal Community;

323. \$200,000 to the Jersey City Medical Center in New Jersey for construction;

324. \$225,000 to the Morris Area YMCA, Morris County, New Jersey for facilities construction and renovation;

325. \$225,000 to the Somerset Hills YMCA in Basking Ridge, New Jersey for facilities construction and renovation;

326. \$225,000 to Ramapo College of New Jersey for construction of the Bill Bradley Sports and Recreation Center;

327. \$225,000 to the Hammonton Revitalization Corporation in Hammonton, New Jersey for property acquisition and

streetscape improvements for the Mainstreet Hammonton Project;

328. \$225,000 to Rutgers University in New Jersey for land acquisition for LEAP University High School;

329. \$250,000 to the Edison Preservation Foundation in New Jersey for building rehabilitation;

330. \$300,000 to the Township of Mount Holly, New Jersey, for an economic planning study for the Mount Holly bypass corridor (\$50,000) and for construction of affordable housing units (\$250,000);

331. \$380,000 to the Borough of North Arlington, New Jersey for sidewalk, curbs and façade improvements in the Morton Avenue neighborhood;

332. \$100,000 to the Hubbard Museum of the American West located in Ruidoso, New Mexico for facilities expansion;

333. \$100,000 to Rio Arriba County, New Mexico for construction of a community center;

334. \$225,000 to the Wheels Museum, Inc. for planning and land acquisition;

335. \$75,000 to the City of Las Vegas, Nevada for renovation of a post office for reuse;

336. \$75,000 to the City of North Las Vegas, Nevada for planning and construction of a public library;

337. \$200,000 to the City of Henderson, Nevada for the purchase and renovation of buildings to revitalize the downtown area;

338. \$225,000 to the City of Sparks, Nevada for rehabilitation of the Deer Park Pool facilities;

339. \$60,000 to the Town of Niagara, New York to complete buildout of a community center;

340. \$75,000 to Eastern Long Island Hospital in Greenport, New York for facilities renovation;

341. \$75,000 to the Town of Brookhaven, New York for construction of the Gorden Heights Community Center;

342. \$75,000 to the Broome County Jewish Community Center in Binghamton, New York for renovation and construction of an early childhood development center;

343. \$75,000 to the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Greater Suffolk, Inc. in Suffolk County, New York for land acquisition;

344. \$75,000 to the Town of Freeport, New York for renovations of buildings;

345. \$75,000 to the Town of North Hempstead for streetscape, façade and building renovation in the hamlet of New Cassel;

346. \$75,000 to the Cross Island YMCA of Queens, New York for facilities expansion and renovation;

347. \$75,000 to the Jamaica YMCA of Jamaica in New York, New York for facilities expansion and renovation;

348. \$75,000 to 1409 Enterprises, Inc. in Buffalo, New York for facilities renovation;

349. \$80,000 to Wayne County, New York for relocation of and renovations to the Wolcott Carriage House;

350. \$80,000 to the Castle Hill, Bronx, New York YMCA for facilities construction;



351. \$100,000 to the Staten Island Economic Development Corporation located in New York for completion of an updated Overall Economic Development Plan;

352. \$100,000 to the Metropolitan Development Association in Syracuse, New York for the VISION 2010 Economic Development plan;

353. \$100,000 to Wayne County, New York for a feasibility study on the planned reuse of the surplus real estate of the Newark Developmental Center Area;

354. \$100,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for renovations to the Redhouse Theater;

355. \$100,000 to the Gloria Wise Boys and Girls Club in the Bronx, New York for facilities renovation;

356. \$100,000 to the Town of Greenburgh, New York for expansion and renovation of a public library;

357. \$100,000 to the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson, New York for renovations to a senior and youth community center;

358. \$100,000 to the Village of Briarcliff Manor, New York for streetscape improvements;

359. \$100,000 to the Regional Foodbank of Northeastern New York for construction and renovation of facilities;

360. \$100,000 to the 59th Street Recreation Center in New York, New York for facilities renovation;

361. \$100,000 to the City of New York's Department of Parks and Recreation for construction of a nature center in Crotona Park;

362. \$125,000 to the Village of Saugerties, New York for streetscape including sidewalk replacement;

363. \$125,000 to the Town of Sleepy Hollow, New York for construction of a new senior center;

364. \$125,000 to the City of Yonkers, New York for renovation of the Nepperhan Valley Technology Center;

365. \$125,000 to Alianza Dominicana Inc. in New York, New York for facilities construction;

366. \$125,000 to Boricua College in New York for building renovation;

367. \$125,000 to the Washington Heights' Armory Foundation for facilities renovations;

368. \$140,000 to the Broadway Market Management Corp. in Buffalo, New York for renovation of the Broadway Market;

369. \$150,000 to the Staten Island University Hospital for the construction of the Regina McGinn Education Center in New York;

370. \$150,000 to On Your Mark in Staten Island, New York for facilities renovations for a community center;

371. \$150,000 to the Town of Lancaster, New York for construction activities of the Landmark Clock project;

372. \$150,000 to the Village of Owego, New York for construction of a community center;

373. \$150,000 to LaGuardia Community College in New York for facilities renovation to house a small business incubator;

374. \$150,000 to the Brooklyn Public Library in New York for restoration of the central plaza;

375. \$200,000 to the Elizabeth Pierce Olmsted Center in Cheektowaga, New York for construction of an affordable housing project for handicapped individuals with an emphasis on individuals with visual impairments;
376. \$200,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for renovation of the Girls Inc. building;
377. \$200,000 to Onondaga County, New York for restoration of the Nine Mile Creek Aqueduct in Camillus, New York;
378. \$200,000 to the Hebrew Academy for Special Children in Brooklyn, New York for construction and renovation of a facility;
379. \$200,000 to Schenectady, New York for expansion of Proctor's Theatre;
380. \$200,000 to the Greater Ridgewood Restoration Corporation in New York for streetscape improvements along the Brooklyn/Queens border;
381. \$225,000 to Putnam County, New York for streetscape improvements along the Rt. 52 Corridor;
382. \$225,000 to the City of Long Beach, New York for the Reynolds Channel Waterfront Rediscovery Project for construction of a Marine Environment Center, pedestrian trails, and recreational facilities;
383. \$225,000 to D'Youville College in Buffalo, New York for facilities renovation, expansion and buildout for the D'Youville College Library Improvement project;
384. \$250,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for renovations to a stone building in Elmwood Park;
385. \$250,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for facilities renovation of the Open Hand Theater;
386. \$250,000 to Onondaga County, New York for construction and expansion of the North Area YMCA;
387. \$250,000 to the State University of New York Environmental School of Forestry for facility renovations and improvements in Onondaga Park;
388. \$250,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for Automobile Row streetscape improvements;
389. \$275,000 to the Natural History Museum of the Adirondacks for construction of a new museum;
390. \$280,000 to the Bedford-Stuyvesant YMCA in Brooklyn, New York for renovation and construction of a youth and family center;
391. \$300,000 to Houghton College, New York for renovation of the Paine Science Center;
392. \$300,000 to Wayne County, New York for demolition and facilities construction improvements at Sodus Point Park;
393. \$350,000 to Per Scholas: Workforce Enterprise Service in the Bronx, New York for renovation of warehouse space to house the WorkSmart program;
394. \$375,000 to the Town of Babylon, New York for facilities construction for the redevelopment of Oak Beach Park;
395. \$400,000 to the Mary Mitchell Family and Youth Center in the Bronx, New York for construction of the Austin Jacobo Center for Community Leadership;
396. \$450,000 to the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry for the acquisition, ren-

ovation and construction of facilities for the North Country Campus Economic Development and Improvement Program in Clayton, New York;

397. \$450,000 to the Belmont Shelter Corporation for the construction of the Shawnee Landing Senior Apartments in Wheatfield, New York;

398. \$450,000 to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City for façade restoration improvements;

399. \$450,000 to Jazz at Lincoln Center in New York City for facilities construction;

400. \$450,000 to the New York Public Library in New York City for renovations to their Map Division;

401. \$500,000 to Onondaga County, New York for renovations to the Fayetteville Library;

402. \$500,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for facilities restoration and expansion of the Landmark Theater;

403. \$500,000 to the WXXI Public Broadcasting Council in Rochester, New York for facilities construction and improvements for an Educational Outreach Center;

404. \$500,000 to Wayne County, New York to construct a new Livestock building at the Wayne County fairgrounds;

405. \$675,000 to the New York Olympic Regional Development Authority for facilities construction for the Mount Van Hoevenberg Olympics Sports Complex;

406. \$1,000,000 to Nazareth College in Rochester, New York for renovations of their Academic Center;

407. \$1,350,000 to Utica College of Syracuse in Utica, New York for design and construction for the expansion of science facilities;

408. \$75,000 to the City of Lorain, Ohio for land acquisition for the Central Lorain Neighborhood Redevelopment project;

409. \$75,000 to the Akron City Hospital in Akron, Ohio for facility construction;

410. \$75,000 to the Southside Community Development Corporation in Youngstown, Ohio for renovation of the former Southside Medical Center;

411. \$100,000 for Jamestown, Ohio to renovate the Jamestown Opera House;

412. \$100,000 to Tuscarawas County, Ohio for infrastructure for an industrial park;

413. \$100,000 to Ross County, Ohio for construction of a regional multipurpose facility in Chillicothe, Ohio;

414. \$100,000 to the Center for Families and Children in Cleveland, Ohio for design and construction of a medical campus;

415. \$100,000 to COMPASS Toledo in Toledo, Ohio for facilities rehabilitation;

416. \$100,000 to Ohio Theatre, Inc. in Toledo, Ohio for marquee and façade rehabilitation of the Ohio Theatre;

417. \$100,000 to North River Development Corporation in Toledo, Ohio for economic development planning for the Galena Street Redevelopment Project;

418. \$100,000 to the Bay Area Neighborhood Development Corporation in Sandusky, Ohio for facilities improvements and construction in blighted areas;

419. \$125,000 to the Ottawa Community Development Corporation in Toledo, Ohio for building construction and renovation along Monroe Street;
420. \$125,000 to the East Toledo Family Center in Toledo, Ohio for building renovations;
421. \$150,000 to the City of Marietta, Ohio for construction of a community recreation center;
422. \$200,000 to the City of Oberlin, Ohio for construction to support the East College Street Project;
423. \$200,000 to the City of Toledo, Ohio for renovation of a community recreation facility;
424. \$200,000 to the J. Frank Troy Senior Center in Toledo, Ohio for renovation and construction;
425. \$225,000 to the Dayton/Montgomery County Port Authority, Ohio for land acquisition, demolition, and site development for a commercial office center at Patterson Place;
426. \$275,000 to the City of St. Clairsville, Ohio for restoration of the Clarendon Hotel;
427. \$300,000 for Ohio Wesleyan University to renovate Merrick Hall;
428. \$300,000 for Catholic Social Services in Springfield, Ohio for renovation of a facility to house the Second Harvest Foodbank;
429. \$300,000 for the Springfield Arts Council for renovation of the Veterans Park Amphitheater in Springfield, Ohio;
430. \$350,000 to the Cincinnati Museum Center in Cincinnati, Ohio for restoration and expansion of facilities;
431. \$350,000 to Lake Erie College in Painesville, Ohio for construction of an athletic and wellness center;
432. \$450,000 to the Portsmouth Area Chamber of Commerce in Portsmouth, Ohio for construction of the Scioto County Welcome Center;
433. \$2,100,000 to the City of Canton, Ohio for property acquisition;
434. \$150,000 to the Heartland of America Foundation for facilities construction for the Heartland of America Museum in Weatherford, Oklahoma;
435. \$150,000 to Area Neighbors in Wagoner, Oklahoma for facilities construction;
436. \$225,000 to the Lawton/Fort Sill Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Lawton, Oklahoma for construction of the National Army Museum of the Southwest;
437. \$225,000 to the Standing Bear Museum and Education Center in Ponca City, Oklahoma for facilities construction;
438. \$75,000 to Douglas County, Oregon for construction of a community recreation pavilion at the Marina RV Resort;
439. \$75,000 to the City of Albany, Oregon for construction of the Swanson Family Aquatic Center;
440. \$90,000 to the City of Portland, Oregon for Portland Central City streetscape and neighborhood integration planning;
441. \$100,000 to the City of Springfield, Oregon for renovation of the Richard E. Wildish Community Theater;
442. \$100,000 to the City of Portland, Oregon for architectural and engineering design for the Portland Public Market;

443. \$125,000 to the City of Salem, Oregon for construction of a civic center;
444. \$275,000 for Union and Wallowa Counties, Oregon for purchase of a railroad line for tourism development;
445. \$50,000 to the City of McKeesport, Pennsylvania to complete refurbishment of the Riverview Playground;
446. \$75,000 to the Penn-Brad Oil Museum in Bradford, Pennsylvania for facilities improvements and landscaping;
447. \$75,000 to the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for Blue Horizon façade restoration;
448. \$75,000 to the Rock School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for facilities renovation;
449. \$75,000 to the Pittsburgh Urban Redevelopment Authority in Pennsylvania for land acquisition in the Larimer neighborhood;
450. \$75,000 to the Bloomfield Garfield Corporation in Pennsylvania for renovation of the St. Joseph's Nursing Home for reuse;
451. \$75,000 to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania for land acquisition for the expansion of Frick Park;
452. \$75,000 to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania for property acquisition along the Centre Avenue Corridor;
453. \$100,000 to the Borough of Morrisville, Pennsylvania for a redevelopment study;
454. \$100,000 to the Hepatitis B Foundation in conjunction with Delaware Valley College for the planning and design of a Biotechnology Research Complex in the Philadelphia suburbs of Bucks County, Pennsylvania;
455. \$100,000 to the National Trust for Historic Gettysburg, Pennsylvania for restoration of the Majestic Theater;
456. \$100,000 to the Strand-Capitol Performing Arts Center in York City, Pennsylvania for facilities renovation;
457. \$100,000 to the Sultan Ahmad Community Foundation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for community center construction;
458. \$100,000 to ONUNDE, Inc of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for facility construction;
459. \$100,000 to the Absalom Jones Foundation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for renovation of the Historic Grand Lodge;
460. \$100,000 to the Philadelphia Dance Company in Pennsylvania for renovation of performance facilities;
461. \$100,000 to the Greater Germantown Housing Development Corporation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for renovations to buildings;
462. \$100,000 to the Parkside Historic Preservation Corporation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for renovations to buildings;
463. \$100,000 to Cheltenham Township, Pennsylvania for renovations to buildings;
464. \$100,000 to Mt. Airy USA in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for renovations to buildings;
465. \$100,000 to the Beech Capital Venture Corporation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for renovations to buildings;
466. \$100,000 to Mercy-Douglass Center of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for facilities renovation;

467. \$100,000 to the Borough of Jenkintown, Pennsylvania for renovation of a theater;
468. \$100,000 to the Borough of Minersville, Pennsylvania for streetscape improvements;
469. \$100,000 to the Seldom Seen Mine in Patton, Pennsylvania for facilities renovations to permit display of equipment;
470. \$125,000 to the City of Lebanon, Pennsylvania for demolition and building restoration;
471. \$125,000 to the City of Lebanon, Pennsylvania for construction of recreation facilities for the Lebanon Valley Family YMCA;
472. \$125,000 to the City of Pittston, Pennsylvania for land acquisition, facilities renovation and demolition;
473. \$125,000 to the City of Scranton, Pennsylvania for land acquisition, facilities renovation and demolition;
474. \$150,000 to the Pennridge Senior Center for the planning, design, and construction of a senior center in Perkasie, Pennsylvania;
475. \$150,000 to the Borough of Donora, Pennsylvania for construction of a pavilion at Palmer Park;
476. \$200,000 to Indiana University of Pennsylvania for construction of an on-campus multi-use facility;
477. \$200,000 to the Borough of Northern Cambria, Pennsylvania for construction of a community recreation center;
478. \$200,000 to Fayette County, Pennsylvania for renovation of the Wellness and Research Center;
479. \$200,000 to Greene County, Pennsylvania for renovation of a community center;
480. \$200,000 to Mount Aloysius College in Pennsylvania for renovation of Alumni Hall;
481. \$225,000 to the Phoenixville Area Economic Development Corporation for restoration of the Phoenixville Foundry building in Phoenixville Borough, Pennsylvania;
482. \$225,000 for the Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program of Western Pennsylvania for acquisition or facilities construction;
483. \$225,000 to the Westmoreland County Industrial Development Corporation for property acquisition and demolition for the Jeannette, Pennsylvania Downtown Redevelopment Plan;
484. \$250,000 to the Urban Education Research and Retreat Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for facility renovations at the 4601 Market Street Building;
485. \$250,000 to the City of Lower Burrell, Pennsylvania for construction of recreational facilities at Community Park, including a pavilion;
486. \$250,000 to Seton Hill College in Greensburg, Pennsylvania for construction of recreational facilities;
487. \$300,000 to the Borough of Brownsville, Pennsylvania for building renovation;
488. \$300,000 to Washington & Jefferson College in Washington, Pennsylvania for renovation of downtown buildings;
489. \$300,000 to Ford City, Pennsylvania for renovation of industrial park buildings;

490. \$300,000 to Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania for building renovation in the Monessen Riverfront Industrial Park;
491. \$325,000 to the University Technology Park, Inc. in Chester, Pennsylvania for facilities construction;
492. \$350,000 to the City of Erie, Pennsylvania for facilities construction at the former EMI/Gunite Corporation facility;
493. \$350,000 to the Oil Creek Railway Historical Society located in Titusville, Pennsylvania for facilities renovations, upgrades, landscaping and for the purchase of railway cars;
494. \$350,000 for construction of a community center in Dushore, Sullivan County, Pennsylvania;
495. \$450,000 to the City of Johnstown, Pennsylvania for construction of a war memorial and conference center;
496. \$75,000 to the Town of West Warwick, Rhode Island for construction of a senior/community center;
497. \$100,000 to the Town of Burrillville, Rhode Island for recreational facilities construction and renovation at the Branch River and Hauser Memorial Field Park areas, including pedestrian walkways;
498. \$250,000 to the City of Central Falls, Rhode Island for recreational facilities construction and renovation;
499. \$100,000 to the Eau Claire Development Corporation in South Carolina for land acquisition near Farrow Road;
500. \$150,000 to the Golden Harvest Food Bank in Aiken, South Carolina for facilities expansion for the Feed the People project;
501. \$150,000 to Lee County, South Carolina for Ashwood Gymnasium renovations;
502. \$150,000 to Calhoun County, South Carolina for construction of a community recreational facility;
503. \$225,000 to the South Carolina School for the Deaf and Blind in Spartanburg, South Carolina for construction of a teaching/living facility;
504. \$275,000 to Dakota Wesleyan University for facilities construction for the McGovern Library and Center for Public Service;
505. \$100,000 to Williamson County, Tennessee for planning for the development of the Williamson County Technology and Research Park;
506. \$100,000 to the 28th Legislative District Community Development Corporation for planning activities for the redevelopment of the Bushtown community in Chattanooga, Tennessee;
507. \$100,000 to the Cocaine & Alcohol Awareness Program, Inc. in Tennessee for renovation and construction of facilities;
508. \$150,000 to Hamilton County, Tennessee for facilities construction for a Center for Entrepreneurial Growth Incubator;
509. \$175,000 to the City of Jackson, Tennessee for industrial park land acquisition;
510. \$450,000 to Knox County, Tennessee for facilities preservation, construction, renovation and expansion at the Beck Cultural Exchange Center, the Blount Mansion, the Ramsey

House and at Willow Creek Youth Park for the Knox Cultural and Tourism initiative;

511. \$575,000 to the Bijou Theatre Center in Knoxville, Tennessee for facilities renovations;

512. \$75,000 to the San Antonio Food Bank in San Antonio, Texas for land acquisition and facility buildout;

513. \$100,000 to Williamson County, Texas for construction of a community center;

514. \$100,000 to the City of Temple, Texas for land acquisition and building demolition along Martin Luther King Boulevard;

515. \$100,000 to the McAllen Boys and Girls Club in McAllen, Texas for construction;

516. \$100,000 to the City of Beaumont, Texas for building renovations and construction of parking facilities;

517. \$100,000 to the Marshall Downtown Development Corporation Marshall, Texas for planning and renovation to permit reuse of a downtown building;

518. \$100,000 to the Abilene Preservation League, in Abilene, Texas for restoration of the Swenson House;

519. \$100,000 to the San Angelo Old Town Conservancy, Inc. in San Angelo, Texas for restoration of the Runkles and Rackley Building for reuse;

520. \$150,000 to the City of Houston, Texas for construction of the Townwood Community Center;

521. \$150,000 to the City of Dallas, Texas for Farmers Market renovation;

522. \$150,000 to the City of El Paso, Texas for restoration of the Plaza Theatre;

523. \$150,000 to the City of San Angelo, Texas for renovation of tourism facilities;

524. \$200,000 to the Permian Basin Petroleum Museum in Midland, Texas for facilities renovations and improvements;

525. \$200,000 to the City of Fort Worth, Texas for renovation of the Clark's Department store building for reuse;

526. \$225,000 to the Brazos Valley Family Medicine Center in Bryan, Texas for facilities improvements and buildout for the Center for Excellence in Family Medicine and Rural Primary Care;

527. \$225,000 to the City of La Feria, Texas for construction of a Boys and Girls Club;

528. \$300,000 to the City of Waco, Texas for construction of a community center;

529. \$350,000 to the Old Red Courthouse, Inc. in Dallas, Texas for facilities restoration and improvements;

530. \$450,000 to Rice University for construction of the Rice University-Texas Medical Center Joint Research Facility in Houston, Texas;

531. \$450,000 to the City of Fort Worth, Texas for construction of urban waterfront improvements for the Trinity River Vision Project;

532. \$900,000 for Christus Santa Rosa Children's Hospital in San Antonio, Texas for facilities upgrades;

533. \$100,000 to the City of Greenville, Texas for renovations to downtown buildings;



534. \$200,000 to the City of Dallas, Texas for restoration of the Texas Theatre;
535. \$75,000 to the Utah Shakespearean Festival for architectural and engineering design of a performance facility;
536. \$75,000 to Salt Lake City, Utah for streetscape improvements in the Ninth and Ninth neighborhood;
537. \$150,000 to West Valley City, Utah for facilities construction and renovation for the Cultural Celebration Center;
538. \$225,000 to the City of Tremonton, Utah for construction of a Historic Wagon Museum;
539. \$75,000 for the Rockfish Community Center in Nelson County, Virginia for roof replacement;
540. \$75,000 for the Town of Boydton, Virginia for facilities improvements in connection with its downtown revitalization;
541. \$100,000 to the Lorton Arts Foundation, Incorporated in Lorton, Virginia for facilities renovation and construction;
542. \$100,000 for the Sedalia Center in Bedford County, Virginia to assist with construction costs of this regional cultural center;
543. \$100,000 for the Colonial Theater in the Town of South Hill, Virginia for facilities renovation;
544. \$100,000 to the John Singelton Mosby Museum Foundation in Warrenton, Virginia for facilities renovations;
545. \$100,000 to the Arlington Housing Corporation in Arlington County, Virginia for property acquisition, building demolition and facilities rehabilitation;
546. \$100,000 to the Reston Association in Reston, Virginia for construction of the Reston Southgate Community Center;
547. \$100,000 to Fairfax County, Virginia for construction of the Richmond Highway Town Center;
548. \$100,000 to Volunteers of America, Chesapeake, Inc. for renovation of the Bailey's Crossroads Community Shelter;
549. \$100,000 to Community Lodgings in Alexandria, Virginia for renovations to a family learning center;
550. \$100,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Hampton Roads, Virginia for facilities renovations and upgrades;
551. \$100,000 to the Children's Museum of Virginia in Portsmouth, Virginia for facilities renovation and expansion;
552. \$125,000 to Craig County, Virginia for construction of a library;
553. \$125,000 to the Dabney S. Lancaster Community College in Virginia for construction of the Virginia Packaging Applications Center;
554. \$150,000 to the City of Suffolk, Virginia for construction of the Great Dismal Swamp Visitors Center;
555. \$150,000 for the North Theater in the City of Danville, Virginia for facilities renovation;
556. \$200,000 to the Imani Intergenerational Community Development Center, Inc. for facilities construction and renovation of the 1400 block of Hull Street in Richmond, Virginia;
557. \$200,000 to the City of Fairfax, Virginia for the Old Town Fairfax Redevelopment Project for construction of parking facilities;

558. \$200,000 to Prince William County, Virginia for the Nokesville Redevelopment Project for facilities rehabilitation and renovation and streetscape improvements;

559. \$200,000 for the Blue Ridge Institute at Ferrum College in the Town of Ferrum, Virginia for the construction of the Agricultural Heritage Education Center to assist with economic development and tourism in the area;

560. \$200,000 for Charlotte County, Virginia for infrastructure and building upgrades;

561. \$200,000 for the Martinsville-Henry County Historical Society in Virginia for improvements to the Old Henry County Court House and Museum;

562. \$200,000 for the Lewis and Clark Exploratory Center in Charlottesville, Virginia for facilities construction;

563. \$225,000 to the City of Newport News, Virginia for the Warwick Boulevard Commercial Corridor Improvement Project for sidewalks, street furniture and façade improvements;

564. \$250,000 for The Prizery in the Town of South Boston, Virginia to assist with renovation efforts and the creation of a community arts center;

565. \$250,000 to Edgehill Recovery Retreat Center in Winchester, Virginia for facilities construction;

566. \$275,000 to the Virginia Holocaust Museum in Richmond, Virginia for facilities renovations and buildout;

567. \$325,000 to the Windy Hill Foundation in Middleburg, Virginia for the construction of affordable housing;

568. \$350,000 to Fairfax County, Virginia for facilities construction for Magnet Housing;

569. \$400,000 for the Institute of Advanced Learning and Research in Danville, Virginia for installation of high technology systems to create and support platform for high-tech instruction;

570. \$400,000 to the Christopher Newport University Foundation of Newport News, Virginia for facilities construction and renovation;

571. \$900,000 to the Art Museum of Western Virginia for construction of a new Art Museum/IMAX Theatre in Roanoke, Virginia;

572. \$90,000 to the Southern Vermont Recreation Center Foundation, in Springfield, Vermont for the construction of a community center;

573. \$100,000 to the Department of Vermont, Veterans of Foreign Wars for construction of veterans memorials in Springfield and Putney, Vermont;

574. \$75,000 to the Boys and Girls Club in Vancouver, Washington for construction of a facility;

575. \$80,000 to the City of Mount Vernon, Washington for construction of a performing arts facility;

576. \$100,000 to the Tacoma Art Museum in Tacoma, Washington for building construction;

577. \$100,000 to Jefferson County, Washington for restoration of the Jefferson County Courthouse Clock Tower;

578. \$100,000 to Olympic College in Washington for construction at the Shelton Branch;

579. \$100,000 to the Lutheran Compass Center in Seattle, Washington for rehabilitation and expansion of facilities;
580. \$100,000 to the City of Burien, Washington for land acquisition;
581. \$125,000 to the Westport Senior Center in Westport, Washington for construction;
582. \$125,000 to Peninsula College in Washington for construction of a science facility;
583. \$125,000 to the Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe of Washington for construction of a community center;
584. \$150,000 to the City of Bremerton, Washington for streetscape and façade renovation;
585. \$225,000 to the Children's Home Society of Washington for facilities construction for the Spokane Valley Family Resource Center;
586. \$350,000 to Kent Youth and Family Services in Kent, Washington for facilities expansion and rehabilitation for the Springwood Community Center;
587. \$450,000 to the City of Yakima, Washington for renovation of the Capitol Theatre;
588. \$450,000 to Richard Allen Enterprises in Spokane, Washington for the Emmanuel Center Project for facilities expansion;
589. \$100,000 to Centro Hispano in Madison, Wisconsin for expansion of facilities;
590. \$100,000 to the East Madison Community Center in Wisconsin for expansion of facilities;
591. \$175,000 to West End Development Corporation in Milwaukee, Wisconsin for building acquisition and renovation in the Near West Side neighborhood;
592. \$175,000 to the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin for building and façade renovation along the Vliet Street corridor;
593. \$225,000 to St. Norbert College in DePere, Wisconsin for continued construction of a Regional Library Learning Center;
594. \$350,000 to the Military Veterans Museum, Inc. in Oshkosh, Wisconsin for facilities construction;
595. \$900,000 to the City of Superior, Wisconsin for facilities improvements, new construction and relocation of facilities at the Barker's Island Redevelopment Project;
596. \$1,000,000 to the City of Wausau, Wisconsin for the construction of a business development center;
597. \$150,000 to the Business and Industrial Development Corporation for the acquisition, renovation and reuse of the Clendenin Middle School;
598. \$225,000 to the Jefferson County Development Authority, West Virginia for infrastructure improvements for the Burr Industrial Park near Charles Town, West Virginia;
599. \$300,000 to the Strand Theatre Preservation Society in Moundsville, West Virginia for theatre renovations;
600. \$500,000 to the Monongalia County Schools Foundation, Inc. in West Virginia for construction of recreation facilities;

601. \$750,000 to the Greenbrier Valley Economic Development Corporation in Lewisburg, West Virginia for facilities construction and buildout;

602. \$750,000 to the Vandalia Heritage Foundation, Inc. for land acquisition;

603. \$1,050,000 to the 4-County Economic Development Corporation in Oak Hill, West Virginia for facilities construction and buildout;

604. \$1,330,000 to Glenville State College in Glenville, West Virginia for the construction of a new campus community education center;

605. \$3,200,000 to the West Virginia High Technology Consortium Foundation, Inc. for land acquisition to expand a high technology business park;

606. \$450,000 to the University of Wyoming for construction of the Wyoming Technology Business Center in Laramie, Wyoming.

—\$21,000,000 for the Neighborhood Initiatives program. Targeted grants shall be provided as follows:

1. \$75,000 for the Heart of Illinois Big Brothers Big Sisters program in Peoria, Illinois for the construction of a facility;

2. \$100,000 to the City of Peoria, Illinois, for the Southern Gateway revitalization project to redevelop this neighborhood into a commercial center;

3. \$150,000 for the Center for the Prevention of Abuse in Peoria, Illinois for the construction of a facility;

4. \$500,000 for the City of Peoria, Illinois for construction on a proposed medical/technical district in Peoria, Illinois;

5. \$650,000 for OSF Saint Francis Medical Center in Peoria, Illinois for the renovation of treatment rooms to expand the facility's emergency department;

6. \$725,000 for Eureka College in Eureka, Illinois for construction of a new Science and Technology Center;

7. \$250,000 to the Community Economic Empowerment Corporation for construction of a recreation center in Louisville, Kentucky;

8. \$350,000 for the Rhema Development Corporation for renovation of housing facilities in Louisville, Kentucky;

9. \$400,000 for the Shiloh Community Renewal Center in Louisville, Kentucky for renovation and conversion of a building into an apartment facility for the elderly;

10. \$400,000 for the St. Stephen Family Life Center in Louisville, Kentucky for facilities renovation of Stewart Hall;

11. \$400,000 for the Shelby Park Neighborhood Association for the design and construction of a community center in Louisville, Kentucky;

12. \$400,000 for the New Zion Community Foundation for facilities renovations and improvements;

13. \$500,000 to NYSERNET to develop a blueprint for building or acquiring dark fiber deployment throughout Upstate New York;

14. \$500,000 to the Cortland County Industrial Development Authority in New York for facilities improvements, equipment, and relocation activities for the Buckbee Mears manufacturing facility;

- 15. \$5,000,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for the Neighborhood Initiative Program;
- 16. \$1,000,000 to The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio for The Ohio State University Neighborhoods Revitalization Initiative;
- 17. \$50,000 for the Halifax County Community Action Agency for the development of a Housing Initiative in Charlotte County, Virginia; —
- 18. \$150,000 to Oneida County, Wisconsin for the restoration of an historic building;
- 19. \$150,000 to Langlade County, Wisconsin for the restoration of an historic building;
- 20. \$3,500,000 for the Institute for Scientific Research for construction related to high-technology diversification initiative;
- 21. \$5,750,000 for the Vandalia Heritage Foundation, Inc. for community and neighborhood revitalization and economic diversification initiatives.

Additionally, not less than \$4,900,000 is provided for transfer to the Working Capital Fund to support the development of and modifications to information technology systems that serve programs or activities under Community Planning and Development.

Language is included in the bill, similar to language carried in prior Acts, which: (1) designates amounts available for the various programs and activities funded under this account; (2) limits administrative expenses to no more than 20 percent of any grant with certain exceptions; and (3) provides three-year availability for obligation of funds provided under this heading.

Language is also included which makes technical changes to grants provided in Public Laws 107-73 and 108-10.

COLONIAS GATEWAY INITIATIVE

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$0
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	16,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	- 16,000,000

The recommendation does not include \$16,000,000 requested for a new initiative in the Colonias since the necessary authorization legislation has not been enacted.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANT

(RESCISSION)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	- \$30,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 enacted .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 30,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 .....	- 30,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	0

The Committee recommends a rescission of \$30,000,000 from unexpended balances from this program, the same amount as requested.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Program costs	Limitation on guaranteed loans
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$0	\$0
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	7,277,000	275,000,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	-7,277,000	-275,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0

The Section 108 Loan Guarantees program underwrites private market loans to assist local communities in the financing of the acquisition and rehabilitation of publicly-owned real property, rehabilitation of housing, and certain economic development projects.

