



## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

April 7, 1998

### **H.R. 1522**

#### **A bill to extend the authorization for the National Historic Preservation Fund, and for other purposes**

*As ordered reported by the House Committee on Resources on March 25, 1998*

#### **SUMMARY**

H.R. 1522 would extend through fiscal year 2004 annual deposits of \$150 million to the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF). Authority for such deposits, which consist of receipts earned from oil and gas development on the Outer Continental Shelf, expired at the end of fiscal year 1997. The National Park Service uses amounts appropriated from the HPF for grants to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, to state, local, and tribal governments, and to nonprofit and other organizations. The bill also would extend through fiscal year 2004 the authorization of \$4 million a year for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. This sum is currently authorized to be appropriated (from the general fund of the U.S. Treasury) through fiscal year 2000.

Assuming appropriation of the amounts deposited into the HPF each year, and assuming appropriation of the authorized amounts for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1522 would result in additional discretionary spending of \$570 million over the 1999-2003 period. The legislation would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 1522 does not contain any intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) and would have no impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

#### **ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

The \$150 million to be deposited into the HPF under H.R. 1522 is the same amount that was deposited to the fund annually from 1980 through 1997, but is significantly higher than the \$30 million to \$50 million generally appropriated (from the HPF) for each year. In recent years, annual appropriations for the advisory council have been about \$3 million. The

estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 1522 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

	By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars					
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
<b>SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION</b>						
Spending Under Current Law						
Budget Authority/Authorization Level <sup>a</sup>	44	4	4	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	44	26	12	2	0	0
Proposed Changes						
Authorization Level	0	150	150	154	154	154
Estimated Outlays	0	40	85	140	145	160
Spending Under H.R. 1522						
Budget Authority/Authorization Level	44	154	154	154	154	154
Estimated Outlays	44	66	97	142	145	160

a. The 1998 level includes \$41 million appropriated from the HTF and \$3 million appropriated for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The 1999 and 2000 levels are the amounts authorized under current law for appropriation to the council.

## **BASIS OF ESTIMATE**

For purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that the entire amounts deposited into the HTF or authorized for the advisory council under H.R. 1522 would be appropriated for each fiscal year. Outlay estimates are based on historical spending patterns for council activities and HTF programs. We adjusted the observed outlay rates for the purposes of projecting future HTF outlays because the higher appropriations assumed in this estimate—relative to historical appropriation levels—would likely cause some delays in finding matching shares for certain grants. The table does not include any potential spending from amounts deposited to the HTF in the past that have not yet been appropriated. Such funds—about \$2.3 billion—will remain available for appropriation under existing law even in the absence of legislation.

Other provisions of H.R. 1522, which would amend the National Historic Preservation Act, would have no impact on the federal budget.

**PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS:** None.

## **INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE-SECTOR IMPACT**

H.R. 1522 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would have no impact on the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

**ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:** Deborah Reis

**ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:**

Robert A. Sunshine  
Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis