

13. OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS AND OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Government records money collected in one of two ways. It is either recorded as a governmental receipt and included in the amount reported on the receipts side of the budget or it is recorded as an offsetting collection or offsetting receipt, which reduces (or “offsets”) the amount reported on the outlay side of the budget. Governmental receipts are discussed in the previous chapter, “Governmental Receipts.” The first section of this chapter broadly discusses offsetting collections and offsetting receipts. The second section discusses user charges, which consist of a subset of offsetting collections and offsetting receipts and a small share of governmental receipts. The third and final section of this chapter describes the Administration’s user charge proposals.

As discussed below, offsetting collections and offsetting receipts are cash inflows to a budget account that are usually used to finance Government activities. The spending associated with these activities is included in total or “gross outlays.” For 2015, gross outlays to the public were \$4,204 billion,¹ or 23.6 percent of gross domestic product (GDP). Offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public are subtracted from gross outlays to the public to yield “net outlays,” which is the most common measure of outlays cited and generally referred to as simply “outlays.” For 2015, net outlays were \$3,688 billion or 20.7 percent of GDP. Government-wide net outlays reflect the Government’s net disbursements to the public and are subtracted from governmental receipts to derive the Government’s deficit or surplus. For 2015, governmental receipts were \$3,250 billion, or 18.3 percent of GDP, and the deficit was \$438 billion, or 2.5 percent of GDP.

There are two sources of offsetting receipts and offsetting collections: from the public and from other budget accounts. In 2015, offsetting receipts and offsetting collections from the public were \$516.0 billion, while intragovernmental offsetting receipts and offsetting collections were \$1,034 billion. Regardless of how it is recorded (as governmental receipts, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections), money collected from the public reduces the deficit or increases the surplus. In contrast, intragovernmental collections from other budget accounts exactly offset the payments made by these accounts, with no net impact on the deficit or surplus.²

¹ Gross outlays to the public are derived by subtracting intragovernmental outlays from gross outlays. For 2015, gross outlays were \$5,238 billion. Intragovernmental outlays are payments from one Government account to another Government account. For 2015, intragovernmental outlays totaled \$1,034 billion.

² For the purposes of this discussion, “collections from the public” include collections from non-budgetary Government accounts, such as credit financing accounts and deposit funds. For more information on these non-budgetary accounts, see Chapter 10, “Coverage of the Budget.”

When measured by the magnitude of the dollars collected, most offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public arise from business-like transactions with the public. Unlike governmental receipts, which are derived from the Government’s exercise of its sovereign power, these offsetting collections and offsetting receipts arise primarily from voluntary payments from the public for goods or services provided by the Government. They are classified as offsets to outlays for the cost of producing the goods or services for sale, rather than as governmental receipts on the receipts side of the budget. Treating offsetting collections and offsetting receipts as offsets to outlays produces budget totals for receipts and (net) outlays that reflect the amount of resources allocated by the Government through collective political choice, rather than through the marketplace.³ These activities include the sale of postage stamps, land, timber, and electricity; charging fees for services provided to the public (e.g., admission to national parks); and collecting premiums for health care benefits (e.g., Medicare Parts B and D).

A relatively small portion (\$34.7 billion in 2015) of offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public is derived from the Government’s exercise of its sovereign power. From a conceptual standpoint, these should be classified as governmental receipts. However, they are classified as offsetting rather than governmental receipts either because this classification has been specified in law or because these collections have traditionally been classified as offsets to outlays. Most of the offsetting collections and offsetting receipts in this category derive from fees from Government regulatory services or Government licenses, and include, for example, charges for regulating the nuclear energy industry, bankruptcy filing fees, immigration fees, food inspection fees, passport fees, and patent and trademark fees.⁴

A third source of offsetting collections and offsetting receipts is intragovernmental transfers. Examples of intragovernmental transfers include interest payments to funds that hold Government securities (such as the Social

³ Showing collections from business-type transactions as offsets on the spending side of the budget follows the concept recommended by the Report of the President’s Commission on Budget Concepts in 1967 and is discussed in Chapter 9 of this volume, “Budget Concepts.”