The Committee does not recommend an appropriation for the section 108 loan program for fiscal year 2004, as requested. Based on current estimated usage of funds appropriated in fiscal year 2003, the Committee recommendation assumes that \$6,000,000 in unobligated balances from prior year credit subsidy appropriations and \$189,344,000 in unused loan commitment authority will be available in fiscal year 2004 for new section 108 loan commitments.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$25,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	24,837,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+163,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+25,000,000

The Brownfields Redevelopment program provides competitive economic development grants in conjunction with section 108 loan guarantees for qualified brownfield projects. Grants are made in accordance with section 108(q) selection criteria.

The goal of the program is to return contaminated sites to productive uses with an emphasis on creating substantial numbers of jobs for lower-income people in physically and economically distressed neighborhoods.

The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for this program, an increase of \$163,000 above the level provided in fiscal year 2003. The budget request proposed elimination of this program based on the assumption that this program is duplicative of brownfields activities funded through the Environmental Protection Agency. The Committee believes that EPA and HUD programs should complement rather than duplicate efforts to recover brownfields sites to promote community economic development. To avoid duplication, the Committee expects HUD to closely coordinate its efforts with EPA.

Language is included in the bill to provide two-year availability for funds provided under this account.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$2,064,100,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	1,987,000,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	2,197,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+77,100,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 133,300,000

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

The Committee recommends \$2,064,100,000 for activities funded under this account, an increase of \$77,100,000 above the fiscal year 2003 level and \$133,300,000 below the request. Funds are provided as follows:

—*Formula Grants*: \$1,879,100,000 for formula grants for participating jurisdictions (States, units of local government and consortia of units local government) and insular areas, a \$25,178,000 increase above the fiscal year 2003. Based on historical usage, the Committee estimates that 36 percent of funds will be used for new construction, 47 percent for rehabilitation, 14 percent for acquisition, and 3 percent for tenant-based rental assistance. Of the amount provided, pursuant to the statute, at least 15 percent of each participating jurisdiction's allocation is reserved for housing that is developed, sponsored, or owned by Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs);

—*Down-payment Assistance Initiative*: \$125,000,000 for the Down-payment Assistance Initiative to be allocated by the Secretary to participating jurisdictions to provide down-payment assistance to low-income families to help them achieve homeownership;

—*Housing Counseling*: \$40,000,000 for housing counseling programs. The Committee has continued funding for this activity within this account rather than creating a separate account as proposed in the budget request;

—*HOME/CHDO Technical Assistance*: \$18,000,000 for technical assistance activities for State and local participating jurisdictions and non-profit CHDOs, an increase of \$117,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2003, and \$2,000,000 above the request. The Committee notes that the HOME statute authorizes technical assistance to be provided through contracts with eligible non-profit intermediaries as well as with other organizations recommended by participating jurisdictions and therefore expects HUD to use \$8,000,000 to contract with qualified non-profit intermediaries to provide CHDO technical assistance in fiscal year 2004;

—*Working Capital Fund*: no less than \$2,100,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund to support the development and modification of information technology systems which

serve programs and activities under Community Planning and Development.

The recommendation does not include \$25,000,000 for a new program for lead paint abatement activities under this account requested in the budget. The Committee notes that such program is unauthorized and may be duplicative of assistance provided under the regular lead paint hazard reduction grant program and other departmental programs.

Language is included in the bill to provide two-year availability for funds provided under this account.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$1,242,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	1,217,037,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	1,325,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+24,963,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 83,000,000

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

The Committee recommends funding homeless programs at \$1,242,000,000, an increase of \$24,963,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2003. The recommendation includes full funding for the costs associated with the renewal of all expiring Shelter Plus Care contracts. Language is included in the bill requiring funds to be made available for this purpose.

The recommendation also includes \$12,000,000 for the national homeless data analysis project and for technical assistance, and no less than \$2,580,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund for development and modifications of information technology systems that serve activities under Community Planning and Development.

The recommendation does not include \$1,500,000 requested under this account for administrative costs for the Interagency Council on the Homeless but instead has continued funding for these activities as a separate account under title III.

Language is included in the bill which: (1) requires not less than 30 percent of the funds appropriated, excluding amounts made available for renewals under the shelter plus care program, be used for permanent housing; (2) requires the renewal of all expiring shelter plus care contracts; (3) requires funding recipients to provide a 25 percent match for social services activities; (4) requires all homeless programs to coordinate their programs with mainstream health, social services and employment programs; and (5) provides two-year availability for obligation of funds provided under this account, except that no year availability is provided for the portion of funding necessary to meet initial contract requirements for the Single Room Occupancy program.



## SAMARITAN HOUSING INITIATIVE

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$0
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	50,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 50,000,000

The recommendation does not include \$50,000,000 requested in the budget for a new homeless assistance grant program since the necessary authorization legislation has not yet been transmitted to the Congress for its consideration.

## HOUSING PROGRAMS

## HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$0
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> 1,027,081,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> 0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> - 1,027,081,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> 0

<sup>1</sup>In fiscal year 2003 funding for the housing for the elderly (Section 202) program and for housing the disabled (Section 811) program were provided for under this account.

The Committee recommendation adopts the budget proposal to fund the section 202 program through a new Housing for the Elderly account and the section 811 program through a new Housing for the Disabled account in lieu of continuing funding for both programs in the Housing for Special Populations account.

## HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$773,320,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> 0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> 773,636,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> +773,320,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 316,000

<sup>1</sup>In fiscal year 2003, the housing for the elderly (Section 202) program and related activities were funded under the Housing for Special Populations account.

The housing for the elderly (Section 202) program provides eligible private, non-profit organizations with capital grants to finance the acquisition, rehabilitation or construction of housing intended for low-income elderly people. In addition, the program provides project-based rental assistance (PRAC) to support operational costs for units constructed under the program.

The Committee recommends a total program level of \$789,320,000 for the Section 202 program for fiscal year 2004, of which \$773,320,000 is provided as a direct appropriation and \$16,000,000 is derived from unobligated balances from funds provided for PRAC renewals in fiscal year 2003 that are not needed to meet this requirement and recaptures of excess prior year funds. The recommendation allocates funding as follows:

—\$695,850,000 for new capital and project rental assistance contracts (PRAC), an increase of \$23,902,000 above fiscal year 2003 and \$22,384,000 above the request;

—\$2,000,000 for one-year renewals of expiring PRAC payments, instead of \$26,000,000 requested in the budget. This

amount represents the revised estimate of funding necessary for PRAC renewals in fiscal year 2004;

—\$50,000,000 for service coordinators and the continuation of congregate services grants;

—\$25,000,000 for grants to convert section 202 projects to assisted living facilities;

—\$16,000,000 for grants for planning, preliminary design and site control activities; and

—no less than \$470,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund to support the development of and modifications to information technology systems which support programs and activities for elderly programs.

The Committee recommendation does not include new language, requested in the budget, to make section 202 funds available for expenditure for 12 years. While the Committee is aware that grants awarded under the section 202 program include 5 years of operating expenses, the Committee believes that 7 years to complete construction is unduly long. The Committee is concerned that planning, design and site control challenges may contribute to delays in completion of, and increased cost for, some projects. The Committee has again included funds to provide grants for planning, preliminary design, and site control. The Committee looks forward to receiving the report required pursuant to the fiscal year 2003 appropriations Act on actions which can be taken to accelerate the completion of projects under the section 202 program and alternatives for restructuring or otherwise modifying the program, including the option to restructure this program in a manner similar to other Federally-funded construction programs.

Language is included, carried in prior years, relating to the initial contract and renewal terms for assistance provided under this heading.

Language is included as requested making funds available for obligation for three years.

New language is included as requested transferring all outstanding balances for section 202 related programs from the Housing for Special Populations account to this account.

The recommendation does not include language requested in the budget authorizing the Secretary to waive any statutory and regulatory requirements related to the section 202 program. The Committee believes that any statutory or regulatory problems associated with these programs should be addressed through the appropriate legislative or regulatory processes.

HOUSING FOR THE DISABLED  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$250,570,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> 0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> 250,515,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	<sup>1</sup> +250,570,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+55,000

<sup>1</sup>In fiscal year 2003, the supportive housing for the disabled (Section 811) program and related activities were funded under the Housing for Special Populations account.

The housing for the disabled (Section 811) program provides eligible private, non-profit organizations with capital grants to finance the acquisition, rehabilitation or construction of supportive

housing for the disabled and provides project-based rental assistance (PRAC) to support operational costs for such units. In addition, to increase flexibility, twenty-five percent of the funding for supportive housing for the disabled is available for tenant-based assistance.

The Committee recommends a total program level of \$256,470,000 for Section 811 activities for fiscal year 2004, of which \$250,570,000 is provided as a direct appropriation and \$5,900,000 is derived from unobligated balances from funds provided for PRAC renewals in fiscal year 2003 that are not needed to meet this requirement and recaptures of excess prior year funds. The recommendation allocates funding as follows:

- \$213,300,000 for new capital and PRAC contracts and new vouchers, a \$13,255,000 increase above the request and \$2,816,000 above the fiscal year 2003 level;
- \$42,700,000 for renewal costs of section 811 tenant-based rental assistance and expiring PRAC contracts for up to a one-year term, instead of \$50,000,000 requested in the budget. This amount represents the revised estimate of funding necessary for PRAC renewals in fiscal year 2004; and
- no less than \$470,000 for transfer to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems for programs and activities for disabled housing programs.

Language is included, carried in prior years, allowing up to 25 percent of the funds provided, excluding amounts for renewals of rental assistance and PRAC contracts, to be used for new rental assistance as requested.

Language is included, carried in prior years, relating to the initial contract and renewal terms for assistance provided under this heading.

Language is included as requested making funds available for obligation for three years.

New language is included as requested transferring all outstanding balances for section 811 programs from the Housing for Special Populations account to this account.

New language requested in the budget is not included making section 811 funds available for expenditure for 12 years. In addition, the recommendation does not include language requested in the budget authorizing the Secretary to waive any statutory and regulatory requirements related to the section 811 program. The Committee believes that any statutory or regulatory problems associated with these programs should be addressed through the appropriate legislative or regulatory processes.

HOUSING COUNSELING

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	10
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	10
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	\$45,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	10
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> - 45,000,000

<sup>1</sup>In fiscal year 2003, \$40,000,000 was appropriated for housing counseling as a set-aside under the HOME Investments Partnership Program account.

Section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 authorized HUD to provide housing counseling services to home-

buyers, homeowners, low and moderate income renters, and the homeless.

The Committee does not recommend the creation of a separate account for housing counseling activities, but instead has provided \$40,000,000 for this activity as a set-aside within the HOME Investments Partnership Program account.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	-\$303,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 100,000,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 303,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 203,000,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 authorized the section 236 Rental Housing Assistance Program to subsidize the monthly mortgage payment of an owner of a rental or cooperative project in order to reduce the rents for lower income tenants.

The Committee recommends a rescission of \$303,000,000 from amounts appropriated in prior years which are in excess of amounts required to subsidize mortgages under section 236, as requested.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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

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

The recommendation includes language identical to language carried in prior years, modified from the request, to allow surplus funds derived from rental collections which were in excess of allowable rents levels to be returned to project owners only for the purposes of rehabilitating and renovating those properties.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$13,000,000
Offsetting collections .....	- 13,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	12,915,000
Offsetting collections .....	- 13,000,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	17,000,000
Offsetting collections .....	- 17,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+85,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 4,000,000

The National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, as amended by the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000, authorized the Secretary to establish Federal manufactured home construction and safety standards for the construction, design, and performance of manufactured homes. All manufactured homes are required to meet the Federal standards, and fees are charged to producers to cover the costs of administering the Act.

The Committee recommends up to \$13,000,000 for the manufactured housing standards programs to be derived from fees collected and deposited in the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund established pursuant to the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000. The amount recommended is an increase of \$85,000 above the fiscal year 2003 level and a decrease of \$4,000,000 below the fiscal year 2003 request.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION  
MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of direct loans	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$50,000,000	\$185,000,000,000	\$359,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	100,000,000	165,000,000,000	345,568,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	50,000,000	185,000,000,000	359,000,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	-50,000,000	+20,000,000,000	+13,432,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0	0

The FHA mutual mortgage insurance program account includes the mutual mortgage insurance (MMI) and cooperative management housing insurance (CMHI) funds. This program account covers unsubsidized programs, primarily the single-family home mortgage program, which is the largest of all the FHA programs. The cooperative housing insurance program provides mortgages for cooperative housing projects of more than five units that are occupied by members of a cooperative housing corporation.

The Committee recommends the following limitations on loan commitments in the MMI program account as follows: \$185,000,000,000 for loan guarantees and \$50,000,000 for direct loans. The recommendation also includes \$359,000,000 for administrative expenses, of which \$355,000,000 is transferred to the Salaries and expenses account, and \$4,000,000 is transferred to the Office of Inspector General. In addition, \$85,000,000 is provided for non-overhead administrative contract expenses, of which no less than \$20,744,000 is transferred to the Working Capital Fund for development and modifications to information technology systems that serve programs or activities under Housing Programs or the Federal Housing Administration.

Language is continued as requested, modified from language carried in previous years, appropriating additional administrative expenses in certain circumstances.

The Committee recommendation does not include authorization legislation proposed in the budget to create a new loan program for borrowers with poor credit histories who are currently being served in the conventional market. The Committee questions the fairness

of this proposal to other participants in the FHA single-family program since the proposal would reduce the premiums charged to higher-risk borrowers below the amount paid by all other participants in the program. In addition, the Committee questions whether such a program would make such borrowers more vulnerable to predatory lending practices. The Committee notes that the budget estimates the default rate on this proposed program to be over 15 percent, thus raising concerns about the potential cost of this program to the Federal government.

According to the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, the nation experienced a 30-year high in mortgage foreclosures in 2002. The Committee is interested in actions that are being taken and can be taken by the Department to avoid further increases in the mortgage foreclosure rate for homeowners participating in the FHA insurance program. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee no later than January 5, 2004 on the current and planned foreclosure mitigation programs being used by the Department to reduce the number of foreclosures on FHA insured homes; the annual costs associated with foreclosures on FHA insured homes; the annual costs associated with foreclosure mitigation programs; and the efficiency of mortgage foreclosure mitigation programs to reduce the number of foreclosures.

GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of direct loans	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative expenses	Program costs
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$50,000,000	\$25,000,000,000	\$229,000,000	\$15,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	50,000,000	23,000,000,000	222,262,000	15,000,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	50,000,000	25,000,000,000	229,000,000	14,902,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation ...	0	+2,000,000,000	+6,738,000	+98,000
Comparison with Fiscal year 2004 budget request	0	0	0	0

The FHA general and special risk insurance (GI and SRI) program account includes 17 different programs administered by the FHA. The GI fund includes a wide variety of insurance programs for special purpose single and multi-family loans, including loans for property improvements, manufactured housing, multi-family rental housing, condominiums, housing for the elderly, hospitals, group practice facilities and nursing homes. The SRI fund includes insurance programs for mortgages in older, declining urban areas which would not be otherwise eligible for insurance, mortgages with interest reduction payments, mortgages for experimental housing and for high-risk mortgagors who would not normally be eligible for mortgage insurance without housing counseling.

The Committee recommends the following limitations on loan commitments for the general and special risk insurance program account as requested: \$25,000,000,000 for loan guarantees and \$50,000,000 for direct loans.

As requested, the recommendation includes a \$15,000,000 direct appropriation for credit subsidy. The recommendation also includes \$229,000,000 for administrative expenses, of which \$209,000,000 is transferred to the Salaries and Expenses account and \$20,000,000 is transferred to the Office of Inspector General. An additional \$93,780,000 is provided for non-overhead administrative expenses,

of which no less than \$16,946,000 is transferred to the Working Capital Fund for development and modifications to information technology systems that serve activities under Housing Programs or Federal Housing Administration.

Language is continued, carried in previous years, appropriating additional administrative expenses in certain circumstances.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE  
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

	Limitation of guaranteed loans	Administrative ex- penses
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$200,000,000,000	\$10,695,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	200,000,000,000	10,276,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	200,000,000,000	10,695,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0	+419
Comparison with Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0

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

The recommendation includes a \$200,000,000,000 limitation on loan commitments for mortgage-backed securities as requested, the same level provided in fiscal year 2003. The Committee also recommends \$10,695,000 for administrative expenses to be transferred to the Salaries and Expenses account, as requested, \$419,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2003.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$47,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	46,695,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	51,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+305,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	-4,000,000

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 directs the Secretary to undertake programs of research, studies, testing, and demonstrations related to the HUD mission. These functions are carried out internally through contracts with industry, non-profit research organizations, and educational institutions and through agreements with state and local governments and other federal agencies.

The bill includes \$47,000,000 for research and technology, as requested. Of this amount, \$7,500,000 is provided for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) Initiative. The Committee believes that the PATH program should include all segments of the housing industry, including the manufactured housing sector. The Committee is concerned that PATH has not adequately addressed the research needs of this sector of the industry. The Committee expects the Department to increase support for manufactured housing from within the amounts provided for the PATH program.

While the Committee has not included bill language designating specific amounts for program evaluations or a study of barriers to affordable housing, the Committee encourages the Department to conduct such studies from within the amounts provided under this account.

Language is included making funds available for obligation for two years.

#### FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

##### FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$46,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	45,601,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	50,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+399,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	-4,000,000

The Fair Housing Act, title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental and financing of housing and authorizes assistance to State and local agencies in administering the provision of fair housing statutes. The Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP) assists State and local fair housing enforcement agencies that are certified by HUD as "substantially equivalent" to HUD with respect to enforcement policies and procedures. The FHAP assures prompt and effective processing of complaints filed under title VIII that are within the jurisdiction of State and local fair housing agencies. The Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) alleviates housing discrimination by providing support to private nonprofit organizations, State and local government agencies and other nonfederal entities for the purpose of eliminating or preventing discrimination in housing, and to enhance fair housing opportunities.

The Committee recommends a total of \$46,000,000 for this account, as requested.

Of this amount, \$25,750,000 is for FHAP and \$20,250,000 is for FHIP.

The Committee expects HUD to continue to provide quarterly reports on obligation and expenditure of these funds, delineated by each program and activity, with the first such report due no later than February 15, 2004.

Language is included, carried in previous years, designating the amount available for FHIP.



## OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

## LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$130,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	174,856,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	136,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 44,856,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 6,000,000

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

The Committee recommends \$130,000,000 for this account, instead of \$136,000,000 requested in the budget. Amounts provided are to be allocated as follows:

—\$100,000,000 is for grants to State and local governments, and Native American tribes, for lead-based paint abatement activities in private low-income housing, \$10,000,000 above the fiscal year 2003 level. The Committee notes that funding for this program has increased by 77 percent over the last three years.

—\$10,000,000 is for Operation LEAP (Lead Elimination Action Program), a new initiative requested in the budget to leverage private sector resources to eliminate lead-based paint hazards in low-income housing. Operation LEAP funds will be allocated competitively to non-profit organizations and the private sector for activities which leverage additional funds for local lead hazard control programs. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee no later than September 15, 2003 on the amount of private-sector funds leveraged, delineated by funding and in-kind support, through this program to eliminate lead-based paint hazards. Such report should include the amount of private sector funding leveraged for abatement of lead paint hazards and the number of housing units addressed to date through this program.

—\$10,000,000 is for technical assistance and support to State and local agencies and private property owners, a \$242,000 increase over fiscal year 2003 as requested.

—\$10,000,000 is for the Healthy Homes program as requested. These funds are competitively awarded to State, local or county agencies, non-profit and community-based organizations, landlord organizations, parents' organizations, and environmental contractors, for research, standards development, and education and outreach activities related to housing-related environmental childhood diseases.

The recommendation does not include a separate set-aside for CLEAR Corps. The Committee notes that as part of the Consolidated Planning process, State and local governments are expected to partner with non-profit organizations to develop and implement their lead-based paint abatement plans. The Committee encourages

local CLEAR Corps programs to partner with local governments to receive funding support as part of the locality's Consolidated Plan.

The Committee is aware of a proposal put forth by the Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning to create a Community Environmental Health Resource Center (CEHRC) to provide technical support, training, and education and outreach to community-based organizations to evaluate and control housing-related and community-wide health hazards. While the Committee has not included an earmark for this new organization, the Committee encourages HUD to evaluate a proposal from the Alliance and provide a grant if warranted.

The Committee reminds the Department that all funding provided under this heading is to be competitively awarded as required under the HUD Reform Act of 1989 and section 206 under Administrative Provisions under this title.

**MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

	By transfer							Total
	Appropriation	FHA funds	GNMA funds	CPD	Title VI	Indian housing	Hawaiian housing	
FY 2004 recommendation .....	\$547,000,000	\$564,000,000	\$10,695,000	\$0	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$35,000	\$1,122,130
FY 2003 appropriation .....	526,852,000	544,639,000	10,276,000	993,000	149,000	199,000	35,000	1,083,143,000
FY 2004 budget request .....	537,000,000	564,000,000	10,695,000	0	150,000	250,000	35,000	1,112,130,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+20,148,000	+19,361,000	+419,000	+7,000	-993,000	+51,000	0	+38,987,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+10,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	+10,000,000

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

The Committee recommends total funding of \$1,122,130,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Department, a net increase of \$38,987,000 above the fiscal year 2003 level and \$10,000,000 above the request. The recommendation includes the following changes: \$59,487,000 increase for inflationary increases necessary to support 9,330 full-time equivalents (FTE) and a \$10,000,000 increase and an additional 75 FTE to support a new section 8 quality assurance office; offset by \$30,500,000 in decreases for one-time expenses.

Language is included in the bill setting forth the amounts and staffing levels provided for the various offices funded under this heading as follows:

Office	FTE	Amount
Office of Housing .....	3,483	\$323,061,000
Office of Public and Indian Housing .....	1,745	183,209,000
Office of Community Planning and Development .....	834	80,696,000
Office of Policy Development and Research .....	161	21,424,000
Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity .....	669	61,564,000
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control .....	38	3,946,000
Government National Mortgage Association .....	70	7,923,000
Departmental Management .....	189	21,084,000
Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives .....	8	2,630,000
Office of the Chief Financial Officer .....	248	38,857,000
Office of the General Counsel .....	698	76,007,000
Office of Field Policy and Management .....	530	53,436,000
Office of Administration .....	732	248,293,000
<b>Total, Management and Administration .....</b>	<b>9,405</b>	<b>\$1,122,130,000</b>

The Department may reallocate funds and FTE between the amounts specified above for these offices only in accordance with operating plan and/or reprogramming procedures. Amounts provided are consistent with modifications made by the Department to the original budget submission to reflect the revised staffing distribution consistent with the corrective action plan submitted to the Committee in response to the significant over-hiring that occurred during fiscal year 2003. The Committee expects that the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's Office of Budget will be provided the necessary resources to implement the corrective action plan.

In addition, the Committee has included an increase of \$10,000,000 and 75 FTE for the Office of Public and Indian Housing to establish a Division of Quality Assurance for activities associated with the Section 8 voucher program.

Consistent with modifications to the original budget submission, the object classification distribution, which shall also serve as the basis for operating plan and reprogramming changes is as follows:

Personal Services—\$888,234,000  
 Travel and Transportation of Persons—\$20,600,000  
 Transportation of Things—\$550,000

Rent, Communications and Utilities—\$135,555,000  
 Printing and Reproduction—\$3,900,000  
 Other Services—\$64,901,000  
 Supplies and Materials—\$4,999,000  
 Furniture and Equipment—\$3,200,000  
 Indemnities—\$200,000

*Public and Indian Housing Division of Quality Assurance.*—Includes \$10,000,000 and 75 FTE to establish a Division of Quality Assurance with the Office of Public and Indian Housing. The Committee recommends the establishment of this new division to ensure accurate and timely data regarding the expenditure and projected future funding requirements for the Section 8 voucher program. The Committee has also addressed the creation of this new division elsewhere in this report under the Housing Certificate Fund. The Committee recommendation includes \$7,500,000 in Personal Services and \$2,500,000 in Other Services object classifications for this purpose.

*Operating Plans/Reprogramming Requirements.*—The Committee appreciates the need for management flexibility to allocate management and administrative resources or reorganize offices and programs to address changing requirements at the departments and agencies funded in the bill, including HUD. To provide such flexibility, while ensuring appropriate consultation and oversight, all Departments within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction are required to submit operating plans and reprogramming letters and reorganization proposals for Committee approval. On a number of occasions, the Committee has expressed its concerns that HUD has not adhered to these requirements and instead has reallocated resources among programs, projects and activities, reorganized offices and created new offices without prior notification and approval by the Committee. The Committee directs HUD to follow the Committee's requirements regarding operating plans, reprogrammings and reorganizations so that the Committee is kept informed of, and therefore is better able to respond to, changing requirements at the Department. HUD is reminded that operating plans or reprogramming requirements apply to any reallocation of resources totaling more than \$500,000 among any program, project or activity as well as to any significant reorganization within offices or the proposed creation or elimination of any program or office, regardless of the dollar amount involved; and any reorganization, regardless of the dollar amount involved. Object classification changes above \$500,000 also are subject to operating plan or reprogramming requirements. Unless otherwise specified in this Act or the accompanying report, the approved level for any program, project, or activity is that amount detailed for that program, project, or activity in the Department's annual detailed budget justification document. These requirements apply to all funds provided to the Department. The Department is expected to make any necessary changes during fiscal year 2004 to its current procedures and systems to ensure that it is able to meet the necessary operating plan and reprogramming requirements applied to other agencies funded in the bill.

*Funds Control/Financial Management.*—To address long-standing weaknesses in departmental compliance with appropriations statutes, regulations and OMB circulars and to improve funds control and financial management, the fiscal year 2003 appropriations

Act included a series of reforms. These reforms included language permanently establishing a Division of Appropriations Law within the Office of the Chief Financial Officer to provide guidance to the Department on all matters related to appropriations law, regulations and circulars, and included language permanently clarifying responsibilities within the Department for investigating and reporting on potential and actual violations of all appropriations laws. The Committee appreciates the Department's cooperation in implementing these permanent changes. In addition, the Committee commends the Department for the commitment it has demonstrated this year to put in place policies and procedures to strengthen funds control and departmental management. The Committee looks forward to continuing to work with the Department toward this goal.

The Committee recommendation includes language clarifying that point of obligation of funds for purposes of funds control and determining violations under the Anti-Deficiency Act requires joint signatures on executing documents except in certain limited instances for those programs for which a joint signature may not be necessary or appropriate. It remains the Committee's intent that the Department recognize well-established appropriations law related to the point of obligation of funds, and to encourage joint execution for obligation of funds whenever possible. The Committee has also included a technical amendment to the fiscal year 2003 Act to clarify this issue.

*Budget Submission.*—For the last two years, the Committee has expressed repeated concerns to the Department regarding the adequacy of its annual Budget Justification submission in providing the necessary information to enable the Committee to understand and assess the Department's funding requirements and requests. For example, the Committee notes that the fiscal year 2004 justification contained less than 13 pages of information on programs representing over half of the Department's entire budget. The Department is directed to develop and present the fiscal year 2005 Budget Justification submission in the traditional appropriations account structure with detailed information on the prior year, current year, and requested funding levels for each program, project, or activity funded within each account, and include a detailed narrative description of the proposed changes requested. The Committee reiterates that object classification displays are supplements, not substitutes, for detailed displays with funding for each program, project, or activity within each account. The Committee continues its direction regarding the budget justification for the Management and Administration account which is to include prior year, current year, and requested position, FTE, and funding levels for each program within each office, delineated by headquarters and field office components. The Department is directed to submit to the Committee no later than September 15, 2003, a template for its fiscal year 2005 budget justification document that complies with this direction.

The Committee notes that the Department provided a supplementary "performance-based budget" document for fiscal year 2004 that attempts to divide the Department's budget requests for programs across six broad strategic planning goals, including "Strengthen Communities", "Embrace High Standards of Ethics,

Management and Accountability”, and “Promote Decent and Affordable Housing”. The Committee considers this document to be a strategic planning document for departmental managers, rather than a detailed budget justification document. The Committee reminds HUD that the budget justification books are intended only for the Committees on Appropriations in order to provide further necessary detail on the budget request. The Committee directs the Department that it is not to submit or otherwise incorporate the strategic planning document or its structure into its fiscal year 2005 Budget Justification submission to the Committee.

Language is included in the bill, similar to language carried in prior Acts, which: (1) designates amounts provided from various accounts for salaries and expenses; (2) requires the Department to implement appropriate funds control and financial management procedures; (3) limits the total number of GS-14 and GS-15 positions in the Department; and (4) requires submission of a staffing plan.

#### WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$240,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	274,504,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	276,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 34,504,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 36,300,000

The Working Capital Fund was established pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3535 to provide necessary capital for the development of, modifications to, and infrastructure for Department-wide information technology systems, and for the continuing operation of both Department-wide and program-specific information technology systems.

The Committee recommends \$305,156,000 for the Working Capital Fund, a \$44,448,000 decrease from the fiscal year 2003 comparable level, of which \$240,000,000 is provided as a separate account to support Department-wide information technology systems activities. Transfers from the following accounts to support program-specific information technology systems provides an additional \$65,156,000:

FHA, Mutual mortgage insurance fund—	\$20,744,000
FHA, General and special risk insurance fund—	\$16,946,000
Community development fund—	\$4,900,000
HOME investment partnerships program—	\$2,100,000
Homeless assistance—	\$2,580,000
Public housing capital fund—	\$10,610,000
Native American Indian block grants—	\$2,720,000
Housing certificate fund—	\$3,010,000
Housing for the elderly—	\$470,000
Housing for the disabled—	\$470,000
Interagency Services—	\$306,000
Office of Inspector General—	\$300,000

The Committee remains committed to improving HUD’s information technology capacity. To a large extent, both HUD’s and Congress’ ability to oversee the effectiveness of HUD’s programs is undermined due to the failure of HUD’s information systems to provide the information necessary to assess program performance and ensure effective resource management. The Committee under-

stands that information technology systems improvements are organizationally and technically challenging endeavors. Effective development and implementation of such improvements requires strong oversight by the Department, strong program management, early and thorough planning, user input, clearly defined systems objectives and requirements, and appropriate milestones. Absent a clearly defined framework and implementation plan, the Committee is concerned that such endeavors will be vulnerable to uncontrollable cost growth and mission failure.

The Committee continues to have concerns regarding the Department's progress in implementing several of its major information technology projects. The Department is directed to continue to work with the Committee to further develop and define its five-year IT requirements based upon the format provided to the Department on May 26, 2003. The Department is directed to provide an updated five-year IT plan consistent with such format no later than November 15, 2003. In addition, the Department is directed to submit to the Committee no later than September 15, 2003 on the status of, funds spent to date, and estimated fiscal year 2004 funding requirements for the following major projects: PIH Information Center (PIC), FHA Subsidiary Ledger, HUD Integrated Financial Management Improvement Project (HIFMIP), HUD Integrated HR and Training System (HIHRTS), and the Single Family Integration System.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

	Appropriation	FHA funds	Total
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$76,080,000	\$24,000,000	\$100,080,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	73,674,000	23,343,000	97,017,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	76,080,000	24,000,000	100,080,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+2,406,000	+657,000	+3,063,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0	0	0

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

The Committee recommends \$100,080,000 for the Office of Inspector General, an increase of \$3,063,000 above the amount provided in fiscal year 2003. Of this amount, \$24,000,000 is derived from transfers from FHA funds.

Language is included in the bill, similar to language carried in prior Acts, which: (1) designates amounts available to the Inspector General from other accounts; and (2) clarifies the authority of the Inspector General with respect to certain personnel issues.



## CONSOLIDATED FEE FUND

## (RESCISSION)

Section 7(j) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act establishes fees and charges from selected programs that are deposited in the fund to offset the costs of audits, inspections and other related expenses that may be incurred by the Department in monitoring these programs.

The Committee recommends a rescission of remaining unobligated balances in the Fund, as requested.

## OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$32,415,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	29,805,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	32,415,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+2,610,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

The Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) was established in 1992 to regulate the financial safety and soundness of the two housing government-sponsored enterprises (GSEs)—the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac). The office was authorized in the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, which also provided the regulator enhanced authority to enforce these standards. In addition to financial regulation, the OFHEO monitors the GSEs compliance with affordable housing goals that were contained in the Act.

The Committee recommends a total of \$32,415,000 for OFHEO, to be derived from fees assessed to the GSEs and deposited into the Federal Housing Enterprises Oversight Fund. The recommendation represents an 8 percent increase over the fiscal year 2003 funding level in order to provide 16 additional FTE in fiscal year 2004. The fiscal year Committee notes that funding for OFHEO has increased by 67 percent to support a 44 percent increase in staffing over the last three years.

The Committee does not recommend proposed language as an administrative provision under this title to take funding for OFHEO off-budget.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The bill contains a number of administrative provisions.

Section 201 relates to the division of financing adjustment factors, as requested.

Section 202 prohibits available funds from being used to investigate or prosecute lawful activities under the Fair Housing Act, which was proposed for deletion.

Section 203 continues language to correct an anomaly in the HOPWA formula that results in the loss of funds for certain States, however requested language to make this provision permanent is not included.

Section 204 extends a technical amendment included in the fiscal year 2000 Appropriations Act relating to the allocation of HOPWA funds in the Philadelphia and Raleigh-Durham metropolitan areas, similar to language requested.

Section 205 authorizes the Secretary to waive certain requirements related to an assisted living pilot project, as requested.

Section 206 continues language with technical modifications, requiring funds appropriated to be distributed on a competitive basis in accordance with the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989.

Section 207 continues language, carried in previous years, regarding the availability of funds subject to the Government Corporation Control Act and the Housing Act of 1950.

