

AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST  
CENTURY

—————  
JUNE 9, 1999.—Ordered to be printed  
—————

Mr. SHUSTER, from the Committee on Transportation and  
Infrastructure, submitted the following

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 1000]

This supplemental report shows the cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office with respect to the bill (H.R. 1000), as reported, which was not included in part 1 of the report submitted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on May 28, 1999 (H. Rept. 106-167, pt. 1).

This supplemental report is submitted in accordance with clause 3(a)(2) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
*Washington, DC, May 28, 1999.*

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House  
of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The principal CBO staff contact for federal costs is Victoria Heid Hall. The staff contact for the private-sector impact is Jean Wooster, and the contact for the state and local impact is Lisa Cash Driskill.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON  
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

*H.R. 1000—Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century*

Summary: H.R. 1000 would authorize funding for programs of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) primarily for fiscal years 2000 through 2004. CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1000 would result in additional outlays totaling about \$56 billion over the 2000–2004 period. That total assumes appropriation action consistent with the bill’s authorizations and the levels of new contract authority it provides for aviation programs. Outlays for the programs authorized by the bill would grow from an estimated \$9.2 billion in 1999 to \$14.8 billion in 2004. We also estimate that enacting the bill would increase direct spending outlays by about \$46 million over the same period. Revenues would decline by \$35 million over the five-year period. Because H.R. 1000 would affect both direct spending and receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply to the bill.

The bill would provide an additional \$7.1 billion in contract authority for the airport improvement program (AIP) over the 2000–2004 period (above the \$2.4 billion a year assumed in the baseline), but providing this contract authority would not affect outlays from direct spending because AIP outlays are subject to appropriation action. (The increase in estimated AIP outlays is included in the discretionary total cited above.) H.R. 1000 also would increase direct spending authority for the Essential Air Service (EAS) program by \$10 million each year. We estimate that enacting that change would increase outlays by \$46 million over the 2000–2004 period. Furthermore, the bill would allow the Secretary of Transportation to authorize certain airports to charge higher passenger facility fees and would expand a pilot program that provides for the innovative use of airport improvement grants to finance airport projects. The Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) expects that these provisions would result in an increase in tax-exempt financing and a subsequent loss of federal revenue. JCT estimates that the revenue loss would be \$35 million over the 2000–2004 period and \$142 million over the 2000–2009 period.

H.R. 1000 would take the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) off-budget and exempt AATF spending from the discretionary spending caps, pay-as-you-go procedures, and Congressional budget controls (including the budget resolution, committee spending allocations, and the reconciliation process). Title X would provide for adjusting AIP contract authority upward based on the difference between the amounts appropriated and the amounts authorized for FAA operations, facilities and equipment, and research and development. Any adjustments would begin in fiscal year 2001.

H.R. 1000 contains intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA), but CBO estimates that the costs would not be significant and would not meet the threshold established by that act (\$50 million in 1996, adjusted annually for inflation). Overall, the bill would provide significant benefits to airports operated by state and local governments. Section 4 of UMRA excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that would establish or enforce statutory rights prohib-

iting discrimination. CBO has determined that section 706 fits within that exclusion. Section 4 also excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that section 710, which implements provisions of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, fits within that exclusion.

H.R. 1000 would impose new private-sector mandates by requiring safety equipment for specific aircraft, imposing consumer and employee protection provisions, and imposing new requirements for commercial air tour operations over national parks. Those mandates would affect owners of fixed-wing aircraft, air carriers, end-users of aircraft parts, operators of commercial air tours, and owners and operators of cargo aircraft. CBO estimates that the total direct costs of the mandates would not exceed the annual threshold for private-sector mandates (\$100 million in 1996, adjusted for inflation).

