

appropriated two years in advance. This gives the beneficiaries of this funding time to plan their broadcasting budgets before the broadcast season starts.

However, advance appropriations can also be used in situations that lack a programmatic justification, as a gimmick to make room for expanded funding within the discretionary spending limits on budget authority for a given year under BBEDCA. For example, some education grants are forward funded (available beginning July 1 of the fiscal year) to provide certainty of funding for an entire school year, since school years straddle Federal fiscal years. This funding is recorded in the budget year because the funding is first legally available in that fiscal year. However, more than \$22.6 billion of this funding is advance appropriated (available beginning three months later, on October 1) rather than forward funded. Prior Congresses increased advance appropriations and decreased the amounts of forward funding as a gimmick to free up room in the budget year without affecting the total amount available for a coming school year. This gimmick works because the advance appropriation is not recorded in the budget year but rather the following fiscal year. But it works only in the year in which funds are switched from forward funding to advance appropriations; that is, it works only in years in which the amounts of advance appropriations for such “straddle” programs are increased.

To curtail this gimmick, which allows over-budget funding in the budget year and exerts pressure for increased funding in future years by committing upfront a portion of the total budget authority limits under the discretionary caps in BBEDCA, in those years, congressional budget resolutions since 2001 have set limits on the amount of advance appropriations. When the congressional limit equals the amount that had been advance appropriated in the most recent appropriations bill, there is no additional room to switch forward funding to advance appropriations, and so no room for this particular gimmick to operate in that year’s budget.

The Budget includes \$28,835 million in advance appropriations for 2017 and freezes them at this level in subsequent years. In this way, the Budget does not employ this potential gimmick. Moreover, the Administration supports limiting advance appropriations to the proposed level for 2017, similar to the limits enacted as sections 112 and 115(c) of the BBA for the Senate and the House, respectively. Those limits apply only to the accounts explicitly specified in a statement submitted to the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget in each House.

In addition, the Administration would allow advance appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is typically enacted two years in advance, and for Veterans Medical Care, as is required by the Veterans Health Care Budget Reform and Transparency Act (P.L. 111-81). The advance appropriations funding level for the veterans medical care accounts (comprising Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities) is largely determined by the Enrollee Health Care Projection Model of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). This actuarial model projects the funding

requirement for over 80 types of health care services, including primary care, specialty care, and mental health. The remaining funding requirement is estimated based on other models and assumptions for services such as readjustment counseling and special activities. The Department of Veterans Affairs has included detailed information in its Congressional Budget Justifications about the overall 2017 VA medical care funding request. For the first time, the Administration is also requesting advance appropriations for the VA mandatory benefit accounts (Compensation and Pension; Readjustment Benefits; and Veterans Insurance and Indemnities), based on projections of anticipated benefit payments, in compliance with the new requirement under the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 113-235).

The Administration also proposes to allow advance appropriations for the spending and collections of the payments in the General Services Administration (GSA) Federal Buildings Fund. This net zero proposal supports capital requirements as well as operating expenses. This would provide greater certainty to support capital projects and ensure that the funds that agencies pay to GSA are used promptly to construct, maintain, and operate GSA facilities.

For a detailed table of accounts that have received discretionary and mandatory advance appropriations since 2014 or for which the Budget requests advance appropriations for 2017 and beyond, please refer to the Advance Appropriations chapter in the *Appendix*.

Budgetary Treatment of Surface Transportation Infrastructure Funding

Overview.—Currently, surface transportation programs financed from the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) are treated as hybrids: contract authority is classified as mandatory, while outlays are classified as discretionary. Broadly speaking, this framework evolved as a mechanism to ensure that collections into the HTF (e.g., motor fuel taxes) were used to pay only for programs that benefit surface transportation users, and that funding for those programs would generally be commensurate with collections. However, HTF collections are no longer adequate to support current law spending levels.

The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform (the “Fiscal Commission”) recommended changing the scorekeeping treatment of surface transportation programs to close loopholes in the present system. This hybrid treatment results in less accountability for transportation spending. The Commission plan reclassifies spending from the Transportation Trust Fund to make both contract authority and outlays mandatory. Specifically, rather than skirting the two mechanisms intended to control spending, caps on discretionary budget authority and PAYGO, the Fiscal Commission’s recommendation would establish surface transportation programs as subject to PAYGO.