Section 208 continues language, carried in previous years, regarding allocation of funds in excess of the budget estimates.

Section 209 continues language, carried in previous years, regarding the expenditure of funds for corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

Section 210 continues language, carried in previous years, requiring submission of a spending plan for technical assistance, training and management improvement activities prior to the expenditure of funds.

Section 211 continues language, modified from language carried in fiscal year 2003, requiring submission of quarterly reports regarding all uncommitted, unobligated, recaptured and excess funds in each departmental program and activity.

The Committee does not recommend seven new administrative provisions requested in the budget to amend various authorization statutes related to minimum rents for public and assisted housing, service coordinators, repeal of a loan program, a new public housing loan program, land costs in the Colonias, the Interagency Council on the Homeless, and a new FHA sub-prime single family insurance program, and FHA interest payments.

### TITLE III

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

##### AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$47,276,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	35,017,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	32,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+15,259,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+14,876,000

The Commission is responsible for the administration, operation and maintenance of cemetery and war memorials to commemorate the achievements and sacrifices of the American Armed Forces where they have served since April 6, 1917. In performing these functions, the American Battle Monuments Commission maintains twenty-four permanent American military cemetery memorials and thirty-one monuments, memorials, markers and offices in fifteen foreign countries, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the British dependency of Gibraltar. In addition, five memorials are located in the United States: the East Coast Memo-

rial in New York; the West Coast Memorial, The Presidio, in San Francisco; the Honolulu Memorial in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Honolulu, Hawaii; and the American Expeditionary Forces Memorial and the Korean War Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC.

The Committee recommends \$47,276,000 for fiscal year 2004 to administer, operate and maintain the Commission's monuments, cemeteries, and memorials throughout the world. The amount provided includes the budget request adjusted for a decrease of \$1,000,000 from the productivity program including a reduction of \$100,000 from personnel studies and \$900,000 from improvement projects. Offsetting the decrease is an increase of \$876,000 for costs associated with 20 additional FTE required because of work-rule changes in France. The Committee further recommends an increase of \$15,000,000 for construction of the Normandy Interpretive Center at the Normandy American Cemetery in France. Of this amount, \$10,000,000 is not available until September 1, 2004. The cemetery averages nearly two million visitors per year, and the existing facilities are over 40 years old and inadequate to serve this large number of visitors. The new and expanded center will provide a fuller array of interpretive services to put the D-Day landings and the following battles in Europe in perspective as one of the greatest military achievements of all time. The Committee expects any remaining funds required to complete the center to be included as part of the fiscal year 2005 budget submission for the Commission.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$8,550,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	7,808,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	8,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+742,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+550,000

The Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board was authorized by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to investigate accidental releases of certain chemical substances resulting in, or that may cause, serious injury, death, substantial property damage or serious adverse effects on human health. The Board became operational in fiscal year 1998.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee is recommending \$8,550,000, an increase of \$692,000 from the level for fiscal year 2003 and an increase of \$500,000 above the request.

Again this year, bill language has been included which limits the number of career senior executive service positions to three.

Consistent with fiscal year 2003, the Committee directs that of the amounts approved in this appropriation, the Board must limit transfers of funds between object classifications or program activities to not more than \$50,000 without prior notification of the Committees on Appropriations. Changes from the budget request in excess of \$250,000 shall be subject to the normal Committee reprogramming guidelines as outlined at the beginning of this report. No changes may be made to any expense as reflected in the budget justification, except as approved by the Committees on Appropria-

tions, if it is construed by the Committee to be policy or change in policy.

The Committee is not convinced that the workload of the Board justifies five full-time compensated Board Members. The Committee looks forward to working with the Board to discuss more efficient organizational structures to ensure that priority needs are met with the resources available.

#### EMERGENCY FUND

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$450,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+450,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+450,000

The emergency fund provides a funding mechanism by which periodic accident investigation cost fluctuations can be met without delaying critical phases of the investigations. In fiscal year 2004, the Committee has provided initial funding to establish such an emergency fund. Amounts provided to the Emergency fund are available until expended and may be added to in future appropriations acts.

The purpose of the fund is to address investigation costs that greatly exceed the amounts already budgeted and provided for in the current fiscal year and is not to be used to offset the agencies normal operating expenses. The Board is directed to notify the Committee in writing of any withdrawals from the emergency fund within 2 business days of such withdrawal. Such notification shall include the amount being withdrawn from the fund, the purpose and need for the withdrawal, and any relevant budget implications.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

##### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

##### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$51,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	74,512,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	51,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 23,512,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	0

The Community Development Financial Institutions Fund provides grants, loans and technical assistance to new and existing community development financial institutions such as community development banks, community development credit unions, revolving loan funds and micro-loan funds. Recipients must use the funds to support mortgage, small business and economic development lending in currently underserved, distressed neighborhoods. The Fund is also responsible for implementation of the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$51,000,000 for the program in fiscal year 2004, the same as the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes bill language designating \$3,000,000 for financial and technical assistance for Native American, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native communities.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$60,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	56,629,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	60,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+3,371,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	0

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 the same level as requested and an increase of \$3,371,000 over the fiscal year 2003 appropriation.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$363,452,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	326,211,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	472,742,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+37,241,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	-109,290,000

The Corporation for National and Community Service was established by the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 to enhance opportunities for national and community service and provide national service educational awards. The Corporation makes grants to States, institutions of higher education, public and private nonprofit organizations, and others to create service opportunities for a wide variety of individuals through full-time national and community service programs. Funds for the Volunteers in Service to America and the National Senior Service Corps are provided in the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education Appropriations bill.

The Committee is completely frustrated at the financial situation created by the lack of financial and grant program accountability at the Corporation, even after years of providing funds specifically for the purpose of grant management and assurances made by the Corporation during the conference on the 2003 Act that the Corporation was on the path of reform. The Committee is recommending funding for the Corporation in fiscal year 2004, but is also expecting thorough reforms of its systems.

The recent funding fiasco at the Corporation has been years in the making. Information provided to this Committee in the course of budget and oversight hearings and justifications by the Corporation and its officers have been inaccurate. A review of enrollment information reported in budget justifications and hearing transcripts compared to the actual enrollment numbers the Corporation provides today, show that for the past five years the Corporation has been unable to account accurately for its resources, obligations,

or volunteers. The Corporation's Fiscal 2002 Budget Estimate and Performance Plan (the "Plan") reports that 40,334 volunteers were enrolled in the National Service Trust in 1999. However, a recent accounting reveals that the Corporation actually enrolled 48,000 in fiscal year 1999. The 2002 Plan reports that 48,000 volunteers were enrolled in 2000, 5,000 less than the actual enrollment of 53,000. The 2002 Plan further states that the fiscal year 2001 appropriation will support the same number of volunteers as 2000, or 48,000. However, the Corporation actually enrolled 59,200 in 2001. Further, the 2002 plan proposes to the Congress that AmeriCorps will remain at 48,000 volunteers in 2002. In reality, the Corporation made commitments in 2002 for a record number of 67,000 volunteers.

In 2003, the over obligations and program mismanagement of the Corporation came to a head and the Corporation had to pause enrollments and request a deficiency appropriation from the Congress of \$64,000,000 to cover the shortage. The Congress and this Committee have tried diligently to help the Corporation out of its financial mess. First, the Committee provided \$275,000,000 in Public Law 108-7 to support 50,000 volunteers based on financial estimates provided by the Corporation. The Committee hoped that fiscal year 2003 would be one of stabilization, enabling the Corporation to make a new, strong start in 2004.

Second, the Committee provided \$64,000,000 in Public Law 108-11 based on an administration request to cover the shortage in the National Service Trust. The Committee notes that the conditions of the deficiency appropriation have not yet been met and so the \$64,000,000 has not yet been released to the Corporation.

Third, the Congress acted quickly to change the investment requirements for the National Service Trust and Public Law 108-45 now allows the Corporation to achieve enrollment of the 50,000 volunteers for the same appropriation to the Trust.

Today, the Corporation is asking for a dramatic increase in resources and flexibility to enroll a record number of volunteers for fiscal year 2004. However, the financial disarray of the Corporation, the absence of accuracy in the Corporation's budget justifications and testimony, the transitioning leadership at the Corporation, and the lack of reform and accountability in the grant and financial programs do not leave the Committee with the sense that a large increase in available funds will be well managed or appropriate at this time. To that end, the Committee's recommendation includes resources and limitations designed to get the Corporation on track by providing a total of \$363,452,000 for operating expenses. The Committee identified regular AmeriCorps programs and financial reform as the priorities for funding in fiscal year 2004.

The Committee recommendation includes \$30,500,000 for administration of the Corporation's grant programs, of which \$15,000,000 is for the Corporation, \$13,000,000 is for the state commissions, and 2,500,000 is for the Office of the Chief Financial Officer to continue the oversight and implementation of financial management reforms.

The Committee recommends \$40,000,000 for subtitle B grants, which fund the Learn and Serve programs \$3,000,000 less than the request, a reduction taken without prejudice.

The Committee recommends \$244,352,000 for subtitle C grants, which fund the competitive and formula state grants, of which not more than \$50,000,000 shall be for national direct service programs. In addition, the Committee recommendation includes no less than \$24,000,000 for the National Civilian Community Corps. The Committee has provided language authorizing the Corporation to fund education award only grants out of subtitle C authority. In creating the funding recommendation, the Committee assumes that roughly \$3,900,000 will be spent on education award only grants and \$240,452,000 will be spent on national and state grants.

The Committee recommends \$6,100,000 for subtitle H grants which fund innovation and demonstration activities. The Committee has provided \$500,000 for Martin Luther King Day of Service grants, \$200,000 for unified state plan activities, \$5,000,000 for disability programs, \$300,000 for recruitment activities related to the National Senior Service Corps, and \$100,000 for literacy programs. The Committee suggests that in the future, USA Freedom Corps activities should be funded in the budget justifications for that office. The Committee notes an absence of budget information for each of the programs and projects proposed for funding in 2004. The Committee directs the Corporation to include detailed funding levels for each initiative, both current and proposed, in the 2005 budget justification.

The Committee recommends \$5,000,000 for America's Promise for capacity building and \$10,000,000 for the Points of Light Foundation, of which \$2,500,000 may be used for the endowment. The Committee did not earmark funding for Teach for America (TFA) simply because the Committee is committed to reducing the number of earmarks in this account. TFA is encouraged to apply for the funds available through the regular competitive and formula grant funding opportunities.

The Committee recommends \$3,500,000 for audit and evaluation activities and directs the Corporation to use these funds to assist grantees develop their performance measurement criteria.

The Committee directs the Corporation to undertake a thorough review of its grant programs and financial systems and submit a comprehensive report not less than 90 days after enactment of this Act detailing a plan for reform and accountability. The Corporation will not compete, consider, negotiate, or award any grant for fiscal year 2004 funds until the Corporation submits the reform report and implements a corrective action plan. Further, the Corporation will not award a grant to a grantee unless the program office has registered with the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) the amount of each grant and the number of FTE associated with each grant. The CFO will provide the Committees on Appropriations a quarterly report on 1) the individual grants awarded during the quarter, 2) the total amount of grant awards year to date, 3) the number of FTE awarded for each grant, and 4) the total number of FTE awarded year to date. In addition, the Committee directs the Corporation to reject from consideration any grant applications from organizations which enlist or hire volunteers for 2004 prior to receiving a signed grant agreement awarding fiscal year 2004 funds.

The Committee directs the Corporation to submit an operating plan within 90 days of enactment of this bill and abide by the reprogramming requirements outlined at the beginning of this report.

## NATIONAL SERVICE TRUST

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$110,771,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	100,000,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	120,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	10,771,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	9,229,000

The National Service Trust (Trust) provides a secure repository for education awards earned by eligible participants who successfully complete a term of service in the AmeriCorps State and National, VISTA and National Civilian Community Corps programs. The current amount of an education award is \$4,725 for a minimum of 1,700 hours of service (full-time), \$2,362.50 for a minimum of 900 hours of service (part-time), and \$1,000 to \$1,800 for reduce part-time awards. Education awards are eligible for payment of qualified student loans, educational expenses at a qualifying institution of higher education, expenses incurred in participation of an approved school-to-work program, or interest accrued on qualified student loans in forbearance while involved in AmeriCorps programs. In addition, the Trust provides a number of college scholarships to high school students for performing service in their community.

The Committee recommends \$110,771,000 for the Trust, an increase of \$10,771,000 over last year's appropriation and \$9,229,000 below the budget request. This funding level will support the enrollment of 55,000 new volunteers in the Trust in 2004, a deposit of \$10,000,000 in the National Service Trust Reserve as mandated by Public Law 108-45, and \$5,000,000 for national service scholarships for high school students.

The 2003 fiscal year appropriation included a statutory limitation of 50,000 enrollees in the Trust. The Committee was hopeful that the Corporation would demonstrate a level of competence in managing the programs under its jurisdiction and tried to support those efforts by providing an additional \$64,000,000 as a deficiency appropriation to the Trust in Public Law 108-11 and endorsing passage of Public Law 108-45 to fix the accounting problems of the Trust. However, the Committee has seen little evidence during 2003 that the Corporation has its grant programs and financial and management control systems in place to truly account for the resources in the agency. Therefore, the Committee is recommending a statutory limitation of 55,000 enrollees in the Trust in 2004 in order to ensure that Trust funds will not be over obligated again.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$6,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	5,961,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	5,108,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	39,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	892,000

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



The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$39,000 over the prior year level and \$892,000 over the budget request.

#### U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$15,938,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	14,233,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	16,220,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+1,705,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	-282,000

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

The bill includes \$15,938,000 for the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims in fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$1,705,000 above the current year appropriation and \$282,000 below the budget request.

The bill also identifies \$1,175,000 of the funds provided to fully fund the pro bono representation program.

The Committee is not recommending funds for purchasing all public spaces in the parking garage of the private building that currently houses the Court. The Committee strongly urges the Court to continue working with the General Services Administration, the building owners, and the other tenants to come to an agreeable solution. If a solution is not agreed to, the Committee recommends the Court look for alternative Federal office space to meet its needs.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

##### CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$25,961,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	32,234,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	25,961,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	-6,273,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

The Secretary of the Army is responsible for the administration, operation and maintenance of Arlington National Cemetery and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery. At the close of fiscal year 2002, the remains of 295,799 persons were interred/inured in these cemeteries. There were 4,022 interments and 2,283 inurnments in fiscal year 2002. It is projected that there will be 3,925 interments and 2,775 inurnments in fiscal year 2003. In addition to its principal function as a national cemetery, Arlington is the site of approximately 3,100 nonfuneral ceremonies each year and has approximately 4,000,000 visitors annually.

The Committee recommends \$25,961,000 for operations and maintenance of the Cemetery, a decrease of \$6,273,000 from the fiscal year 2003 funding level and equal to the budget request. In the past, the Committee has provided additional funds over the

budget requests to address construction and maintenance issues. The funding decrease from last year is not a cut to operating and current maintenance plans.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$80,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	83,528,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	78,744,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	-3,528,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+1,256,000

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

For fiscal year 2004 the Committee has recommended a funding level of \$80,000,000, an increase of \$1,256,000 above the budget request. This amount represents a decrease of \$3,528,000 from the fiscal year 2003 level because of one-time expenses provided for in fiscal year 2003. The Committee directs that funds be divided between the research and the worker training programs in the same proportions as in the budget request.

The Committee urges NIEHS to collaborate with the Federal Emergency Management Agency at the Department of Homeland Security with regard to studies already being conducted on the long-term health effects following the World Trade Center disaster.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$73,467,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	82,262,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	73,467,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	-8,795,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has recommended a funding level of \$73,467,000, a decrease of \$8,795,000 from the fiscal year 2003 funding level and the same as the budget request.

The Committee encourages ATSDR to continue to provide adequate funds for minority health professions, as well as for continuation of a health effects study on the consumption of Great Lakes fish.

Within the amount provided, the Committee urges ATSDR to assist the New York State Department of Health, in consultation with community residents, in public health activities related to potential exposure to volatile organic compounds in the Village of Endicott, New York.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$8,005,097,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	8,078,705,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request .....	7,630,538,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 73,608,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+374,559,000

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

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

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended.

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

Toxic Substances Control Act, as amended.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

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

Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

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

Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended.

Clean Air Act, as amended.

Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended.

Bioterrorism Act of 2002.

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

Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2001 (amending CERCLA).

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

Pollution Prevention Act of 1990.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has recommended a total program and support level of \$8,005,097,000, a decrease of \$73,608,000 below last year's appropriated level and an increase of \$374,559,000 above the budget request.

Of the amounts approved in the following appropriations accounts, the Agency must limit transfers of funds between objectives to not more than \$500,000, except as specifically noted, without prior approval of the Committee. No changes may be made to any account or objective except as approved by the Committee, if it is construed to be policy or a change in policy. Any activity or program cited in the report, including specific funding amounts, shall be construed as the position of the Committee and should not be subject to reductions or reprogramming without prior approval of the Committee, unless adjusted by the subsequent Conference Report. It is the intent of the Committee that all carryover funds in the various appropriations accounts are subject to the normal reprogramming requirements outlined above. The Agency is expected to comply with all normal rules and regulations in carrying out these directives. Reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes applying for Partnership Grants do not need to be submitted to the Committee for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations. Finally, the Committee wishes to continue to be notified regarding reorganizations of offices, programs, or activities prior to the planned implementation of such reorganizations.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation <sup>1</sup> .....	\$767,115,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	715,579,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	731,483,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+51,536,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+35,632,000

<sup>1</sup>Total does not include transfer of \$44,697,000 from the Hazardous Substance Superfund.

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

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$767,115,000 for Science and Technology for fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$51,536,000 above last year's spending level, and an increase of \$35,632,000 above the budget request.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following changes to the funding levels included in the budget submission:

1. \$9,750,000 for the STAR Fellowship program, the same as the fiscal year 2003 level.
2. \$7,000,000 for Communicating Research Information.

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

1. +\$2,500,000 for EPSCoR;
2. +\$4,000,000 for Water Environmental Research Foundation;
3. +\$5,000,000 for the American Water Works Association Research Foundation;
4. +\$2,000,000 for the National Decentralized Water Resource Capacity Development Project, in coordination with EPA, for continued training and research and development of the program;
5. +\$2,000,000 for the Water Information Sharing and Analysis Center (Water ISAC) to gather, analyze, and disseminate sensitive security information to water and wastewater systems;
6. \$500,000 to the University of California, Riverside for development of vehicle emissions measurement technology and improved models for assessing the effectiveness of new technologies and control strategies at the College of Engineering-Center for Environmental Research and Technology (CE-CERT) facility;
7. \$1,500,000 to California State University, Fresno for the International Center for Water Technology;
8. \$500,000 to the City of San Bernardino, California for the Lakes and Streams project;
9. \$100,000 to California State University—Fullerton to enhance ongoing research related to water hazard mitigation;
10. \$250,000 to the University of West Florida to continue the Partnership for Environmental Research and Community Health (PERCH);
11. \$750,000 for the University of South Florida Study, Protection and Amelioration of Coastal Environments;
12. \$250,000 to the University of Miami National Center for Caribbean Coral Reef Research;
13. \$200,000 to the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus for Chicago, Illinois for the Clean Air Counts Campaign;
14. \$500,000 to Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Michigan for the Great Lakes Center for Environmental and Molecular Science;
15. \$1,375,000 for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences in Ann Arbor, Michigan for assisting EPA in meeting the Strategic Goals Program in the metal finishing sector;
16. \$700,000 to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for a Green Chemical Manufacturing and Processing research program;
17. \$200,000 for turfgrass research centers at the University of Georgia and North Carolina State University to develop turfgrass management strategies;
18. \$500,000 for the State of New Jersey pilot and demonstration project for further development of proven, affordable, and effective dredge contaminant reduction technologies;

19. \$250,000 to LaGuardia Community College, New York for an air quality study throughout the Queens and the Bronx;

20. \$300,000 to Alfred University for the Center for Environmental and Energy Research;

21. \$250,000 to New York University for the South Bronx Air Pollution Study;

22. \$8,775,000 for the Environmental Systems Center of Excellence at Syracuse University for research and technology transfer in the fields of indoor environmental quality and urban ecosystems sustainability;

23. \$1,000,000 to the Syracuse Research Corporation in Syracuse, New York, for the continuation of environmental research at its Probability Risk Assessment Center;

24. \$250,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research;

25. \$200,000 for the National Environmental Technology Incubator at Central State University for technology transfer and commercialization activities;

26. \$900,000 for the Integrated Petroleum Environmental Consortium;

27. \$250,000 to the Overbrook Environmental Educational Center—a community based Technology and Literacy center, with a primary focus on environmental exploration and educational services—for environmental protection and conservation efforts at the center's on-site Green Roof and Bio-lab;

28. \$350,000 to the University of South Carolina for a geologic study for uranium groundwater contamination;

29. \$200,000 for Middle Tennessee State University for research on cedar glades;

30. \$1,800,000 for the Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxics Research Center in Houston, Texas;

31. \$250,000 for the Texas Institute for Environmental Assessment and Management at the University of North Texas, Denton for watershed research;

32. \$200,000 for the Texas Institute for Applied Environmental Research at Tarleton State University in Stephenville, Texas;

33. \$1,700,000 for the Canaan Valley Institute to continue to develop a regional sustainability support center and coordinated information system in the Mid-Atlantic Highlands;

34. \$1,000,000 for the Canaan Valley Institute in close coordination with the Regional Vulnerability and Assessment (ReVA) initiative and ORD Re+ program to demonstrate, validate and report on critical ecological hubs and corridors within the Mid-Atlantic Highlands and approaches to Highlands ecological prioritization, restoration and conservation. Research and educational tools are to be developed using integrative technologies to predict future environmental risks and support informed, proactive decision-making to be undertaken in conjunction with the Highlands Action Program.

The Committee has recommended a general reduction of \$5,500,000 in this account.

In addition to the funds provided through appropriations directly to this account, the Committee has recommended that \$44,697,000 be transferred to "Science and Technology" from the "Hazardous

Substance Superfund” account for ongoing research activities consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended.

The Committee is fully supportive of the collaborative partnership of the EPA and the National Institutes of Health in their system of Centers for Children’s Environmental Health and Disease Prevention Research. The Committee directs that EPA continue to support a competitive system of not less than twelve such centers and that it maintain the average level of funding for each center at not less than the historic level of approximately \$500,000.

The Committee recognizes the EPA’s commitment to developing a Computational Toxicology program to reduce the cost and use of animal testing. The Committee further encourages EPA to focus resources on research, development and validation of new and revised non-animal and other alternative chemical screening and prioritization methods which reduce, refine or replace animal studies but might not be categorized as “computational toxicology” methods. Any such activities should be designed in consultation with EPA’s Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxic Substances. The Committee directs the Agency to provide a report to the Committee by March 30, 2004 regarding expenditures for fiscal year 2004 funds for research, development and validation of non-animal and other alternative methods by the Office of Research and Development.

The Committee is aware of industry’s voluntary decision, announced on February 12, 2002, to attend their EPA-approved FIFRA labels for Chromated Copper Arsenate (CCA) wood preservation so as to prohibit treatment of wood for certain residential uses effective January 1, 2004. The Committee is also aware of the agency’s interest to issue an assessment of the cancer risk posed to children by CCA treated decks and playsets despite the expressed sentiment of its own Science Advisory Board (SAB) that there is “a high degree of uncertainty inherent in the assumptions and default measures proposed for use in the exposure assessment pathway,” and that, “the cumulative uncertainty in the resulting exposure [risk] assessment was likely to be substantial.” To ensure EPA was able to make the most informed decision possible based on the best available science and most accurate data, the SAB recommended a biomonitoring study of children exposed to CCA be conducted, designed according to well-accepted epidemiological properties. The Committee shares the belief that such a biomonitoring study is necessary to properly evaluate risks to children from CCA treated structures and directs EPA to assist in the development, conduct, and review such a biomonitoring study before issuing any proposed or final risk assessment for CCA.

In order to improve EPA’s biomonitoring capabilities, the Committee directs EPA, in coordination with the Department of Health and Human Services, to request the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study that would develop a research agenda for interpreting human biomonitoring data. The study shall identify the key uncertainties in estimating the exposure, health effects, and health risk potentially associated with biomonitoring data and shall propose research that will address these uncertainties. The study shall also include approaches to improve the future collection of biomoni-

toring data so that the data are more usable for health risk evaluations.

The Committee continues to support the partnership between the EPA and the National Technology Transfer Center and directs that the Agency continue the cooperative agreement at the fiscal year 2001 level.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$2,192,552,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	2,097,879,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	2,219,659,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+94,673,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	-27,107,000

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

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

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

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has recommended \$2,192,552,000 for Environmental Programs and Management, a decrease of \$27,107,000 below the budget request and an increase of \$94,673,000 above the fiscal year 2003 funding level. For this account only, the Agency may transfer funds of not more than \$500,000 between programs and activities without prior notice to the Committee, and of not more than \$1,000,000 without prior approval of the Committee. But for this difference, all other re-programming procedures as outlined earlier shall apply.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following changes to the funding levels included in the budget submission:

1. \$24,500,000 for the National Estuary Program, an increase of \$5,405,800 above the budget request;
2. \$5,500,000 for Environmental Justice programs, an increase of \$1,673,900 above the budget request;
3. \$2,675,000 for the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Program, an increase of \$1,675,000 over the budget request;
4. \$112,000,000 for Management Services and Stewardship;
5. \$35,000,000 for Regional Management;
6. \$26,500,000 for Information Technology Management;



7. \$2,750,000 for Data Standards;
8. \$33,500,000 for Regulatory Development;
9. \$10,000,000 for the Great Lakes Legacy Act;
10. \$27,500,000 for the EPM account's portion of the Brownfields program;
11. \$14,000,000 for RCRA Waste Reduction;
12. \$2,500,000 for the Long Island Sound program office, an increase of \$1,522,000 over the budget request.

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

1. +\$18,250,000 for rural water technical assistance activities and groundwater protection with distribution as follows: \$10,250,000 for the NRWA; \$4,250,000 for RCAP, to be divided equally between assistance for water programs and assistance for wastewater programs; \$750,000 for GWPC; \$2,000,000 for Small Flows Clearinghouse; \$1,000,000 for the NETC;
2. +\$1,500,000 for the Water Systems Council Wellcare Program;
3. +\$1,000,000 for implementation of the National Biosolids Partnership Program;
4. +\$2,500,000 for source water protection programs;
5. +\$4,000,000 for grants to interested States for a long-term ambient monitoring and assessment framework at relevant geographic scales to support water quality management objectives;
6. +\$5,000,000 for a cost-shared grant program to school districts for necessary upgrades of their diesel bus fleets;
7. +\$3,000,000 for EPA's National Computing Center to provide for the remote mirroring of all critical information and related systems to achieve a Continuity of Operations (COOP)/Disaster Recovery capability;
8. \$1,500,000 for the Highlands Action Program;
9. \$200,000 to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, California for its Operation Clean Air public education program;
10. \$300,000 to the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, California and National Park Service for shoreline and habitat restoration;
11. \$750,000 to the Santa Clara Valley Water District in California for groundwater remediation;
12. \$1,350,000 for the Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy;
13. \$300,000 to the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services for its Reclaimed Rainwater Irrigation Project to demonstrate nonpoint source pollution prevention;
14. \$1,200,000 to Florida Gulf Coast University for the Institute of Coastal Watershed Studies;
15. \$2,000,000 for Osceola County, Florida to treat invasive plants (Hydrilla and Hygophila) in the County's watershed and drainage system;
16. \$100,000 for development and implementation of the Georgia Water Planning and Policy Center, Offset Banking Water Quality Improvement program;

17. \$400,000 to the Georgia Environmental Training and Education Authority for a lagoon waste management demonstration program;

18. \$175,000 to Cerro Gordo County, Iowa for continuation of the initiatives related to the Clear Lake Restoration Project;

19. \$200,000 to Storm Lake, Iowa for the Storm Lake Water Quality Project;

20. \$100,000 to the Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee for monitoring programs and pilot studies on how to stabilize the deep aquifer water levels and ensure a long-term water supply for the Palouse region serving the Cities of Moscow, Idaho and Pullman, Washington, the University of Idaho, Washington State University and the surrounding areas in Latah County, Idaho and Whitman County, Washington;

21. \$300,000 for the Selenium Information System Project at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory;

22. \$500,000 to the State of Idaho for Producers Supply Coop to carry out a program of environmental response for fuel contamination cleanup;

23. \$800,000 for the Coeur d'Alene Basin Commission to continue a pilot program for environmental response, natural resource restoration and related activities;

24. \$1,500,000 to Boise State University for research projects aimed at developing and demonstrating multi-purpose sensors to detect and analyze contaminants and time-lapse imaging of shallow subsurface fluid flow;

25. \$600,000 to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency for the Fox River Watershed Management Program;

26. \$100,000 to the Lincoln Trail Area Development District, Kentucky for the PRIDE in the Heartland of Kentucky environmental study;

27. \$1,450,000 for the Olmsted Parks Conservancy for a regional watershed demonstration in the Louisville, Kentucky Olmsted Parks;

28. \$1,550,000 for the Louisville Waterfront Development Corporation, a non-profit corporation in Kentucky, for a riverbank stabilization project to demonstrate pollution run-off reduction strategies;

29. \$400,000 for Red River Watershed Management Institute at Louisiana State University-Shreveport for research, education, and community service/outreach related to watershed management in the area drained by the Red River and its tributaries;

30. \$175,000 to Oakland County, Michigan for the Clinton River Watershed Initiative including watershed research and modeling, creation of a web-based database on stream flow and water quality, bacterial source tracking, and outreach activities;

31. \$1,000,000 for the Oakland County Drain Commission, Michigan for water and sewerage infrastructure management and planning;

32. \$125,000 for the Hypoxia Education and Stewardship Project in Kansas City, Missouri;

33. \$250,000 for Wake County, North Carolina for a ground-water protection program;
34. \$750,000 for the North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center to develop a statewide Water and Wastewater Assessment, Management and Security Initiative;
35. \$850,000 for continued support of a North Carolina Central University research initiative to assess environmental exposure and impact in communities of color and economically disadvantaged communities;
36. \$175,000 to the University of Nebraska, Lincoln for development of a large-scale, system-level mathematical model of critical water resources in western Nebraska;
37. \$100,000 to the State of New Jersey for the New Jersey Geographic Information System Smart Growth Program;
38. \$100,000 for the Peconic Estuary Program Office in Riverhead, New York for implementation of a Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan;
39. \$150,000 in technical assistance grants to Washington County, Rensselaer County, and Saratoga County, New York, for Hudson River stewardship programs;
40. \$200,000 to Orange County, New York for a county-wide water analysis;
41. \$200,000 to Madison County, New York for the landfill gas to energy project;
42. \$200,000 for Columbia University in New York City, New York for education and training related to ongoing biomedical research on environmentally induced cancers and immunological responses, at the Audubon Biomedical Science and Technology Park;
43. \$250,000 to Wayne County, New York for the development of a Sodus Bay comprehensive watershed management plan;
44. \$250,000 to the Center for Environmental Information in Rochester, New York for planning, research and environmental analysis for a Lake Ontario coastline remediation and restoration initiative;
45. \$300,000 for the NADO (National Association of Development Organizations) Research Foundation for environmental training and information dissemination related to rural brownfields, air quality standards and water infrastructure;
46. \$350,000 to the State University of New York Environmental School of Forestry for research and demonstration of contaminant mitigation strategies for rural/suburban run-off affecting water quality along the rural-urban interface in Central New York watersheds;
47. \$350,000 to the State University of New York Environmental School of Forestry for an Onondaga Creek habitat restoration demonstration initiative;
48. \$750,000 to Cortland County, New York for continued work on the aquifer protection plan, of which \$350,000 is for continued implementation of the comprehensive water quality management program in the Upper Susquehanna Watershed;
49. \$1,500,000 for continued work on water management plans for the Central New York Watersheds in Onondaga and Cayuga counties;

50. \$500,000 for Springfield, Ohio for environmental restoration activities;

51. \$250,000 to Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP) Community Asthma Prevention program to increase awareness of environmental asthma triggers in the homes of families in Philadelphia;

52. \$250,000 to the Caribbean American Mission for Education Research and Action (CAMERA) in support of their youth environmental stewardship and education program;

53. \$200,000 to the National Energy Technology Center for the Monogahela River Mine Pool Study in Northwestern West Virginia and Southwestern Pennsylvania;

54. \$500,000 to the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for lead screening, testing, outreach and education throughout the public school system;

55. \$500,000 to the Urban Education Research and Retreat Center (UEDRARC) of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

56. \$500,000 to Environment and Sports Inc., a nonprofit organization, for an environmental and awareness program;

57. \$1,500,000 to the American Cities Foundation for the Neighborhood Environmental Action Team program and other community environmental efforts;

58. \$250,000 to the Brazos River Authority for the Brazos/Navasota Watershed Management project;

59. \$50,000 to Frederick County, Virginia for a water resources study in the counties of Frederick, Warren, Clark and Shenendoah in Virginia and Berkley County in West Virginia;

60. \$200,000 to Loudoun County, Virginia for development of a comprehensive watershed management plan;

61. \$200,000 to the Columbia Basin Groundwater Management Area in Washington State for the Columbia Basin Groundwater Management Area Study;

62. \$800,000 to the Polymer Alliance Zone's MARCEE Initiative with oversight being provided by the Office of Solid Waste;

63. \$2,000,000 for on-going activities at the Canaan Valley Institute, including activities relating to community sustainability.

