

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: National Economic Council

Series/Staff Member: Dorothy Robyn

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 17413

FolderID:

Folder Title:

TEA - 21 [Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century] [Folder 1]: March 10 ISTEA [Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act] Meeting

Stack:

S

Row:

15

Section:

5

Shelf:

8

Position:

3

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.8
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	28.5	25.9
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.6
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	6.7

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

NEC Meeting on NEXTEA Issues
March 10, 1998

- The Senate agreement on NEXTEA funding provides \$50 billion more than the President's request for 1998-2003 for highways, highway safety and transit. This includes \$38 billion more for highways and \$13 billion for transit. (See attached tables.)
- Two issues arise:
 - What is our public posture towards this increased spending, and
 - How should these increased authorizations be treated in the context of the Budget Resolution?

Public Posture

- To date our message on spending levels has been mixed. Secretary Slater's March 3, 1998, letter to the Senate stated "The Administration urges Congress to enact a bill that is consistent with the President's fiscal year 1999 Balance Budget." At the same time, the President told the Nation's Governors that he would support higher spending on surface transportation if and only if it could be done within the budget caps.
- Secretary Slater is concerned that a strong public position against transportation funding increases will undercut efforts to defeat objectionable NEXTEA policy provisions
- The message that the Administration would support increased funding levels within the context of the budget caps will only be successful if we truly keep our options open and do not actively raise unrealistic expectations on the Hill or in the transportation community for funding increases.
- We should reconfirm that we are not supporting a specific level of additional surface transportation funding at this time, be circumspect in our conversation about funding levels, emphasize that the President's priorities must be protected, and set the stage for funding levels below the authorization levels in the Senate agreement.

Budget Resolution

- The Senate agreement does not include outlays. (It would require an additional \$33 billion in outlays over 6 years to fully fund the agreement.) The upcoming budget resolution negotiations will force us and Congress to address the outlay issue. Also, when the House takes up NEXTEA later this

month, Chairman Shuster will be seeking specific commitments regarding outlays.

- Domenici has publicly committed to finding the outlays to fund the agreement, at least in 1999. VA tobacco is the only offset that has been mentioned to date.
- The degree to which added transportation spending will impinge upon other Presidential priorities depends upon whether Domenici proposes new mandatory offsets which would effectively expand the discretionary cap or whether he proposes to fund the increases through offsets that the President's Budget would use for other purposes.
- The real decisions on funding will be made in the context of the Budget Resolution, not NEXTEA. However, negotiations on both will come to a head at approximately the same time.
- In these negotiations, we will seek to protect the President's priorities while accommodating Congress' desire to increase surface transportation spending. However, there is no easy way to do this.
- ★ Therefore, internally, we need to be prepared to fight off attempts to fund transportation at the expense of other priorities. This could be a very difficult fight along the lines of last year's fight in the House against Chairman Shuster's attempts to defeat the Budget Resolution.

Background

- The Senate may wrap up consideration of NEXTEA within the next week. The Administration has prevailed on several contentious issues, such as DBEs and Clean Air standards. A vote on transit minimum allocation may take place today or tomorrow.
- The House plans to take up NEXTEA before the Easter recess.

March 4, 1998

Senate ISTEA Reauthorization

Spending

- Senate highway agreement. Provides \$173 billion over 6 years for highway and highway safety programs. This is \$38 billion more than the President's Request and \$26 billion more than the original S. 1173. No additional funding was provided for transit.
- Agreement spends approximately \$4 billion more than CBO's estimate of receipts into the highway portion of the Highway Trust Fund over 6 years.
- No agreement yet on the obligation limitation or outlays that will be included in the Budget Resolution. Domenici is "committed" to finding offsets for this added spending, but they have not been identified.
- Additional funding allocated as follows:
 - \$18.9 billion in additional Federal-aid highway grants to States,
 - \$1.9 billion to ensure States receive at least 91% of their payments to the HTF,
 - \$1.8 billion for High Density States primarily serving 10 Northeast States,
 - \$1.8 billion for Appalachian Development Highways,
 - \$850 million for Federal lands Highways, and
 - \$450 million for border infrastructure and trade corridors.
- Vote on adding the \$173 billion likely to be today. It is expected to be adopted by a large margin.
- Transit. No agreement on adding additional funding for transit. Banking Committee Chairman D'Amato is seeking another \$4.5 billion over 6 years above the \$36.3 billion included in the committee reported transit title. If D'Amato is successful, total transit spending would exceed the President's request of \$28.5 billion by \$12.3 billion.