The 2016 Budget includes structural reforms to surface transportation programs that mirror the recommendation of the Fiscal Commission. These reforms help ensure that when crafting a surface transportation plan, the

President and the Congress will work together to ensure that funding increases do not increase the deficit.

The Budget uses transition revenue from pro-growth business tax reform to offset the cost of President's six-year surface transportation proposal beyond what the current funding mechanism can cover. Beyond the reauthorization window (2016-2021), the Budget assumes that spending returns to baseline levels based on what was enacted in 2015 – and accordingly the structural gap between baseline trust fund spending and baseline trust fund receipts returns. This reflects the assumption that while the Administration has identified a revenue source that will sustain baseline spending levels and programmatic increases proposed in the pending reauthorization, the offset does not offer a permanent solution. The proposal fills both the gap between baseline receipts and baseline spending for the six-year period of the reauthorization and all of the outlays associated with programmatic increases during the six-year reauthorization. Policy-makers will need to work together to develop other fiscally responsible solutions beyond the six-year reauthorization period.

The Budget also includes a surface transportation reauthorization proposal that would broaden the scope of programs included under the Trust Fund umbrella: the HTF is renamed the Transportation Trust Fund (TTF), and supports additional highway safety and transit programs, as well as passenger rail programs and multimodal programs administered by the Department of Transportation. The mechanics of the 2016 proposal are described in greater detail below. Generally speaking:

- Hybrid treatment is ended; all TTF accounts have mandatory contract authority and mandatory outlays.
- For the sake of comparability, the Budget reclassifies current law spending for all TTF activities as mandatory. This is intended to allow policy makers to: 1) transparently calculate the difference between baseline levels and the President's proposal, and 2) account for that difference under a unified, existing scorekeeping regime, PAYGO.
- Rescissions of contract authority in appropriations acts would be scored as CHIMPs (discretionary changes that would be rebased as mandatory subsequent to enactment, following long-standing scorekeeping conventions).

As proposed by the Administration, this unified scoring framework does not radically alter traditional roles and jurisdictional relationships as they are conceived of under current law and scorekeeping practice. Authorizing committees would be scored with the full cost of contract authority and outlays associated with their proposal; discretionary outlays would no longer be a central feature of the scorekeeping system. However, under the proposal, the Appropriations Committees would continue to set obligation limitations that are legally binding. In addition, the Appropriations Committees would continue to liquidate contract authority. As under current law, multi-year

authorizing bills would set initial expectations for spending. The new scorekeeping regime would fully reflect the cost of that legislation in terms of both budget authority and outlays.

While the Administration envisions both types of committees playing important roles, the central innovation of the proposed scorekeeping regime is that it would require all stakeholders to identify offsets for new spending during the authorization process. A scorekeeping regime that closes loopholes in current practice and forecloses options that are not fiscally responsible is necessary for budget discipline and to drive policy makers towards consensus.

The proposal for surface transportation and the corresponding structural reforms are essentially similar to the proposal presented in 2015 Budget. The 2015 Budget presented the Administration's proposal for a four-year \$302 billion reauthorization of transportation programs that would substantially increase average annual spending over the four years compared to MAP-21, while the 2016 Budget proposes a six-year \$478 billion proposal. As discussed above, the Administration proposes to pay for the reauthorization proposal by using transition revenue from pro-growth business tax reform.

As a matter of policy, the Administration believes that the proceeds from existing Highway Trust Fund excise taxes should be dedicated solely to the highway and transit accounts; no existing excise taxes would be diverted to rail or other activities. Rather, under the Administration's proposal, transition revenue from business tax reform would offset the General Fund transfers that have been used in recent years to compensate for the projected shortfall in the Highway and Mass Transit accounts, cover increased funding for highways and mass transit, and finance passenger rail and multimodal activities.

This budget process reform is only one element of the Administration's comprehensive plan to rebuild the Nation's transportation infrastructure. The *Budget* and *Appendix* volumes discuss the broader policy in more detail.

Account-by-Account Budgetary Treatment.—The Budget proposes the enactment of contract authority for the Transportation Trust Fund for each year, 2016-2021, totaling \$478 billion over six years. The contract authority is to be enacted by the reauthorization bill and, as under current law, will be classified as mandatory.

Under the budget, outlays flowing from that contract authority will also be treated as mandatory. The same treatment is applied to outlays flowing from prior obligations of the Highway Trust Fund, which will now be attributed to the Transportation Trust Fund; this is a departure from current law. As is the case for all other programs, this aligns outlays with budget authority. By placing outlays on the PAYGO scorecard, it gives real scoring effect to funding increases for surface transportation programs.