The Committee has recommended a general reduction of \$30,213,000 in this account.

The Committee supports the Agency's fiscal year 2004 request for 100 FTEs over the fiscal year 2003 request level for the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, and has provided sufficient funding for this increase.

The Committee supports the full budget request of \$50,300,000 for the Energy Star Program.

Within available funds, the Agency is directed to provide no less than last year's level of \$9,160,000 for Environmental Education programs. The Agency is directed to distribute funds under the Environmental Education program proportionally in a manner consistent with the provisions of the National Environmental Education Act.

The Committee has, within available funds, provided \$2,000,000 for the eight Environmental Finance Centers, the same as for fiscal year 2003. Also from within available funds, the Agency is provided with \$250,000 to continue development of BASINS models, GIS

mapping, integration with other financial and planning tools, and incorporation of cost-effectiveness considerations into integrated priority ranking systems.

The Committee has provided the full budget request for the High Production Volume Chemical Challenge Program, the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program, and the Voluntary Children's Chemical Evaluation Program and directs that no reductions be proposed in the operating plan submission for these important programs.

In addition to funds provided to the NRWA, RCAP, the GWPC, NETC, and the Small Flows Clearinghouse, the Committee has provided \$2,500,000 for source water protection programs. The Committee intends that these funds be used to continue and to expand the statewide grassroots sourcewater protection programs being carried out by state rural water associations.

The Committee has again provided funding for grants to States to establish a long-term ambient monitoring and assessment framework. Consistent with last year's direction, the Committee expects that the Agency may reserve up to five percent from the total appropriation to administer the program and enable it to provide technical assistance to States in developing and implementing multi-year ambient monitoring and assessment frameworks.

The Committee has recommended \$5,000,000 to continue a program initiated last year to provide grants to local school districts to reduce emissions from their buses. It is again the Committee's intent that the Agency should require, where appropriate, a modest cost-share commitment on the part of the recipient school district.

The Committee has provided modest increases to the Data Standards and Information Technology Management programs over the fiscal year 2003 levels, but has not provided the budget request for substantial increases to these programs. The Committee does not believe the Agency has demonstrated sufficient environmental or management benefits to justify the requested increases to these programs.

The Committee is concerned that the Federal Agencies continue to receive failing grades due to weaknesses in cyber security management. To address this weakness, the Committee believes Agencies can use vulnerability management as a means of securing critical computer networks. The Committee is aware of a new appliance-based technology that runs a hardened operating system and communicates through encryption using digital certificates for authentication. The technology will allow for greater certainty in identifying business risk, and eliminating those risks. The Committee directs EPA to provide no less than \$1,000,000 within available funds to demonstrate this technology as part of its cyber-security architecture.

The Committee supports continuation of funding for the Center for Agricultural Partnerships to help farmers increase use of environmentally sound pest management practices.

The Committee commends the Agency for resolving a large number of pending Title VI environmental justice cases and has provided adequate funds to address the remaining backlog of cases.

The Committee directs the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to file a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriation indicating whether the amendments adopted by the State of Florida to its 1994 Everglades Forever Act have

been approved by the Environmental Protection Agency as a change in water quality standards consistent with the requirements of the Clean Water Act. In addition, the Committee directs the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to file a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations indicating whether the Environmental Protection Agency has approved the State of Florida's rule to set forth the numeric interpretation of the phosphorus criterion, as required under the Everglades Forever Act. The report shall contain EPA's analysis as to whether the numeric criterion will result in improvements to the quality of water entering the Everglades Protection Area and protect the federal resources located therein consistent with the Consent Decree entered in *United States v. South Florida Water Management District*.

In 2000 the DC Circuit Court of Appeals held that EPA was improperly regulating recycling by using an overly broad definition of "discarded material." The Committee encourages EPA to promulgate a rule in fiscal year 2004 revising the regulation of recycling under 40 C.F.R. Part 261, by limiting the definition of "discarded material" to materials that are "disposed of, abandoned or thrown away" as defined by the court. The Committee also supports EPA's work to examine the effectiveness of the current comparable fuel program to supplement domestic energy sources with industrial materials, and encourages EPA to promulgate a rule in fiscal year 2004 allowing additional industrial materials to be safely used as fuels.

The Committee is pleased to note that in response to Congressional direction in the 2002 Committee report, EPA is submitting the current version of the Multi-Media, Multi-Pathway, Multi-Receptor, Risk Assessment (3MRA) model, documentation and sample results from the model to the Science Advisory Board (SAB) for its review during fiscal year 2003–2004. The Committee again strongly encourages the Agency to spend no resources to use the 3MRA risk model or any portion of the model for any regulatory or other similar purposes until recommendations of the Science Advisory Board are incorporated into the model.

The Committee is aware that the U.S. is committed to the goal of the Montreal Protocol to phase-out all ozone-depleting substances, including CFCs in metered-dose inhalers (MDIs). The Committee is also aware that the leading patient and physician organizations, representing millions of American patients suffering from asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and their health care providers, submitted a Citizen Petition requesting the first stage in the CFC MDI phase-out be the removal of albuterol from the list of essential uses at 21 CFR 2.125(e). The Committee therefore urges EPA to work with FDA to complete its review of this petition and issue a proposed rule on albuterol non-essentiality no later than September 30, 2003. The health and environmental benefits of this action on albuterol referred to in the Citizen Petition can be protected and enhanced by corresponding international actions within the Montreal Protocol. The Committee therefore also urges EPA to consult with FDA on a final Protocol decision this year that deems albuterol non-essential for developed countries by 2005 and takes other steps to bring timely and effective closure to the Protocol's essential use exemption.

The Committee notes that EPA has relied upon the Integrated Planning Model (IPM), a proprietary model, in developing its proposed mercury MACT rulemaking and in assessing other multi-pollutant legislative proposals. The Committee wishes to ensure that the model conforms with the new Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility and Integrity of Information Disseminated by Federal Agencies that establishes a standard of “reproducibility” for “influential” statistical results. The Agency is to report to the Committee no later than December 1, 2003 on the conformance of the IPM model with the guidelines.

The Great Lakes Legacy Act, enacted in November 2002, authorizes appropriations for remediation of sediment contamination in the Great Lakes ecosystem. The Committee encourages EPA to promulgate rules implementing this program before the end of fiscal year 2004.

The Committee notes that agency is developing a report on pending regulations on radon in drinking water in consultation with state water, air and radiation programs. Upon completion of this report, the Committee looks forward to working with the Agency on this issue.

The Committee is concerned that EPA is not providing equal access to the benefits of the Energy Star Labeled Homes Program to all sectors of the affordable housing industry. The Committee strongly urges EPA to cooperate with the manufactured housing industry, including the Manufactured Housing Research Alliance (MHRA), to expand the Energy Star Labeled Homes program to include research planning and the development of approaches, tools and techniques for manufactured housing.

The Committee is concerned that a proposed rule on pesticide spray drift could have significant negative impacts, of a random nature, on broad sectors of the production agriculture community, including decreased farm income. As the EPA proceeds with a potential rulemaking, the Agency should recognize the diverse geography of U.S. agriculture, and give sufficient consideration to the needs of the nation’s agricultural economy and affected communities.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	<sup>1</sup> \$36,808,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	35,766,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	36,808,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+1,042,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

<sup>1</sup>Total does not include transfer of \$13,214,000 from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) provides audit, evaluation, and investigation products and advisory services to improve the performance and integrity of EPA programs and operations. This account funds personnel compensation and benefits, travel, and expenses (excluding rent, utilities, and security costs) for the Office of Inspector General. The appropriation for the OIG is funded from two separate accounts: Office of Inspector General and Hazardous Substance Superfund.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee recommends a total appropriation of \$50,022,000 for the Office of Inspector General, an increase of \$1,597,000 above last year’s funding level and the same as the budget request. Of the amount provided, \$13,214,000 shall

be derived by transfer from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$42,918,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	42,639,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	42,918,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+279,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

The Committee is recommending \$42,918,000, the budget request, for Buildings and Facilities. This funding level represents an increase of \$279,000 above the fiscal year 2003 funding level. This recommendation provides for necessary maintenance and repair and improvement costs at Agency facilities and the ongoing renovation of EPA's new headquarters.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$1,275,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	1,264,614,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	1,389,716,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+10,386,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	- 114,716,000

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

The Superfund program is operated by EPA subject to annual appropriations from a dedicated trust fund and from general revenues. Enforcement activities are used to identify and induce parties responsible for hazardous waste problems to undertake clean-up actions and pay for EPA oversight of those actions. In addition, responsible parties have been required to cover the cost of fund-financed removal and remedial actions undertaken at spills and waste sites by Federal and State agencies. Through transfers to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) and Science and Technology accounts, the OIG and the Office of Research and Development also receive funding from this account. Due to the site-specific nature of the Agency's Superfund program, site-specific travel is not considered part of the overall travel ceiling set for the Superfund account.

For fiscal year 2004, \$1,275,000,000 has been recommended by the Committee, an increase of \$10,386,000 above last year's fund-



ing level and \$114,716,000 below the budget request. Bill language is included which provides \$200,000,000 of the appropriated amount from the Superfund Trust Fund and \$1,075,000,000 from general revenues of the treasury. The Committee recognizes that the amounts provided from the trust fund and general revenues in this account may require adjustments prior to enactment of this legislation.

Bill language has been included which transfers \$13,214,000 from this account to the Office of Inspector General and \$44,697,000 to the Science and Technology account. The Committee's recommendation includes the following program level:

\$890,763,000 for Superfund remedial, removal and other response/cleanup activities.

\$147,500,000 for enforcement activities.

\$140,000,000 for management and support.

\$13,214,000 to be transferred to the Office of Inspector General.

Bill language is included which provides for this transfer.

\$44,697,000 to be transferred to Science and Technology for research and development activities. Bill language is included which provides for this transfer.

\$28,150,000 for the Department of Justice.

\$10,676,000 for other necessary, reimbursable interagency activities, including reimbursements to the Department of the Interior, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the United States Coast Guard.

The Committee has provided a \$39,327,000 increase over the fiscal year 2003 level for Superfund response activities. The Committee recognizes the importance of cleaning up Superfund hazardous waste sites, and encourages the EPA to expedite cleanup efforts, especially those underway. In addition, the Committee encourages EPA to focus particular attention to remediate sites in the states with the largest number of Superfund sites.

The Committee directs the EPA Inspector General to conduct an evaluation of Superfund expenditures at Headquarters and the Regions and recommend options for increasing resources directed to cleanup while minimizing administrative costs. As part of its analysis, the Inspector General should recommend options for enhancing the cost-effectiveness of cleanup contracting. The Inspector General should also evaluate whether the distribution of the Superfund resources among the various Agency Offices and Regions is appropriate to achieve the goal of expediting Superfund cleanups. The Agency is to report to the Committee on the implementation of the direction of this paragraph, identifying measures that the Agency will take to minimize overhead costs while accelerating cleanups with available resources.

The Committee commends the Agency for the accomplishments of its Contaminated Sediments Technical Advisory Group (CSTAG), and believes that CSTAG can improve the Agency's consistency with national policy on contaminated sediment issues. The Agency is encouraged to expand CSTAG's role with an outside panel of experts who are involved in the evaluation process and remedy selection for contaminated sediments. Those named to the panel should have expertise in contaminated sediment management issues such

as site assessment, risk assessment, ecological risk, sediment stability, and sediment remedial technology. To the extent practicable, the Agency should establish a preference for funding the cleanup of contaminated sites that have undergone CSTAG review.

The Committee supports the national pilot worker training program which recruits and trains young persons who live near hazardous waste sites or in the communities at risk of exposure to contaminated properties for work in the environmental field. The Committee directs EPA to continue funding this effort in cooperation and collaboration with NIEHS. The research activities of NIEHS can compliment the training and operational activities of EPA in carrying out this program.

The Committee is aware that the former Alameda Point Naval Air Station is currently being considered as a candidate for early transfer based on the pending agreement between the Navy and the City of Alameda for reuse, development, and preservation of the property. The Committee is further aware that the Administrator of EPA must approve the deferral of the CERCLA covenant. The Committee believes that the early transfer of the land and associated facilities in the City of Alameda could serve as a model for the military services of base conversion in an urban environment. Accordingly, the Committee expects the Administrator of EPA and the Secretary of the Navy to work cooperatively to achieve this early transfer in the most expeditious manner possible.

The Committee understands that the Administrator of EPA visited Washington State and Idaho in August 2002 and expressed support for a combined effort on the part of the Federal government, the State of Idaho, and the State of Washington to clean up the Coeur d' Alene River Basin. While the Committee supports the criteria established for prioritizing funding for Superfund sites, it is also supportive of moving forward on a regional approach to cleanup in both Idaho and Washington. The Committee urges the Administrator to work with affected parties in the State of Washington on this issue.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$72,545,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	71,843,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	72,545,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+702,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

Subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, authorized the establishment of a response program for clean-up of releases from leaking underground storage tanks. Owners and operators of facilities with underground tanks must demonstrate financial responsibility and bear initial responsibility for clean-up. The Federal trust fund is funded through the imposition of a motor fuel tax of one-tenth of a cent per gallon, which generates approximately \$170,000,000 per year.

Most states also have their own leaking underground storage tank programs, including a separate trust fund or other funding mechanism, in place. The Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund provides additional clean-up resources and may also be used to enforce necessary corrective actions and to recover costs ex-

pended from the Fund for clean-up activities. The underground storage tank response program is designed to operate primarily through cooperative agreements with states. However, funds are also used for grants to non-state entities including Indian tribes under Section 8001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has provided \$72,545,000, an increase of \$702,000 over fiscal year 2003 and the same as the budget request.

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

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$16,209,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	15,480,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	16,209,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+729,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

This appropriation, authorized by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, provides funds to prepare for and prevent releases of oil and other petroleum products in navigable waterways. In addition, EPA is reimbursed for incident specific response costs through the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund managed by the United States Coast Guard.

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

The Committee recommends \$16,209,000 for fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$729,000 over the fiscal year 2003 level and the same as the budget request.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$3,601,950,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	3,834,905,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	3,121,200,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	-232,955,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	+480,750,000

The State and Tribal Assistance Grants account provides grant funds for programs operated primarily by state, local, tribal and other governmental partners. The account provides funding for infrastructure projects through the State Revolving Funds, geo-

graphic specific projects in rural Alaska and Alaska Native Villages and on the United States-Mexico Border, and other targeted special projects. In addition, the account funds Brownfields assessment and revitalization grants as well as miscellaneous categorical grant programs.

The largest portion of the STAG account consists of two State Revolving Funds (SRFs), which provide Federal financial assistance to protect the nation's water resources. The Clean Water State Revolving Funds are intended to help eliminate municipal discharge of untreated or inadequately treated pollutants and thereby maintain or help restore this country's water to a swimmable and/or fishable quality. This program provides resources for municipal, inter-municipal, state, interstate agencies, and tribal governments to plan, design, and construct wastewater facilities and other projects, including non-point source, estuary, stormwater, and sewer overflow projects. The Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Fund program finances improvements to community water systems so that they can achieve compliance with the mandates of the Safe Drinking Water Act and continue to protect public health.

This account also funds various categorical grant programs to ensure continued environmental protection nation-wide. Among these are non-point source grants under Section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, Public Water System Supervision grants, Section 106 water quality grants, grants to improve targeted watersheds, Clean Air Act Section 105 and 103 air grants, a program targeted to environmental information, Brownfields cleanup grants, and other grants utilized by the states, tribes, and others to meet Federal environmental statutory and regulatory requirements.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee recommends a total of \$3,601,950,000, a decrease of \$232,955,000 below the current fiscal year spending level, and \$480,750,000 above the level proposed in the budget request.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following program levels:

- \$1,200,000,000 for Clean Water State Revolving Funds;
- \$850,000,000 for Safe Drinking Water State Revolving Funds;
- \$50,000,000 for high priority U.S./Mexico border projects;
- \$25,000,000 for Alaska rural and Native Villages;
- \$93,500,000 for Brownfields assessment and revitalization grants;
- \$8,250,000 for the National Community Decentralized Wastewater Demonstration program;
- \$1,180,200,000 for state and tribal program/categorical grants; and
- \$195,000,000 for a program targeting grants to communities for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection.

As was the case in past years, no reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes applying for Partnership grants need to be submitted to the Committee for approval should such grants exceed the normal reprogramming limitations.

The Committee has included bill language, as carried in previous appropriations acts, to clarify that drinking water health effects

studies are to be funded through the science and technology account.

The Committee has also included bill language, as requested by the administration and as carried in previous appropriations acts, to: (1) extend for an additional year the authority for States to transfer funds between the Clean Water SRF and the Drinking Water SRF; (2) waive the one-third of 1 percent cap on the Tribal set aside from non-point source grants; (3) increase to 1.5 percent the cap on the Tribal set-aside for the Clean Water SRF; and (4) require that any funds provided to address the water infrastructure needs of colonias within the United States along the United States-Mexico border be spent only in areas where the local governmental entity has established an enforceable ordinance or rule which prevents additional development within colonias that lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure. Bill language has been included which provides specific dollar amounts for each of the above listed programs.

Bill language has been included which stipulates that, consistent with section 603 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, \$68,000,000 of the \$1,200,000,000 proposed for the Clean Water SRF program is to be made available by the States for interest-free loans that increase non-point and non-structural, decentralized alternatives, to expand the choices available to communities in their fight for clean water. The Committee continues to enthusiastically support this program, and believes that the States will be able to increase their participation in this program with the funds made available by this provision.

From within the Committee's \$50,000,000 recommendation for the United States-Mexico Border program, the Agency is expected to provide \$2,000,000 for continuation of the Brownsville, Texas area water supply project, \$7,000,000 for continuation of the El Paso, Texas area desalination and water supply project, and \$1,000,000 for the City of Imperial Beach, California for an Enhanced Solids Reduction Pilot Project.

The Committee has provided \$8,250,000 for six specific grants under the National Decentralized Wastewater Demonstration program. The program, which has shown tremendous success in developing and transferring technologies which offer alternatives to centralized wastewater treatment facilities, also requires a cost-share whereby each grantee must provide 25% of the project's total cost. The six projects included for funding are located in Seattle, Washington (\$1,700,000); Blackstone Watershed, Massachusetts and Rhode Island (\$1,700,000); Boise, Idaho (\$1,250,000); Pasquotank River Watershed, North Carolina (\$1,700,000); Washington, D.C. (\$1,000,000); and Chagrin River Watershed, Ohio (\$900,000). As in previous years, these projects were determined by non-governmental, independent analysis based upon their unique and diverse geology and geography, their ability to provide the greatest technological diversity using limited financial resources, and the commitment of each community or regional area to find and fund appropriate alternative technologies to resolve their wastewater treatment needs.

The Committee has not provided funding for a grant for drinking water infrastructure improvements in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

The Committee has included bill language which makes technical corrections to grants provided to Wellsboro, Pennsylvania, Newton, Mississippi, and McComb, Mississippi in last year's bill.

The Committee has provided \$1,180,200,000 for state and tribal program assistance/categorical grants. The Committee's recommendation for each categorical grant follows:

- (1) \$228,550,000 for air resource assistance to State and local governments under sections 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act, including \$10,000,000 for the five State/Regional Haze planning organizations;
- (2) \$11,050,000 for air resource assistance grants to Tribal governments;
- (3) \$8,150,000 for radon grants;
- (4) \$200,400,000 for water pollution control agency resource supplementation under section 106 of FWPCA;
- (5) \$10,000,000 for beach grants to develop and implement monitoring and information programs for coastal recreation waters pursuant to the Beach Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000;
- (6) \$238,550,000 for section 319 of FWPCA non-point source pollution grants, including programs formerly eligible under the section 314 Clean Lakes program;
- (7) \$20,000,000 for wetlands program development grants;
- (8) \$19,000,000 for water quality cooperative agreements under section 104(b)(3) of FWPCA;
- (9) \$15,000,000 for targeted watershed grants;
- (10) \$102,600,000 for public water system supervision grants;
- (11) \$11,000,000 for underground injection control grants;
- (12) \$5,000,000 for Drinking Water Program State Homeland Security Coordination grants;
- (13) \$106,400,000 for RCRA financial assistance grants;
- (14) \$50,000,000 for Brownfields categorical cleanup grants;
- (15) \$11,950,000 for underground storage tank grants;
- (16) \$13,100,000 for pesticides program implementation grants;
- (17) \$13,700,000 for lead risk reduction grants;
- (18) \$5,150,000 for toxic substances compliance/enforcement grants;
- (19) \$19,900,000 for pesticides enforcement grants;
- (20) \$20,000,000 for the information exchange network program;
- (21) \$6,000,000 for pollution prevention incentive grants;
- (22) \$2,250,000 for enforcement and compliance assurance grants;
- (23) \$62,500,000 for Indians general assistance grants; and

The Committee has provided \$228,550,000 for grants to state and local air quality agencies under sections 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act. This level is equal to the budget request and \$5,012,000 over last year's level.

Section 106 pollution control grants are funded at a level of \$200,400,000, equal to the budget request and \$9,151,000 over last year's level.

The Committee has provided \$238,500,000 for Section 319 non-point source grants, equal to the budget request.

Wetlands program development grants are funded at a level of \$20,000,000, equal to the budget request and \$5,130,00 over last year's level.

The Committee has provided \$102,600,000 for public water system supervision grants, an increase of \$10,105,000 over the fiscal year 2003 level and a decrease of \$2,500,000 from the budget request.

The Committee has provided \$62,500,000 for Indian general assistance grants, an increase of \$5,404,000 over last year's level and equal to the budget request.

The total Brownfields program level is \$171,000,000, consisting of a total of \$143,500,000 from two portions of this account, as well as the administrative portion of this program, which is funded in the EPM account at \$27,500,000.

The Committee has not provided increases for targeted watershed grants or the information exchange network program requested by the President. These programs have been provided with modest increases over the fiscal year 2003 level.

The Committee has provided \$180,000,000 for a targeted program making grants to communities for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection. As in past years, these grants shall be accompanied by a cost-share requirement whereby 45 percent of a project's cost is the responsibility of the community or entity receiving the grant. In those few cases where such cost-share requirement poses a particular financial burden on the recipient community or entity, the Committee supports the Agency's use of its long-standing guidance for financial capability assessments to determine reductions or waivers from this match requirement. But for the limited instances in which an applicant meets the criteria for a waiver, the Committee has provided no more than 55% of an individual project's cost, regardless of the amount appropriated below. Consistent with direction in the fiscal year 2003 Conference Report on this bill, the phrase "terms and conditions" referenced in the Bill Language includes the maximum 55% federal share, as well as the intended recipients and the specific project descriptions, as listed below:

1. \$85,000 to the City of Cedar Bluff, Alabama for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
2. \$90,000 to the Town of Pennington, Alabama for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
3. \$100,000 to the Fayette, Alabama, Water Works Board for water system infrastructure improvements;
4. \$100,000 to the Limestone County Water and Sewer Authority, Alabama for drinking water improvements;
5. \$100,000 to the City of Athens, Alabama for wastewater system improvements;
6. \$100,000 to Lawrence County, Alabama for the Bankhead Forest Water project;
7. \$100,000 to the City of New Hope, Alabama for wastewater system improvements;
8. \$150,000 to the Coosa Valley Water Authority in St. Clair County, Alabama for water infrastructure improvements;

9. \$175,000 to the West Morgan-East Lawrence Water and Sewer Authority, Alabama for water infrastructure improvements;
10. \$175,000 to the City of Lineville, Alabama for purchase and construction of a water tank;
11. \$200,000 to Walker County Commission, Alabama for water line extensions in isolated areas;
12. \$200,000 to Colbert County, Alabama, for water system improvements;
13. \$200,000 to the Utilities Board of the Town of Citronelle, Alabama for water infrastructure improvements;
14. \$225,000 to the West Lawrence Water Co-Op of Mount Hope, Alabama for water system infrastructure improvements;
15. \$250,000 to Attalla, Alabama, for sewerage system improvements;
16. \$300,000 to the Town of Gordo, Alabama for sanitary sewer expansion project;
17. \$300,000 to the Guntersville, Alabama, Water and Sewer Board for the Sand Mountain water storage system project;
18. \$300,000 to the Waterworks Board for the Towns of Section and Dutton, Alabama for water system improvements;
19. \$350,000 to the Town of Berry, Alabama for construction of a wetlands treatment facility;
20. \$350,000 to the Chilton Water Authority in Chilton County, Alabama for water infrastructure improvements;
21. \$400,000 to Jackson County, Alabama for water system improvements;
22. \$400,000 to the West Lauderdale County Water and Fire Protection Authority, Alabama for construction of a water treatment plant;
23. \$475,000 to Franklin County, Alabama for water system infrastructure improvements;
24. \$500,000 to Hartselle Utilities for wastewater infrastructure improvements in the City of Hartselle, Alabama;
25. \$700,000 to Lawrence County, Alabama for construction of a wastewater treatment facility;
26. \$850,000 to the Upper Bear Creek Water Treatment Plant in Haleyville, Alabama, for water treatment plant improvement project;
27. \$875,000 to the CREMS (Carlisle, Rockledge, Egypt, Mountainboro, and Shady Grove) Water Authority, Alabama for water system infrastructure improvements;
28. \$1,000,000 to the City of Florence, Alabama for the rehabilitation of the Canal/Jones Hollow Interceptor sewer lines;
29. \$100,000 to the Baxter County Water Facilities Board, Arkansas for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
30. \$125,000 to the City of Jonesboro, Arkansas for developing drainage plans;
31. \$200,000 to the Faulkner County Public Utilities Board, Arkansas for wastewater infrastructure improvements for Lake Conway;
32. \$300,000 to the Fort Chaffee Redevelopment Authority, Arkansas for water infrastructure improvements;



33. \$300,000 to the White Mountain Apache Tribe in Arizona to prepare a master plan for drinking water infrastructure on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation;
34. \$400,000 to the City of Scottsdale, Arizona for the Scottsdale Arsenic Removal Pilot Project;
35. \$600,000 to the City of Avondale, Arizona for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
36. \$750,000 to the Town of Huachuca, Arizona for the Effluent Recharge Project;
37. \$750,000 to the City of Tucson, Arizona for water security infrastructure improvements;
38. \$100,000 to the City of Chino Hills, California for a needs assessment study for 39 improvements to the Los Serranos storm water drainage system;
39. \$110,000 to the City of East Palo Alto, California for the East Palo Alto Master Water Plan including water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvements;
40. \$175,000 to the City of Brisbane, California for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
41. \$200,000 to the City of Colton, California for stormwater infrastructure improvements as part of the Comprehensive 3-5 Storm Drain Plan;
42. \$200,000 to the Los Osos Community Services District, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
43. \$200,000 to the City of Modesto, California for the Ninth Street Corridor Storm Drain project;
44. \$200,000 to the City of Norwalk, California for the Norwalk Reservoir Project;
45. \$200,000 to the City of Cudahy, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
46. \$200,000 to the City of Bell, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
47. \$200,000 to Marin County, California for the Tomales Bay Wastewater Treatment Facility;
48. \$250,000 to the City of Long Beach, California for storm water infrastructure improvements;
49. \$250,000 to the City of Westminster, California for a water quality improvement pilot project;
50. \$250,000 to the City of Fort Bragg, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
51. \$250,000 for the City of Gardena, California for wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvements;
52. \$275,000 to the City of Santa Ana, California for the West Pump Station Facility Upgrade project;
53. \$300,000 to the City of Murrieta, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
54. \$300,000 to the City of El Segundo, California for sanitary sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
55. \$300,000 to the City of Santa Monica, California for water infrastructure improvements;
56. \$300,000 to the City of Brisbane, California for the Valley Drive Pump Station Replacement project;
57. \$350,000 to the Monterey County Water Resource Agency in California for the Salinas Valley Water Project;

58. \$350,000 to the City of Roseville, California for water infrastructure improvements;
59. \$350,000 to the City of Vallejo, California for infrastructure improvements for the Mare Island Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain System;
60. \$375,000 to the City of Huntington Beach, California for the Alabama Storm Drain project;
61. \$400,000 to the Irvine Ranch Water District, California for the San Diego Creek Watershed Natural Treatment System;
62. \$400,000 to the County of Ventura, California for implementation of the Calleguas Creek Watershed Management Plan;
63. \$400,000 to the United Water Conservation District, California for the River Park Reclamation and Recharge Authority Groundwater Project;
64. \$400,000 to the City of Redding, California for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Stillwater Business Park;
65. \$400,000 to the City of Victorville, California for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
66. \$400,000 to the City of Whittier, California for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
67. \$400,000 to the City of Folsom, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
68. \$400,000 to the City of Lodi, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
69. \$500,000 to the City of Fresno, California for a water conveyance project;
70. \$650,000 to Placer County, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
71. \$750,000 to the San Diego Water Authority, California for a water desalination program;
72. \$800,000 to the Olivenhain Municipal Water District in Encinitas, California for water infrastructure improvements;
73. \$800,000 to the City of Sacramento, California for the Sacramento Combined Sewer System Improvement and Rehabilitation Project;
74. \$800,000 to the Castaic Lake Water Agency, California for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
75. \$1,100,000 to the Mojave Water Agency, California for the Mojave Desert Arsenic Demonstration project;
76. \$1,650,000 to the Cities of Arcadia and Sierra Madre, California for water infrastructure improvements;
77. \$250,000 to the North Pecos Water and Sanitation District, Colorado for groundwater protection infrastructure improvements;
78. \$500,000 to the Town of Rico, Colorado for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
79. \$200,000 to the Town of Prospect, Connecticut for water infrastructure improvements;
80. \$250,000 to the Southington Water Department, Connecticut for its water supply and distribution system improvement project;

81. \$250,000 to the City of Stamford, Connecticut for stormwater management improvements for the restoration of the Mill River ecosystem;
82. \$400,000 to the City of Danbury, Connecticut for the West Side Sewer Interceptor;
83. \$400,000 to the City of New Britain, Connecticut for the New Britain Water Filtration Plant Replacement project;
84. \$400,000 to East Hampton, Connecticut for water infrastructure improvements;
85. \$400,000 to the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments for its Regional Water System Security Enhancement Program;
86. \$500,000 to the City of Wilmington, Delaware for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
87. \$150,000 to the City of Safety Harbor, Florida for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
88. \$175,000 to the City of Miami Gardens, Florida for drinking water, wastewater, stormwater and sewer infrastructure improvements;
89. \$200,000 to Citrus County, Florida for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Homosassa and Chassahowitzka Water Collection System;
90. \$200,000 to the City of Hollywood, Florida for water infrastructure improvements;
91. \$200,000 to Palm Beach County, Florida for improvements at the Lake Okeechobee Regional Water Treatment Plant;
92. \$200,000 to the Escambia County Utility Authority, Florida for a wastewater treatment/water reclamation partnership project;
93. \$240,000 to the City of Marathon, Florida for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Boot Key Municipal Harbor Development;
94. \$300,000 to Orange County, Florida for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Holden Heights;
95. \$350,000 to the City of Tampa, Florida for the South Tampa Area Reclaimed Project;
96. \$350,000 to St. Johns County, Florida for the Stormwater and Septic Tank Replacement Project;
97. \$400,000 to the City of Tarpon Springs, Florida for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
98. \$400,000 to Sarasota County, Florida for the Phillipi Creek Septic Tank Replacement Project;
99. \$400,000 to the City of Key West, Florida for stormwater infrastructure improvements;
100. \$400,000 to the City of Oakland Park, Florida for the Kimberly Lake Drainage Project;
101. \$400,000 to the City of Riviera Beach, Florida for stormwater infrastructure improvements for Lake Worth Lagoon;
102. \$400,000 to the Town of Orange Park, Florida for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the St. Johns River;
103. \$650,000 to the County of Putnam, Florida for a Regional Wastewater System project;

104. \$800,000 to the City of Sweetwater, Florida for stormwater and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
105. \$800,000 to the City of Homestead, Florida for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
106. \$800,000 to the Southwest Florida Water Management District for the Upper Peace River Watershed Restoration Initiative;
107. \$2,200,000 for St. Johns Rivers Water Management District, Florida to integrate alternative water supplies;
108. \$10,000,000 to the Southwest Florida Water Management District for continuation of the Tampa Bay Reservoir Project;
109. \$110,000 to the City of Helena, Georgia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
110. \$350,000 to the Liberty County Development Authority, Georgia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Liberty County Coastal Megapark;
111. \$400,000 to the City of Roswell, Georgia for the Big Creek Watershed Project;
112. \$500,000 to the City of Forsyth, Georgia for wastewater treatment and collection upgrades;
113. \$500,000 to the City of Atlanta, Georgia for the West Area Combined Sewer project;
114. \$600,000 to Gwinnett County, Georgia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Liberty Heights revitalization project;
115. \$800,000 for the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District for water and wastewater infrastructure improvement projects;
116. \$1,000,000 to the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the City of Atlanta Nancy Creek project;
117. \$2,250,000 for Columbus Water Works, Columbus, Georgia for its Biosolids Flow-Through Thermophilic Treatment Demonstration Project;
118. \$300,000 to the Guam Waterworks Authority for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
119. \$200,000 to Sioux City, Iowa for improvements at the Sioux City Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility;
120. \$200,000 to the City of Postville, Iowa for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
121. \$300,000 to the City of Des Moines, Iowa for the Des Moines River Outfall and Overflow Sanitary Sewer project;
122. \$350,000 to the City of Dubuque, Iowa for implementation of a storm management plan;
123. \$500,000 to the City of Ottumwa, Iowa for the South Ottumwa Sewer Separation project;
124. \$600,000 for the Mason City Water Treatment Plant in Mason City, Iowa for water infrastructure improvements;
125. \$650,000 to the City of Davenport, Iowa for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Davenport Westside Diversion Tunnel;
126. \$400,000 to the City of Middleton, Idaho for its water and sewer utility extension and regional lift station project;