⁴ This category of receipts is known as “offsetting governmental receipts.” Some argue that regulatory or licensing fees should be viewed as payments for a particular service or for the right to engage in a particular type of business. However, these fees are conceptually much more similar to taxes because they are compulsory, and they fund activities that are intended to provide broadly dispersed benefits, such as protecting the health of the public. Reclassifying these fees as governmental receipts could require a change in law, and because of conventions for scoring appropriations bills, would make it impossible for fees that are controlled through annual appropriations acts to be scored as offsets to discretionary spending.

Table 13–1. OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS AND OFFSETTING RECEIPTS FROM THE PUBLIC
(In billions of dollars)

	Actual 2015	Estimate	
		2016	2017
Offsetting collections (credited to expenditure accounts):			
User charges:			
Postal Service stamps and other USPS fees (off-budget)	73.5	74.8	75.3
Defense Commissary Agency	5.5	6.0	5.7
Employee contributions for employees and retired employees health benefits funds	13.9	15.1	16.1
Sale of energy:			
Tennessee Valley Authority	43.2	40.9	41.5
Bonneville Power Administration	3.3	4.0	4.2
All other user charges	68.7	65.2	71.8
Subtotal, user charges	208.1	206.0	214.6
Other collections credited to expenditure accounts:			
Commodity Credit Corporation fund	5.5	6.8	7.0
Supplemental Security Income (collections from the States)	2.6	2.7	2.7
Other collections	17.6	8.2	7.5
Subtotal, other collections	25.7	17.7	17.2
Subtotal, offsetting collections	233.9	223.7	231.8
Offsetting receipts (deposited in receipt accounts):			
User charges:			
Medicare premiums	67.1	72.1	79.1
Spectrum auction, relocation, and licenses	30.1	12.9	13.9
Outer Continental Shelf rents, bonuses, and royalties	3.5	2.8	3.2
All other user charges	34.2	35.7	40.1
Subtotal, user charges deposited in receipt accounts	134.9	123.5	136.3
Other collections deposited in receipt accounts:			
Military assistance program sales	32.4	36.0	37.4
Interest received from credit financing accounts	38.7	60.0	65.3
Proceeds, GSE equity related transactions	20.7	16.0	18.7
All other collections deposited in receipt accounts	55.5	51.1	44.4
Subtotal, other collections deposited in receipt accounts	147.3	163.1	165.8
Subtotal, offsetting receipts	282.2	286.6	302.2
Total, offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public	516.0	510.3	534.0
Total, offsetting collections and offsetting receipts excluding off-budget	442.4	435.4	458.6
ADDENDUM:			
User charges that are offsetting collections and offsetting receipts ¹	343.0	329.5	350.9
Other offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public	173.0	180.8	183.1

¹ Excludes user charges that are classified on the receipts side of the budget. For total user charges, see Table 13-3.

Security trust funds), general fund transfers to civilian and military retirement pension and health benefits funds, and agency payments to funds for employee health insurance and retirement benefits. Although these intragovernmental collections exactly offset the payments themselves, with no effect on the deficit or surplus, it is important to record these transactions in the budget to show how much the Government is allocating to fund various programs. For example, in the case of civilian retirement pensions, Government agencies make accrual payments to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund on behalf of current employees to fund their future retirement benefits; the receipt of these payments to the Fund is shown in a single receipt account. Recording the receipt of these payments is important because it demonstrates the total cost to the Government today of providing this future benefit.

The final source of offsetting collections and offsetting receipts is gifts. Gifts are voluntary contributions to the Government to support particular purposes or reduce the amount of Government debt held by the public.

Although both offsetting collections and offsetting receipts are subtracted from gross outlays to derive net outlays, they are treated differently when it comes to accounting for specific programs and agencies. Offsetting collections are usually authorized to be spent for the purposes of an expenditure account and are generally available for use when collected, without further action by the Congress. Therefore, offsetting collections are recorded as offsets to spending within expenditure accounts, so that the account total highlights the net flow of funds.