Description of the bill's major provisions: Title I would authorize the appropriation of \$47.6 billion for FAA operations, facilities, and equipment for fiscal years 2000 through 2004. Title I also would provide \$19.2 billion in contract authority for the FAA's airport improvement program for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

Title I would allow the Secretary of Transportation to authorize certain airports to charge higher passenger facility fees than under current law. This title also would expand a pilot program that provides for the innovative use of airport improvement grants to finance airport projects. Title II would establish a federal credit program to assist commuter air carriers in purchasing regional jet aircraft. Title II also would increase the amount of direct spending authority for the EAS program and would authorize the use of appropriations to FAA operations for that program.

Title III would provide that, of the amounts appropriated for FAA operations in fiscal year 2000, up to \$1.5 million may be used to obtain contractual audit services to complete a report on FAA's costs and on the allocation of such costs among different FAA services and activities.

Title IV would make the Death on the High Seas Act (DOHSA) inapplicable to aviation incidents, thereby broadening the circumstances under which relatives can seek compensation for the death of a family member in an aviation incident over the ocean.

Title V would establish civil penalties for individuals who interfere with or jeopardize the safety of a cabin crew or other passengers.

Title VI would provide whistleblower protection for employees of air carriers who notify authorities that their employer is violating a federal law relating to air carrier safety. The bill would set up a complaint and investigation process within the Department of Labor (DOL).

Title VII would extend the war risk insurance program and prohibit the FAA from charging fees for certain services. This title would provide that, of the amounts appropriated for FAA operations in fiscal year 2000, \$2 million may be used to eliminate a backlog of equal employment opportunity complaints at the Department of Transportation (DOT).

Title VIII would make clear that the FAA has the authority to regulate aircraft overflights affecting public and tribal lands, and would establish a process for the FAA and the National Park Service (NPS) to coordinate the development and implementation of such regulations.

Title IX would place receipts to and spending from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) off-budget and exempt the fund from any general budget limitations. Titles IX and X would provide for periodic adjustments to the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the FAA based on estimated and actual deposits to the AATF and on appropriations action.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: Over the 2000–2004 period, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1000 would result in additional discretionary outlays of about \$56 billion, additional direct spending outlays of \$46 million, and a net loss of federal revenues of \$35 million. The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 100, excluding the potential impact of title X, is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall primarily within budget function 400 (transportation).

	By fiscal years, in millions of dollars—					
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Spending Under Current Law:						
Budget Authority <sup>1</sup> .....	7,654	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays <sup>2</sup> .....	9,247	3,458	1,347	512	166	78
Proposed Changes <sup>3</sup> :						
Estimated Authorization Level .....	0	7,572	8,950	9,886	10,357	10,860
Estimated Outlays .....	0	6,020	9,653	12,095	13,687	14,710
Spending Under H.R. 1000 <sup>3</sup> :						
Estimated Authorization Level <sup>1</sup> .....	7,654	7,572	8,950	9,886	10,357	10,860
Estimated Outlays .....	9,247	9,478	11,000	12,607	13,853	14,788
DIRECT SPENDING—EXCLUDING TITLE X						
Baseline Spending Under Current Law:						
Estimated Budget Authority <sup>4</sup> .....	2,410	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,460
Estimated Outlays .....	0	30	50	50	50	50
Proposed Changes:						
Estimated Budget Authority .....	0	75	1,600	1,700	1,850	1,950
Estimated Outlays .....	0	6	10	10	10	10
Spending Under H.R. 1000:						
Estimated Budget Authority <sup>4</sup> .....	2,410	2,535	4,060	4,160	4,310	4,410
Estimated Outlays .....	0	36	60	60	60	60
CHANGES IN REVENUES						
Estimated Revenues .....	0	–1	–3	–6	–11	–14

<sup>1</sup> The 1999 level is the amount appropriated for that year for FAA's operations account and facilities and equipment account.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated outlays under current law are from amounts appropriated for 1999 and previous years for the FAA operations account and the facilities and equipment account, as well as the discretionary outlays from the AIP obligation limitations, assuming a full year of authority in 1999.

<sup>3</sup> H.R. 1000 authorizes such sums as necessary for the FAA operations account and for the facilities and equipment account for fiscal year 2000. The table reflects a level for 2000 equal to the amounts provided in 1999—that is, without any adjustment for anticipated inflation. Alternatively, if the 1999 level is increased to adjust for inflation, the 2000 level would be \$300 million higher, resulting in \$300 million more in outlays over the 2000–2004 period.