For all of the resources in the surface transportation reauthorization proposal, the Budget proposes that the reauthorization contain annual obligation limits at the same level as the contract authority, and also that annual appropriations bills include obligation limits at those levels. The obligation limits enacted by the appropriators

enable the Administration and the Congress to review TTF policies and resource levels on an annual basis, but under a framework that will continue to give external stakeholders a high level of certainty regarding the multi-year resource trajectory for highways, transit, passenger rail, and multimodal activities.

The Budget modifies individual accounts to conform to the proposed budgetary treatment in all years. Specifically:

- For accounts that are presently classified as having discretionary budget authority and outlays, but that the Administration proposes to incorporate into the TTF (for example, the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grants account), the Budget includes separate schedules that:
 - Show baseline budget authority and outlays as discretionary, consistent with current classifications.
 - Reclassify baseline budget authority and outlays as mandatory in all years, including 2014 and 2015, for comparability purposes (i.e., to enable a comparison of funding levels across years in an account).
 - Show adjustments (subject to PAYGO) to the reclassified mandatory amounts so that the proposal properly accounts for requested program growth in the new trust fund accounts.
- For accounts that are presently funded from the HTF and that the Administration proposes to incorporate into the TTF (for example, Federal-Aid Highways), the Budget includes separate schedules that:
 - Show baseline levels of mandatory contract authority and discretionary outlays resulting from obligation limitations contained in appropriations acts. Since the current law surface transportation extension will expire May 31, 2015, the contract authority is frozen in all years subsequent to that date, consistent with current scorekeeping conventions.
 - Reclassify discretionary outlays from obligation limitations as mandatory outlays from mandatory contract authority for the 2015 estimate and create a new baseline of contract authority that is equal to the previous inflated discretionary baseline for obligation limitations.
 - Reclassify 2014 enacted budget authority and outlays as mandatory for comparability purposes (i.e., to enable a comparison of funding levels across years in an account).
 - Show proposed mandatory spending above or below the baseline as PAYGO costs or savings.
- For proposed new accounts supported by the TTF (for example, the Federal Railroad Administration's Rail Service Improvement Program account), the Budget includes a schedule that includes new man-

datory contract authority and outlays requested to support those programs.

The discretionary accounts that are incorporated into the TTF construct are:

- Office of the Secretary, National Infrastructure Investments.
- Federal Railroad Administration (FRA): Operating Subsidy Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation; Capital and Debt Service Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation; Capital Assistance for High-Speed Rail Corridors.
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA): Operations and Research.
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA): Administrative Expenses; Capital Investment Grants; Transit Research; Technical Assistance and Training; Public Transportation Emergency Relief.

Amounts in these accounts total \$4.2 billion in discretionary budget authority for 2015. The baseline levels for these amounts are what constitute the discretionary cap adjustment noted in the OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2016. Note that in a number of cases, activities captured in these accounts are requested under a new account in the Administration's reauthorization proposal. For example, activities under the two existing Amtrak accounts are requested as part of the Federal Railroad Administration's new Current Passenger Rail Service account. In those instances, the PAYGO impact of the Administration's reauthorization proposal must be calculated at the aggregate level rather than the individual account level (i.e., the change between the reclassified baseline amounts in the existing General Fund accounts and the proposed levels in the successor account).

Outyear Assumptions.—Beyond the reauthorization proposal, the Budget assumes that contract authority will return to baseline levels, as calculated from 2015, for 2022 and thereafter. This reflects that while the Administration has identified savings to offset the presently-pending reauthorization, policy-makers will need to develop alternative fiscally responsible solutions for 2022 and beyond.

Transportation Trust Fund Mechanics.—As discussed earlier, the Budget proposes a successor to the Highway Trust Fund, the Transportation Trust Fund, containing four accounts:

- The Highway Account subsumes the highway and highway safety activities currently in the Highway Trust Fund plus the NHTSA Operations and Research account, currently a General Fund account.
- The Mass Transit Account subsumes the transit activities currently in the Highway Trust Fund plus five FTA accounts currently financed by the General Fund: Capital Investment Grants; Transit Research; and Technical Assistance and Training; Public

Transportation Emergency Relief; and Administrative Expenses.