Blood Alcohol Level/Drunk Driving

- Senate adopted today by a 62-32 vote the Lautenberg amendment to require States to establish .08 Blood Alcohol levels for drunk driving as a prerequisite for receiving Federal highway funds.

Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE)

- The Senate is expected to consider the McConnell DBE amendment following the vote on funding.
- McConnell would eliminate the current 10 percent nationwide goal for women-owned and minority-owned firms of Federal-aid highway funded contracts. The set-aside would be replaced with an education and outreach program targeting "emerging businesses" without regard to race or gender of the owner. States would be required to target recruitment efforts to women and minority owned firms.
- Experience from States that have eliminated the set-aside on State contracts shows that it results in contracts to women and minority-owned firms effectively drying up completely.
- Vote will be close. Cabinet Secretaries and others calling Senators.

PM/Ozone

- An Inhofe amendment on PM/ozone also will be considered today or tomorrow.
- Inhofe would require three years of monitoring before an area could be designated as non-attainment for either particulate matter or ozone. It would also require additional research on health effects of particulate matter and ozone.
- EPA, through Chafee and Baucus, are negotiating with Inhofe to add the following 2 amendments: (1) establish a date certain for terminating the 3 year monitoring requirement and (2) permit reimbursement to States for monitoring costs.
- Inhofe has votes to win on the Floor without these changes. A floor fight to add these changes would split the Democratic caucus.
- Depending on the outcome of the negotiations, a decision will be required as to whether to fight this on the Floor or seek an agreement with Inhofe and Senate leadership that (1) Inhofe will not seek further Clean Air Act changes on other legislative vehicles and (2) the Senate will not accept further changes in conference with the House.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998 BA	QL	1999 BA	QL	2000 BA	QL	2001 BA	QL	2002 BA	QL	2003 BA	QL	1998-2003 BA	QL
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.8
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	28.5	25.9
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.6
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	6.3

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998 BA	QL	1999 BA	QL	2000 BA	QL	2001 BA	QL	2002 BA	QL	2003 BA	QL	1998-2003 BA	QL
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.8
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	28.5	25.9
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.6
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	6.3

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998	QL	1999	QL	2000	QL	2001	QL	2002	QL	2003	QL	1998-2003	QL
	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.8
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	28.5	25.9
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.5
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	6.3

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.8
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	23.5	25.3
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.6
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	6.3

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998 BA	QL	1999 BA	QL	2000 BA	QL	2001 BA	QL	2002 BA	QL	2003 BA	QL	1998-2003 BA	QL
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.8
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	28.5	25.9
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.5
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	6.3

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998	OL	1999	OL	2000	OL	2001	OL	2002	OL	2003	OL	1998-2003	OL
	BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA		BA	
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	23.5	25.9
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.6
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	5.3

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.8
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	28.5	25.9
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.6
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	6.3