Like governmental receipts, offsetting receipts are credited to receipt accounts, and any spending of the re-

Table 13–2. OFFSETTING RECEIPTS BY TYPE SUMMARY

(In millions of dollars)

Receipt Type	Actual 2015	Estimate					
		2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Intragovernmental	686,493	823,097	770,912	820,655	888,642	922,187	966,150
Receipts from non-Federal sources:							
Proprietary	252,655	262,143	273,983	272,422	289,209	306,332	321,718
Offsetting governmental	29,535	24,445	28,181	21,277	14,468	15,033	15,315
Total, receipts from non-Federal sources	282,190	286,588	302,164	293,699	303,677	321,365	337,033
Total, offsetting receipts	968,683	1,109,685	1,073,076	1,114,354	1,192,319	1,243,552	1,303,183

ceipts is recorded in separate expenditure accounts. As a result, the budget separately displays the flow of funds into and out of the Government. Offsetting receipts may or may not be designated for a specific purpose, depending on the legislation that authorizes their collection. If designated for a particular purpose, the offsetting receipts may, in some cases, be spent without further action by the Congress. When not designated for a particular purpose, offsetting receipts are credited to the general fund, which contains all funds not otherwise allocated and which is used to finance Government spending that is not financed out of dedicated funds. In some cases where the receipts are designated for a particular purpose, offsetting receipts are reported in a particular agency and reduce or offset the outlays reported for that agency. In other cases, the offsetting receipts are “undistributed,” which means they reduce total Government outlays, but not the outlays of any particular agency.

Table 13–1 summarizes offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public. Note that this table does not include intragovernmental transactions. The amounts shown in the table are not evident in the commonly cited budget measure of (net) outlays. For 2017, the table shows that total offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public are estimated to be \$534.0 billion or 2.8 percent of GDP. Of these, an estimated \$231.8 billion are offsetting collections and an estimated \$302.2 billion are offsetting receipts. Table 13–1 also identifies those offsetting collections and offsetting receipts that are considered user charges, as defined and discussed below.

As shown in the table, major offsetting collections from the public include proceeds from Postal Service sales,

electrical power sales, loan repayments to the Commodity Credit Corporation for loans made prior to enactment of the Federal Credit Reform Act, and Federal employee payments for health insurance. As also shown in the table, major offsetting receipts from the public include premiums for Medicare Parts B and D, proceeds from military assistance program sales, rents and royalties from Outer Continental Shelf oil extraction, proceeds from auctions of the electromagnetic spectrum, dividends on holdings of preferred stock of the Government-sponsored enterprises, and interest income.

Tables 13–2 and 13–5 provide further detail about offsetting receipts, including both offsetting receipts from the public (as summarized in Table 13–1) and intragovernmental transactions. Table 13–5, formerly printed in this chapter, is available on the Internet at www.budget.gov/budget/Analytical_Perspectives and on the Budget CD-ROM. In total, offsetting receipts are estimated to be \$1,073.1 billion in 2017; \$770.9 billion are from intragovernmental transactions and \$302.2 billion are from the public. The offsetting receipts from the public consist of proprietary receipts (\$274.0 billion) and those classified as offsetting receipts by law or long-standing practice (\$28.2 billion) and shown as offsetting governmental receipts in the table. Proprietary receipts from the public result from business-like transactions such as the sale of goods or services, or the rental or use of Government land. Offsetting governmental receipts are composed of fees from Government regulatory services or Government licenses that, absent a specification in law or a long-standing practice, would be classified on the receipts side of the budget.

II. USER CHARGES

User charges or user fees⁵ refer generally to those monies that the Government receives from the public for market-oriented activities and regulatory activities. In combination with budget concepts, laws that authorize

user charges determine whether a user charge is classified as an offsetting collection, an offsetting receipt, or a governmental receipt. Almost all user charges, as defined below, are classified as offsetting collections or offsetting receipts; for 2017, only an estimated 1.5 percent of user charges are classified as governmental receipts. As summarized in Table 13–3, total user charges for 2017 are estimated to be \$356.2 billion with \$350.9 billion being offsetting collections or offsetting receipts, and accounting for more than half of all offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public.