- The Rail Account focuses on developing high-performance rail and also subsumes activities currently financed from the General Fund: Capital Assistance for High-Speed Rail Corridors; Capital and Debt service grants to AMTRAK; and Operating Grants to AMTRAK.
- The Multimodal Account includes a multimodal, competitive program that the Department currently operates: National Infrastructure Investments (TIGER) grants.

The goal of a broader Trust Fund is to allow policy-makers to review surface transportation policy and spending in a more comprehensive way.

Offsets.—The 2016 Budget fully pays for the 2016-2021 reauthorization proposal by applying transition revenue from pro-growth business tax reform to cover outlays associated with: 1) new spending associated with the Administration’s six-year surface transportation reauthorization proposal; and 2) shortfalls between revenue and spending that exist under current law for the same time period. As discussed above, the Budget proposes to make surface transportation spending subject to PAYGO rules, and specific savings are identified to cover the PAYGO costs.

Because the Budget retains the Trust Fund concept, fully-offset transfers from the General Fund to the TTF are reflected to maintain TTF solvency through the reauthorization period and to cover outlays generated from the six-year proposal but projected to occur beyond the reauthorization period. Offsets from business tax reform are only used to cover the structural deficit for six years and all new outlays associated with the reauthorization proposal for the 10-year window. Since the Administration’s proposed offset is finite, after the reauthorization period spending levels drop back to baseline levels calculated from 2015 and spending again outstrips revenue.

Explanation of the Administration’s Proposal and PAYGO Treatment.—Table 11-4 details the Administration’s surface transportation reauthorization proposal.

- Line one illustrates the proposed contract authority levels for accounts under the TTF, including accounts presently reflected as General Fund budget authority, HTF-funded accounts (hybrid treatment), and new activities. Line two illustrates outlay estimates associated with that contract authority, as well as prior-year outlays from the HTF.
- Line three illustrates the baseline level of budgetary resources for all activities proposed under the TTF (including enacted appropriations and programs authorized under MAP-21). For comparability, those budgetary resources that were previously classified as discretionary are displayed here as mandatory. Line four illustrates the outlay estimates associated

with those budgetary resources, including prior year outlays from the HTF.

- Lines five and six calculate the mandatory budget authority and outlay changes—the increases over the baseline levels. As previously noted and indicated in this line, after this reauthorization period, spending falls back to baseline levels. Line six is the amount that would be subject to PAYGO.
- Line seven indicates the assumed deposits to the Transportation Trust Fund necessary to liquidate outlays. That figure is made up of two components: estimates associated with current law receipts (line eight) to the Highway Trust Fund and offset transfers needed to maintain Trust Fund solvency during the six-year reauthorization and cover outlays from this reauthorization that are expected to occur after 2021 (line nine).
- Line 10 illustrates the net cash flow to the TTF assumed in each year (revenues minus outlays).
- Line eleven illustrates the notional cash balances of the TTF over the ten-year period. As mentioned above, offsets from transition revenue from business tax reform only cover the structural deficit for six years and new outlays associated with the reauthorization proposal; since the Administration’s proposed offset is finite, after the reauthorization period spending levels drop back to baseline levels calculated from 2015 and structural deficits return.

In order to ensure the successful transition of these programs to a fiscally responsible framework, the Administration’s proposal—or any proposal to make surface transportation programs subject to PAYGO—must consider two initial adjustments.

First, congressional scorekeeping must accommodate the initial shift from discretionary to mandatory outlays. As illustrated by line four, the activities that the administration proposes to incorporate in the TTF as mandatory outlays would generate discretionary outlays under current law totaling an estimated \$347 billion over six years. If those outlays are reclassified, they should not be added to the PAYGO cost of any legislation by virtue of the fact that they are new to the mandatory side of the budget. Rather, the mandatory baseline should be adjusted to include those outlays that would occur under current law—as the 2016 Budget does—and calculate any changes from that baseline. Without this initial accommodation, scorekeeping rules would overstate the cost of legislation intended to reform the hybrid system.