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Balanced Budget Agreement	25.9	24.7	26.1	25.6	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.1	26.5	26.4	26.6	26.6	157.6	155.4
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
NEXTEA	28.6	26.6	28.2	27.4	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.1	28.4	28.7	28.5	169.9	167.1
Original Senate (S. 1173)	29.9	26.7	29.9	28.3	30.5	29.4	30.9	29.9	31.7	30.6	32.8	31.4	185.6	176.3
Senate (S. 1173) with Byrd - Gramm	29.9	26.7	35.9	29.9	36.6	33.4	37.1	35.0	38.0	36.2	39.2	37.2	216.6	198.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.3
House BESTEA (Shuster)	30.4	26.6	34.6	29.1	38.5	32.7	38.5	35.3	38.5	36.7	38.5	37.4	219.1	197.7
Spending Equal to Receipts with AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	31.6	28.2	31.8	30.3	32.7	31.4	33.3	32.2	33.9	33.0	191.1	181.3
Spending Equal to Receipts without AMTRAK trust funded	27.7	26.3	32.2	28.4	32.4	30.7	33.2	31.8	33.8	32.7	34.4	33.5	193.8	183.3

Notes

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

Attached pages provide greater detail on the assumptions and break out the funding.

The Balanced Budget Agreement scenario represents the amounts attributable to highways, highway safety, and transit at the time of the agreement.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

All Scenario includes funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used in all Senate scenarios.

The two spending equal to receipt scenarios assume total spending for surface transportation is equal to the prior year receipts, without interest, beginning in FY 1999. The difference between the two scenarios is that the first scenario funds AMTRAK out of the Highway Trust Fund, as proposed by the President's Budget.

Comparison of Surface Transportation Funding levels under discussion for ISTEA Reauthorization
(\$ in Billions)

This table has been updated for the Transit Agreement of 3/5/98

President's Budget Versus Deal

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
1999 President's Budget	27.7	26.3	27.7	27.1	27.7	27.5	27.6	27.7	27.6	27.8	27.6	27.9	166.1	164.4
Senate Agreement (3/3/98)	30.7	26.9	35.7	29.9	36.5	33.1	37.1	34.8	37.8	36.0	38.7	37.0	216.5	197.8
Delta	2.9	0.7	7.9	2.8	8.8	5.6	9.5	7.1	10.2	8.2	11.1	9.1	50.4	33.4

President's Budget Versus Deal - Highways Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (highways)	22.8	22.0	22.6	23.0	22.5	23.0	22.5	22.9	22.4	22.7	22.4	22.6	135.2	136.2
Senate Deal (Highways)	24.7	22.6	28.5	25.4	29.2	27.6	29.7	28.6	30.2	29.1	30.9	29.8	173.2	163.1
Delta	1.9	0.6	5.9	2.5	6.7	4.6	7.2	5.7	7.8	6.4	8.4	7.1	37.9	26.9

President's Budget Versus Deal - Transit Only

	1998		1999		2000		2001		2002		2003		1998-2003	
	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL	BA	QL
Pres Bud (transit)	4.6	3.9	4.7	3.8	4.8	4.1	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	23.5	25.9
Senate Deal (transit)	5.7	4.0	6.8	4.2	7.0	5.2	7.1	5.9	7.3	6.5	7.5	6.9	41.3	32.6
Delta	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	2.2	1.1	2.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.7	2.0	12.8	6.3

All Congressional scenarios assume obligation levels equal to the contract authority and authorization levels in the legislation. This assumption also holds for FY 1998. Therefore, the outlays shown are the maximum if the legislation was fully funded.

The President's Budget represents the budget authority and obligation limitations included in the budget. The Budget funds Surface Transportation at essentially the FY 1998 level.

All Scenarios include funding for Highways, Transit, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. In the case where multiple committees have jurisdiction over program authorizations, the most recent committee action is used. For example, the Senate Banking Committee levels for transit are used.

NEC Meeting on NEXTEA Issues
March 10, 1998

- The Senate agreement on NEXTEA funding provides \$50 billion more than the President's request for 1998-2003 for highways, highway safety and transit. This includes \$38 billion more for highways and \$13 billion for transit. (See attached tables.)
- Two issues arise:
 - What is our public posture towards this increased spending, and
 - How should these increased authorizations be treated in the context of the Budget Resolution?