<sup>4</sup> Budget authority for AIP is provided as contract authority, a mandatory form of budget authority; however, outlays from AIP contract authority are subject to obligation limitations contained in appropriation acts and are therefore discretionary. CBO's baseline projections assume a full year budget authority will be provided for AIP for fiscal year 1999 and each subsequent year. The full-year total is 1.2 times the \$2,050 million provided through August 6, 1999.

The preceding table excludes the potential effects of title X, which would provide for adjustments to AIP funding, beginning in fiscal year 2001. The annual adjustments would be derived by comparing the amounts authorized for FAA operations, facilities and equipment, and research and development, and the amounts pro-

vided in appropriations acts for those purposes. If appropriations equal the authorized amounts, then there would be no adjustment in AIP contract authority. Any adjustment would constitute new direct spending authority because it would be triggered by title X; however, all outlays for AIP would still be subject to obligation limitations established in appropriation acts. Depending on the appropriation actions, this provision could result in additional AIP contract authority of up to \$40 billion over the 2001–2004 period, as shown in the following table. (The maximum contract authority would result if no appropriations were provided for the accounts in question.)

	By fiscal years, in millions of dollars—					
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING—TITLE X <sup>1</sup>						
Estimate Budget Authority .....	0	0	8,950	9,886	10,357	10,868
Estimate Outlays .....	0	0	0	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> The amounts shown are potential additions to AIP contract authority attributable to section 1001 of title X.

**Basis of estimate:** Implementing H.R. 1000 would affect spending subject to appropriation, direct spending, and revenues. Estimates of outlays are based on historical spending patterns for the affected programs and on information provided by DOT and FAA staff.

#### *Spending subject to appropriation*

For purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 1000 will be enacted before the start of fiscal year 2000, and that the amounts authorized for aviation programs will be appropriated for each fiscal year.

**FAA Operations.** H.R. 1000 would authorize the appropriation of such sums as necessary for FAA operations for fiscal year 2000. The bill also provides that funds appropriated for FAA operations in fiscal year 2000 may be used for a number of new activities, including \$2 million to eliminate a backlog of equal opportunity complaints at DOT, up to \$1.5 million to study the use of recycled materials in aviation pavement, and up to \$1.5 million to obtain contractual audit services to complete the Inspector General’s report on the FAA’s costs and cost allocations. In total, we estimate that the additional activities would require appropriations of \$5 million for 2000. For fiscal years 2001 through 2004, the bill would authorize specific annual amounts totaling \$28,553 million.

In the absence of specific authorizations for FAA operations in 2000, CBO estimates the amounts of the 2000 authorization based on the 1999 funding levels, with and without adjustments for inflation. The FAA received an appropriation of \$5,567 million for operations in 1999. If that level is not adjusted for inflation between 1999 and 2000, CBO estimates that the funding level for fiscal year 2000 would be \$5,572 million (including an additional \$5 million for the new activities cited above). CBO estimates that appropriation of that amount in 2000 and the authorized levels specified in the bill for 2001 through 2004 would result in additional outlays for FAA operations totaling \$33.3 billion over the 2000–2004 period (excluding outlays from amounts appropriated in 1999 and prior years). Alternatively, if the Congress increased funding for oper-

ations in 2000 to account for inflation, we estimate that the funding level for that year would be \$5,825 million. Combining that amount with the specified authorizations for 2001 through 2004 would yield additional outlays of \$33.5 billion for FAA operations over the 2000–2004 period.

H.R. 1000 also provides that funds appropriated for FAA operations may be used for certain activities and programs beginning in fiscal year 2001. Assuming that the Congress appropriates the amounts authorized in the bill for FAA operations for the years 2001 through 2004, we expect that earmarking amounts for the programs described below would not have any significant impact on outlays for FAA operations.