127. \$500,000 to the City of McCammon, Idaho for wastewater system improvements;
128. \$900,000 to the City of Jerome, Idaho for extension of sewer lines;
129. \$100,000 to the Village of Carbon Hill, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements;
130. \$125,000 to the Village of Romeoville, Illinois for stormwater infrastructure improvements;
131. \$175,000 to the City of Lexington, Illinois for the design engineering and construction of a wastewater treatment plant;
132. \$200,000 to the City of Monmouth, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements;
133. \$200,000 to the Village of Lisbon, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
134. \$200,000 to the Town of Cortland, Illinois for construction of an elevated water storage tower;
135. \$200,000 to the Village of Burlington, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
136. \$200,000 to the City of Genoa, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
137. \$250,000 for the Village of Oreana, Illinois for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
138. \$300,000 to the City of Shelbyville, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
139. \$300,000 to the City of Breese, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements;
140. \$325,000 to the Village of East Hazel Crest, Illinois for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements at the 171st Street Water Main Interconnection and Pump Station;
141. \$325,000 to the Village of Downs, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
142. \$350,000 for the City of Delavan, Illinois for the construction of new water service lines and storage tanks;
143. \$350,000 for the City of Springfield, Illinois for the replacement of the First Street Sanitary Sewer and stormwater management for Memorial Medical Center;
144. \$350,000 to the Lake County Stormwater Management Committee, Illinois for stormwater detention, infrastructure, modeling, design and management activities in the Upper Des Plaines River watershed;
145. \$350,000 to the Village of Johnsburg, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
146. \$400,000 to the Village of LaGrange Park, Illinois for a water main replacement project;
147. \$401,500 for the Village of Washington, Illinois for improvements to the School Street Sewer Interceptor;
148. \$500,000 for the City of Virginia, Illinois for the construction of a water treatment facility;
149. \$500,000 for the City of Lincoln, Illinois for upgrades for its wastewater treatment plant;
150. \$500,000 for the Village of Armington, Illinois for the construction of a sanitary sewer project;
151. \$500,000 for the City of Forsyth, Illinois for construction of a new water treatment plant;

152. \$500,000 to the Village of Port Barrington, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
153. \$648,500 for the City of Peoria, Illinois for the installation of sanitary sewer infrastructure in Growth cells 2 and 3;
154. \$175,000 to the Village of Evansville, Indiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
155. \$200,000 to the City of Martinsville, Indiana for replacement of the city's water wells;
156. \$200,000 to the City of Jeffersonville, Indiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
157. \$200,000 to the City of Richmond, Indiana for wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvements;
158. \$350,000 to the City of Evansville, Indiana for the Pigeon Creek Enhancement Project;
159. \$400,000 to the City of Carmel, Indiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
160. \$400,000 to the City of Fort Wayne, Indiana for the Camp Scott Program for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
161. \$400,000 to Rensselaer, Indiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
162. \$600,000 to the City of Martinsville, Indiana for replacement of the city's water storage tank;
163. \$250,000 to the City of Roeland Park, Kansas for stormwater infrastructure improvements for Roeland Park;
164. \$400,000 to the City of Hutchinson, Kansas for the Hutchinson Water Remediation Water Supply Project;
165. \$450,000 to the City of Newton, Kansas for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
166. \$200,000 to the City of Frankfort, Kentucky for the Schenkel Lane Sewer Replacement project;
167. \$200,000 to Grant County, Kentucky for the Grant County/Bullock Pen Waterline Extension project;
168. \$200,000 to the City of Wickliffe, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
169. \$300,000 to the Boyle County Fiscal Court, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
170. \$325,000 to the Green River Valley Water District, Kentucky for the Hatcher Valley Water project;
171. \$350,000 to the City of Whitesburg, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
172. \$480,000 to the City of Mt. Vernon, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
173. \$800,000 to Martin County, Kentucky for wastewater infrastructure improvements and extension of wastewater lines;
174. \$1,000,000 for the Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District, Kentucky to construct a wet weather storage basin to control sewer overflows;
175. \$125,000 to Waterworks District No. 1, Vermilion Parish, Louisiana for water infrastructure improvements;
176. \$200,000 to the City of Denham Springs, Louisiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

177. \$300,000 to the Military Department of Louisiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Gillis W. Long Center in St. Gabriel, Louisiana;

178. \$400,000 to the City of New Orleans, Louisiana for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

179. \$800,000 to the City of Shreveport, Louisiana for the installation of backflow preventers within the water distribution system;

180. \$800,000 to the South Central Planning and Development Commission, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;

181. \$200,000 to the Boston Groundwater Trust of Massachusetts for its groundwater initiative;

182. \$200,000 to the City of Brockton, Massachusetts for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Brockton Wastewater Treatment Facility;

183. \$200,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvement projects in Essex County, Massachusetts;

184. \$250,000 to the City of Lowell, Massachusetts for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;

185. \$500,000 to the Cities of Fall River and New Bedford, Massachusetts for the Bristol County Sewer Infrastructure Improvement project;

186. \$500,000 to the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission for sewage pollution control projects along the Connecticut River in Massachusetts and Connecticut;

187. \$200,000 to the Town of Elkton, Maryland for construction of biological nutrient removal facilities;

188. \$200,000 to the Anacostia Watershed Society in Bladensburg, Maryland for installation and maintenance of trash collection devices along the Anacostia River;

189. \$350,000 to the City of Cambridge, Maryland for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;

190. \$400,000 to the City of Crisfield, Maryland for construction of biological nutrient removal facilities;

191. \$400,000 to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission for wastewater disinfection system upgrades for Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland;

192. \$300,000 to the Sanford Sewer District, Maine for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

193. \$200,000 to the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe of Michigan for the Saginaw Chippewa Water Main Extension Project;

194. \$250,000 to the City of Bad Axe, Michigan for construction of water treatment infrastructure for North Central Huron County, Michigan;

195. \$250,000 to the Grand Traverse County Board of Public Works, Water and Sewer Committee, Michigan for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

196. \$300,000 to the City of Negaunee, Michigan for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

197. \$325,000 to the Genesee County Drain Commission, Michigan for the Northeast Relief Sewer/Kersley Creek Interceptor project;

198. \$325,000 to Livingston County, Michigan for wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Tyrone and Hartland Townships;
199. \$400,000 to the City of Detroit, Michigan for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Belle Isle Sewerage Pumping Station and Combined Sewer Overflow Facility;
200. \$750,000 to the City of Grand Rapids, Michigan for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
201. \$1,000,000 to Wayne County, Michigan for continuation of the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project;
202. \$1,375,000 for the Oakland County Drain Commission to address sanitary sewer overflows in Evergreen Farmington, Michigan;
203. \$300,000 to the City of Roseau, Minnesota for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
204. \$750,000 to the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe for construction of the Mille Lacs Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility in Minnesota;
205. \$750,000 to the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
206. \$175,000 to the City of Belton, Missouri for stormwater and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
207. \$300,000 to the City of Pacific, Missouri for water infrastructure improvements for the Brush Creek Sanitary Sewer District;
208. \$300,000 to the City of Lake St. Louis, Missouri for wastewater infrastructure improvements in the Peruque Creek watershed;
209. \$350,000 to the City of Springfield, Missouri for feasibility studies, preliminary and final designs and for stormwater infrastructure improvements for the Upper James River;
210. \$400,000 to Franklin County, Mississippi for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for the Okissa Lake Community development;
211. \$620,000 to the Town of Farmington, Mississippi for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
212. \$110,000 to the Town of Erwin, North Carolina to enhance its water and wastewater infrastructure through the purchase of treatment facilities at the former Swift Denim textile plant;
213. \$200,000 to the City of Shelby, North Carolina for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
214. \$200,000 to the Neuse Regional Water and Sewer Authority for water infrastructure improvements for Lenoir County, North Carolina;
215. \$200,000 to the City of Creedmore, North Carolina for water quality improvements for Lake Rogers;
216. \$200,000 to the Town of Bryson City, North Carolina for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
217. \$250,000 to the Town of Hillsborough, North Carolina for wastewater system maintenance and upgrades;
218. \$250,000 to the City of Durham, North Carolina for water security improvements;



219. \$250,000 to the City of Cherryville, North Carolina for renovation of the Sunbeam Industrial Park Water Tank and Water Line;
220. \$250,000 to Hoke County, North Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
221. \$250,000 to the Town of Bolton, North Carolina for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
222. \$250,000 to the Town of East Spencer, North Carolina for water infrastructure improvements;
223. \$300,000 to the City of Belmont, North Carolina for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
224. \$400,000 to the City of Marion, North Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
225. \$750,000 to the Town of Holly Springs, North Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements according to the Master Water Reuse Plan;
226. \$300,000 to the City of Park River, North Dakota for water infrastructure improvements;
227. \$400,000 to the City of South Sioux City, Nebraska for the Bi-State Missouri River Sewer Crossing project between Nebraska and Iowa;
228. \$600,000 to the City of Omaha, Nebraska for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
229. \$300,000 to the City of Manchester, New Hampshire for the West Bridge and Bremer Street Sewer Separation project;
230. \$400,000 to the City of Nashua, New Hampshire for its Combined Sewer Overflow project;
231. \$400,000 to the State of New Jersey, New Jersey Meadowlands Commission for wetlands restoration;
232. \$500,000 to the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission in New Jersey for its combined sewage overflow reduction program and the Passaic River/Newark Bay Restoration program;
233. \$800,000 to the Township of Jefferson, New Jersey for wastewater infrastructure improvements to help protect water quality of Lake Hopatcong;
234. \$125,000 to the Dona Ana Mutual Domestic Water Consumers Association for wastewater management and treatment infrastructure improvements in northern Dona Ana County, New Mexico;
235. \$250,000 to the City of Las Vegas, New Mexico for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
236. \$300,000 to the City of Elephant Butte, New Mexico for wastewater infrastructure improvements in North Sierra County;
237. \$600,000 to Bernalillo County, New Mexico for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for South and North Valley;
238. \$175,000 to the City of Henderson, Nevada for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
239. \$600,000 to the Virgin Valley Water District, Nevada for an arsenic treatment facility;
240. \$113,000 to the Village of Pelham, New York for sanitary sewer and storm water infrastructure improvement project;

241. \$125,000 to the Town of Chester, New York for water infrastructure improvements;
242. \$200,000 to the Town of Sennett, New York for water infrastructure improvements;
243. \$200,000 to the Town of Bethel, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
244. \$200,000 to the Village of Endicott, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
245. \$200,000 to the Town of Babylon, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
246. \$250,000 to the Town of Grand Isle, New York for wastewater and combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
247. \$300,000 to the Town of Oyster Bay, New York for the Oyster Bay-Cold Spring Harbor Complex Storm Water Drainage Catch Basin Inserts Project;
248. \$325,000 to Fulton County, New York for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
249. \$400,000 for the Town of North Hempstead, New York for stormwater management infrastructure improvements;
250. \$400,000 to the County of Rockland, New York for the Western Ramapo Sewer Extension and Water Reuse project;
251. \$400,000 to the City of Dunkirk, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
252. \$400,000 to the City of Hamburg, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
253. \$400,000 to the Town of Greece, New York for sanitary sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
254. \$400,000 to the Saratoga Water Committee in Saratoga County, New York for construction of a drinking water transport pipeline;
255. \$400,000 to the Village of Lake Placid, New York for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
256. \$600,000 to the Wayne County Water and Sewer Authority for construction of a waterline in the Towns of Sodus and Huron, New York;
257. \$3,000,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for Westcott Reservoir for drinking water infrastructure improvements;
258. \$5,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure needs in the New York City Watershed;
259. \$5,000,000 for water quality infrastructure improvements for Long Island Sound, New York;
260. \$12,300,000 for continued clean water improvements for Onondaga Lake, New York;
261. \$200,000 to Trumbull County, Ohio for construction of the Little Squaw Creek Interceptor Belmont Avenue;
262. \$250,000 to the City of Rocky River, Ohio for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
263. \$250,000 to Mahoning County, Ohio for wastewater infrastructure improvements for Springfield Township;
264. \$300,000 to the City of Akron, Ohio for the Rack No. 40 Combined Sewer Overflow program;
265. \$300,000 to the Village of Haskins, Ohio for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

266. \$350,000 to the Village of New Riegel, Ohio for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
267. \$350,000 to the City of Galion, Ohio for the Galion Bio-Solids Handling Replacement Project;
268. \$400,000 to the Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District for the Doan Brook Pollution Abatement Project;
269. \$450,000 to the City of Ashland, Ohio for water infrastructure improvements;
270. \$500,000 for the Village of Somerset, Perry County, Ohio to rehabilitate its existing water treatment plant;
271. \$500,000 to the City of Kirtland, Ohio for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
272. \$600,000 to the City of Vermilion, Ohio for wastewater infrastructure improvements and sanitary sewer rehabilitations;
273. \$750,000 to Guernsey County, Ohio for a water line extension project in Eastern Guernsey County;
274. \$800,000 for Springfield, Ohio for the establishment of water and sewer infrastructure in preparation for and economic development project;
275. \$800,000 to the Metropolitan Sewer District of Greater Cincinnati, Ohio for sanitary sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
276. \$850,000 to the City of Delphos, Ohio for water infrastructure improvements;
277. \$900,000 to the City of Urbana, Ohio for construction of a new well field;
278. \$1,000,000 to the City of Toledo, Ohio for wet weather flow and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
279. \$1,200,000 to the City of Amherst, Ohio for wastewater treatment plant improvements;
280. \$1,200,000 to the City of Port Clinton, Ohio for wastewater treatment plant improvements;
281. \$2,000,000 for Shawnee Hills subdivision of Greene County, Ohio for a central sewer system;
282. \$200,000 to the City of Sallisaw, Oklahoma for water infrastructure improvements in Sequoyah County;
283. \$200,000 to the City of Midwest City, Oklahoma for water infrastructure improvements;
284. \$200,000 to the City of Norman, Oklahoma for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
285. \$200,000 to the City of Seminole, Oklahoma for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
286. \$325,000 to the Town of Arcadia, Oklahoma for water supply and wastewater handling systems upgrades;
287. \$325,000 to the City of Choctaw, Oklahoma for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
288. \$200,000 to the City of Sweet Home, Oregon for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
289. \$200,000 to Tillamook County, Oregon for construction of a dairy manure composting facility;
290. \$200,000 to the City of Warrenton, Oregon for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
291. \$250,000 to the Odell Sanitary District, Oregon for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

292. \$400,000 to the City of Portland, Oregon for a wet weather demonstration program;
293. \$125,000 to Paint Borough, Pennsylvania for stormwater and sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements;
294. \$200,000 to Cheltenham Township, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
295. \$200,000 to Downingtown Borough, Pennsylvania for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
296. \$200,000 to Lycoming County, Pennsylvania for water infrastructure improvements for the Jersey Shore Borough;
297. \$200,000 to the Borough of Avondale, Pennsylvania for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
298. \$200,000 to Springettsbury Township, Pennsylvania for a Biosolids Treatment Facility Replacement project;
299. \$200,000 to the Matamoras Municipal Authority of the Borough of Matamoras, Pike County, Pennsylvania for water infrastructure improvements;
300. \$250,000 to the Somerset County Redevelopment Authority, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for development of the Windber Business Park;
301. \$300,000 for Big Beaver Borough, Pennsylvania for extension of water and wastewater lines;
302. \$300,000 to the City of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania for the Mish Run Sewer Improvement Project;
303. \$300,000 to the Hanover Township Sewage Authority, Pennsylvania for extension of sewer lines for Starpoint Business and Industrial Park;
304. \$325,000 to the City of Lancaster, Pennsylvania for water infrastructure improvements;
305. \$400,000 to the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Water Department for the planning, design, and construction of stormwater management solutions;
306. \$400,000 for the Wyoming Valley Sanitation Authority, Pennsylvania for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
307. \$400,000 to the Kulpmont-Marion Heights Joint Municipal Authority, Northumberland County, Pennsylvania for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
308. \$600,000 to the Borough of Coudersport, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
309. \$750,000 to the City of Sharon, Pennsylvania for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
310. \$1,200,000 to the Allegheny County Sanitation District, Pennsylvania for the Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration Program;
311. \$1,650,000 to the Municipality of Barceloneta, Puerto Rico for water infrastructure improvements in the Palenque and Garrochales communities;
312. \$175,000 to the Town of Lincoln, Rhode Island for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
313. \$175,000 to the Town of North Providence, Rhode Island for wastewater and stormwater infrastructure improvements;

314. \$250,000 to the Narragansett Bay Commission of Rhode Island for combined sewer overflow control and wastewater infrastructure improvements;

315. \$175,000 to the City of Greenville, South Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;

316. \$200,000 to the Abbeville County Development Board, South Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;

317. \$250,000 to the Town of Estill, South Carolina for water infrastructure improvements;

318. \$300,000 to Calhoun County, South Carolina for water infrastructure improvements for the Fort Motte Water System;

319. \$300,000 to the Alligator Rural Water Company for water infrastructure improvements in Chesterfield County, South Carolina;

320. \$400,000 to Charleston Public Works, South Carolina for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

321. \$400,000 to the Myrtle Beach Downtown Redevelopment Corporation, South Carolina for stormwater infrastructure improvements according to the Pavilion Area Master Plan;

322. \$125,000 to Franklin, Tennessee for water and stormwater infrastructure improvements in the Watson Branch Watershed;

323. \$200,000 to Meigs County, Tennessee for extension of water lines;

324. \$200,000 to the City of Decatur, Tennessee for water infrastructure improvements;

325. \$250,000 to the City of Jackson, Tennessee for stormwater and sanitary sewer overflow infrastructure improvements along Sandy Creek;

326. \$300,000 to the City of Tesculum, Tennessee for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

327. \$200,000 to the City of Taylor, Texas for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

328. \$200,000 to Harris County, Texas Precinct 2 for water quality planning and design to provide water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;

329. \$200,000 to the El Paso Water Utilities, Texas for water infrastructure improvements;

330. \$200,000 to the City of Austin, Texas for sanitary sewer infrastructure improvements;

331. \$325,000 to the San Antonio, Texas Water System for water infrastructure security improvements;

332. \$350,000 to the City of Leonard, Texas for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

333. \$400,000 to the Texas Water Development Board in Freeport Texas for the Texas Water Desalination Initiative;

334. \$400,000 to the City of Waco, Texas for the Waco-McLennan County Regional Water project;

335. \$500,000 to the Brazos River Authority for water infrastructure improvements in West Fort Bend County, Texas;

336. \$175,000 to Sandy City, Utah for drinking water and storm water infrastructure improvements;

337. \$400,000 to Park City, Utah for water infrastructure improvements associated with the Spiro and Judge Water Tunnels;
338. \$125,000 for the Phoebe Needles System in Franklin County Virginia for a secondary sewage treatment system;
339. \$150,000 to the Town of Chatham, Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
340. \$200,000 to Westmoreland County, Virginia for the Washington District Sewer Project;
341. \$250,000 for the Prentis Park Water and Sewer Rehabilitation project in Portsmouth, Virginia;
342. \$300,000 to the County of Accomack, Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
343. \$400,000 to Chesterfield County, Virginia for drainage and wastewater infrastructure improvements for Rayon Park;
344. \$400,000 to be divided equally between the City of Alexandria, Virginia and Arlington County, Virginia for water quality improvements in the Four Mile Run watershed;
345. \$440,000 for Henry County and the City of Martinsville, Virginia for a wastewater treatment plant upgrade and the conversion of two wastewater plants to pumping stations;
346. \$500,000 for the Piney River Wastewater Improvement Project in Nelson County, Virginia;
347. \$500,000 for Fluvanna County, Virginia for water and sewer projects;
348. \$500,000 for the Town of Kenbridge, Virginia for the expansion of a wastewater treatment plant;
349. \$785,000 for Franklin County, Virginia for a drinking water infrastructure project;
350. \$800,000 to the City of Richmond, Virginia for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements;
351. \$1,000,000 for Appomattox County and the Town of Appomattox, Virginia for water and sewer projects;
352. \$1,200,000 to Dale Service Corporation wastewater infrastructure improvements in Dale City, Virginia;
353. \$350,000 to the Government of the Virgin Islands for wastewater treatment infrastructure improvements;
354. \$175,000 to King County, Washington for an Infiltration/Inflow project;
355. \$200,000 to the City of Tacoma, Washington for water and stormwater infrastructure improvements for the Salishan housing development;
356. \$200,000 to the City of Grand Coulee, Washington for water infrastructure improvements;
357. \$200,000 for the Public Utility District of Skagit County, Washington for wastewater infrastructure improvements for Similk Beach on Fidalgo Island;
358. \$200,000 to the City of Seattle, Washington for the High Point Natural Drainage System project;
359. \$250,000 to the City of Lakewood, Washington for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
360. \$400,000 to the City of Carnation, Washington for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
361. \$400,000 to the City of Duvall, Washington for wastewater infrastructure improvements;

362. \$600,000 to the City of Shelton, Washington for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
363. \$200,000 to the Village of Fairchild, Wisconsin for water and sewer infrastructure improvements;
364. \$300,000 to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District, Wisconsin for its Central Metropolitan Interceptor System project;
365. \$325,000 to the City of Marinette, Wisconsin for wastewater infrastructure improvements;
366. \$400,000 to the City of Racine Water Utility, Wisconsin for water infrastructure improvements;
367. \$1,800,000 to the City of Chipewa Falls, Wisconsin for sewer and water infrastructure enhancements;
368. \$2,150,000 to the Village of Port Edwards, Wisconsin for replacement of a sewage treatment plant;
369. \$380,000 to the City of Moundsville Sanitary Department in West Virginia for storm sewer and sanitary improvements on Jefferson Avenue;
370. \$671,000 to the City of Petersburg, West Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
371. \$750,000 to the Town of Harrisville, West Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
372. \$824,000 to the City of Philippi, West Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
373. \$875,000 to the Marshall County Sewerage District in West Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
374. \$1,617,000 to the Gilmer County Public Service District in West Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
375. \$2,000,000 to the Sun Valley Public Service District in West Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements;
376. \$5,000,000 to the City of Parkersburg, West Virginia for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Committee has again this year included an administrative provision giving the Administrator specific authority to, in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, award cooperative agreements to federally recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia so as to properly carry out EPA's environmental programs.

In order to continue providing sufficient and necessary resources for EPA's pesticide re-registration program, the Committee has included bill language which authorizes for one year the collection by EPA of \$21,500,000 in maintenance fees. This provision extends to September 30, 2004 the date upon which such authority for collections expires. The Committee expects that, in the absence of a new tolerance fee, funds requested in the budget submission to support FTEs in the re-registration program may be used to support tolerance reassessment activities. Bill language is also once again included prohibiting the use of funds to promulgate a final regulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance processing fees as proposed at 64 Federal Register 31040, or any simi-

lar proposal; and prohibiting the collection of pesticide registration fees if a new maintenance fee has gone into effect.

The Committee is aware that stakeholders affected by this complex issue are working to finalize a comprehensive legislative proposal on pesticide fees. The Committee encourages all parties involved to continue to work together on this important issue. The Committee looks forward to working with the authorizing committees so that long-awaited revisions in the program's fee structure can be considering during this session of the 108th Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$7,027,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	5,333,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	7,027,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+1,694,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	0

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,027,000 for fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$1,694,000 above the fiscal year 2003 appropriation and the same level as the budget request.

The Committee is concerned that reports from various Agencies have not been submitted to the Committee in a timely fashion because they have been delayed by reviews by multiple layers of the Administration, including OSTP. The Committee strongly urges OSTP to work with its constituency agencies to expedite reports required by the Committee.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$3,238,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	3,011,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	3,238,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+227,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has recommended the budget request of \$3,238,000 for the CEQ and OEQ, an increase of \$227,000 above last year's spending level. The Committee directs that CEQ's total staffing level not exceed 24 FTEs at any time during the fiscal year.



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

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$30,125,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	30,848,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	30,125,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 723,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

Funding for the Office of the Inspector General at the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is provided pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1105(a)(25), which requires a separate appropriation account for appropriations for each Office of Inspector General of an establishment defined under section 11(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978.

The Committee recommendation, the same as the budget request, provides for the transfer of \$30,125,000 from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund to finance the Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2004.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CITIZEN INFORMATION CENTER FUND

Fiscal year 2003 recommendation .....	\$12,500,000
Fiscal year 2002 appropriation .....	11,466,000
Fiscal year 2003 budget request .....	17,6431,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2002 appropriation .....	+1,134,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 request .....	- 5,043,000

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

The Federal Information Center (FIC) program was established within the General Services Administration in 1966, and was formalized by Public Law 95-491 in 1980. The program's purpose is to provide the public with direct information about all aspects of Federal programs, regulations, and services. To accomplish this mission, contractual services are used to respond to public inquiries via a nationwide toll-free telephone call center.

In 2000, the Consumer Information Center assumed responsibility for the operations of the FIC program with the resulting organization being officially named the Federal Consumer Information Center. The Federal Consumer Information Center combines the nationwide toll-free telephone assistance program and the database of the FIC with the CIC website and publications distribution programs.

During fiscal year 2002, the Federal Consumer Information Center became part of GSA's newly established Office of Citizen Services and Communications and was renamed the Federal Citizen Information Center (FCIC). The new Office serves as a central federal gateway for citizens, businesses, other governments, and the media to obtain information and services from the government. FCIC assumed operational control of the FirstGov.gov website in fiscal year 2002.

Public Law 98-63, enacted July 30, 1983, established a revolving fund for the CIC. Under this fund, FCIC activities are financed from the following: annual appropriations from the general funds of the Treasury, reimbursements from agencies for distribution of publications, user fees collected from the public, and any other income incident to FCIC activities. All are available as authorized in appropriation acts without regard to fiscal year limitations. The bill includes a limitation of \$18,000,000 on the availability of the revolving fund. Any revenues accruing to this fund during fiscal year 2004 in excess of this amount shall remain in the fund and are not available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriation Acts.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee recommends \$12,500,000, an increase of \$1,134,000 over the level for fiscal year 2003 and a decrease of \$5,043,000 from the budget request.

The appropriation will be augmented by reimbursements from Federal agencies for distribution of consumer publications, user fees from the public, and other income.

INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS OPERATING EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$1,500,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	1,490,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> 0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+10,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	<sup>1</sup> 1,500,000

<sup>1</sup>The budget proposed funding for this activity within the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Homeless Assistance Grants account under title II.

The Committee recommends \$1,500,000 for operating expenses of the Interagency Council on the Homeless, the same amount requested in the budget under the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Proposed authorization language is not included to allow the Council to receive support from other agencies on a non-reimbursable basis and to change the name of the Council.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$15,540,300,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	15,338,907,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	15,469,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+201,393,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+71,000,000

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

The Committee has recommended a total program level of \$15,540,300,000 in fiscal year 2004, which is an increase of

\$71,000,000 from the budget request and an increase of \$201,393,000 when compared to the fiscal year 2003 enacted appropriation.

NASA's Full Cost initiative is expected to introduce new cost accounting, budgeting and management practices into NASA. The NASA full cost concept and approach is intended to integrate full-cost accounting budgeting, and management practices to enhance cost-effective mission performance by providing complete cost information for improved (more fully informed) decision making and management. The initiative introduces a concept that ties all NASA costs (including civil service personnel costs) to major activities (programs and projects) and budgets, accounts, reports, and manage programs and projects from a full-cost perspective.

While the title "Full Cost" implies financial matters, the Committee understands that NASA's approach to implementation includes broad and significant management implications. Full costing should also support full disclosure and reporting on programs and projects with an improved matching of costs with related program and project performance. In that regard, the Committee believes that full costing is consistent with sound business practices and with recent legislative and administrative guidance, including the CFOs Act of 1990, Government Performance and Results Act, and the National Performance Review (NPR). Accordingly, the Committee expects NASA to implement full cost accounting in fiscal year 2004 within the account structure as set forth in its fiscal year 2004 budget request. In the event of a continuing resolution prior to enactment of a permanent fiscal year 2004 appropriation, the Committee expects that NASA will implement any such continuing resolutions in full cost under the account structure presented in the fiscal year 2004 budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the NASA Inspector General continues to find weaknesses in cyber-security management within the NASA organization. To address this weakness, the Committee believes NASA can use vulnerability management as a means of securing critical computer networks. The Committee is aware of a new appliance-based technology that runs a hardened operating system and communicates through encryption using digital certificates for authentication. The technology will allow for greater certainty in identifying business risk, and eliminating those risks. The Committee directs NASA to provide no less than \$2,000,000 within available funds to demonstrate this technology as part of its cyber-security architecture.

The Committee directs NASA to reevaluate all its international cooperative efforts and hopes NASA looks to cultivate better relations with the United Kingdom, Italy, Australia, Poland and Spain on projects in the future.

SPACE FLIGHT CAPABILITIES  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$7,806,100,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	7,908,500,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	7,782,100,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	- 102,400,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+24,000,000

This appropriation provides for the conduct and support of space flight capabilities, including research, development, support and services. Within this appropriation, two major subcategories of funding exist, space flight and aerospace technology. Funding in the space flight category is provided for continued development and operation of the International Space Station, operations and upgrades to the performance and safety of the space shuttle, and flight support operations. Funding in the aerospace technology category includes the space launch initiative, mission and science measurement technology, and innovative technology transfer partnerships.

The Committee recommends a total of \$7,806,100,000 for the space flight capabilities account in fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$24,000,000 to the budget request and a reduction of \$102,400,000 from the fiscal year 2003 level as estimated in this new account structure.

The Committee has taken no action at this time with regard to the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle program, the Orbital Space Plane program, or the Next Generation Launch Technology program. All of these programs will undoubtedly undergo significant transformation in the coming weeks as the results of the *Columbia* Accident Investigation Board's work is published and discussed. The Committee will use the report of the Board, and NASA's proposed response to the Board's findings and recommendations, as the basis for final action on the fiscal year 2004 budget proposal. The Committee has taken this position at this time because it expects the Board's recommendations to be far-reaching and significant. The Committee expects NASA to provide its plan of action for implementing the Board's recommendations to the Congress as soon as possible, with at least preliminary budget implications formally submitted to the Committee no later than September 15, 2003.

The Committee remains committed to the full scientific utilization of the International Space Station (ISS), which will require a robust and expeditious means by which station crew can return safely to Earth in the case of an emergency. The Committee recognizes that NASA is in the process of using independent review teams to evaluate the costs and benefits of developing a reusable or expendable Orbital Space Plane (OSP) crewed system, which will return crew from, and soon thereafter transport crew to, the ISS. The Committee emphasizes its intent that full scientific utilization of the ISS begin as soon as possible, and therefore an American crew return and transport capability should be developed as expeditiously as possible.

Therefore, NASA is directed to provide to the Committee within ninety days of enactment of this act a report on the costs and benefits of both reusable and expendable architectures for the OSP crewed system, including the implications of each architecture type on the development timeline for a system that meets NASA's OSP Level I requirements. In addition, NASA is directed to notify the Committee before it takes any action that would preclude the OSP crewed system from eventually being integrated with a reusable launch booster.

In the past, this Committee and the Congress have been staunch supporters of NASA's efforts to upgrade its shuttle fleet in the

areas of safety and reliability and has provided all amounts requested for upgrades only to see significant upgrades canceled or deferred due to technological obstacles or cost constraints. The Committee therefore is pleased that NASA has initiated a new process that will integrate safety, supportability, obsolescence, infrastructure, and ground systems associated with the shuttle. The Committee expects that this overall process will result in long range plans for the shuttle, a prioritized list of investments, and a formal selection process for those investments that will achieve the goal of safe and efficient shuttle operations.

The Committee has provided an increase of \$24,000,000 to this appropriation for the express purpose of continuing the commercial programs within the Innovative Technology Transfer Partnerships theme. The Committee does not agree with the termination of this program as proposed in the budget submission and directs NASA to keep the program in place as it existed in fiscal year 2003 and prior fiscal years.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND EXPLORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$7,707,900,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	7,404,900,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	7,660,900,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+303,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+47,000,000

This appropriation provides for the research and development activities, and all associated costs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These activities include: space science, earth science, biological and physical research, aeronautics, and education programs.

The Committee recommends \$7,707,900,000 for Science, Aeronautics and Exploration in fiscal year 2004. The amount recommended is an increase of \$47,000,000 to the budget request, and an increase of \$303,000,000 to the fiscal year 2003 level as estimated in this new account structure.

The Committee is aware of a concern in the graduate education community that the current level of stipends in NASA's Graduate Student Research Program and the Earth System Science Fellowship are lagging the level in other areas of the Federal government and that participation in the programs by the best and brightest is therefore jeopardized. The Committee believes that NASA's investment in graduate education tries to fill a crucial funding gap in much the same way that NASA support for basic and applied research fills a gap in those programs. When the NASA investment in graduate education via stipends is increased, the rewards to NASA will increase. The Committee directs NASA to evaluate the stipend level in its programs and report to the Committee on actions it will take to increase the level of stipend for its programs. Additionally, the Committee directs NASA to evaluate and report on the value of expanding its use of graduate fellowships to all NASA science offices.