Public Posture

- To date our message on spending levels has been mixed. Secretary Slater's March 3, 1998, letter to the Senate stated "The Administration urges Congress to enact a bill that is consistent with the President's fiscal year 1999 Balance Budget." At the same time, the President told the Nation's Governors that he would support higher spending on surface transportation if and only if it could be done within the budget caps.
- Secretary Slater is concerned that a strong public position against transportation funding increases will undercut efforts to defeat objectionable NEXTEA policy provisions
- The message that the Administration would support increased funding levels within the context of the budget caps will only be successful if we truly keep our options open and do not actively raise unrealistic expectations on the Hill or in the transportation community for funding increases.
- We should reconfirm that we are not supporting a specific level of additional surface transportation funding at this time, be circumspect in our conversation about funding levels, emphasize that the President's priorities must be protected, and set the stage for funding levels below the authorization levels in the Senate agreement.

Budget Resolution

- The Senate agreement does not include outlays. (It would require an additional \$33 billion in outlays over 6 years to fully fund the agreement.) The upcoming budget resolution negotiations will force us and Congress to address the outlay issue. Also, when the House takes up NEXTEA later this

month, Chairman Shuster will be seeking specific commitments regarding outlays.

- Domenici has publicly committed to finding the outlays to fund the agreement, at least in 1999. VA tobacco is the only offset that has been mentioned to date.
- The degree to which added transportation spending will impinge upon other Presidential priorities depends upon whether Domenici proposes new mandatory offsets which would effectively expand the discretionary cap or whether he proposes to fund the increases through offsets that the President's Budget would use for other purposes.
- The real decisions on funding will be made in the context of the Budget Resolution, not NEXTEA. However, negotiations on both will come to a head at approximately the same time.
- In these negotiations, we will seek to protect the President's priorities while accommodating Congress' desire to increase surface transportation spending. However, there is no easy way to do this.
- Therefore, internally, we need to be prepared to fight off attempts to fund transportation at the expense of other priorities. This could be a very difficult fight along the lines of last year's fight in the House against Chairman Shuster's attempts to defeat the Budget Resolution.

Background

- The Senate may wrap up consideration of NEXTEA within the next week. The Administration has prevailed on several contentious issues, such as DBEs and Clean Air standards. A vote on transit minimum allocation may take place today or tomorrow.
- The House plans to take up NEXTEA before the Easter recess.

NEC Meeting on NEXTEA Issues
March 10, 1998

- The Senate agreement on NEXTEA funding provides \$50 billion more than the President's request for 1998-2003 for highways, highway safety and transit. This includes \$38 billion more for highways and \$13 billion for transit. (See attached tables.)
- Two issues arise:
 - What is our public posture towards this increased spending, and
 - How should these increased authorizations be treated in the context of the Budget Resolution?

Public Posture

- To date our message on spending levels has been mixed. Secretary Slater's March 3, 1998, letter to the Senate stated "The Administration urges Congress to enact a bill that is consistent with the President's fiscal year 1999 Balance Budget." At the same time, the President told the Nation's Governors that he would support higher spending on surface transportation if and only if it could be done within the budget caps.
- Secretary Slater is concerned that a strong public position against transportation funding increases will undercut efforts to defeat objectionable NEXTEA policy provisions
- The message that the Administration would support increased funding levels within the context of the budget caps will only be successful if we truly keep our options open and do not actively raise unrealistic expectations on the Hill or in the transportation community for funding increases.
- We should reconfirm that we are not supporting a specific level of additional surface transportation funding at this time, be circumspect in our conversation about funding levels, emphasize that the President's priorities must be protected, and set the stage for funding levels below the authorization levels in the Senate agreement.