Section 211 would establish a program to provide commuter air carriers with federal loans, loan guarantees, or lines of credit for the purchase of regional jet aircraft. The program is designed to improve service by jet aircraft to smaller airports and to markets that the Secretary of Transportation determines have insufficient air service. Section 212 provides that, from appropriations for FAA operations for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2004, such sums as necessary may be used to carry out the program, including administrative expenses. The Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 requires appropriation of the subsidy costs and administrative costs for credit programs. The subsidy cost is the estimated long-term cost to the government of a direct loan or loan guarantee, calculated on a net present value basis and excluding administrative costs. Based on information from the FAA, CBO estimates that the subsidy appropriation necessary to implement this program would total about \$80 million over the 2001–2004 period, and that outlays for this program would be \$60 million over the five-year period. CBO estimates that administering the credit program would cost about \$11 million over the 2001–2004 period. The bill would permit the Secretary to charge fees to cover all costs to the federal government of making such loans and would allow the secretary to spend the fee receipts generated to administer the program. For purposes of this estimate, we assume the Secretary would not charge any fees.

Section 202 provides that, of amounts appropriated for FAA operations beginning in fiscal year 2001, up to \$15 million each year may be used to subsidize air carrier service to airports not receiving sufficient service as determined by the Secretary of Transportation. Such amounts would be in addition to the spending authorized under current law for the EAS program. CBO estimates that implementing this section would result in outlays of \$54 million over the 2001–2004 period from the operations account, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts.

Section 131 would direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a pilot program to contract for air traffic control services at certain towers that do not qualify for the current contract tower program. The pilot program would include a federal contribution to the costs of constructing control towers at up to two facilities. The section provides that, of the amounts appropriated for FAA operations beginning in fiscal year 2000, up to \$6 million may be used each year for the pilot program. Because \$6 million was earmarked for cost sharing for contract towers in the fiscal year 1999 appro-

priation for FAA operations, we estimate that enacting section 131 would not affect the outlay rate.

FAA Air Navigation Facilities and Equipment. H.R. 1000 would authorize the appropriation of such sums as necessary for air navigation facilities and equipment (F&E) in fiscal year 2000 and specified amounts for fiscal years 2001 through 2004.

FAA received an appropriation for \$2,000 million for F&E in 1999 (excluding \$87 million that was provided in a separate appropriation specifically for addressing year 2000 computer problems). CBO estimates that appropriation of that amount in 2000 and the authorized levels specified in the bill for 2001 through 2004 would result in additional outlays for F&E totaling \$10.3 billion over the 2000–2004 period (excluding outlays from amounts appropriated in 1999 and prior years). Alternatively, if the Congress increased F&E funding in 2000 to account for inflation, the estimated funding level for that year would be \$2,047 million. Combining that amount with the specific authorizations for 2001 through 2004 would yield additional outlays of \$10.4 billion for F&E over the 2000–2004 period.

FAA Airport Improvement Program. Title I would provide \$2,410 million in contract authority (a mandatory form of budget authority) for the airport improvement program for 1999 and a total of \$19,175 million in contract authority over the 2000–2004 period, as discussed below in the section on direct spending. That amount represents \$7,125 million in contract authority above the amount assumed in CBO's March 1999 baseline. For purposes of this estimate, we assume that the obligation limitations for AIP contained in annual appropriation acts for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 would equal the amounts of contract authority that would be provided in this bill.

Other Provisions. Based on the current costs of operating a whistleblower protection program at the Department of Energy, CBO estimates that the administrative costs of operating the new DOL program provided in section 601 would be less than \$1 million a year.

Based on information from the NPS and the FAA, CBO estimates that discretionary outlays to conduct planning and rulemaking for park overflights, complete air tour management plans (including environmental analyses), and monitor any overflight limits established in such plans would total \$29 million over the 2000–2009 period. This process is already underway, and we expect that these costs will be incurred within the next 10 years under current law, assuming appropriation of the estimated amounts. CBO estimates that the provisions of title VII dealing with park overflights would cause no significant change in FAA or NPS spending over the next five years. We estimate that operating the joint advisory group would cost the agencies a total of about \$25,000 each year.