⁵ In this chapter, the term “user charge” is generally used and has the same meaning as the term “user fee.” The term “user charge” is the one used in OMB Circular No. A–11, “Preparation, Submission, and Execution of the Budget”; OMB Circular No. A–25, “User Charges”; and Chapter 9 of this volume, “Budget Concepts.” In common usage, the terms “user charge” and “user fee” are often used interchangeably, and in *A Glossary of Terms Used in the Federal Budget Process*, GAO provides the same definition for both terms.

Table 13-3. GROSS OUTLAYS, USER CHARGES, OTHER OFFSETTING COLLECTIONS AND OFFSETTING RECEIPTS FROM THE PUBLIC, AND NET OUTLAYS

(In billions of dollars)

	Actual 2015	Estimate	
		2016	2017
Gross outlays to the public	4,204.3	4,461.6	4,681.2
Offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public:			
User charges ¹	343.0	329.5	350.9
Other	173.0	180.8	183.1
Subtotal, offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public	516.0	510.3	534.0
Net outlays	3,688.3	3,951.3	4,147.2

¹ \$4.8 billion of the total user charges for 2015 were classified as governmental receipts, and the remainder were classified as offsetting collections and offsetting receipts. \$4.6 billion and \$5.3 billion of the total user charges for 2016 and 2017 are classified as governmental receipts, respectively.

Definition. In this chapter, user charges refer to fees, charges, and assessments levied on individuals or organizations directly benefiting from or subject to regulation by a Government program or activity, where the payers do not represent a broad segment of the public such as those who pay income taxes.

Examples of business-type or market-oriented user charges and regulatory and licensing user charges include those charges listed in Table 13-1 for offsetting collections and offsetting receipts. User charges exclude certain offsetting collections and offsetting receipts from the public, such as payments received from credit programs, interest, and dividends, and also exclude payments from one part of the Federal Government to another. In addition, user charges do not include dedicated taxes (such as taxes paid to social insurance programs or excise taxes on gasoline) or customs duties, fines, penalties, or forfeitures.

Alternative definitions. The definition for user charges used in this chapter follows the definition used in OMB Circular No. A-25, “User Charges,” which provides policy guidance to Executive Branch agencies on setting the amount for user charges. Alternative definitions may be used for other purposes. Much of the discussion of user charges below—their purpose, when they should be levied, and how the amount should be set—applies to these alternative definitions as well.

A narrower definition of user charges could be limited to proceeds from the sale of goods and services, excluding the proceeds from the sale of assets, and to proceeds that are dedicated to financing the goods and services being provided. This definition is similar to one the House of Representatives uses as a guide for purposes of committee jurisdiction. (See the Congressional Record, January 3, 1991, p. H31, item 8.) The definition of user charges could be even narrower by excluding regulatory fees and focusing solely on business-type transactions. Alternatively, the user charge definition could be broader than the one used in this chapter by including beneficiary- or liability-based excise taxes.⁶

⁶ Beneficiary- and liability-based taxes are terms taken from the Congressional Budget Office, *The Growth of Federal User Charges*, August 1993, and updated in October 1995. Gasoline taxes are an example of beneficiary-based taxes. An example of a liability-based tax is the excise tax that formerly helped fund the hazardous substance superfund

What is the purpose of user charges? User charges are intended to improve the efficiency and equity of financing certain Government activities. Charging users for activities that benefit a relatively limited number of people reduces the burden on the general taxpayer, as does charging regulated parties for regulatory activities in a particular sector.

User charges that are set to cover the costs of production of goods and services can result in more efficient resource allocation within the economy. When buyers are charged the cost of providing goods and services, they make better cost-benefit calculations regarding the size of their purchase, which in turn signals to the Government how much of the goods or services it should provide. Prices in private, competitive markets serve the same purposes. User charges for goods and services that do not have special social or distributional benefits may also improve equity or fairness by requiring those who benefit from an activity to pay for it and by not requiring those who do not benefit from an activity to pay for it.