Budget Resolution

- The Senate agreement does not include outlays. (It would require an additional \$33 billion in outlays over 6 years to fully fund the agreement.) The upcoming budget resolution negotiations will force us and Congress to address the outlay issue. Also, when the House takes up NEXTEA later this

month, Chairman Shuster will be seeking specific commitments regarding outlays.

- Domenici has publicly committed to finding the outlays to fund the agreement, at least in 1999. VA tobacco is the only offset that has been mentioned to date.
- The degree to which added transportation spending will impinge upon other Presidential priorities depends upon whether Domenici proposes new mandatory offsets which would effectively expand the discretionary cap or whether he proposes to fund the increases through offsets that the President's Budget would use for other purposes.
- The real decisions on funding will be made in the context of the Budget Resolution, not NEXTEA. However, negotiations on both will come to a head at approximately the same time.
- In these negotiations, we will seek to protect the President's priorities while accommodating Congress' desire to increase surface transportation spending. However, there is no easy way to do this.
- Therefore, internally, we need to be prepared to fight off attempts to fund transportation at the expense of other priorities. This could be a very difficult fight along the lines of last year's fight in the House against Chairman Shuster's attempts to defeat the Budget Resolution.

Background

- The Senate may wrap up consideration of NEXTEA within the next week. The Administration has prevailed on several contentious issues, such as DBEs and Clean Air standards. A vote on transit minimum allocation may take place today or tomorrow.
- The House plans to take up NEXTEA before the Easter recess.

NEC Meeting on NEXTEA Issues
March 10, 1998

- The Senate agreement on NEXTEA funding provides \$50 billion more than the President's request for 1998-2003 for highways, highway safety and transit. This includes \$38 billion more for highways and \$13 billion for transit. (See attached tables.)
- Two issues arise:
 - What is our public posture towards this increased spending, and
 - How should these increased authorizations be treated in the context of the Budget Resolution?

Public Posture

- To date our message on spending levels has been mixed. Secretary Slater's March 3, 1998, letter to the Senate stated "The Administration urges Congress to enact a bill that is consistent with the President's fiscal year 1999 Balance Budget." At the same time, the President told the Nation's Governors that he would support higher spending on surface transportation if and only if it could be done within the budget caps.
- Secretary Slater is concerned that a strong public position against transportation funding increases will undercut efforts to defeat objectionable NEXTEA policy provisions
- The message that the Administration would support increased funding levels within the context of the budget caps will only be successful if we truly keep our options open and do not actively raise unrealistic expectations on the Hill or in the transportation community for funding increases.
- We should reconfirm that we are not supporting a specific level of additional surface transportation funding at this time, be circumspect in our conversation about funding levels, emphasize that the President's priorities must be protected, and set the stage for funding levels below the authorization levels in the Senate agreement.

Budget Resolution

- The Senate agreement does not include outlays. (It would require an additional \$33 billion in outlays over 6 years to fully fund the agreement.) The upcoming budget resolution negotiations will force us and Congress to address the outlay issue. Also, when the House takes up NEXTEA later this

month, Chairman Shuster will be seeking specific commitments regarding outlays.

- Domenici has publicly committed to finding the outlays to fund the agreement, at least in 1999. VA tobacco is the only offset that has been mentioned to date.
- The degree to which added transportation spending will impinge upon other Presidential priorities depends upon whether Domenici proposes new mandatory offsets which would effectively expand the discretionary cap or whether he proposes to fund the increases through offsets that the President's Budget would use for other purposes.
- The real decisions on funding will be made in the context of the Budget Resolution, not NEXTEA. However, negotiations on both will come to a head at approximately the same time.
- In these negotiations, we will seek to protect the President's priorities while accommodating Congress' desire to increase surface transportation spending. However, there is no easy way to do this.
- Therefore, internally, we need to be prepared to fight off attempts to fund transportation at the expense of other priorities. This could be a very difficult fight along the lines of last year's fight in the House against Chairman Shuster's attempts to defeat the Budget Resolution.