H.R. 1000 contains several additional provisions that would require the FAA to conduct studies, complete reports, issue rulemakings, and develop test programs. CBO assumes that such costs would be funded from the authorizations provided in the bill for FAA operations, facilities, and equipment. In total, CBO estimates that these studies, rulemakings, and reports would cost about \$1 million in fiscal year 2000.

*Direct spending*

Relative to CBO's March 1999 baseline, enacting title I of the bill would provide an additional \$7,125 million in contract authority (a mandatory form of budget authority) for the airport improvement program for fiscal years 1999 through 2004. It also would extend the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to incur obligations to make grants under that program.

Under current law, \$2,050 million in AIP contract authority for fiscal year 1999 is available for obligation until August 6, 1999, equivalent to an annual rate of \$2,410 million. Title I would bring the total contract authority for fiscal year 1999 up to the baseline level of \$2,410 million and would provide a total of \$19,175 million in contract authority over the 2000–2004 period. Consistent with the Budget Enforcement Act, CBO's baseline projections assume that a full year of contract authority (\$2,410 million) will be provided for AIP in fiscal year 1999 and each subsequent year. Therefore, relative to the baseline, enacting title I would not affect contract authority for 1999, and would increase contract authority by a total of \$7,125 million over the 2000–2004 period.

Expenditures from AIP contract authority are governed by obligation limitations contained in annual appropriation acts and thus are categorized as discretionary outlays. For purposes of this estimate, we assume that appropriation acts for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 will set obligation limitations for AIP equal to the annual levels of contract authority provided in this bill (as discussed above).

Section 202 would increase DOT's direct spending authority for the EAS program by \$10 million each year, beginning in fiscal year 2000. In 1999, the program has \$50 million of funding from amounts made available to FAA in discretionary appropriations, and it has a permanent, mandatory level of \$50 million a year for future years. Section 202 would increase that mandatory level to \$60 million a year. We estimate that additional outlays from the increased authority would total \$456 million over the 2000–2004 period. (This provision is in addition to the authorization for additional discretionary spending for EAS out of amounts appropriated for FAA operations.)

Section 715 would prohibit the FAA from charging fees for certain FAA certification services pertaining to particular products manufactured outside the United States. Based on information from the FAA, CBO estimates that the forgone receipts would total about \$1 million a year beginning in fiscal year 2000 and as much as \$4 million a year in future years. Because the FAA has the authority to spend such fees, a reduction in such fee collections would also reduce spending; therefore, we estimate that this provision would have no significant net effect on direct spending over the 2000–2004 period.

Section 404 would amend title 49 of the U.S. Code so that the Death of the High Seas Act of 1920 (DOHSA) would not apply to aviation incidents. Under DOHSA, a family can only seek compensation if the relatives were financially dependent upon the deceased. By making DOHSA inapplicable to aviation incidents, section 404 would broaden the circumstances under which relatives can seek compensation for the death of a family member in an

aviation incident over the ocean. It could also lead to larger awards. Based on information from DOT, CBO estimates that it is unlikely that enacting section 404 would have a significant impact on the federal budget. The provision could affect federal spending if the government becomes either a defendant or a plaintiff in a future civil action related to aviation. Since any additional compensation that might be owed by the federal government under such an action could be paid out of the Claims and Judgments Fund, the provision could affect direct spending. But CBO has no basis for estimating the likelihood or outcome of any such actions.

Section 708 would extend the authorization for the FAA's aviation insurance program through December 31, 2004. Under current law, the aviation insurance program will end on August 6, 1999. Enacting this provision could cause an increase in direct spending if new claims would result from extending the insurance program. Moreover, such a new spending could be very large, particularly if a claim exceeded the balance of the trust fund and the FAA had to seek a supplemental appropriation. But historical experience suggests that claims under this program are very rare; therefore, extending the aviation insurance program would probably have no significant impact on the federal budget over the next five years.