When should the Government impose a charge? Discussions of whether to finance spending with a tax or a fee often focus on whether the benefits of the activity accrue to the public in general or to a limited group of people. In general, if the benefits of spending accrue broadly to the public or include special social or distributional benefits, then the program should be financed by taxes paid by the public. In contrast, if the benefits accrue to a limited number of private individuals or organizations and do not include special social or distributional benefits, then the program should be financed by charges paid by the private beneficiaries. For Federal programs where the benefits are entirely public or entirely private, applying this principle can be relatively easy. For example, the benefits from national defense accrue to the public in general, and according to this principle should be (and are) financed by taxes. In contrast, the benefits of electricity sold by the Tennessee Valley Authority accrue primarily to those using the electricity, and should be (and are) financed by user charges.

in the Environmental Protection Agency. This tax was paid by industry groups to finance environmental cleanup activities related to the industry activity but not necessarily caused by the payer of the fee.

In many cases, however, an activity has benefits that accrue to both public and private groups, and it may be difficult to identify how much of the benefits accrue to each. Because of this, it can be difficult to know how much of the program should be financed by taxes and how much by fees. For example, the benefits from recreation areas are mixed. Fees for visitors to these areas are appropriate because the visitors benefit directly from their visit, but the public in general also benefits because these areas protect the Nation's natural and historic heritage now and for posterity. For this reason, visitor recreation fees generally cover only part of the cost to the Government of maintaining the recreation property. Where a fee may be appropriate to finance all or part of an activity, the extent to which a fee can be easily administered must be considered. For example, if fees are charged for entering or using Government-owned land then there must be clear points of entry onto the land and attendants patrolling and monitoring the land's use.

What amount should be charged? When the Government is acting in its capacity as sovereign and where user charges are appropriate, such as for some regulatory activities, current policy supports setting fees equal to the full cost to the Government, including both direct and indirect costs. When the Government is not acting in its capacity as sovereign and engages in a purely business-type transaction (such as leasing or selling goods, services, or resources), market price is generally

the basis for establishing the fee.⁷ If the Government is engaged in a purely business-type transaction and economic resources are allocated efficiently, then this market price should be equal to or greater than the Government's full cost of production.

Classification of user charges in the budget. As shown in the note to Table 13–3, most user charges are classified as offsets to outlays on the spending side of the budget, but a few are classified on the receipts side of the budget. An estimated \$5.3 billion in 2017 of user charges are classified on the receipts side and are included in the governmental receipts totals described in the previous chapter, "Governmental Receipts." They are classified as receipts because they are regulatory charges collected by the Federal Government by the exercise of its sovereign powers. Examples include filing fees in the United States courts and agricultural quarantine inspection fees.

The remaining user charges, an estimated \$350.9 billion in 2017, are classified as offsetting collections and offsetting receipts on the spending side of the budget. As discussed above in the context of all offsetting collections and offsetting receipts, some of these user charges are collected by the Federal Government by the exercise of its sovereign powers and conceptually should appear on the receipts side of the budget, but they are required by law or a long-standing practice to be classified on the spending side.

⁷ Policies for setting user charges are promulgated in OMB Circular No. A–25: "User Charges" (July 8, 1993).

III. USER CHARGE PROPOSALS

As shown in Table 13–1, an estimated \$231.8 billion of user charges for 2017 will be credited directly to expenditure accounts and will generally be available for expenditure when they are collected, without further action by the Congress. An estimated \$302.2 billion of user charges for 2017 will be deposited in offsetting receipt accounts and will be available to be spent only according to the legislation that established the charges.

As shown in Table 13–4, the Administration is proposing new or increased user charges that would, in the aggregate, increase collections by an estimated \$4.2 billion in 2017 and an average of \$11.1 billion per year from 2018 through 2026. These estimates reflect only the amounts to be collected; they do not include related spending. Each proposal is classified as either discretionary or mandatory, as those terms are defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended. "Discretionary" refers to user charges controlled through annual appropriations acts and generally under the jurisdiction of the appropriations committees in the Congress. "Mandatory" refers to user charges controlled by permanent laws and under the jurisdiction of the authorizing committees. These and other terms are discussed further in this volume in Chapter 9, "Budget Concepts."