Background

- The Senate may wrap up consideration of NEXTEA within the next week. The Administration has prevailed on several contentious issues, such as DBEs and Clean Air standards. A vote on transit minimum allocation may take place today or tomorrow.
- The House plans to take up NEXTEA before the Easter recess.

NEC Meeting on NEXTEA Issues
March 10, 1998

- The Senate agreement on NEXTEA funding provides \$50 billion more than the President's request for 1998-2003 for highways, highway safety and transit. This includes \$38 billion more for highways and \$13 billion for transit. (See attached tables.)
- Two issues arise:
 - What is our public posture towards this increased spending, and
 - How should these increased authorizations be treated in the context of the Budget Resolution?

Public Posture

- To date our message on spending levels has been mixed. Secretary Slater's March 3, 1998, letter to the Senate stated "The Administration urges Congress to enact a bill that is consistent with the President's fiscal year 1999 Balance Budget." At the same time, the President told the Nation's Governors that he would support higher spending on surface transportation if and only if it could be done within the budget caps.
- Secretary Slater is concerned that a strong public position against transportation funding increases will undercut efforts to defeat objectionable NEXTEA policy provisions
- The message that the Administration would support increased funding levels within the context of the budget caps will only be successful if we truly keep our options open and do not actively raise unrealistic expectations on the Hill or in the transportation community for funding increases.
- We should reconfirm that we are not supporting a specific level of additional surface transportation funding at this time, be circumspect in our conversation about funding levels, emphasize that the President's priorities must be protected, and set the stage for funding levels below the authorization levels in the Senate agreement.

Budget Resolution

- The Senate agreement does not include outlays. (It would require an additional \$33 billion in outlays over 6 years to fully fund the agreement.) The upcoming budget resolution negotiations will force us and Congress to address the outlay issue. Also, when the House takes up NEXTEA later this

month, Chairman Shuster will be seeking specific commitments regarding outlays.

- Domenici has publicly committed to finding the outlays to fund the agreement, at least in 1999. VA tobacco is the only offset that has been mentioned to date.
- The degree to which added transportation spending will impinge upon other Presidential priorities depends upon whether Domenici proposes new mandatory offsets which would effectively expand the discretionary cap or whether he proposes to fund the increases through offsets that the President's Budget would use for other purposes.
- The real decisions on funding will be made in the context of the Budget Resolution, not NEXTEA. However, negotiations on both will come to a head at approximately the same time.
- In these negotiations, we will seek to protect the President's priorities while accommodating Congress' desire to increase surface transportation spending. However, there is no easy way to do this.
- Therefore, internally, we need to be prepared to fight off attempts to fund transportation at the expense of other priorities. This could be a very difficult fight along the lines of last year's fight in the House against Chairman Shuster's attempts to defeat the Budget Resolution.

Background

- The Senate may wrap up consideration of NEXTEA within the next week. The Administration has prevailed on several contentious issues, such as DBEs and Clean Air standards. A vote on transit minimum allocation may take place today or tomorrow.
- The House plans to take up NEXTEA before the Easter recess.