#### *Revenues*

H.R. 1000 would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to allow certain airports to charge higher passenger facility fees than under current law. JCT expects that this provision would allow airports to generate more income from fees, which would be used to back additional tax-exempt debt. Such debt would result in a loss of federal revenue. JCT estimates a revenue loss of about \$33 million over the 2000–2004 period and about \$136 million over the 2000–2009 period.

The bill also would expand a pilot program that provides for the use of airport improvement grants to implement innovative financing techniques for airport capital projects. These techniques include payment of interest, purchase of bond insurance, and other credit enhancements associated with airport bonds. While the first pilot program, enacted in 1996, included these provisions, the early use of the program was geared more toward changing federal/local matching ratios. In addition, the earlier authorization provided for no more than 10 projects. This provision represents an expansion to 25 pilot projects. It is designed to leverage new investment financed by additional tax-exempt debt. JCT expects that this provision would lead to an increase in tax-exempt financing and a resulting loss of federal revenue. JCT estimates a loss of revenue of about \$2 million over the 2000–2004 period and about \$6 million over the 2000–2009 period.

H.R. 1000 would authorize the FAA to impose a new civil penalty on individuals who interfere with the duties and responsibilities of the flight crew or cabin crew of a civil aircraft, or who pose an imminent threat to the safety of the aircraft. The bill also would impose civil penalties on air carriers that discriminate against handicapped individuals and on violators of certain other provisions. Based on information from the FAA, CBO estimates that the civil

penalties in H.R. 1000 would increase revenues, but that the effect is likely to be less than \$500,000 annually.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending and receipts. The net changes in outlays and receipts that are subject to pay-as-you-go procedures are shown in the following table. For the purposes of enforcing such procedures, only the effects in the current year, the budget year, and the succeeding four years are counted.

	By fiscal years, in millions of dollars—										
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Changes in outlays .....	0	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Changes in receipts .....	0	-1	-3	-6	-11	-14	-17	-19	-21	-24	-26

Changes in the budgetary control of aviation spending: H.R. 1000 would change the budgetary status of funding for aviation programs by placing the AATF off-budget and removing AATF funding from discretionary caps altogether. The bill also provides for periodic adjustments in FAA authorization levels based on AATF receipts and appropriation action.

*Exempting AATF spending from budgetary control and enforcement procedures*

Beginning in fiscal year 2001, title IX would take the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) off-budget and exempt trust fund spending from the discretionary spending caps, pay-as-you-go procedures, and Congressional budget controls (including the budget resolutions, committee spending allocations, and reconciliation). By itself, taking the AATF off-budget would not change total spending of the federal government and would not affect spending or revenue estimates for Congressional scorekeeping purposes. However, because title IX would exempt AATF spending from the budgetary control and enforcement procedures that apply to most other programs, spending for air transportation would likely increase significantly. The amounts of potential increases are uncertain because they would depend upon future actions by both authorizing and appropriations committees.

*Adjustments to FAA authorization and program funding*

Beginning in calendar year 2000, title IX would require the Secretaries of Transportation and the Treasury to estimate, by March 31 of each year, whether the unfunded aviation authorizations at the close of the subsequent fiscal year exceed net aviation receipts to be credited to the AATF during the fiscal year. If the unfunded authorities exceed estimated receipts, authorizations for appropriations from the trust fund would be reduced. It is unclear how this provision would be implemented, but enacting this provision could decrease the amount authorized to be appropriated from the AATF.

Beginning with the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2003, title X would adjust the upcoming fiscal year's FAA authorizations based on the difference between estimated and actual receipts to the AATF in the most recently completed year. Title X provides that when the President submits a budget for a fiscal

year, the Office of Management and Budget shall calculate and the budget shall report the extent to which the actual receipts (including interest) deposited to the AATF for the base year (that is, the most recently completed fiscal year) were greater or less than the estimated deposits specified in H.R. 1000 for the base year.

If there is a difference between the estimated and actual deposits in the base year, then title X provides that the amounts authorized to be appropriated in the upcoming fiscal year for FAA operations, facilities and equipment, research and development, and airport improvement shall be adjusted proportionately such that the total adjustments equal the revenue difference.