A. Discretionary User Charge Proposals

1. Offsetting collections

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service: Grazing administrative processing fee. The Budget proposes, beginning on March 1, 2017, and in each subsequent year through February 28, 2020, to recover some of the costs of issuing grazing permits and leases on Forest Service lands. The Forest Service would charge a fee of \$2.50 per head month for cattle and its equivalent for other livestock, which would be collected along with current grazing fees. The fee would allow the Forest Service to more expeditiously address pending applications for grazing permit renewals and perform other necessary grazing activities.

Department of Commerce

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA): Infrastructure permitting fee. The Budget includes a proposal to allow NOAA to collect user fees from private entities for activities related to regulatory permitting. This authority would allow NOAA to expedite studies and data collection supporting decision-making in collaboration with private entities seeking regulatory permits. Annual collections are estimated to be \$100,000.

Department of Health and Human Services

Food and Drug Administration (FDA): Food facilities registration, inspection, and import fees. The Budget includes a proposed fee to finance activities that support the safety and security of America's food supply and help meet the requirements of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act.

FDA: International courier fees. The volume of imports, predominantly medical products, being brought into the United States by international couriers is growing substantially. To ensure the safety of these FDA-regulated products through increased surveillance efforts, the Budget includes a new charge to international couriers.

FDA: Cosmetic facility registration fees. FDA promotes the safety of cosmetics and other health and beauty products. The Budget includes a new facility registration fee for cosmetic and other health and beauty product facilities that will improve FDA's capacity to promote greater safety and understanding of these products.

FDA: Food contact substances notification fee. Food contact substances include components of food packaging and food processing equipment that come in contact with food. This new fee will allow FDA to promote greater safety and understanding of the products that come into contact with food when used.

FDA: Export certification user fee cap increase. Firms exporting products from the United States are often asked by foreign customers or foreign governments to supply a "certificate" for products regulated by the FDA to document the product's regulatory or marketing status. The proposal increases the maximum user fee cap from \$175 per export certification to \$600 to meet FDA's true cost of issuing export certificates and to ensure better and faster service for American companies that request the service.

Health Resources and Services Administration: 340B Pharmacy Affairs fee. To improve the administration and oversight of the 340B Drug Discount Program, the Budget includes a new charge to those entities participating in the program.

Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS): Survey and certification revisit fee. The Budget proposes a revisit user fee to provide CMS with a greater ability to revisit poor performing health care facilities to build greater accountability by creating an incentive for facilities to correct deficiencies and ensure quality of care.

Department of Homeland Security

Transportation Security Administration (TSA): Aviation passenger security fee increase. Since 2001 the aviation passenger security fee had been limited to \$2.50 per passenger enplanement with a maximum fee of \$5.00 per one-way trip pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act. Pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act (BBA) of 2013, starting in July 2014, this fee was restructured into a single per-trip charge and increased to \$5.60 per one-way trip. Over the next 10 years, this restructured fee is projected to provide \$40 billion in additional discretionary offsetting collections and \$13 billion for deficit reduction.

The 2017 Budget proposes to increase the \$5.60 fee established by the BBA of 2013 to \$6.60 for 2017 and by an additional 40 cents in 2018, and by an additional 25 cents in 2019 and 2020, resulting in a fee of \$7.50 in 2020 that will capture 69 percent of the costs of aviation security in 2020 and 70 percent by 2026. Under this proposal, starting in 2018, a portion of the collections would be allocated between general fund deposits and discretionary offsetting collections. In total, this proposal will increase receipts by an estimated \$12.3 billion from 2017 through 2026. Of that amount, \$6.9 billion will be categorized as discretionary offsetting collections to pay for the costs of aviation security while the remaining \$5.4 billion will be deposited in the general fund for deficit reduction.