Second, to reflect the true cost of fully funding the surface transportation program for the six-year reauthorization period, any offset should be required to cover: 1) the difference between current law revenues and baseline HTF outlays (\$85 billion, including a \$5 billion cash management cushion for the reauthorization period) to restore solvency to the existing HTF, 2) any reclassification of the inflated baseline activities currently financed by the General Fund (\$27 billion in the Administration’s

Table 11–4. FUNDING, SPENDING, REVENUES, AND DEPOSITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND¹

(Dollars in billions)

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	6-year	10-year
1. Funding for the Transportation Trust Fund (Contract Authority)	77	78	79	80	81	82	63	64	65	67	478	737
2. Estimated outlays	60	68	73	75	77	79	77	72	70	69	433	720
3. Baseline funding (Contract Authority and Budget Authority)	56	57	58	59	60	62	63	64	65	67	352	610
4. Estimated baseline outlays ²	55	56	58	58	59	60	61	63	64	65	347	599
5. Proposed funding increase	21	21	21	21	21	21	126	126
6. Estimated outlay increase	5	11	15	17	18	19	16	10	6	4	85	121
7. Deposits into the Transportation Trust Fund	79	79	80	80	80	80	40	40	40	40	477	637
8. Highway Trust Fund revenues (at current rates)	39	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	238	399
9. Corporate Tax Proposal Savings	40	40	40	40	40	40	238	238
10. Transportation Trust Fund annual cash flow (net)	19	11	7	4	2	1	(37)	(32)	(30)	(29)	44	(83)
11. Transportation Trust Fund end-of-year balances	19	30	37	41	43	44	7	(25)	(54)	(83)	214	60

¹ This table includes \$5 billion in outlays from the GROW AMERICA proposal that were erroneously omitted from the totals in other parts of this Budget.

² Note that the FY16 proposal would incorporate into the Transportation Trust Fund all new spending from accounts that would previously have been considered discretionary (e.g. the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grants account), and future outlays from these accounts will now be paid from the Transportation Trust Fund. FY15 enacted levels for these accounts total \$4.2 billion.

proposal, of which \$21 billion outlays over the first six years), and 3) all program increases relative to the inflated baseline (\$126 billion). While PAYGO rules only require an offset to spending above the BBEDCA baseline, the Administration believes that for both scoring purposes and Trust Fund solvency the offset should cover both proposed spending increases and the gap between baseline spending and current law revenue. As discussed earlier, the outyears beyond the reauthorization, 2022-2025, reflect lower surface transportation spending at baseline levels calculated from 2014 to illustrate that after the current reauthorization, the structural deficit returns and the Transportation Trust Fund faces insolvency. As a matter of policy, the Administration believes that the spending levels under its reauthorization proposal should be the starting point for subsequent authorizations, but policy makers will again have to confront the gap between spending and revenue.

Pell Grants

The Pell Grant program includes features that make it unlike other discretionary programs including that Pell Grants are awarded to all applicants who meet income and other eligibility criteria. From the start of the Great Recession through 2011, when many Americans returned to school to improve their skills while their own job prospects were not strong, the number of students receiving Pell Grants increased by 3.8 million. This increase in participation, coupled with greater average financial need, resulted in a significant rise in Pell program costs. Since this peak, the number of Pell Grant recipients has slowly decreased, and program costs that were once growing have started to decline. This section provides some background on the unique nature of the Pell Grant program and explains how the Budget accommodates these changes in discretionary costs. A later section of this chapter discusses the treatment of Pell Grants in the adjusted baseline.

Under current law, the Pell Grant program has several notable features:

- The Pell Grant program acts like an entitlement program, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or Supplemental Security Income, in which everyone who meets specific eligibility requirements and applies for the program receives a benefit. As a result, the size of the individual award and the number of eligible applicants together determine the cost in any given year. Specifically, Pell Grant costs depend on the maximum award set in statute, the number of eligible applicants, and the award for which those applicants are eligible based on their needs and costs of attendance. The maximum Pell award for the academic year 2014-2015 is \$5,730, of which \$4,860 will be established in the annual appropriations act and the remaining \$870 is provided automatically by the College Cost Reduction and Access Act (CCRAA). Under the CCRAA, the amount needed to index the Pell Grant for inflation is provided through the mandatory funds through the 2017-18 award year.
- The cost of each Pell Grant is funded by discretionary budget authority provided in annual appropriations acts, along with mandatory budget authority provided not only by the CCRAA, and the BCA, but also by amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 contained in the 2011 and 2012 appropriations acts. There is no programmatic difference between the mandatory and discretionary funding.
- If valid applicants are more numerous than expected, or if these applicants are eligible for higher awards than anticipated, the Pell Grant program will cost more than the appropriations provided. If the costs during one academic year are higher than provided for in that year's appropriation, the Department of