

H.R. 1690, Safe Housing for Families Act of 2019			
As ordered reported by the House Committee on Financial Services on June 26, 2019			
By Fiscal Year, Millions of Dollars	2019	2019-2024	2019-2029
Direct Spending (Outlays)	0	0	0
Revenues	0	0	0
Deficit Effect	0	0	0
Spending Subject to Appropriation (Outlays)	0	300	300
Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply?	No	Mandate Effects	
Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2030?	No	Contains intergovernmental mandate?	Yes, Under Threshold
		Contains private-sector mandate?	No

H.R. 1690 would require owners of rental units that receive assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to install and maintain carbon monoxide detectors. The bill also would authorize the appropriation of \$100 million in each year over the 2020-2022 period for grants to property owners to purchase and install detectors. Based on historical spending patterns for similar programs, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would cost \$300 million over the 2020-2024 period, assuming appropriation of the authorized amounts.

The bill also would require the Secretary of HUD to measure and report annually to the Congress about the number of assisted units without detectors, detectors installed, and fatalities caused by carbon monoxide poisoning. Using information from HUD about the cost of collecting and reporting similar data, CBO estimates implementing the provision would cost less than \$500,000 over the 2020-2024 period.

The costs of the legislation (detailed in Table 1) fall within budget function 600 (income security).



Table 1.
Authorized Increases in Spending Subject to Appropriation Under H.R. 1690

	By Fiscal Year, Millions of Dollars						2019-2024
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	
Authorization	0	100	100	100	0	0	300
Estimated Outlays	0	20	80	100	80	20	300

H.R. 1690 would preempt state and local laws governing the installation and location of carbon monoxide devices in rental housing units that receive federal assistance. The preemption would be a mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). Although the bill would limit the application of state and local laws, it would impose no duty on state or local governments that would result in additional spending.

The bill contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Elizabeth Cove Delisle (for federal costs) and Rachel Austin (for mandates). The estimate was reviewed by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.