Estimated impact on State, local and tribal governments: Overall, H.R. 1000 would provide significant benefits to airports operated by state and local governments. It also would impose two small mandates on state governments, but CBO estimates the cost of complying with these mandates would not be significant and would not meet the threshold established by UMRA (\$50 million in 1996, adjusted annually for inflation).

#### *Mandates*

Section 401 of the bill would prohibit a state or local government from preventing people associated with disaster counseling services who are not licensed in that state from providing those services for up to 60 days after an aviation accident. Section 402 of the bill would expand a current preemption of state liability laws by limiting the liability of air carriers that provide information concerning flight reservations to the families of passengers involved in airline accidents. Air carriers are already provided immunity from state liability laws for providing passenger lists under these circumstances. Because neither mandate would require state or local governments to expend funds or to change their laws, CBO estimates that any costs associated with these mandates would be insignificant.

#### *Other impacts*

H.R. 1000 would authorize \$19.2 billion in contract authority for the AIP for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, an increase of more than \$7 billion over CBO's March baseline for that period. Because the AIP provides grants to fund capital improvement and planning projects for more than 3,300 of the nation's state and locally operated commercial airports and general aviation facilities, those airports could realize significant benefits from this increase.

The bill also would expand the uses and change the distribution of AIP funds. For instance, it would increase from \$500,000 to \$1.5 million the minimum amount of money going to each of the nation's 428 primary airports from the entitlement portion of the AIP. (Primary airports board more than 10,000 passengers each year.) These funds are distributed based on the number of passengers boarding at an airport. The amount of money received per passenger would be significantly increased, and the current \$22 million cap would be eliminated. The bill would also allow non-primary and reliever airports to receive up to \$200,000 in entitlement funds per eligible airport. (Non-primary airports board between

2,500 and 10,000 passengers each year; reliever airports are designated by the FAA to relieve congested primary airports.)

Under this bill, eligible airports, under certain circumstances, would be able to increase passenger facility charges (PFCs) to \$6 from the current \$3 limit. Based on information from the General Accounting Office and the FAA, CBO estimates that if all airports currently charging PFCs chose to increase them, revenues would total about \$475 million for every \$1 increase in the fee. The revenue generated from increased PFCs could be used to leverage tax-exempt bonds for airport projects. The bill also would increase to 25 the number of airports eligible to participate in an innovative financing pilot program. Under this program, eligible airports could use AIP funds to leverage new investment financed by additional tax-exempt debt.

Title II of the bill would deregulate the number and timing of takeoffs and landings (slots) at La Guardia Airport, Chicago O'Hare International Airport, and John F. Kennedy International Airport, effective March 1, 2000. Title II also would increase the number of slots available at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport by six, subject to certain criteria. In general, as a condition of receiving money from the AIP, airports must agree to provide gate access, if available, to air carriers granted access to a slot. Based on information from the affected airports, CBO estimates that the increase in slots would have an insignificant impact on their budgets.

Estimated impact on the private sector: H.R. 1000 would impose new mandates by requiring safety equipment for specific aircraft, imposing consumer and employee protection provisions, and imposing new requirements for commercial air tour operations over national parks. Those mandates would affect owners of fixed-wing aircraft, air carriers, end-users of aircraft parts, commercial air tour operators, and cargo aircraft owners and operators. CBO estimates that the total direct costs of the mandates would not exceed the annual threshold for private-sector mandates (\$100 million in 1996, adjusted for inflation).

#### *Owners of fixed-wing powered aircraft*

Section 510 would require the installation of emergency locator transmitters on certain types of fixed-wing, powered civil aircraft. It would do this by eliminating certain uses from the list of those currently excluded from that requirement. Most aircraft that would lose their exemption and currently do not have emergency locator transmitters are general aviation aircraft. According to information from the National Air Transportation Association, the trade association representing general aviation, the cost of acquiring and installing an emergency locator transmitter would range from \$2,000 to \$7,000 depending on the type of aircraft. CBO estimates that fewer than 5,000 aircraft would be affected, and that the cost of this mandate would be between \$15 million and \$30 million.