1. An increase of \$1,000,000 for the GSFC "COM Simulation Architecture Project";
2. An increase of \$1,000,000 for the Alabama Supercomputer Education Outreach program;

3. An increase of \$1,000,000 for the Pulsed Power and Energetic Research Center at the University of Huntsville, Alabama;
4. An increase of \$1,000,000 for Science, Engineering, Math and Aerospace Academy programs. The Academy is to be established at Albany State College in Georgia;
5. An increase of \$250,000 for the National Science Center Foundation of Augusta, Georgia for its Learning Logic Program;
6. An increase of \$1,000,000 for aircraft engine research, including research being done in conjunction with the Department of Defense;
7. An increase of \$150,000 for the North Alabama Planetarium Initiative;
8. An increase of \$250,000 to establish the University of Alabama at Huntsville Center for Modeling, Simulation and Analysis;
9. An increase of \$900,000 to Alabama A&M University—Advanced Space Propulsion Material Research and Technology Center;
10. An increase of \$1,500,000 to the BizTech High Tech Business Incubator;
11. An increase of \$3,000,000 to the In-Space Propulsion program for High-Power Pulsed Inductive Thruster technology research, utilizing a vector inversion pulsed generator to pre-ionize the propellant at an exceptionally high frequency;
12. An increase of \$1,000,000 for remote sensing infrastructure at the University of Miami Center for Southeastern Tropical Remote Sensing (CSTARS) in Miami-Dade County, Florida;
13. An increase of \$500,000 for Southeast Missouri State University's NASA Educator Resource Center;
14. An increase of \$2,200,000 for the Education Advancement Alliance in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for education grants and scholarships;
15. An increase of \$250,000 for Rutgers for continued construction of a research and teaching facility on its Busch Campus in Piscataway, New Jersey;
16. An increase of \$250,000 for Middle Tennessee State University for K-12 Science Education Enhancements;
17. An increase of \$500,000 for the Northwestern University's Institute for Proteomics and Nanotechnology;
18. An increase of 2,300,000 for the NASA—Illinois Technology Commercialization Center at DuPage County Research Park;
19. An increase of \$300,000 to develop a high temperature nanotechnology research program;
20. An increase of \$300,000 for a national Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance test bed;
21. An increase of \$300,000 for the Biological and Physical Research Rack on the ISS;
22. An increase of \$500,000 for the Industrial Technology Institute at Cleveland State University;
23. An increase of \$800,000 for an Aerospace Education Center in Cleveland, Ohio;

24. An increase of \$800,000 for the Glennan Microsystems Initiative;
25. An increase of \$500,000 for the Bowling Green State University Hybrid Engine project;
26. An increase of \$500,000 for the Ohio View Consortium;
27. An increase of \$1,000,000 for the University of Toledo Turbine Institute
28. An increase of \$1,000,000 for the Garrett Morgan Commercialization Initiative in Ohio;
29. An increase of \$200,000 for the Adler Planetarium in Chicago, Illinois for its Cosmic Gateway Teacher Training program;
30. An increase of \$1,000,000 for Michigan SATS Incorporated;
31. An increase of \$2,000,000 for the Michigan Technology Commercialization Corporation to identify and develop new medical materials and technologies which have the ability to provide low cost alternatives to current therapies;
32. An increase of \$300,000 for the Center for Science and Mathematics at the University of Redlands, California;
33. An increase of \$3,000,000 for continued Space Radiation Research at Loma Linda University Medical Center;
34. An increase of \$300,000 for Fulton Montgomery Community College in Johnstown, New York for the Spatial Information Technology Center;
35. An increase of \$1,000,000 for the Goddard Space Flight Center's Clustering and Advanced Visual Environments Initiative;
36. An increase of \$1,500,000 for on-going activities in support of NASA Dryden Flight Research Center's Intelligent Flight Control System (IFCS) research project;
37. An increase of \$1,500,000 for on-going activities of the Goddard Institute for Systems, Software, and Technology Research, including mission design tools, Earth science analysis, and remote sensing instrumentation development;
38. An increase of \$2,500,000 for the Institute for Scientific Research, Inc. for research related to transversable access to orbit;
39. An increase of \$3,000,000 for continued development of a lightweight carrier pallet to support the Hubble Space Telescope Program;
40. An increase of \$4,000,000 for NASA's Independent Verification and Validation Facility;
41. An increase of \$15,500,000 for the Institute for Scientific Research, Inc. for development and construction of research facilities;
42. An increase of \$750,000 for the NASA Goddard Commercial Technology program only to fund the full implementation of the Earth Alert Project;
43. An increase of \$500,000 for the NASA Specialized Center for Research and Training in Gravitational Biology at North Carolina State University;
44. An increase of \$1,000,000 to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for the Morehead Planetarium and Science Center;

45. An increase of \$1,500,000 to the MCNC-Research and Development Institute (RDI) to establish a Laboratory for Distributed Chemical and Biological Sensors;
46. An increase of \$500,000 for the Montana Aerospace Development Authority;
47. An increase of \$1,500,000 for Idaho State University for the Temporal Land Cover Change Research Program;
48. An increase of \$1,500,000 for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory for development of performance, safety, and mission success tools for NASA programs;
49. An increase of \$500,000 for continuation of emerging research that applies remote sensing technologies to forest management practices at the State University of New York, College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry;
50. An increase of \$500,000 for the development of an Aircraft Radio Guidance System (ARGUS) utilizing a new radio frequency interferometer that will provide two or three dimensional navigation guidance for airborne, space or surface vehicles;
51. An increase of \$1,000,000 for the Advanced Interactive Discovery Environment engineering research program at Syracuse University;
52. An increase of \$1,500,000 for Integrated Sensing Systems at the Rochester Institute of Technology;
53. An increase of \$2,000,000 to research Secure Automatic Dependent Surveillance Broadcast (ADS-B) Surveillance data link technology for enhanced aviation security and general aviation airspace access;
54. An increase of \$2,000,000 for Cryogenic Power Electronics Development at the State University of New York at Albany;
55. An increase of \$2,500,000 for the JASON Foundation;
56. An increase of \$2,500,000 for the Regional Application Center for the Northeast;
57. An increase of \$2,550,000 for the Fractional Ownership Test Program;
58. An increase of \$3,000,000 in the Computing, Information and Communications Technology Program (CICT) for High Information Density Approaches to Mobile Broadband Internet Communications;
59. An increase of \$4,000,000 for new Adaptive Surveillance Techniques for Airport Surface Safety;
60. An increase of \$4,500,000 for the National Center of Excellence in Infotonics in Rochester, New York;
61. An increase of \$4,500,000 for the National Center of Excellence in Bioinformatics in Buffalo, New York;
62. An increase of \$4,500,000 for a new Science Center at St. Bonaventure University in New York State;
63. An increase of \$5,000,000 for Project SOCRATES;
64. An increase of \$6,000,000 for the continuation of the Space Alliance Technology Outreach Program, including \$2,500,000 for business incubators in Florida and New York;



65. An increase of \$175,000 to the Astronaut Memorial Foundation for the Columbia STS 107 addition to the National Space Mirror Memorial at Kennedy Space Center;

66. An increase of \$900,000 for the Florida Institute for Technology in Melbourne, Florida for a Hydrogen Production, Fuel Cell and Sensor Technology Initiative;

67. An increase of \$1,900,000 for replacement and upgrade of equipment at Kennedy Space Center;

68. An increase of \$300,000 for the Florida State University Challenger Learning Center;

69. An increase of \$500,000 to the University of South Florida Center for Space Cellular and Macromolecular Biotechnology;

70. An increase of \$8,000,000 for the Florida State University System Hydrogen Research Initiative;

71. An increase of \$1,000,000 to the Little River Canyon field school;

72. An increase of \$1,000,000 to the Tulane Institute for Macromolecular Engineering and Science for research on polymers;

73. An increase of \$7,500,000 for the implementation of a remote data store at the NASA IV&V Facility, to be distributed as follows: no less than fifty percent of appropriated funds are for the acquisition of data storage hardware and software including, but not limited to, content addressable storage technologies; remaining funds are provided for communications, facility and integration services at the IV&V Facility to support data backup, recovery, and on-line access capabilities for the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) ECS program;

74. A decrease of \$20,000,000 to the James Webb Space Telescope;

75. A decrease of \$13,000,000 to the Earth Science Applications program;

76. A decrease of \$55,000,000 to the New Frontiers program;

77. A decrease of \$8,150,000 to the Space Interferometer Mission.

#### SPACE SCIENCE

The Committee is concerned that the high radiation environment in the Jovian system will cause problems for the Jupiter Icy Moons Orbiter (JIMO) mission unless an investment is made in developing effective and reliable hardened microcircuit devices that can be produced in quantity at reasonable cost. Presently, the only available option for producing such devices for the forthcoming JIMO mission involves using very high cost techniques for customized microdevice construction. However, the Committee is aware of promising technology wherein conventional, low cost, high volume device fabrication might be used to produce the required radiation hardened microcircuits in bulk using a variation on conventional techniques. The Committee directs NASA to undertake an immediate effort to validate this technology in time for use on the JIM mission and assess its potential for cost effectiveness for that purpose and for other missions.

## EARTH SCIENCES

The fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill and accompanying reports gave NASA Congressional direction to establish an implementation plan for Earth science applications partnerships. NASA completed the report on its implementation plan in June of 2002 and forwarded the report to the Committee for its review. The result of the implementation plan was a competition from which awards were announced on July 2, 2003. The Committee notes that NASA received 258 proposals in response to the competition notice of a peer-review process and 41 proposals were selected based on highest merit. The Committee commends NASA for moving forward with this effort and looks forward to working with NASA in the future to ensure adequate funding is provided for a more robust peer-reviewed competitive program. For this reason, the Committee recommendation does not include any funding for new remote sensing applications centers.

The Committee directs \$5,000,000 from the NASA Earth Science Enterprise be transferred to the Air Force Research Laboratory (PE 62204F Aerospace Sensors) to develop dual-use lightweight space radar technology.

## BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL RESEARCH

The Committee has included an increase of \$3,000,000 for technology development necessary to ensure the Satellite Test of the Equivalence Principle (STEP) mission can move forward. While the STEP mission was rejected for funding under NASA's SMEX program last year primarily because of its lack of technology development, the Committee has found that this was due to promised funds not being provided from NASA's Office of Space Science. With this action, the Committee is not negating the results of the SMEX competition. Instead, the Committee action creates a level playing field so the STEP program can compete in future programs.

The Committee continues its support for the materials science research community, and expects substantial progress to be made during fiscal year 2004 towards the completion and U.S. utilization of the Materials Science Research Rack-1 onboard the International Space Station.

## AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY

The Committee continues to be concerned that insufficient effort is being made to modernize the Nation's air traffic management system. While NASA has requested \$27,000,000 for a new initiative, the National Airspace System Transition Augmentation, the Committee remains concerned that there is a lack of government-wide coordination of air traffic management effort. As the Commission on the Future of the U.S. Aerospace Industry recommended, a National Program Office is needed to bring together the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, Transportation, and Commerce as well as the Federal Aviation Administration and NASA with industry to develop the next generation air traffic management system for the United States that will improve the security, safety, quality, and affordability of aviation services. The Committee directs NASA to report on efforts within the Federal government to establish a National Program Office and report to the

Committee by March 31, 2004 on how its initiative on the National Airspace System Transition Augmentation is integrated into the National Program Office efforts.

The Committee directs \$5,000,000 within the Aerospace Technology Enterprise be transferred to the Air Force Research Laboratory (PE 602702F Command, Control and Communications) to deploy and develop Interactive Data Wall technology as part of a joint AFRL-NASA Information Operations Center of the Future research initiative.

The Committee directs \$3,000,000 within the Aerospace Technology Enterprise be transferred to the Air Force Research Laboratory (PE 602702F Command, Control and Communications) to conduct joint research with NASA on emerging areas of computing including grid computing, quantum and biomolecular information processing technology.

The Committee notes that NASA’s budget has proposed a significant increase in funding on aircraft engine programs to develop high risk, high payoff technologies to meet critical national aviation challenges. The Committee applauds NASA’s commitment to addressing these important research needs and looks forward to working with NASA to ensure continued support for this research.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Committee has included \$25,325,000 for the National Space Grant College and Fellowship program. This amount is an increase of \$1,225,000 to the fiscal year 2003 pre-rescission appropriation of \$24,100,000 and an increase of \$6,225,000 to the budget request. The amount provided will fund the current core programs in 52 Space Grant Consortia, including 35 states at \$475,000 each (including 7 upgrades), 17 states at \$300,000 each and \$3,600,000 for Workforce Supplement Awards.

The Committee remains concerned that NASA is no closer to solving its workforce problems than at this time a year ago. At that time, the Committee had directed NASA, in cooperation with the Nation’s leading research universities, to develop a comprehensive plan and implementation strategy that will result in an increase in the number of students pursuing advanced degrees. While the education budget indicates NASA has a program of Explorer Academies starting in fiscal year 2003, very little information is provided which would give the Committee an assurance that this program will energize student interest in science, engineering, mathematics or other disciplines needed for NASA’s future workforce. Likewise, the Education Base Program is listed in the budget material as being “under review” for alignment with new priorities. While this budget material in no way justifies the requested funding level of \$169,800,000, the Committee has provided the budget request and directs NASA to inform the Committee expeditiously on its detailed plans for an education program in fiscal year 2004.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$26,300,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	25,434,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	26,300,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+866,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	0

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

The Committee recommends \$26,300,000 for the Office of the Inspector General in fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$866,000 to the amount provided in fiscal year 2003 and the same as the budget request for fiscal year 2004.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The bill includes five administrative provisions. The first provision allows for the availability of funds to remain until expended when any activity has been initiated for construction of facilities. The second provision makes all amounts appropriated for construction of facilities to remain available until September 30, 2006. The third provision allows for the Administrator to transfer amounts between aeronautics and crosscutting technologies. The fourth provision makes announced prizes available, without fiscal year limitation. The final provision allows unexpended balances of prior appropriations to be transferred to the new account established for the appropriations that provides such activity under this Act.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

	Limitation on direct loans	Limitation on administrative expenses
Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	(\$1,500,000,000)	(\$310,000)
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	(1,500,000,000)	(309,000)
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	(1,500,000,000)	(0)
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	(0)	(+1,000)
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	(0)	(0)

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

The Committee recommends a limitation of \$1,500,000,000 on CLF lending activity to member credit unions from borrowed funds. This limitation represents the same level as fiscal year 2003 and the same as the budget request. The Committee expects to be kept apprised of CLF lending activity.

The Committee recommends the budget request of not more than \$310,000 for administrative expenses.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN FUND

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$1,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	1,000,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	1,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	0

The Community Development Revolving Loan Fund Program (CDRLF) was established in 1979 to assist officially designated "low-income" credit unions in providing basic financial services to low-income communities. Low-interest loans and deposits are made available to assist these credit unions. Loans or deposits are normally repaid in five years, although shorter repayment periods may be considered. Technical assistance grants are also available to low-income credit unions. Earnings generated from the CDRLF are available to fund technical assistance grants in addition to funds provided for specifically in appropriations acts. Grants are available for improving operations as well as addressing safety and soundness issues.

The Committee recognizes that the technical assistance grant program is oversubscribed and therefore recommends that \$1,000,000 be provided specifically for technical assistance grants to low-income and community development credit unions to be available for fiscal year 2004.

The Committee strongly urges the NCUA to seek a partnership agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to further expand credit union services in public housing developments plagued by unscrupulous financial intermediaries and check cashing operations.

#### NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$5,639,070,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	5,309,951,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	5,481,200,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+329,119,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+157,870,000

Established in 1950, the National Science Foundation's primary purpose was to develop a national policy on science, and support and promote basic research and education in the sciences filling the void left after World War II. The Committee is committed to keeping the Foundation's current activities true to the founding purpose of supporting basic science.

The Committee recommends a total of \$5,639,070,000 for fiscal year 2004. This recommendation is an increase of \$329,119,000 above last year's appropriation and an increase of \$157,870,000 above the President's budget request.

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

The Committee directs the NSF to remove the "People," "Ideas," and "Tools" descriptions from the regular account chapters in the budget justifications and instead consolidate that information under the separate chapter titled "Investments and Strategic Goals." The Committee reminds NSF that the budget justification

books are intended only for the Committees on Appropriations in order to provide further detail on the budget request. Information on strategic planning should be included in a separate chapter, and not a part of, the appropriations chapters.

#### RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$4,306,360,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	4,056,460,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	4,106,360,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+249,900,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+200,000,000

The appropriation for Research and Related Activities covers all programs in the Foundation except Education and Human Resources, Salaries and Expenses, Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction, the National Science Board, and the Office of Inspector General. These are funded in other accounts in the bill. The Research and Related Activities appropriation includes United States Polar Research Programs and Antarctic Logistical Support Activities and the Critical Technologies Institute, which were previously funded through separate appropriations.

The Committee recommends a total of \$4,306,360,000 for Research and Related Activities in fiscal year 2003, an increase of \$249,900,000 above last year's funding level and an increase of \$200,000,000 above the budget request. The Committee's recommendation includes the following program levels:

Directorate	2004 request	2004 recommendation
Biological Sciences .....	\$562,220,000	\$586,841,000
Computer & Information Science & Engineering .....	584,260,000	609,846,000
Engineering .....	536,570,000	560,067,000
Geosciences .....	687,920,000	718,045,000
Mathematical & Physical Sciences .....	1,061,270,000	1,107,745,000
Social, Behavioral & Economic Sciences .....	211,740,000	221,012,000
Polar Programs .....	329,930,000	355,000,000
Integrative Activities .....	132,450,000	147,804,000

Except as specifically noted herein, in allocating the increases provided by the Committee, the Foundation should give the highest priority to increasing research opportunities for investigator initiated research in the core scientific disciplines. Should the NSF find it necessary to pursue funds for "emergency" research needs at any time during the fiscal year, the Committee will make every effort to respond to appropriate reprogramming requests as quickly as possible.

Within the funds made available for the Mathematical and Physical Sciences directorate, the Committee directs the NSF to use not less than \$8,000,000 million for planning and design activities for the Rare Symmetry Violating Processes program in an effort to accelerate the construction phase of this program.

From within the Engineering, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Computer and Information Science and Engineering Directorates and the National Nanotechnology Initiative, the Committee is concerned that researchers are reaching the physical limits of current complementary metal oxide semiconductor process technology and that this will have significant implications for continued productivity growth in the information economy. The Com-

mittee encourages NSF to examine the challenges and timelines outlined in the International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors and, where feasible, increase research support in this area accordingly.

While the National Institutes of Health has principal responsibility for research involving human health and disease, NSF has historically played a critical role in funding long range basic research and technology development which have been critical to NIH's more focused mission. NSF's work on the basic chemical processes which made possible the mapping of the human genome is perhaps the best known example of this extraordinarily important collaboration. The Committee believes that the future of scientific advancement in both the physical sciences and the life sciences will increasingly rely on such collaborations and urges the NSF to work aggressively with NIH to determine how this research can be strengthened. The Committee has recently asked the NIH to convene a conference of all the stakeholder agencies within the Federal government whose missions involve the conduct or support of research at the scientific interface between the life sciences and the physical sciences. NSF is encouraged to play a leading role in this conference, which will hopefully occur during 2003. The Director should be prepared to testify to the Committee at NSF's appropriations hearings on the 2005 budget on the results of this conference as they relate to NSF and on any changes in resource allocations or management systems within NSF which would strengthen this critical area of research.

The Committee recommends \$6,000,000 for the Children's Research Initiative from within the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate.

For the Office of Polar Programs (OPP), an increase of \$25,070,000 above the budget request, for a program level of \$355,000,000, has been provided to enhance the ongoing research effort as well as to provide additional necessary resources for operations, research support and logistics, and science and research grant support. Expenses for the Antarctic operation programs have substantially increased due to the weather and unique situation created by lodged icebergs and three-year ice in the bay. The Committee has provided NSF with the flexibility to meet the funding needs in this situation and expects NSF to fully fund the Antarctic operations.

#### MAJOR RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$192,330,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	148,538,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	202,330,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+43,792,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	-10,000,000

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

The Committee recommends a total of \$192,330,000 for the major research construction and equipment account for fiscal year 2004, an increase of \$43,792,000 over the fiscal 2003 funding level and \$10,000,000 less than the budget request.

The Committee's recommendation includes:

Project	2004 request	2004 recommendation
Atacama Large Millimeter Array (ALMA) .....	\$50,840,000	\$50,840,000
EarthScope .....	45,000,000	43,530,000
IceCube Neutrino Detector Observatory .....	60,000,000	42,000,000
George E. Brown Jr. Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation .....	8,000,000	8,000,000
South Pole Station .....	960,000	960,000
Terascale Computing Systems .....	0	10,000,000
National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON) .....	12,000,000	12,000,000
Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP) .....	0	25,000,000

In 2003, the Committee provided funds in addition to the budget request in order to complete or accelerate construction of two NSF projects: \$25,360,000 for completion of the HIAPER project and \$24,700,000 to accelerate the IceCube Neutrino Detector Observatory. Consequently, the Committee recommendation has taken the 2003 funding levels into consideration and adjustments were taken accordingly.

The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for the Terascale Computing Systems and \$960,000 for the South Pole Station in 2004, the final year of funding for both of these projects.

The Committee's recommendation includes \$12,000,000 for a demonstration of the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON) project as requested in the budget submission. The Committee cautions NSF that this funding is provided purely for two prototype sites to determine the scientific requirements and optimum configuration of the network. Further, before NSF deploys the two prototype stations and formulates future budget requests for this project, NSF must identify and quantify other Federal funding and observatory networks in order to avoid redundancy of Federal research dollars and reduce the overall cost of the NEON project. The Committee directs NSF to provide a preliminary report to the Committee no later than 18 months from the enactment of this legislation and a final report no later than 24 months after enactment. The Committee will not entertain further budget requests for NEON until the final report is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations.

The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 to start the construction phase of the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP) in 2004 instead of 2005.

The Committee recommends funding for the preliminary planning and design phase of the RSVP program under the "Research and related activities" account.

#### EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$910,680,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	903,171,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	938,040,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+7,509,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	-27,360,000

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



tend greater research opportunities to underrepresented segments of the scientific and engineering communities.

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee recommends \$910,680,000, an increase of \$7,509,000 above last year's appropriated level and \$27,360,000 below the budget request.

The Committee's recommendation includes the following program levels:

Program	2004 Request	2004 Recommendation
Math and Science Partnerships .....	\$200,000,000	\$140,000,000
EPSCoR .....	75,000,000	90,000,000
Elementary, Secondary and Informal Education .....	194,450,000	204,450,000
Undergraduate Education .....	142,100,000	146,440,000
Graduate Education .....	156,880,000	156,880,000
Human Resource Development .....	103,410,000	106,710,000
Research, Evaluation and Communication .....	66,200,000	66,200,000

The Committee recommends \$140,000,000 for the Math and Science Partnerships, while a decrease from the budget request, the funding level represents a \$12,500,000 increase over the current year funding level.

The Committee recommends \$90,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) program, an increase of \$15,000,000 over the budget request and equal to the 2003 funding level.

Within the Committee's recommendation for the Elementary, Secondary and Informal Education activity is an additional \$10,000,000 over the budget request for Informal Science, bringing the total program level to \$60,000,000, \$1,000,000 less than last year.

Within the Undergraduate Education activity, an additional \$6,840,000 above the budget request have been provided for the Advanced Technological Education (ATE) program for a total funding level of \$45,000,000. No funds have been provided for the start of the Workforce for the 21st century program.

The Committee recommends \$10,000,000 for the Robert Noyce Scholarship Program, an increase of \$3,000,000 over the fiscal year 2003 funding level and \$6,000,000 over the budget request.

Finally, within the Human Resource Development Activity, an additional \$1,270,000 above the budget request has been added to the Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation (LSAMP) program for a total funding level of \$34,000,000, and \$2,030,000 above the budget request has been added to Historically Black Colleges and Universities Undergraduate Program (HBCU-UP) for a total 2004 program level of \$22,000,000.

The Committee recommends that all other programs and activities within the Education and Human Resources account not already mentioned above should be funded at the levels proposed in the NSF 2004 budget justification.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$215,900,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	189,115,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	225,700,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+26,785,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	-9,800,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$215,900,000 for salaries and expenses, \$9,800,000 below the President's budget request and an increase of \$26,785,000 above last year's appropriated level.

The Committee has only recently come to understand that the salaries and related costs associated with temporary employees working for the Foundation under Intergovernmental Personnel Act and similar authorities are not included in the Salaries and Expenses account. The Committee believes that these so-called "rotator" personnel are part of the basic administrative structure of the Foundation and should be shown together with costs for Federal employees. The Committee expects future budget requests to consolidate such costs in this account.

The Committee is a concerned with the current contract underway to examine the administrative and management structure of NSF, especially since NSF still has not completed a project plan. The Committee directs NSF to submit the final project plan to the Committee and the General Accounting Office for review when completed and further limits funding for this contract to \$3,000,000 in fiscal year 2004.

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$3,800,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	3,477,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+323,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+3,800,000

The National Science Board, established in 1950, establishes policies and assesses the quality, relevance and performance of the National Science Foundation's awards and capital investments. In addition, the Board provides advice to the President and the Congress on matters of science and engineering policy.

The Committee recommends \$3,800,000 for the operations of the National Science Board, an increase of \$323,000 over last year's appropriated level and equal to the budget request, which was included under Salaries and expenses. A representation allowance of \$9,000 has been provided for the Board.

The Committee directs NSF to submit the budget for the Board in the fiscal year 2005 budget justification materials as a separate account, just as the Committee has provided funds for the Board in an account separate from the "Salaries and expenses" account.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$10,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	9,190,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	8,770,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+810,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 request .....	+1,230,000

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

For fiscal year 2004, the Committee has recommended \$10,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General. This amount is \$810,000 above last year's funding level and is \$1,230,000 above the budget request.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$115,000,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	104,317,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	115,000,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+10,683,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

The Committee recommends a funding level of \$115,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, the same amount as the budget request and an increase of \$10,683,000 when compared to the fiscal year 2003 appropriation.

The Committee has included an administrative provision, as proposed in the budget submission, which would bring the NRC's compensation practices in line with those of federally chartered non-profit corporations upon which NRC's authorizing statute was modeled.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Fiscal year 2004 recommendation .....	\$28,290,000
Fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	26,308,000
Fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	28,290,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2003 appropriation .....	+1,982,000
Comparison with fiscal year 2004 budget request .....	0

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

For fiscal year 2004, the bill includes the budget request of \$28,290,000 for the Selective Service System, \$1,982,000 above the fiscal year 2003 funding level.

## TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommends inclusion of twenty-one general provisions, seventeen of which were carried in the fiscal year 2003 Appropriations Act (Public Law 108–10).

The Committee has modified a provision carried in the fiscal year 2003 Appropriations Act which stipulates that transfers to government Agencies must be made pursuant to Appropriations Acts.

The Committee has included a new provision which changes names of accounts for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

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

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

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

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

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

## STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is a statement of general performance goals and objectives for which this measure authorizes funding:

The Committee on Appropriations considers program performance, including a program’s success in developing and attaining outcome-related goals and objectives, in developing funding recommendations.

## TRANSFER OF FUNDS

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

The Committee has included language transferring not to exceed \$17,617,000 from compensation, pension and burial benefits to general operating expenses and medical services for priority 1–6 veterans. These funds are for the administrative costs of implementing cost-savings proposals required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 and the Veterans’ Benefits Act of 1992. Language is also included permitting necessary sums to be transferred to the medical facilities revolving fund to augment funding of medical centers for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized by the Veterans’ Benefits Act of 1992.

The Committee recommends transferring the following amounts to the VA's general operating expenses appropriation pursuant to the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990: the veterans housing benefit program fund program account (\$154,850,000), the education loan fund program account (\$70,000), the vocational rehabilitation loans program account (\$300,000) and the Native American veteran housing loan program account (\$571,000). In addition, the bill provides up to \$350,000 in general operating expenses and medical services for priority 1–6 veterans for administration of the guaranteed transitional housing loans for homeless veterans program account.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Veterans Affairs which would transfer funds from the medical care collections fund to medical services for priority 7–8 veterans.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Veterans Affairs which would allow the transfer of funds between the medical services for priority 1–6 veterans and medical services for priority 7–8 veterans accounts.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Veterans Affairs which would transfer balances as of August 1, 2004 in the medical care collections fund to medical services for priority 7–8 veterans.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Veterans Affairs which would allow the transfer of funds from medical administration and medical facilities accounts to the medical services for priority 1–6 veterans and medical services for priority 7–8 veterans accounts.

The Committee recommends providing authority under administrative provisions for the Department of Veterans Affairs for any funds appropriated in 2004 for compensation and pensions, readjustment benefits, and veterans insurance and indemnities to be transferred between those three accounts. This will provide the Department of Veterans Affairs flexibility in administering its entitlement programs. Language is also included permitting the funds from three life insurance funds to be transferred to general operating expenses for the costs of administering such programs.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring all outstanding balances of funds appropriated to the section 202 program in prior years under the housing for special populations account to the housing for the elderly account.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring all outstanding balances of funds appropriated to the section 811 program in prior years under the housing for special populations account to the housing for the disabled account.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring all uncommitted prior balances of excess rental charges as of fiscal year 2003 and all collections made during fiscal year 2004 to the flexible subsidy fund.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring the following amounts to the salaries and expenses account for administrative expenses: FHA mutual mortgage insurance and general and special

risk insurance program accounts (\$564,000,400); GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account (\$10,695,000); Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account (\$250,000); native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund (\$35,000); and Native American housing block grants account (\$150,000).

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring up to \$13,000,000 from the manufactured housing fees trust fund to the manufactured housing standards program.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring no less than the following amounts to the working capital fund under the salaries and expenses account for development and management of information technology systems: housing certificate fund (\$3,010,000); public housing capital fund (\$10,610,000); community development fund (\$4,900,000); home investment partnership program account (\$2,100,000); homeless assistance grants account (\$2,580,000); housing for the elderly account (\$470,000); housing for persons with disabilities account (\$470,000); FHA mutual mortgage insurance program account (\$20,744,000); FHA general and special risk insurance program account (\$16,946,000); Office of Inspector General (\$300,000); and native American housing block grants account (\$2,720,000).

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring \$24,000,000 from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration to the Office of Inspector General.

The Committee has included language under the Department of Housing and Urban Development transferring \$32,415,000 from the federal housing enterprise oversight fund to the office of federal housing enterprise oversight account.

The Committee has included language under the Environmental Protection Agency transferring funds from the hazardous substance superfund trust fund to the Office of Inspector General in the amount of \$13,214,000. In addition, \$44,697,000 is transferred from the hazardous substance superfund trust fund to the science and technology account.

The Committee has included language under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation transferring up to \$30,125,000 from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund to the Office of Inspector General.

The Committee has included general transfer language under National Aeronautics and Space Administration, space flight capabilities account and the science aeronautic and exploration account. This language will allow for the transfer of funds among these two accounts, as necessary, to reflect full cost accounting recently scheduled for implementation.

The Committee has included general transfer language under National Aeronautics and Space Administration allowing the transfer of unexpired prior year balances in the old accounts to the appropriate accounts in the new budget structure.

RESCISSIONS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Certificate Fund .....	- 1,372,000,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development, Consolidated Fee Fund .....	0
Department of Housing and Urban Development, Rental Housing Assistance .....	- 303,000,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development, Urban Development Action Grants .....	- 30,000,000

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE XIII, CL. 3(e) (RAMSEYER RULE)

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

\* \* \* \* \*

**SECTION 225 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000**

SEC. 225. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount allocated for fiscal [year 2000, and the amounts that would otherwise be allocated for fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002] years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 to the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on behalf of the Philadelphia, PA-NJ Primary Metropolitan Area (hereafter "metropolitan area"), under section 854(c) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall adjust such amounts by allocating to the State of New Jersey the proportion of the metropolitan area's amount that is based on the number of cases of AIDS reported in the portion of the metropolitan area that in located in New Jersey.

\* \* \* \* \*

**DIVISION K—DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003**

\* \* \* \* \*

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g), \$2,730,000,000 (the "Act"), to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, in addition to amounts

otherwise allocated under this heading, \$447,000,000 shall be allocated for such capital and management activities only among public housing agencies that have obligated all assistance for the agency for fiscal years [1998, 1999,] 2000[, ] and 2001 made available under this same heading in accordance with the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 9(j) of such Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, during fiscal year 2003, the Secretary may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary any authority under paragraph (2) of such section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such section for obligation of amounts made available for fiscal year 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, or 2003: *Provided further*, That with respect to any amounts made available under the Public Housing Capital Fund for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, or 2003 that remain unobligated in violation of paragraph (1) of such section 9(j) or unexpended in violation of paragraph (5)(A) of such section 9(j), the Secretary shall recapture any such amounts and reallocate such amounts among public housing agencies determined under 6(j) of the Act to be high-performing: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this heading, the term “obligate” means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue final regulations to carry out section 9(j) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(j)), not later than August 1, 2003: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$51,000,000 shall be for carrying out activities under section 9(h) of such Act, of which up to \$11,000,000 shall be for the provision of remediation services to public housing agencies identified as “troubled” under the Section 8 Management Assessment Program and for surveys used to calculate local Fair Market Rents and assess housing conditions in connection with rental assistance under section 8 of the Act: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$500,000 shall be for lease adjustments to section 23 projects, and no less than \$18,600,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems which serve programs or activities under “Public and Indian housing”: *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$50,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs resulting from emergencies and natural disasters in fiscal year 2003: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$15,000,000 shall be for Neighborhood Networks grants for activities authorized in section 9(d)(1)(E) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts made available in the previous proviso shall be awarded to public housing agencies on a competitive basis as provided in section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$55,000,000 shall be for supportive services, service



coordinators and congregate services as authorized by section 34 of the Act and the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996.

\* \* \* \* \*

**DIVISION K—DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS  
AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDE-  
PENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003**

\* \* \* \* \*

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$1,090,229,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2004, for funds control improvements; and of which \$548,202,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, \$10,343,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association, \$1,000,000 shall be provided from the “Community development loan guarantees program” account, \$150,000 shall be provided by transfer from the “Native American housing block grants” account, \$200,000 shall be provided by transfer from the “Indian housing loan guarantee fund program” account and \$35,000 shall be transferred from the “Native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund” account: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading shall only be allocated in the manner specified in the report accompanying this Act unless the Committees on Appropriations of both the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified of any changes in an operating plan or reprogramming: *Provided further*, That no less than \$10,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of and modifications to information technology systems: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not less than \$21,000,000 is to be made available to the Chief Financial Officer exclusively for activities to implement appropriate funds control systems, including improvements in automated financial management systems, additional training of departmental employees in proper fund control procedures, and establishment of a division of appropriations law within the Office of the Chief Financial Officer: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall submit a revised departmental funds control handbook to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate no later than 30 days after enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That no official or employee of the Department shall be designated as an allotment holder unless the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) has determined that such allotment holder has implemented an adequate system of funds control and has received training in funds control procedures

and directives: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, within 30 days of enactment of this Act, permanently transfer no fewer than four appropriations law attorneys from the Legislative Division of the Office of Legislation and Regulations, Office of General Counsel to the OCFO: *Provided further*, That personnel transferred pursuant to the previous proviso shall report directly to the Chief Financial Officer: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, hereafter, the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Budget Officer, have sole authority to investigate potential or actual violations under the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341 et seq.) and all other statutes and regulations related to the obligation and expenditure of funds made available in this, or any other Act; shall determine whether violations exist; and shall submit final reports on violations to the Secretary, the President, the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress in accordance with applicable statutes and Office of Management and Budget circulars: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall establish positive control of and maintain adequate systems of accounting for appropriations and other available funds as required by 31 U.S.C. 1514: *Provided further*, That for [the purpose of] *purposes of funds control and determining whether a violation exists under the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341 et seq.)*, the point of obligation shall be the executed agreement or contract, *except with respect to insurance and guarantee programs, certain types of salaries and expenses funding, and incremental funding that is authorized under an executed agreement or contract, and shall be designated in the approved funds control plan*: *Provided further*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall: (a) appoint qualified personnel to conduct investigations of potential or actual violations; (b) establish minimum training requirements and other qualifications for personnel that may be appointed to conduct investigations; (c) establish guidelines and timeframes for the conduct and completion of investigations; (d) prescribe the content, format and other requirements for the submission of final reports on violations; and (e) prescribe such additional policies and procedures as may be required for conducting investigations of, and administering, processing, and reporting on, potential and actual violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act and all other statutes and regulations governing the obligation and expenditure of funds made available in this or any other Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall fill 7 out of 10 vacancies at the GS-14 and GS-15 levels until the total number of GS-14 and GS-15 positions in the Department has been reduced from the number of GS-14 and GS-15 positions on the date of enactment of Public Law 106-377 by 2½ percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit a staffing plan for the Department by March 15, 2003.

\* \* \* \* \*

**FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT**

\* \* \* \* \*  
 SEC. 136a-1. (i) \* \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* \* \*

(5) MAINTENANCE FEE.—

(A) Subject to \* \* \*

(B) In the case of \* \* \*

(C)(i) The amount of each fee prescribed under subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted by the Administrator to a level that will result in the collection under this paragraph of, to the extent practicable, an aggregate amount of **[\$20,000,000] \$21,500,000** in **[each]** fiscal year **2004**.

(D) The maximum \* \* \*

(E)(i) For a small \* \* \*

(F) The Administrator shall \* \* \*

(G) If any fee \* \* \*

(H) The authority provided under this paragraph shall terminate on September 30, **[2003] 2004**.

(6) OTHER FEES.—During the period beginning on October 25, 1988, and ending on September 30, **[2003] 2004**, the Administrator shall \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(k) \* \* \*

(3) EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF SIMILAR APPLICATIONS.—

(A) The Administrator shall use for each of the fiscal years 1997 through **[2003] 2004**, not more than 1/10 of the maintenance fee collected \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION ACT**

\* \* \* \* \*

SEC. 605. (a) EMPLOYMENT, COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS.—The board shall have power to select, employ, and fix the compensation and benefits of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the performance of its duties under this subchapter, without regard to the provisions of title 5 governing appointments in the competitive service, classification, and General Schedule pay rates, except that no officer, employee, attorney, or agent of the corporation may be paid **[compensation] salary** at a rate in excess of the **[highest rate provided for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5.] rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule. The Corporation shall also apply the provisions of section 5307 (a)(1), (b)(1), and (b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, governing limitations on certain pay as if its employees were Federal employees receiving payments under title 5.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958**

\* \* \* \* \*

**TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS**

\* \* \* \* \*

*FULL COST APPROPRIATIONS ACCOUNT STRUCTURE*

\* \* \* \* \*

SEC. [312] 313. (a) Appropriations for the Administration for fiscal year [2002] 2003 and thereafter shall be made in three accounts, “[Human space flight] *Space flight capabilities*”, “Science, aeronautics and [technology] *exploration*”, and an account for amounts appropriated for the necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General. Appropriations shall remain available for 2 fiscal years. Each account shall include the planned full costs of the Administration’s related activities.

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) The [Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall determine what balances from the “Mission support” account are to be transferred to the “Human space flight” and “Science, aeronautics and technology” accounts. Such balances shall be transferred and merged with the “Human space flight” and “Science, aeronautics and technology” accounts, and remain available for the period of which originally appropriated.”] *unexpired balances of prior appropriations to the Administration for activities authorized under this Act may be transferred to the new account established for such activity in subsection (a). Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the newly established account and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund under the same terms and conditions.*

#### CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

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

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

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

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

Sections 401 through 417 of title IV of the bill, sixteen of which were carried in the fiscal year 2003 Appropriations Act, are general provisions which place limitations or restrictions on the use of funds in the bill and which might, under certain circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law.

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

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, medical services for priority 1–6 veterans, setting aside and delaying the availability of certain equipment funds.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, medical facilities, setting aside and delaying the availability of certain land and structures funds.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, general operating expenses, providing for the reimbursement to the Department of Defense for the costs of overseas employee mail. This language has been carried previously and permits free mailing privileges for VA personnel stationed in the Philippines.

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

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

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions, permitting transfers between mandatory and discretionary accounts, limiting and providing for the use of certain funds, funding administrative expenses associated with VA life insurance programs from excess program revenues, extending authority to operate the Franchise Fund, allowing reimbursement from enhanced-use leases, allowing for reimbursement for certain services, requiring notification of new lease agreements, requiring disclosure of insurance and income information, designating funds for enterprise architecture activities, prohibiting funds for implementation of two sections of Public Law 107-287, allowing the Secretary to establish a priority system for medical services, allowing a recovery audit collection program, and allowing medical services funds for recreational and funeral expenses. Fourteen provisions have been carried in previous Appropriations Acts. Three provisions were carried in other parts of VA accounts and consolidated under administrative provisions. Two new provisions have been added.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions transferring balances in excess of a specified amount in the Medical Care Collections Fund to the medical services for priority 7-8 veterans account.

Language is included under the Department of Veterans Affairs, administrative provisions allowing the transfer of funds between the medical services for priority 1-6 veterans account and the medical services for priority 7-8 veterans account.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, which designates funds for various programs, activities, and purposes, and specifies the uses of such funds.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, housing certificate fund, which specifies the allocation of certain funds; includes a reserve fund for certain purposes; sets forth certain reporting requirements; specifies the allocation of certain administrative funds and places limitations on the uses of certain administrative funds; and requires certain data to be submitted.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, public housing capital fund, which specifies the allocation of certain funds; limits the delegation of certain waiver authorities; waives certain penalties related to withholding of funds unless the Department takes action to implement necessary regulations; requires reallocation of certain funds; and prohibits funds from being used for certain activities.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, public housing operating fund, which designates certain funds to be distributed by the Attorney General through a reimbursable agreement; prohibits funds from being used for certain activities; and prohibits funds from being used to pay for prior year operations.

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

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, home investment partnerships program, which specifies the allocation of certain funds.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, homeless assistance grants, which establishes certain minimum funding and matching requirements; and requires grantees to integrate homeless programs with other social service providers.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, housing for the elderly, which specifies the allocation of certain funds; designates certain funds to be used only for certain grants; and allows the Secretary to waive certain provisions governing contract terms.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, housing for persons with disabilities, which specifies the allocation of certain funds; allows funds to be used to renew certain contracts; and allows the Secretary to waive certain provisions governing contract terms.

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

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, manufactured housing fees trust fund, which permits fees to be modified and permits temporary borrowing authority from the General Fund of the Treasury.

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

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, management and administration, which specifies the allocation of funds; sets forth certain authorities of, and requirements on, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer; places limitations on personnel; and requires submission of a staffing plan.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, which permits temporary borrowing authority from the General Fund of the Treasury.

Language is included under Department of Housing and Urban Development, administrative provisions, which maintains and reduces annual adjustment factors; prohibits funds to investigate or prosecute certain lawful activities; revises allocations for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS grant recipients; waives certain section 8 rental payment limits for a demonstration program; requires a competitive selection process for certain HUD programs; relates to the expenditures for certain corporations and agencies; relates to allocations of funds in excess of budget estimates; requires a competitive selection process for certain HUD programs; requires submission of a spending plan for certain activities; exempts some states from certain board membership requirements; and requires submission of certain reports regarding departmental funds.

Language is included under Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, salaries and expenses, which limits certain personnel employed by the Board.

Language is included under Department of the Treasury, Community Development Financial Institutions, community development financial institution program account, which sets aside funds for various purposes.

Language is included under Corporation for National and Community Service, national and community service programs operating expenses, allowing funds to be used for education award-only grants under subtitle C and prohibiting funds for national service programs in other Federal agencies.

Language is included under Corporation for National and Community Service, national service trust, limiting enrollment in the Trust.

Language is included under Corporation for National and Community Service, administrative provisions allowing certain loans to be considered a qualified student loan and allowing certain grantees to be eligible for grants targeted to individuals with disabilities.

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

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

Language is included under the Environmental Protection Agency, administrative provisions, which permits the Administrator to award cooperative agreements to Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia under certain circumstances, prohibits the use of funds for implementation of a specific new pesticide tolerance fee, and which authorizes for one year a pesticide maintenance fee.

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

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

Language is included under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, administrative provision, extending the availability of construction of facility funds, permitting funds for contracts for

various services in the next year, and transferring of prior year appropriations to the appropriate new appropriations accounts.

Language is included under the National Credit Union Administration, central liquidity facility, limiting loans from borrowed funds and administrative expenses.

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

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

#### APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the agencies in the accompanying bill which contain appropriations that are not authorized by law:



Agency/Program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriation in last year of authorization	Appropriation this bill
<b>DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</b>				
Construction, Major:				
Seismic Corrections for Palo Alto, CA, Building 2 .....				\$14,013,000
Seismic Corrections for Palo Alto, CA, Building 4 .....				21,750,000
Seismic Corrections for San Francisco, CA, Building 203 .....				31,000,000
Seismic Corrections for West Los Angeles, CA, Building 500 .....				27,200,000
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>				
Housing Certificate Fund:				
Section 8 contract renewals and administrative expenses .....	1994	\$8,446,173	\$5,458,106	18,097,564
Section 441 contracts .....	1994	109,410	150,000	23,517
Section 23 leased housing conversions .....	1994	13,303		500
Section 8 preservation, protection, and family unification .....	1994	759,259	541,000	206,495
Incremental Vouchers .....	1994	2,060,725		0
Contract Administrators .....				100,000
Native American Housing Block Grant .....	2001	Such sums	636,000	661,600
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS .....	1994	156,300	156,000	297,000
Rural Housing and Economics Development .....				25,000
Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities .....				15,000
Community Development Fund:				
Community Development Block Grants .....	1994	4,168,000	4,380,000	4,358,650
Housing Assistance Council .....				3,300
Native American Indian Housing Council .....				2,400
National Housing Development Corporation .....				5,000
National Council on La Raza HOPE Fund .....				5,000
Self-Help Housing Opportunity Program .....	2000	Such sums	20,000	28,000
Capacity Building .....	1994	25,000	20,000	33,250
Economic Development Initiatives .....				137,500
Neighborhood Initiatives .....				21,000
YouthBuild .....	1994	41,680	28,000	65,000
Brownfields .....				25,000
HOME Investment Partnerships .....	1994	2,173,612	1,275,000	2,064,100
Homeless Assistance Grants .....	1994	465,774	599,000	1,242,000
FHA General and Special Risk Program Account:				
Limitation on guaranteed loans .....	1995	Such sums	(20,885,072)	(25,000,000)
Limitation on direct loans .....	1995	Such sums	(220,000)	(50,000)
Credit Subsidy .....	1995	Such sums	188,395	15,000
Administrative Expenses .....	1995		197,470	93,780

Agency/Program	Last year of authorization	Authorization level	Appropriation in last year of authorization	Appropriation this bill
<b>GNMA Mortgage-Backed Securities Loan Guarantee Program Account:</b>				
Limitation on guaranteed loans .....	1996	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(200,000,000)
Administrative Expenses .....	1996	Such sums	9,101	10,695
Policy Development and Research .....	1994	36,470	35,000	47,000
Fair Housing Activities, Fair Housing Initiatives Program .....	1994	26,000	20,481	20,250
Lead Hazards Reduction Program .....	1994	276,000	185,000	130,000
Salaries and Expenses .....	1994	1,029,496	916,963	1,122,130
Community Development Financial Institutions Fund .....	1998	111,000	80,000	51,000
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation .....	1994	30,714	32,000	115,000
Consumer Product Safety Commission .....	1992	45,000	40,200	60,000
<b>Federal Citizen Information Center Fund:</b>				
Federal Information Center .....	1980	7,000	4,492	12,500
Interagency Council on the Homeless .....	FY 1994	1,563	.....	1,500
National Credit Union Administration, loan fund .....	1979	0	0	1,000
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</b>				
<b>Categorical Grants:</b>				
Clean Air Act .....	FY 1997	Such sums	167,230	228,550
Radon Abatement Act .....	FY 1991	10,000	9,000	8,150
Clean Water Act (FWPCA) .....	FY 1990-91	.....	.....	492,900
BEACH Act .....	FY 2005	30,000	.....	10,000
Safe Drinking Water Act .....	FY 2003	115,000	.....	118,600
Solid Waste Disposal Act (RCRA) .....	FY 1988	70,000	71,391	106,400
Toxic Substances Control Act .....	FY 1983	1,500	5,100	5,150
Pollution Prevention Act .....	FY 1993	8,000	6,800	6,000
Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act .....	FY 1998	Such sums	38,585	62,500
Clean Water SRF .....	FY 1992	1,800,000	2,400,000	1,200,000
Sewer Overflows .....	FY 2003	750,000	.....	0
Drinking Water SRF .....	FY 2003	1,000,000	.....	850,000
Alaskan Native Village .....	FY 1979	2,000	Not available	25,000
Hazardous Substance Superfund .....	FY 1994	5,100,000	1,480,853	1,275,000
LUST Trust Fund .....	FY 1988	10,000	14,400	72,545
Oil Spills (FWPCA) .....	No expiration	35,000	15,000	16,209
<b>Science and Technology:</b>				
Clean Air Act .....	FY 1997	Such sums	177,150	
Clean Water Act .....	FY 1990	159,520	27,028	
FIFRA .....	FY 1991	95,000 (part)	11,890	
Safe Drinking Water Act .....	FY 2003	Such sums	51,501	

ERDDA .....	FY 1981	1,115,591	217,828	
Office of Inspector General .....	No expiration	Such sums	34,019	36,808

---

The statutory authority for appropriations in all eight of EPA's accounts is provided to the Agency through a wide variety of primarily media-specific statutes as shown in the following chart:

Section title	Statute section	Terms of authorization	Expiration
<b>Federal Water Pollution Control Act</b>			
Res., Invest., Train., Tech. Asst., Info. Activ .....	104(U)(1) .....	\$22.77m, FY86-90 .....	33,146.
Train. Progs. for Treat. Works Personnel .....	104(U)(2) .....	\$3m, FY86-90 .....	33,146.
Forecasting Manpower .....	104(U)(3) .....	\$1.5m, FY86-90 .....	33,146.
Agricul. Research .....	104(U)(4) .....	\$10m, FY73-75 .....	27,575.
Fresh Water Aquatic Ecosystems Res. Grants .....	104(U)(5) .....	\$15m, FY73-75 .....	27,575.
Thermal Discharge Cont .....	104(U)(6) .....	\$10m, FY73-75 .....	27,575.
Res., Dev., Demo. Grants Storm Water Poll. Cont .....	105(H) .....	\$75m, FY73-75, 10% for 105(E) .....	27,575.
Grants for Pollution Control and Enforce .....	106(A) .....	\$75m, FY86-90 .....	33,146.
Mine Wtr. Poll. Control .....	107(E) .....	\$30m, until expend .....	When expended.
Great Lakes Pollution Control Demo. Projects .....	108(C) .....	\$20m, until expend .....	When expended.
Lake Erie Corp. of Eng. Deno. Project .....	108(E) .....	\$5m, until expend .....	When expended.
Train, Grts., Cont., Schol .....	112(C) .....	\$7m, FY86-90 .....	33,146.
Alaska Vill. Deno. Proj .....	113(D) .....	\$2m .....	29,128.
In-Place Toxic Poll. Removal From Ports .....	115 .....	\$15m .....	When expended.
Hudson Bay PCB Reclamation Demo. Proj .....	116(D) .....	\$20m .....	Indefinite.
Chesapeake-Bay Program .....	117(D) .....	\$3m, FY87-90 .....	33,146.
Great Lakes Program .....	118(g) .....	\$10m for grants, FY87-90 .....	33,146.
Assur. for Every State .....	205(E) .....	\$11m, FY87-91 (30% to NOAA) .....	9/30/91.
Reserve % for Admin. Specific Sections .....	205(G) .....	\$75m, FY79-90 .....	9/30/90.
Set-Aside for Altern. Conv. Sewage Treat. Wrks .....	205(H) .....	Limit subject to formula .....	No exp. date.
Altern. and Innovative Technologies-Fed. Share .....	205(I) .....	Limit subject to formula .....	No exp. date.
Reserve Con. Grants for WQ Mgt. Planning .....	205(J) .....	Limit subject to formula .....	9/30/90.
Nonpoint Source Resrv .....	205(J)(5) .....	Limit subject to formula .....	No exp. date.
Sewage Covey. Cost NYC-NTWTON Treatment Plant .....	205(K) .....	Limit subject to formula .....	9/30/82.
Reim. for Treat. Works .....	206(E) .....	\$2600m for 206(a) .....	When expended.
Grants for Construct. of Treatment Works .....	207 .....	\$750m for 206(b) .....	When expended.
Grants to Areawide Waste Mgt. Agencies .....	208(F)(3) .....	\$1200m, FY89-90 .....	9/30/90.
Corps of Eng. Program of Tech Asst .....	208(H)(2) .....	Such sums FY 83-90 .....	9/30/90.
DOI,Natl. Wetlands Inv .....	208(i)(2) .....	\$50m, FY73-74 .....	6/30/74.
Agri Contracts—Control Non-Point Source Poll .....	208(j)(2) .....	\$6m .....	12/31/81.
Water Resources Council Basin Planning .....	208(J)(9) .....	Such sums FY83-90 .....	9/30/90.
IAG Transf. to Supp. WQ .....	209(C) .....	\$200m .....	When expended.
Rev. Fund for Remov. of Oil or Haz. Sub. Progs .....	304(K)(3) .....	\$100m, FY79-83 .....	9/30/90.
Clean Lakes Grants .....	311(K) .....	Such sums FY84-90 .....	9/30/90.
	314(C)(2) .....	\$35m .....	No exp. date.
		\$30m, FY86-90 until expend .....	9/30/90.

Section title	Statute section	Terms of authorization	Expiration
Clean Lakes Demo. Proj .....	314(D)(4) .....	\$40m .....	When expended.
Natl. Study Commission .....	315(H) .....	\$17.25m .....	When expended.
Non-Point Source Mgt. Prog. Grants to States .....	319(J) .....	\$130m, FY-91 until expend .....	9/30/91.
Sewage Sludge Studies .....	405(G)(2) .....	\$5m, FY87 .....	No exp. date.
Con. Grants—San Diego .....	510(J) .....	\$600m, FY94 .....	No exp. date.
Oakwood Beach/Red Hood .....	512(B) .....	\$7m, FY87 and beyond .....	No exp. date.
Boston Harbor & Adj. Wtrs .....	513(D) .....	\$100m, FY87 .....	When expended.
San Diego Wastewater Reclamation Demo .....	514(C) .....	\$2m, FY87 and beyond .....	No exp. date.
Des Moines Sewage Plnt .....	515(B) .....	\$50m, FY87 and beyond .....	No exp. date.
General Authorization .....	517 .....	\$135m, FY86-90 .....	9/30/90.
Studies of Wtr. Poll. Probs. in Aquifers .....	520(C) .....	\$7m, FY87 and beyond .....	No exp. date.
Great Lakes Consumptv. Use Study .....	521(D) .....	\$750k, FY87 and beyond .....	No exp. date.
Sulfide Corrosn. Study .....	522(D) .....	\$1m, FY87 and beyond .....	No exp. date.
State Water Poll. Cont. Revolving Fund Auth .....	607 .....	\$1.8b, FY92 .....	9/30/94.
Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002			
Great Lakes—Remediation of Sediment Contamination .....	103 .....	\$50m, FY04-08 .....	9/30/2008.
Great Lakes—Public Information Program .....	103 (13) .....	\$1m, FY04-08 .....	9/30/2008.
Great Lakes—Section 118(h) of FWPCA Amended .....	105 .....	\$25m, FY04-08 .....	9/30/2008.
Great Lakes—R&D Program .....	106 .....	\$3m, FY04-08 .....	When expended.
Lake Champlain—Protection Plan Implementation .....	120 .....	\$11m, FY04-08 .....	9/30/2008.
Center for Brownfields Excellence—Tech Transfer .....	305 .....	\$1m, none .....	No exp. date.
Beaches Environmental Assessment & Coastal Health Act of 2003			
Coastal Recreation W.Q Monitoring & Notification .....	406(l) .....	\$30m, FY01-08 .....	No exp. date.
Marine Prot. Rsrch. & Sanct. Act			
Ocean Dumping Ban Act			
For Title I .....	111 .....	\$14m, FY94-97 .....	When expended.
Clean Air Act			
General Authorization .....	327(A) .....	Such sums FY90-97 .....	9/30/97.
Local Impl. Revisn. Grants .....	327(A)(1) .....	\$50m, FY91 .....	9/30/91.
FIFRA—Food Quality Protection Act			
Gen. Authorization/Res .....	31 .....	\$95m, FY91 .....	9/30/91.
Asbestos School Hazards Abatement Act			
Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act			
General Authorization .....	512 .....	\$100m, FY85-90 .....	9/30/90.

Estab. Trust Fund for Collect. Loan Repayments .....	4(A)/5(E) .....	\$25m, FY87-90 .....	No date spec.
Resource Conserv. & Recov. Act			
Solid Waste Disposal Act			
Tire Shredding Grants .....	2004 .....	\$750K, FY78-79 .....	9/30/79.
General Authorization .....	2007(A) .....	\$80m, FY88 .....	9/30/88.
Criminal Investigators .....	2007(E) .....	\$2.529m, FY88 .....	9/30/88.
Undrgrnd. Storg. Tank Reg .....	2007(F)(1) .....	\$10m, FY85-88 .....	9/30/88.
St. Asst.-UST Prog. Dev .....	2007(F)(2) .....	\$25m, FY85-88 .....	9/30/88.
St. Haz. Wst. Prog. Grants .....	3011(A) .....	\$60m, FY88 .....	9/30/88.
Grants to States for Invntory Haz. Wst. Sites .....	3012 .....	\$25m, FY85-88 .....	9/30/88.
Solid Wst. Prog. St. Grts .....	4008(A)(1) .....	\$10m, FY85-88 .....	9/30/88.
Grants for Studies & Market Analysis .....	4008(A)(2)(D) .....	\$10m, FY85-88 .....	9/30/88.
St. Asst. for Provisns. Relt. to Recycled Oil .....	4008(A)(3)(A) .....	\$4m, FY82-86 .....	9/30/86.
Spec. Communities Disposal Site Grants .....	4008(E)(2) .....	\$500K, FY85-88 .....	9/30/88.
Municip. Asst. for Enrgy. Conserv. & Recov. Plang .....	4008(F)(2) .....	\$8m, FY82-86 .....	9/30/86.
St. Asst. for Recycled Oil Programs .....	4008(G)(4) .....	\$5m, FY85-88 .....	9/30/88.
Rural Community Grants .....	4009(D) .....	\$15m, FY81-82 .....	9/30/82.
Dept. of Commerce Funct .....	5006 .....	\$1.5m, FY85-88 .....	9/30/88.
Resource Conserv. Comm .....	8002(J)(5) .....	\$2m .....	When expended.
Drilling Fluids. Study .....	8002(M) .....	\$1m .....	When expended.
Special Studies .....	8002(Q) .....	\$8m, FY78-79 .....	7/30/91
Res., Training & Info .....	8007 .....	\$35m, FY78 .....	9/30/79.
Medical Waste Tracking. Demo. Program .....	11012 .....	Such sums FY89-91 .....	9/30/78.
Natl. Ground Water Comm .....	04(I) Title VII .....	\$7m, FY85-87 .....	1/11/87.
Safe Drinking Water Act			
Health Risk Red. & Cost Analysis in Regulation Dev .....	1412(b)(3)(C)(iv) .....	\$35m, FY96-03 .....	9/30/03.
Arsenic and Sulfate Studies .....	1412(b)(12)(A)(vi) .....	\$2.5m, FY97-00 .....	9/30/00.
Small Systems Operator Certification Grants .....	1419(d)(3) .....	\$30m, FY97-03 .....	9/30/03.
Small PWS Technology Assistance Centers Grants .....	1420(f)(6) .....	\$2m, FY97-99 .....	9/30/99.
		\$5m, FY00-03 .....	9/30/03.
Environmental Finance Centers .....	1420(g)(4) .....	\$1.5m, FY97-03 .....	9/30/03.
Sole Source Aquifer Demonstration Program .....	1427(m) .....	\$15m, FY92-03 .....	9/30/03.
State Programs to Establish Wellhead Prot. Areas .....	1428(k) .....	\$30m, FY92-03 .....	9/30/03.
State Ground Water Protection Grants .....	1429(f) .....	\$15m, FY97-03 .....	9/30/03.
Tech. Assist. for Small Systems Circuit Rider .....	1442(e) .....	\$15m, FY97-03 .....	9/30/03.
Emergency Assistance to States (1442(a)(2)(B)) .....	1442(d) .....	\$8,050k, FY91 .....	9/30/91.
Research, Tech. Assist., Info., Trng of Personnel .....	1442(d) .....	\$38,020k, FY91 .....	9/30/91.
Grants for State Public Water .....	1443(a)(7) .....	\$100m, FY97-03 .....	9/30/03.
Underground Injection Control Grants .....	1443(b)(5) .....	\$15m, FY92-03 .....	9/30/03.

Section title	Statute section	Terms of authorization	Expiration
New York Watershed Protection Program	1443(d)(4)	\$15m, FY97-03	9/30/03.
Special Study and Demonstration Grants	1444(c)	\$10m	6/30/77.
Grants to Public Sector Agencies for Dev. & Demo. Proj	42 U.S.C. (300j-3a(c)1)	\$25m	9/30/78.
Monitoring Program for Unregulated Contaminants	1445(a)(2)(H)	\$10m, FY97-03	9/30/03.
Capitalization of Drinking Water SRFs	1452(m)	\$1b, FY95-03	9/30/03.
Grants to Sppt State Source WQ Prot. Partnership Prog	1454(e)	\$5m, FY97-03	9/30/03.
Drinking Water Assistance to Colonias	1456(e)	\$25m, FY97-99	9/30/99.
Studies on Harmful Substances in Drinking Water	1458(c)(3)	\$12.5m, FY97-03	9/30/03.
Waterborne Disease Occurrence Study	1458(d)(3)	\$3m, FY97-01 (with limitations)	9/30/01.
Grants to States for Remedying School Drinking Water	1465(c)	\$30m, FY91	9/30/91.
General Drinking Water Research Authorization	201	Such sums (not to exc. \$26.593m)	9/30/03.
Grants to Alaska to Improve Sanitation	303(e)	\$15m, FY97-00	9/30/00.
Wastewater Assistance to Colonias	307(e)	\$25m, FY97-99	9/30/99.
Grants for Water Supply Sys. & Source WQ Prot. Prog	401(d)	\$25m, FY97-03 uncondit. auth \$25m, FY97-03 condit. auth.	9/30/03.
Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Emergency and Response Act of 2002			
Terrorist and Other Intentional Acts	1433	\$160M, FY02 Sums as nec. FY03-05	9/30/2002. 9/30/2005.
Contaminant Prevention/Supply Disruption	1434-1435	\$15m, FY02 Sums as nec. FY03-05	9/30/2002. 9/30/2005.
Miscellaneous and Technical Amendments	403	\$35m, FY02 Sums nec. each FY thereafter	9/30/2002. No date spec.
Pollution Prevention Act			
EPA Activities—Source Reduct	6610	\$8m, FY91-93	9/30/93.
State Grants for Tech. Assist	6610	\$8m, FY91-93	9/30/93.
Noise Control Act			
Res., Dev.—Low Noise Prod	15(G)	\$2.42m, FY77	9/30/77.
General Authorization	19	\$15m, FY79	9/30/79.
Envir. Research, Development, & Demo Act			
EPA Environ. Reserach & Dev. Activities	2		9/30/81.
Health and Ecological Effects program	2 CAA	\$45.2m	FY81.
Industrial Processes program		\$4.1m	FY81.
Monitoring and Technical Support		\$20.8m	FY81.
Health and Ecological Effects	2 CWA	\$23.8m	FY81.
Industrial Processes		\$13.7m	FY81.



Public Sector Activities .....		\$14.3m .....	FY81.
Monitoring and Technical Support .....		\$12.1m .....	FY81.
Health and Ecological Effects .....	2 SDWA .....	\$12.36m .....	FY81.
Public Sector Activities .....		\$14.08m .....	FY81.
Monitoring and Technical Support .....		\$1.008m .....	FY81.
	2 SWDA .....	\$26.446m .....	FY81.
Health and Ecological Effects .....	2 PHSA .....	\$2.99m .....	FY81.
Monitoring and Technical Support .....		\$191m .....	FY81.
Health and Ecological Effects .....	2 IA .....	\$5.232m .....	FY81.
Monitoring and Technical Support .....		\$2.868m .....	FY81.
Anticipatory Research .....		\$14.745m .....	FY81.
Health and Ecological Effects .....	2 FIFRA .....	\$5.97m .....	FY81.
Industrial Processes .....		\$2.9m .....	FY81.
Monitoring and Technical Support .....		\$565k .....	FY81.
Health and Ecological Effects .....	2 TSCA .....	\$31.87m .....	FY81.
Industrial Process .....		\$1.77m .....	FY81.
Monitoring and Technical Support .....		\$3.247m .....	FY81.
Health and Ecological Effects .....	2 EA .....	\$50.096m .....	FY81.
Energy Control .....		\$57.503m .....	FY81.
Program Management .....	2 EPA .....	\$4.666m .....	FY81.
	Inspector General Act		
OIG Approp. Accounts .....	108 .....	Amounts as appropriated .....	No exp. date.
	Toxic Substances Control Act		
	Radon Abatement Act		
TSCA Research & Dev .....	10 .....		9/30/81.
State Programs .....	28(D) .....	\$1.5m, FY82-83 .....	9/30/83.
General Authorization .....	29(D) .....	\$58.646m FY82, \$62m, FY-83 .....	9/30/83.
Radon Profic. Rating .....	305(E) .....	\$1.5m .....	When expended.
Citizen Guide, Model Constr. Stds., Tech. Asst .....	305(F) .....	\$3m, FY89-91 .....	9/30/91.
Radon St. Prog. Grants .....	306(J) .....	\$10m, FY89-91 .....	9/30/91.
Radon Diag./Remedial in High-Risk Schools .....	307(B) .....	\$1m & 500k (diag. & remed.) .....	When expended.
Region. Radon Trng. Ctrs .....	308(F) .....	\$1m, FY89-91 .....	9/30/91.
	Comp. Env. Response, Compensation & Liability Act		
	Superfund Amend. & Reauth. Act		
	Emergency Plan. & Community Right to Know Act		
Limit. on Sec. 515/516 .....	111(A) .....	\$5.1b, FY91-94 .....	9/30/94.
Pilot Proj. for Removal of Lead Contam. Soil .....	111(A)(6) .....	\$15b .....	No exp. date.