DOT's Draft Talking Points

Talking Points for The Secretary NEC Meeting NEXTEA Issues

- Thank you for providing the opportunity to meet and discuss next steps we may wish to consider on the pending ISTEA legislation. As you know the legislation is moving in the Senate. We had a substantial success last week with the vote on DBE which was 58 to 37 to table the McConnell amendment. The Senate has also raised the contract authority levels to \$26 billion annually for highways and \$6.88 billion annually for transit. In the case of transit these are General Fund authorizations.
- I have been meeting with a number of House and Senate members and they see the Senate moving the bill quickly to closure. Possibly this week.
- We will soon be asked for our position on this enhanced funding as well as other features of the bill. While the added funding provides no increases in outlays as soon as the debate starts on the budget resolution the pressure will build to put more outlays toward transportation. Also Mr. Shuster will be pressing for additional real spending in the House.
- I think it would be good for us to formulate an administration position before we are at the point where we will need to be more precise. I believe it is in our interests to get the ISTEA bill done in a way that is consistent with the Administration's priorities.
- To accomplish that objective we could consider moving to conference with a position that keeps our options open. We could respond by stating that while progress is being made on the bill we must see its effects on Administration priorities before making a firm decision on agreement or opposition to its provisions. Further we could extend that position to conference where we can see the results of the budget resolution and the likely House action.
- Therefore, I suggest that we continue to stay with the position taken by the President when he met with the Governors' which was within the Balanced Budget Agreement we will work with the Congress to complete this legislation.
- As the Senate moves forward we have other critical policy issues such as Transit Minimum Allocation to which we need to concentrate our energies on defeating. Some of the same people that were our allies in the DBE and Minimum Allocation issues are also supporters of the increased funding for highways and transit.

BACKGROUND

The NEC is likely to wish to take a strong position to limit potential funding increases that may result from the current ISTEA legislative process. Given that the Senate hasn't yet actually provided for any real spending increases it is better for the Administration to keep its options open as we concentrate on defeating objectionable policy amendments e.g. Minimum Allocation and others that may yet surface.

In addition to the funding issues it is possible that Treasury may raise objections to Chafe's amendment for innovative financing on the grounds that it violates the longstanding policy against the Federal government accepting itself as a subordinated debtor.

DOT's Draft Talking Points**Talking Points for
The Secretary NEC Meeting
NEXTEA Issues**

- Thank you for providing the opportunity to meet and discuss next steps we may wish to consider on the pending ISTEA legislation. As you know the legislation is moving in the Senate. We had a substantial success last week with the vote on DBE which was 58 to 37 to table the McConnell amendment. The Senate has also raised the contract authority levels to \$26 billion annually for highways and \$6.88 billion annually for transit. In the case of transit these are General Fund authorizations.
- I have been meeting with a number of House and Senate members and they see the Senate moving the bill quickly to closure. Possibly this week.
- We will soon be asked for our position on this enhanced funding as well as other features of the bill. While the added funding provides no increases in outlays as soon as the debate starts on the budget resolution the pressure will build to put more outlays toward transportation. Also Mr. Shuster will be pressing for additional real spending in the House.
- I think it would be good for us to formulate an administration position before we are at the point where we will need to be more precise. I believe it is in our interests to get the ISTEA bill done in a way that is consistent with the Administration's priorities.
- To accomplish that objective we could consider moving to conference with a position that keeps our options open. We could respond by stating that while progress is being made on the bill we must see its effects on Administration priorities before making a firm decision on agreement or opposition to its provisions. Further we could extend that position to conference where we can see the results of the budget resolution and the likely House action.
- Therefore, I suggest that we continue to stay with the position taken by the President when he met with the Governors' which was within the Balanced Budget Agreement we will work with the Congress to complete this legislation.
- As the Senate moves forward we have other critical policy issues such as Transit Minimum Allocation to which we need to concentrate our energies on defeating. Some of the same people that were our allies in the DBE and Minimum Allocation issues are also supporters of the increased funding for highways and transit.

BACKGROUND

The NEC is likely to wish to take a strong position to limit potential funding increases that may result from the current ISTEA legislative process. Given that the Senate hasn't yet actually provided for any real spending increases it is better for the Administration to keep its options open as we concentrate on defeating objectionable policy amendments e.g. Minimum Allocation and others that may yet surface.

In addition to the funding issues it is possible that Treasury may raise objections to Chafe's amendment for innovative financing on the grounds that it violates the longstanding policy against the Federal government accepting itself as a subordinated debtor.

Meeting on ISTE A
March 10, 1998
6:30-7:30

Sec. Slater

Jack Basso

Janno Lieber

Steve Palmer

Stein

Raines

Michael Deitch

Rahm (tentative)

Sally

Dorothy