#### *Air carriers*

Sections 402 and 403 would add new requirements to the plans to address the needs of families of passengers involved in aircraft accidents. Currently both domestic air carriers that hold a certifi-

cate of public convenience and necessity and foreign air carriers that use the United States as a point of embarkation, destination, or stopover are required to submit and comply with those plans. This bill would require that as part of those plans air carriers give assurance that they would provide adequate training to their employees and agents to meet the needs of survivors and family members following an accident. In addition, domestic air carriers would be required to provide assurance that, if requested by a passenger's family, the air carrier would inform them whether the passenger's name appeared on the preliminary manifest. Updated plans would have to be submitted to the Secretary of Transportation and the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board on or before the 180th day following enactment.

The bill does not specify what level of training would be adequate for air carriers to be able to provide required assurance. Based on information from representatives of air carriers, CBO concludes that the major domestic and foreign air carriers and some smaller carriers currently provide training to deal with the needs of survivors and family members following an accident. In addition, the domestic carriers provide flight reservation information upon request, as would be required under H.R. 1000. CBO estimates that the cost of meeting the additional requirements would be small.

Section 601 would protect employees of air carriers or contractors or subcontractors if those employees provide air safety information to the U.S. government. Those firms would not be able to discharge or discriminate against such employees with respect to compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment. Based on information provided by one of the major air carriers and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the agency that would enforce those provisions, CBO estimates that neither the air carriers nor their contractors would incur any direct costs in complying with this requirement.

Section 727 would grant the FAA the authority to request from U.S. air carriers information about the stations located in the United States that they use to repair contract and noncontract aircraft and aviation components. CBO expects that the FAA would request such information. Based on information from the FAA and air carriers, CBO anticipates that the carriers would be able to provide the information easily because it would be readily available and that any costs of doing so would be negligible.

*End users of life-limited aircraft parts*

Section 507 would require the safe disposition of parts with a limited useful life, once they are removed from an aircraft. The FAA would issue regulations providing five options for the disposition of such parts. The segregation of those parts to preclude their installation in aircraft is one option. Information from end users of such aircraft parts indicates that most currently segregate those parts before they reach the end of their useful life. CBO estimates that additional costs imposed by this mandate would be small since the end users would choose the most cost-effective method to safely dispose of such parts and most currently comply with the segregation option.

*Commercial air tour operations*

Title VIII would require operators of commercial air tours to apply for authority from the FAA before conducting tours over national parks or tribal lands within or abutting a national park. The FAA, in cooperation with the NPS, would devise air tour management plans for every park where an air tour operator flies or seeks authority to fly. The management plans would affect all commercial air tour operations up to a half-mile outside each national park boundary. The plans could prohibit commercial air tour operations in whole or in part and could establish conditions for operation, such as maximum and minimum altitudes, the maximum number of flights, and time-of-day restrictions. H.R. 1000 would not apply to air tour operations over the Grand Canyon or Alaska. Those operations would be covered by other regulations.

CBO estimates that title VIII would impose no additional costs on the private sector beyond those that are likely to be imposed by FAA regulations under current law. CBO expects that the cost of applying to the FAA for authority to operate commercial air tours over national parks or tribal lands would be negligible.

*Cargo aircraft owners and operators*

Section 501 would mandate that a collision avoidance system be installed on each cargo aircraft with a maximum certified takeoff weight in excess of 15,000 kilograms or more by December 31, 2002. Cargo industry representatives say they are currently developing a collision avoidance system using new technology and expect it to be installed in such cargo aircraft by the deadline, even if no legislation is enacted. CBO estimates that this mandate would impose no additional costs on owners and operators of cargo aircraft.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Victoria Heid Hall, for FAA provisions and NPS overflights; Christinia Hawley Sadoti, for DOL penalties; and Hester Grippando, for FAA penalties.

Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Lisa Cash Driskill.

Impact on the Private Sector: Jean Wooster.

Estimate approved by: Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