Section title	Statute section	Terms of authorization	Expiration
Worker Train. & Ed. Grts .....	111(C)(12) .....	\$20m, FY87-94 .....	9/30/94.
Agency—Tox. Sub. Disease .....	111(M) .....	\$60m, FY90-94 .....	9/30/94.
Limit. on Rad. Demo. Prog .....	111(N)(1) .....	\$20m, FY87-94 .....	9/30/94.
Limit. on Maz. Sub. R&D, Demo. and Training Activ .....	111(N)(2) .....	\$35m, FY91-94 .....	9/30/94.
Gulf Coast Haz. Sub. R&D, and Demo. Center .....	118(i)(4) .....	\$5m, FY87 and thereafter .....	No exp. date.
Pacific Northwest Haz. Sub. R&D and Demo. Centr .....	118(O)(5) .....	\$5m, FY87 and thereafter .....	No exp. date.
Emer. Trng. & Review of Emer. Systems—St. & Locl .....	305(A)(2) .....	\$5m, FY87-90 .....	9/30/90.
Gen. Auth. T-111 Emer. Plan. Comm. Right to Knw .....	330 .....	Such sums beginning FY87 .....	No exp. date.
Small Business Liability Relief & Brownfields Revitalization Act			
Brownfield Revitalization Funding .....	101 .....	\$200m .....	No exp. date.
Contiguous Properties .....	107 .....	.....	No exp. date.
Prospective Purchasers & Windfall Liens .....	101 .....	.....	No exp. date.
Innocent Landowners .....	101 (35) .....	.....	No exp. date.
State Response Programs .....	101 .....	\$50m .....	No exp. date.
Additions to National Priorities List .....	105 .....	.....	No exp. date.

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

(In millions of dollars)

	302(b) allocation—		This bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary .....	90,034	95,590	90,033 <sup>1</sup>	95,590
Mandatory .....	32,432	32,266	32,482	32,266

<sup>1</sup> Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

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

	<i>Millions</i>
Outlays:	
2004 .....	<sup>2</sup> 76,073
2005 .....	18,030
2006 .....	7,984
2007 .....	4,129
2008 .....	3,448

<sup>2</sup> Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

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

	<i>Millions</i>
Budget Authority in bill .....	30,728
Fiscal year outlays resulting therefrom .....	6,538

BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT

During fiscal year 2004 for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), the following information provides the definition of the term “program, project, and activity” for departments and agencies carried in the accompanying bill. The term “program, project, and activity” shall include the most specific level of budget items identified in the 2004 Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, the accompanying House and Senate reports, the conference report of the joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committee of conference.

In applying any sequestration reductions, departments and agencies shall apply the percentage of reduction required for fiscal year 2004 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 99-177 to each program, project, activity, and subactivity contained in the budget justification documents submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate in support of the fiscal year 2003 budget estimates, as amended, for such departments and agencies, as subsequently altered, modified, or changed by Congressional action identified by the aforementioned Act, resolutions and reports. Further, it is intended that in implementing any Presidential sequestration order, (1) no program, project, or activity should be eliminated, (2) no reordering of funds or priorities occur, and (3) no unfunded program execution, it is not intended that normal reprogramming between programs, projects, and activities be precluded after reductions required under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are implemented.

#### FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

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

#### ROLLCALL NO. 1

Date: July 21, 2003.

Measure: Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2004.

Motion by: Mr. Edwards.

Description of motion: To substitute the amendment offered by Mr. Goode by providing funds for VA medical services offset by a reduction to tax cuts for certain income groups instead of a transfer from the VA Medical Administration account.

Results: Rejected 25 yeas to 31 nays.

#### *Members Voting Yea*

Mr. Boyd  
Mr. Clyburn  
Mr. Cramer  
Ms. DeLauro  
Mr. Dicks  
Mr. Edwards  
Mr. Farr  
Mr. Fattah  
Mr. Hinchey  
Mr. Hoyer  
Ms. Kaptur  
Mr. Kennedy  
Ms. Kilpatrick  
Mrs. Lowey  
Mr. Mollohan  
Mr. Moran  
Mr. Murtha  
Mr. Obey  
Mr. Olver

#### *Members Voting Nay*

Mr. Aderholt  
Mr. Crenshaw  
Mr. Culberson  
Mr. Cunningham  
Mr. Doolittle  
Mrs. Emerson  
Mr. Frelinghuysen  
Mr. Goode  
Ms. Granger  
Mr. Istook  
Mr. Kingston  
Mr. Kirk  
Mr. Knollenberg  
Mr. Kolbe  
Mr. LaHood  
Mr. Latham  
Mr. Lewis  
Mr. Nethercutt  
Mrs. Northup

Mr. Price	Mr. Regula
Mr. Rothman	Mr. Rogers
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Sherwood
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Simpson
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Vitter
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Dr. Weldon
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

## ROLLCALL NO. 2

Date: July 21, 2003.

Measure: Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2004.

Motion by: Mr. Edwards.

Description of motion: To add \$2,200,000,000 to VA medical services for priority 1–6 veterans offset by a reduction to tax cuts for certain income groups.

Results: Rejected 26 yeas to 32 nays.

<i>Members Voting Yea</i>	<i>Members Voting Nay</i>
Mr. Bishop	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Crenshaw
Mr. Clyburn	Mr. Culberson
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Cunningham
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Doolittle
Mr. Dicks	Mrs. Emerson
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Farr	Mr. Goode
Mr. Fattah	Ms. Granger
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Istook
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Kirk
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Kolbe
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. LaHood
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Latham
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Moran	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Obey	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Olver	Mr. Regula
Mr. Price	Mr. Rogers
Mr. Rothman	Mr. Sherwood
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Simpson
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Tiahrt

Mr. Visclosky

Mr. Vitter  
Mr. Walsh  
Mr. Wamp  
Dr. Weldon  
Mr. Wicker  
Mr. Wolf  
Mr. Young

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>TITLE I</b>					
<b>DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</b>					
<b>Veterans Benefits Administration</b>					
Compensation and pensions.....	28,949,000	29,845,127	29,845,127	+896,127	---
Readjustment benefits.....	2,264,808	2,529,734	2,529,734	+264,926	---
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	27,530	29,017	29,017	+1,487	---
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite).....	437,522	305,834	305,834	-131,688	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(300)	(300)	(300)	---	---
Credit subsidy.....	-98,000	---	---	+98,000	---
Administrative expenses.....	167,114	154,850	154,850	-12,264	---
Education loan fund program account.....	1	1	1	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3)	(3)	(3)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	70	---	70	---	+70
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	55	52	52	-3	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3,626)	(3,938)	(3,938)	(+312)	---
Administrative expenses.....	287	300	300	+13	---
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account..	554	571	571	+17	---
<b>Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....</b>	<b>31,748,941</b>	<b>32,865,486</b>	<b>32,865,556</b>	<b>+1,116,615</b>	<b>+70</b>
<b>Veterans Health Administration</b>					
Medical services for Priority 1-6 Veterans.....	---	---	15,579,220	+15,579,220	+15,579,220
Delayed obligation.....	---	---	200,000	+200,000	+200,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>15,779,220</b>	<b>+15,779,220</b>	<b>+15,779,220</b>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill Enacted	Bill vs. Request	Bill vs. Request
Medical services for Priority 7-8 Veterans.....	---	---	2,166,000	+2,166,000	+2,166,000
Offsetting receipts.....	---	---	-1,502,000	-1,502,000	-1,502,000
Medical and prosthetic research.....	397,400	408,000	+10,600	---	---
Medical administration.....	---	---	4,854,000	+4,854,000	+4,854,000
Medical facilities.....	---	---	3,920,000	+3,920,000	+3,920,000
Delayed obligation.....	---	---	+80,000	+80,000	+80,000
Total.....	---	---	4,000,000	+4,000,000	+4,000,000
Medical care.....	23,889,304	25,218,080	---	-23,889,304	-25,218,080
Medical care cost recovery collections:					
Offsetting receipts.....	-1,386,000	-1,800,000	---	+1,386,000	+1,800,000
Appropriations (indefinite).....	1,386,000	1,800,000	---	-1,386,000	-1,800,000
Total available (excludes offsetting receipts)...	25,275,304	27,018,080	---	-25,275,304	-27,018,080
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	74,230	79,140	---	-74,230	-79,140
Total, Veterans Health Administration.....	24,360,934	25,705,220	25,705,220	+1,344,286	---
Departmental Administration					
General operating expenses.....	1,245,849	1,283,272	1,283,272	+37,423	---
Supplemental Appropriations (P.L. 108-11).....	100,000	---	---	-100,000	---
National Cemetery Administration.....	132,284	144,203	144,223	+11,939	+20
Office of Inspector General.....	57,623	61,750	61,750	+4,127	---
Construction, major projects.....	99,128	272,690	274,690	+175,562	+2,000
Construction, minor projects.....	224,531	252,144	252,144	+27,613	---



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....	99,350	102,100	102,100	+2,750	---
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries.....	31,792	32,000	32,000	+208	---
Total, Departmental Administration.....	1,990,557	2,148,159	2,150,179	+159,622	+2,020
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs.. (Limitation on direct loans).....	58,100,432 (3,929)	60,718,865 (4,241)	60,720,955 (4,241)	+2,620,523 (+312)	+2,090
Consisting of:					
Mandatory.....	(31,580,860)	(32,709,712)	(32,709,712)	(+1,128,852)	---
Discretionary.....	(26,519,572)	(28,009,153)	(28,011,243)	(+1,491,671)	(+2,090)
Medical care collection fund.....	(1,386,000)	(1,800,000)	---	(-1,386,000)	(-1,800,000)
Total Discretionary (excluding MCCF)	(25,133,572)	(26,209,153)	(28,011,243)	(+2,877,671)	(+1,802,090)

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Public and Indian Housing

Housing Certificate Fund:					
Direct appropriation.....	12,938,913	---	14,230,606	+1,291,693	+14,230,606
Advance appropriations provided in previous acts..	4,172,700	---	4,200,000	+27,300	+4,200,000
Advance appropriations provided in current year...	4,200,000	---	4,200,000	---	+4,200,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Subtotal.....	21,311,613	---	22,630,606	+1,318,993	+22,630,606
Appropriations.....	(17,111,613)	---	(18,430,606)	(+1,318,993)	(+18,430,606)
Advance appropriations prov. in current year	(4,200,000)	---	(4,200,000)	---	(+4,200,000)
Housing assistance for needy families:					
Direct appropriation.....	---	8,335,201	---	---	-8,335,201
Advance appropriations provided in previous acts..	---	4,200,000	---	---	-4,200,000
Advance appropriations provided in FY 2004.....	---	4,200,000	---	---	-4,200,000
Subtotal 1/.....	---	16,735,201	---	---	-16,735,201
Appropriations, FY 2004 1/.....	---	(12,535,201)	---	---	(-12,535,201)
Advance appropriations, FY 2004 1/.....	---	(4,200,000)	---	---	(-4,200,000)
Project based rental assistance 1/.....					
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	-1,600,000	4,823,405	---	---	-4,823,405
Public housing capital fund.....	2,712,255	-300,000	-1,372,000	+228,000	-1,072,000
Public housing operating fund.....	3,576,600	2,641,000	2,712,255	---	+71,255
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing..	570,269	3,574,000	3,600,000	+23,400	+26,000
Native American housing block grants.....	644,782	---	50,000	-520,269	+50,000
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account....	5,266	646,600	661,600	+16,818	+15,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(197,243)	1,000	5,300	+34	+4,300
Native Hawaiian housing block grant.....	---	(27,473)	(197,243)	---	(+169,770)
Native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund.....	1,028	10,000	---	---	-10,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(39,712)	1,000	1,000	-28	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing (net).....	23,021,813	23,932,206	24,088,761	+1,066,948	+156,555
In addition:					
Advance appropriations, FY 2003 and FY 2004.	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	---	---
1/ The FY 2003 Act provided funds for these purposes under the Housing Certificate Fund account					

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Community Planning and Development</b>					
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS.....	290,102	297,000	297,000	+6,898	---
Rural housing and economic development.....	24,837	---	25,000	+163	+25,000
Empowerment zones / enterprise communities.....	29,805	---	15,000	-14,805	+15,000
Community development fund.....	4,904,909	4,716,000	4,959,000	+54,091	+243,000
Colonias initiative (legislative proposal).....	---	16,000	---	---	-16,000
Urban development action grant (rescission).....	---	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	---
Section 108 loan guarantees: (Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(275,000)	---	---	(-275,000)	---
Credit subsidy.....	6,284	---	---	-6,284	---
Administrative expenses.....	983	---	---	-983	---
Brownfields redevelopment.....	24,837	---	25,000	+163	+25,000
HOME investment partnerships program.....	1,987,000	2,197,000	2,064,100	+77,100	-132,900
Homeless assistance grants.....	1,217,037	1,325,000	1,242,000	+24,963	-83,000
Samaritan housing initiative (legislative proposal)...	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
<b>Total, Community planning and development.....</b>	<b>8,485,804</b>	<b>8,571,000</b>	<b>8,597,100</b>	<b>+111,296</b>	<b>+26,100</b>
<b>Housing Programs</b>					
Housing for special populations.....	1,027,081	---	---	-1,027,081	---
Housing for the elderly 2/.....	---	773,636	773,320	+773,320	-316
Housing for persons with disabilities 2/.....	---	250,515	250,570	+250,570	+55
Housing counseling assistance.....	---	45,000	---	---	-45,000
Rental housing assistance (rescission).....	-100,000	-303,000	-303,000	-203,000	---
Manufactured housing fees trust fund.....	12,915	17,000	13,000	+85	-4,000
Offsetting collections.....	-13,000	-17,000	-13,000	---	+4,000
<b>Total, housing programs.....</b>	<b>926,996</b>	<b>766,151</b>	<b>720,890</b>	<b>-206,106</b>	<b>-45,261</b>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
2/ The FY 2003 Act provided funds for these activities in the Housing for special populations account Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)					
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(165,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(100,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(-50,000)	---
Administrative expenses.....	345,588	359,000	359,000	+13,432	---
Negative subsidy.....	-2,753,000	-2,921,000	-2,921,000	-168,000	---
Administrative contract expenses.....	85,163	85,000	85,000	-163	---
Additional contract expenses.....	993	1,000	1,000	+7	---
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(23,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(+2,000,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	222,262	229,000	229,000	+6,738	---
Negative subsidy.....	-225,000	-225,000	-225,000	---	---
Subsidy.....	14,902	15,000	15,000	+98	---
Non-overhead administrative expenses.....	93,170	93,700	93,780	+610	+80
Additional contract expenses.....	3,974	4,000	4,000	+26	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-2,211,968	-2,359,300	-2,359,220	-147,252	+80
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	---	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Administrative expenses.....	10,276	10,695	10,695	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-358,000	-318,000	-318,000	---
Policy Development and Research				
Research and technology.....	46,695	51,000	47,000	-4,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity				
Fair housing activities.....	45,601	50,000	46,000	-4,000
Office of Lead Hazard Control				
Lead hazard reduction.....	174,856	136,000	130,000	-6,000
Management and Administration				
Salaries and expenses.....	526,852	537,000	547,000	+10,000
Transfer from:				
Limitation on FHA corporate funds.....	(544,639)	(564,000)	(564,000)	---
GNMA.....	(10,276)	(10,695)	(10,695)	(+419)
Community Development Loan Guarantees Program.....	(993)	---	---	(-993)
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	(149)	(150)	(150)	(+1)
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program.....	(199)	(250)	(250)	(+51)
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantees.....	(35)	(35)	(35)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,083,143)	(1,112,130)	(1,122,130)	(+38,987)
Working capital fund.....	274,504	276,300	240,000	-36,300

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General.....	73,674	76,080	76,080	+2,406	---
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)...	(23,343)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+657)	---
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	(97,017)	(100,080)	(100,080)	(+3,063)	---
Consolidated fee fund (rescission).....	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.....	29,805	32,415	32,415	+2,610	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-30,000	-32,415	-32,415	-2,415	---
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	31,008,908	31,729,132	31,826,306	+817,398	+97,174
Appropriations.....	(36,095,908)	(35,875,547)	(37,040,721)	(+944,813)	(+1,165,174)
Rescissions.....	(-1,708,000)	(-633,000)	(-1,705,000)	(+3,000)	(-1,072,000)
Negative subsidy.....	(-2,978,000)	(-3,146,000)	(-3,146,000)	(-168,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-401,000)	(-367,415)	(-363,415)	(+37,585)	(+4,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(150,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-50,000)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(388,511,955)	(410,062,821)	(410,232,591)	(+21,720,636)	(+169,770)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(578,634)	(598,130)	(599,130)	(+19,496)	---

TITLE III

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

American Battle Monuments Commission	35,017	32,400	47,276	+12,259	+14,876
Salaries and expenses.....					

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill Enacted	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,408	8,000	8,550	+2,142	+550
Emergency fund.....	---	---	450	+450	+450
Total.....	6,408	8,000	9,000	+2,592	+1,000
<b>Department of the Treasury</b>					
Community Development Financial Institutions					
Community development financial institutions fund program account.....	74,512	51,000	51,000	-23,512	---
Consumer Product Safety Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	56,629	60,000	60,000	+3,371	---
Corporation for National and Community Service					
National and community service programs operating expenses.....	326,211	472,742	363,452	+37,241	-108,290
National Service Trust.....	100,000	120,000	110,771	+10,771	-9,229
Rescission.....	-48,000	---	---	+48,000	---
Office of Inspector General.....	5,961	5,108	6,000	+39	+892
Total.....	384,172	597,850	480,223	+96,051	-117,627
<b>U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	14,233	16,220	15,938	+1,705	-282

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
Department of Defense - Civil					
Cemeterial Expenses, Army	32,234	25,961	25,961	-6,273	---
Salaries and expenses.....					
Department of Health and Human Services					
National Institute of Health					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	83,528	78,774	80,000	-3,528	+1,226
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention					
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry					
Toxic substances and environmental public health.....	82,282	73,467	73,467	-8,795	---
Total, Department of Health and Human Services..	165,790	152,241	153,467	-12,323	+1,226
Environmental Protection Agency					
Science and Technology.....	715,579	731,483	767,115	+51,536	+35,632
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	85,608	44,687	44,697	-40,911	---
Subtotal, Science and Technology.....	801,187	776,180	811,812	+10,625	+35,632
Environmental Programs and Management.....	2,097,879	2,219,659	2,192,552	+94,673	-27,107



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General.....	35,766	36,808	36,808	+1,042	---
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	12,659	13,214	13,214	+555	---
Subtotal, OIG.....	48,425	50,022	50,022	+1,597	---
Buildings and facilities.....	42,639	42,918	42,918	+279	---
Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,264,614	1,389,716	1,275,000	+10,386	-114,716
Transfer to Office of Inspector General.....	-12,742	-13,214	-13,214	-472	---
Transfer to Science and Technology.....	-86,168	-44,697	-44,697	+41,471	---
Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,165,704	1,331,805	1,217,089	+51,385	-114,716
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program.....	71,843	72,545	72,545	+702	---
Oil spill response.....	15,480	16,209	16,209	+729	---
State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	2,692,000	1,918,500	2,419,750	-272,250	+501,250
Categorical grants.....	1,142,905	1,202,700	1,182,200	+39,295	-20,500
Subtotal, STAG.....	3,834,905	3,121,200	3,601,950	-232,955	+480,750
=====					
Total, EPA.....	8,078,062	7,630,538	8,005,097	-72,965	+374,559
=====					
Executive Office of the President					
Office of Science and Technology Policy.....	5,333	7,027	7,027	+1,694	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	3,011	3,238	3,238	+227	---
Total.....	8,344	10,265	10,265	+1,921	---
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation					
Office of Inspector General (transfer).....	(30,848)	(30,125)	(30,125)	(-723)	---
General Services Administration					
Federal Consumer Information Center Fund.....	11,466	17,643	12,500	+1,034	-5,143
Interagency Council on the Homeless					
Operating expenses.....	1,490	---	1,500	+10	+1,500
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Human space flight.....	6,165,658	---	---	-6,165,658	---
Space flight capabilities.....	---	7,782,100	7,806,100	+7,806,100	+24,000
Science, aeronautics and technology.....	9,147,815	---	---	-9,147,815	---
Science, aeronautics and exploration.....	---	7,660,900	7,707,900	+7,707,900	+47,000
Office of Inspector General.....	25,434	26,300	26,300	+866	---
Total, NASA.....	15,338,907	15,469,300	15,540,300	+201,393	+71,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>National Credit Union Administration</b>					
Central liquidity facility: (Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds.....	(309)	(310)	(310)	(+1)	---
Community Development Revolving Loan Fund.....	993	1,000	1,000	+7	---
<b>National Science Foundation</b>					
Research and related activities.....	3,988,902	4,038,360	4,238,360	+249,458	+200,000
Defense function.....	67,558	68,000	68,000	+442	---
Subtotal.....	4,056,460	4,106,360	4,306,360	+249,900	+200,000
Major research equipment and facilities construction..	148,538	202,330	192,330	+43,792	-10,000
Education and human resources.....	903,171	938,040	910,680	+7,509	-27,360
Salaries and expenses.....	189,115	225,700	215,900	+26,785	-9,800
National Science Board.....	3,477	---	3,800	+323	+3,800
Office of Inspector General.....	9,190	8,770	10,000	+810	+1,230
Total, NSF.....	5,309,951	5,481,200	5,639,070	+329,119	+157,870
<b>Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation</b>					
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation..	104,317	115,000	115,000	+10,683	---
<b>Selective Service System</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	26,308	28,290	28,290	+1,982	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Total, title III, Independent agencies.....	29,648,833	29,686,908	30,195,887	+547,054	+498,979
Appropriations.....	(29,696,833)	(29,696,908)	(30,195,887)	(+499,054)	(+498,979)
Rescissions.....	(-48,000)	---	---	(+48,000)	---
(By transfer).....	(30,848)	(30,125)	(30,125)	(-723)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(309)	(310)	(310)	(+1)	---
Grand total (net).....	122,958,173	126,344,905	126,943,148	+3,984,975	+598,243
Appropriations.....	(123,893,173)	(126,291,320)	(127,957,563)	(+4,064,390)	(+1,666,243)
Rescissions.....	(-1,756,000)	(-633,000)	(-1,705,000)	(+51,000)	(-1,072,000)
Negative subsidy.....	(-2,978,000)	(-3,146,000)	(-3,146,000)	(-168,000)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-401,000)	(-367,415)	(-363,415)	(+37,585)	(+4,000)
Advance appropriations.....	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	---	---
(By transfer).....	(30,848)	(30,125)	(30,125)	(-723)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,653,929)	(1,604,241)	(1,604,241)	(-49,688)	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(388,511,955)	(410,062,821)	(410,232,591)	(+21,720,636)	(+169,770)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(579,943)	(599,440)	(599,440)	(+19,497)	---

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2003  
AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2004  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2003 Enacted	FY 2004 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
FSLIC resolution fund (mandatory).....	-4,000	-3,000	-3,000	+1,000	---
Housing assistance for needy families, advance appropriation provided in FY 2003 and FY 2004 1/	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	---	---
Total, adjustments.....	-4,204,000	-4,203,000	-4,203,000	+1,000	---
Total (including adjustments).....	118,754,173	122,141,905	122,740,148	+3,985,975	+598,243
Amounts in this bill.....	(122,958,173)	(126,344,905)	(126,943,148)	(+3,984,975)	(+598,243)
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	(-4,204,000)	(-4,203,000)	(-4,203,000)	(+1,000)	---
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	118,754,173	122,141,905	122,740,148	+3,985,975	+598,243
Mandatory.....	31,576,860	32,706,712	32,706,712	+1,129,852	---
Discretionary.....	87,177,313	89,435,193	90,033,436	+2,856,123	+598,243

1/ The FY 2003 Act provided funds for these purposes under the Housing Certificate Fund account

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. DAVID OBEY AND HON. CHET EDWARDS

The appropriations bill for the Departments of Veterans, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies reported by the Committee is wholly inadequate in its attempt to provide resources for the needs of many of our most deserving citizens. This is especially true with veterans—those men and women who made sacrifice after sacrifice to guarantee our freedom. Veterans who have laid their lives on the line deserve more than waving flags and grateful words. Unfortunately, this bill fails to meet many of its basic obligations to these veterans, especially in funding for the VA medical care system.

In 1995, VA treated 2.7 millions veterans; in 2002 there were approximately 4.5 million patients. An additional 600,000 veterans are projected to enroll in VA health care in 2003. The \$1.3 billion increase requested in the Administration's budget for veterans' medical care and approved by the Committee is, simply, not enough. Overall, the amount provided in the bill for veterans' health care is \$1.1 billion less than the \$2.4 billion increase provided by the Congress last year for veterans' health care. Enrollment in the VA medical care system continues to grow at a rate of 9 percent per year and inflation in medical care exceeds 3 percent. To deal with this 12 percent minimum requirement just to maintain current services the bill provides less than a 6 percent actual increase in funding. The result is that the system cannot meet the increased demand for services let alone address the large need for new investments within the VA health care network.

Insufficient funding has put a huge strain on the system. More than 235,000 veterans are currently waiting six months or more for initial appointments and many veterans have reported waiting two years to see a doctor. With so many veterans waiting for care, VA has now reached capacity at many health-care facilities and has closed enrollment to new patients at many hospitals and clinics. Additionally, the VA has placed a moratorium on all outreach activities to veterans to squelch demand.

The Committee bill ignores the pledge made to veterans groups by the House leadership. Veterans have been betrayed and deceived. The Congress and the Republican Leadership of the House have reneged on its promise made in the context of the FY 2004 Budget Resolution to provide a \$3.4 billion increase over the FY 2003 level for veterans' medical care. The concerns of the veterans groups are expressed in the attached letter from the Independent Budget group, as well as by numerous other veterans' organizations. Here are some of the comments made by the veterans' service organizations:

The VA–HUD–Independent Agencies appropriations bill, which calls for a \$1.4 billion increase over last year and

approximately the President's request, is wholly inadequate to provide health care to sick and disabled veterans and represents a flagrant disregard of promises made to veterans by this Congress \* \* \* (The Independent Budget, July 18, 2003)

So much for promises \* \* \* The funding levels and cost-shifting schemes are specifically designed to ration care at VA hospitals, increase waiting times for services and rely on higher fees and co-payments from certain sick and disabled veterans to subsidize the health care for others (Press release, AMVETS, DAV, PVA, VFW, July 18, 2003)

My greatest disappointment with this bill is that the drastic cuts made to the various programs in this bill are preventable, the result of the myopic focus of the House Republican Leadership on tax cuts as their top, if not only, priority—regardless of the consequences. This VA-HUD bill reflects this policy as veterans, as well as housing, and environmental programs, are reduced to finance taxes for many very wealthy Americans. We on the Minority want to be clear that we reject this Republican fiscal policy. We believe that the current bill is not an adequate response to the needs of the American people. This country and its leadership have the ability, even in difficult economic times, to provide the necessary resources to serve its veterans, provide adequate housing for its elderly, disabled and indigent citizens, protect its environment and support basic scientific research, if they so choose.

It is my view, and that of many on the Minority, that the bill, as currently written, is not an adequate response to the needs of the American people. For these reason, I would urge all Members to vote against any rule which does not permit amendments to address these failings. Members should insist that this Congress honor the promise it made to American's veterans and provide additional funds for veterans health care and other critical programs.

DAVE OBEY.  
CHET EDWARDS.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF THE HONORABLE ALAN MOLLOHAN

The appropriations bill for the Departments of Veterans, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies reported by the Committee reflects the sincere effort of a very capable Subcommittee Chairman to allocate scarce resources fairly and thoughtfully among many of the most critical programs of our federal government. These include health care for our veterans, investments in basic scientific research, housing programs for the most vulnerable of our citizens and programs to protect and improve the environment. The Subcommittee Chairman consulted with the Minority Members of the Committee throughout this difficult process and bill reflects our views and recommendations in many areas. Unfortunately, a fair and open process presided over by a capable chairman committed to meeting the needs of the country cannot make up for an overall allocation of funds to the subcommittee which is inadequate. Thus, in the end, this bill does not adequately meet many obligations because there was just not enough funding available to the Majority.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize the positive aspects of the bill. These include restoration of many of the cuts proposed by the President as well as making some important investments. Within very constrained resources, the bill provides a relatively generous \$330 million, 6 percent, increase for basic science programs at the National Science Foundation. These funds may provide the next generation with the fundamental scientific advances that lead to new sources of energy, new mechanisms of communication beyond the Internet, and a basic understanding of the chemistry and biology underlying the life processes.

For the Department of Housing and Urban Development the bill provides a \$1.3 billion increase for the section 8 low-income housing program, necessary to renew all vouchers using the latest verified per unit cost data and provide a cushion for those housing agencies that are increasing their utilization rates. We continue to make every effort to maintain our commitment of funding all voucher renewals. This bill again makes changes to section 8 administrative fees and we hope to work with the majority to ensure that this new process is fair and equitable to both large and small public housing authorities. Lastly, the bill provides level funding or slight increase for most other HUD accounts.

The bill recognizes within its restricted allocation that veterans health care is a top priority by providing an increase for this program of \$1.3 billion. Although insufficient, this does represent nearly half of the total increase available for the entire bill.

The bill also provides \$480 million for the Corporation for National and Community Service, \$96 million above the current year's appropriation. It must be noted that it is very rare for a House appropriations bill to contain funding for this program. The Chair-



man is to be recognized for this effort in light of the Corporation's recent financial difficulties and the limits they have placed on the AmeriCorp program. While this funding is an endorsement of the merit of the volunteer programs, the Corporation must undertake significant financial and accounting reforms to maintain such support in the future.

Unfortunately, like most of the accounts in this bill, NASA is essentially flat-funded with a mere one percent increase above last year's level. The report accompanying this bill states that the Committee has chosen to defer decisions in many areas until the Gehman Board's report concerning the loss of the Columbia shuttle is released. This is a wise decision. The issue we face, however, is how do we fund the necessary changes and improvements recommended by the Board's report and NASA's response to this report? How will we find additional monies to fully address the challenges NASA will have to overcome to return to flight? We must work to ensure that NASA has the appropriations needed to safely operate the shuttle and to make the necessary technology investments to develop a replacement vehicle.

There are several programs in the bill that did not see increases at all. While most of the programs at HUD are funded at or about last year's level, the Shelter Plus Care program was again merged with the Homeless Assistance Grants program. The Committee was also unable to fully fund the President's budget request for homeless grants and did not fund HUD's new homeless initiative—the Samaritan program. This does nothing to meet the President's stated priority of ending chronic homelessness in ten years. Within EPA, the president's request for clean-up of Superfund sites has been reduced by \$114 million. Further, the Committee has provided only \$51 million to the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) fund—down from \$75 million in last year's bill.

In a few areas, however, the funding provided in the bill is clearly inadequate. We are especially concerned by major shortfalls in three critical areas.

I cannot support the recommendation to drastically cut funding for HUD's HOPE VI program, which not only eliminates obsolete public housing but also replaces it with mixed-income neighborhood revitalizing developments. The recommendation to reduce funding for HOPE VI from the \$570 million provided for fiscal year 2003 to \$50 million, as recommended in this bill, is essentially a recommendation to terminate HOPE VI. Eliminating the program will shortchange communities around the country. In addition to being an important program for the revitalization of our communities, there has been bipartisan support for this program in the House of Representatives.

The Committee's decision to reduce funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund from \$1.35 billion in the current year to \$1.2 billion is an excellent example of the difficult choices the bill's inadequate allocations has forced. Given the large number of requests from Members of the House for assistance with their communities needs for clean drinking water and waste water treatment systems, how can Congress justify reducing funding for the main federal program to assist local communities in their efforts to fix their decaying water treatment systems? Last September, Environmental

Protection Agency Administrator Whitman released a major study entitled the Water Gap Analysis showing a funding shortfall nationwide in this area of at least \$380 billion. This report is a call for increased funding, not a justification for a \$150 million reduction.

By far the most serious problem with this bill, however, is its failure to adequately address the health care needs of our veterans. The \$1.3 billion increase requested in the Administration's budget and approved by the Committee is, simply, not enough. Overall, the amount provided in the bill for veterans' medical care is a \$1.1 billion less than the \$2.4 increase provided by the Congress last year for veterans' medical care. Medical care inflation is still running at near double-digit levels and enrollment continues to grow.

Inadequate funding has put a huge strain on the system. More than 235,000 veterans are currently waiting six months or more for initial appointments and many veterans have reported waiting two years to see a doctor in certain parts of the country. With so many veterans waiting for care, VA has now reached capacity at many health-care facilities and has closed enrollment to new patients at many hospitals and clinics. Additionally, the VA has placed a moratorium on all marketing and outreach activities to veterans. The inability of the Committee to address these needs can only lead veterans to conclude that the Republican Leadership of the House has reneged on its promise made in the context of the FY 2004 Budget Resolution to provide a \$3.4 billion increase over the FY 2003 level.

Every Member will have to judge these funding decisions when he or she decides how to vote when the bill is presented to the House. The greatest frustration with this bill is that the shortcomings that we have outlined are unnecessary. This country, even in difficult economic times, has the resources to serve its veterans, provide adequate housing for its elderly, disabled and indigent citizens, protect its environment and support basic scientific research. But adequate resources have been denied to the Committee to meet these obligations. This critical failing is the result solely of the myopic budgetary priorities of the House Republican Leadership with a focus on tax cuts as their top, if not only, priority. This VA-HUD bill is perhaps one of the best examples of the impact of taking funding out of the treasury to provide tax cuts for the very wealthy, forcing reductions in program for veterans, housing, and the environment. We on the Minority want to be clear that we reject this Republican fiscal policy and that we are hopeful that substantial additional funding can be found for this bill before it becomes law. The allocation for this bill is not adequate to meet the needs of the American people.

ALAN B. MOLLOHAN.