TSA: Aviation security infrastructure fee. The aviation security infrastructure fee was authorized in 2001 by the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, requiring air carriers to pay a fee reflecting the aviation industry's share of the costs for screening passengers and property as well as providing other aviation security services. The BBA of 2013 repealed the Aviation Security Infrastructure Fee, effective October 1, 2014, causing offsetting collections to decrease by \$4.2 billion over ten years. The 2017 Budget proposes that TSA continue to collect the aviation security infrastructure fee, starting in 2017. The Budget also proposes to reinstate the Aviation Security Infrastructure Fee permanently in the future while providing a mechanism for the agency to more equitably apportion the collection of \$420 million among air carriers on the basis of current market share. This proposal increases collections by an estimated \$4.2 billion from 2017 through 2026.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Administrative support fee. The Budget requests authority to charge lenders using FHA mortgage insurance an administrative support fee, which would generate an estimated \$30 million annually in offsetting collections. These additional collections will offset the cost of enhancements to administrative contract support and FHA staffing, including increasing the number of loans reviewed annually for quality assurance.

Department of the Interior (DOI)

Bureau of Land Management (BLM): Public lands oil and gas lease inspection fees. The Budget proposes new inspection fees for oil and gas facilities that are subject to inspection by BLM. The fees would be based on the number of oil and gas wells per facility, providing for costs to be shared equitably across the industry. In 2017, BLM will spend \$48 million on managing the compliance inspection program. Inspection costs include, among other things, the salaries and travel expenses of inspectors. The proposed fees will generate approximately \$48 million in 2017, thereby fully offsetting the Bureau's cost of compliance inspections and requiring energy developers on Federal lands to fund the majority of inspection-related compliance costs incurred by BLM.

BLM: Grazing administrative processing fee. The Budget proposes a three-year pilot project to allow BLM

to recover some of the costs of issuing grazing permits and leases on BLM lands. BLM would charge a fee of \$2.50 per animal unit month, which would be collected along with current grazing fees. The fee would allow BLM to address pending applications for grazing permit renewals more expeditiously. BLM would promulgate regulations for the continuation of the grazing administrative fee as a cost recovery fee after the pilot expires.

Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement: Inspection fees. The Budget proposes to update the existing inspection fee structure for offshore oil and gas production facilities to allow fees to be collected for each inspection that is conducted when a facility is subject to multiple inspections during a given year. This will reduce the need for taxpayer funds to support the program, while more equitably distributing costs among operators based on risk factors such as an operator's history of compliance with safety regulations. The proposed fees are estimated to generate \$65 million in 2017, an increase of approximately \$11 million over the amount that would be collected under the current fee structure.

Department of Justice

Antitrust Division: Increase Hart-Scott-Rodino fees. The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice Antitrust Division are responsible for reviewing corporate mergers to ensure they do not promote anticompetitive practices. Revenues collected from pre-merger filing fees, known as Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) fees, are split evenly between the two agencies. The Budget proposes to increase the HSR fees and index them to the annual change in the gross national product. The fee proposal would also create a new merger fee category for mergers valued at over \$1 billion. Under the proposal, the fee increase would take effect in 2018, and it is estimated that in 2018 HSR fees would total \$378 million (\$189 million for each of Federal Trade Commission and DOJ Antitrust Division), an increase of \$118 million per year (\$59 million for each of Federal Trade Commission and DOJ Antitrust Division).

Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC)

CFTC fee. The Budget proposes an amendment to the Commodity Exchange Act, effective in 2017, authorizing the CFTC to collect fees, like other Federal financial and banking regulators, from its regulated community equal to the agency's annual appropriation. Fee rates would be designed in a way that supports market access, market liquidity, and the efficiency of the Nation's futures, options, and swaps markets. Fee funding would shift the costs of regulatory services provided by the CFTC from the general taxpayer to the primary beneficiaries of the CFTC's oversight. Subject to enactment of authorizing legislation permitting the CFTC to collect user fees, the Administration proposes that collections begin with the fiscal year 2018 appropriation.

Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)

Import surveillance user fee. The fee, effective in 2018, will expand a CPSC initiative to keep dangerous prod-

ucts out of the hands of U.S. consumers. CPSC proactively detects and stops hazardous products that do not meet safety standards from entering U.S. ports, while expediting compliant trade. The program uses a risk-based methodology as a cost-efficient means to target and inspect high risk imports.

Federal Trade Commission

Increase Hart-Scott-Rodino fees. See description under Department of Justice.

2. Offsetting receipts

Department of Justice

U.S. Trustee Program (USTP): Chapter 11 quarterly filing fee increase. The USTP is responsible for promoting the integrity and efficiency of the Nation's bankruptcy system for the benefit of all stakeholders – debtors, creditors, and the public. Since 1989, the Program has been fully funded through bankruptcy fees paid primarily by those who use the bankruptcy system. Bankruptcy filings have fallen for the last five years, and have not in recent years followed traditional historical patterns. Unlike other bankruptcy fees that are set administratively by the Judicial Conference of the United States, USTP quarterly fees are set in statute. The Budget proposes to adjust the current quarterly fee structure only for those larger chapter 11 debtors in which quarterly disbursements total \$1 million or more, excluding 98% of all debtors. The quarterly fees for these large cases would be assessed at 1% of the disbursements with a \$250,000 per quarter cap.

Department of State

Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative surcharge extension. The Administration proposes to extend the authority for the Department of State to collect the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative surcharge for one year, through September 30, 2017. The surcharge was initially enacted by the Passport Services Enhancement Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–167) to cover the Department's costs of meeting increased demand for passports, which resulted from the implementation of the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative.

Border Crossing Card (BCC) fee increase. The Budget includes a proposal to allow the fee charged for BCC minor applicants to be set administratively, rather than statutorily, at one-half the fee charged for processing an adult border crossing card. Administrative fee setting will allow the fee to better reflect the associated cost of service, consistent with other fees charged for consular services. As a result of this change, annual BCC fee collections beginning in 2017 are projected to increase by \$1.8 million (from \$0.4 million to \$2.2 million).

Department of Transportation

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration: Pipeline design review fees. The Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (P.L. 112-90) established a new fee for companies engaged in the design, permitting, and construction of new pipe-

line projects. The legislation allowed for the collection of the fee as a mandatory receipt with the spending subject to appropriations. No fees have been collected to date pursuant to this authority. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 and the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act of 2015 provided the authority to retain fees collected in 2014 pursuant to P.L. 112-90. However, since the Administration would like to use these fees as an offset for discretionary spending and does not wish to collect them as a mandatory receipt in exactly the manner prescribed in P.L. 112-90, the Administration proposes collection of this fee pursuant to appropriations language.

B. Mandatory User Charge Proposals

1. Offsetting collections

Department of Agriculture (USDA)

Biobased labeling fee. Biobased products are industrial products (other than food or feed) that are composed, in whole or in part, of biological products, including renewable domestic agricultural materials and forestry materials or an intermediate ingredient or feedstock. USDA issues labels for biobased products through the BioPreferred® program that producers can use in advertising their products. To ensure the integrity of the label, the Budget requests authority for USDA to: 1) impose civil penalties on companies who misuse the label, and 2) assess each producer who applies for the label a \$500 fee to fund a program audit. This fee, which will begin to be collected once authorizing legislation is enacted, was broadly supported by potential users who commented on the label's proposed rule, which was issued in May 2010.

Rural Housing Service: Guaranteed Underwriting System (GUS) fee. The 2017 Budget includes a proposal that would allow up to a \$50 per loan guaranteed underwriting fee for lenders who participate in the section 502 single family housing loan guarantee program, which would become a dedicated funding source to offset the cost of systems upgrades and maintenance for the GUS. Estimates assume the collections will begin in 2019 with a charge of \$25 per loan generating \$4 million per year for the GUS system.

Department of Labor (DOL)

Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC): Premium increases. PBGC acts as a backstop to protect pension payments for workers whose companies have failed. Currently, PBGC's pension insurance programs are underfunded, and its liabilities far exceed its assets. PBGC receives no taxpayer funds and its premiums are currently much lower than what a private financial institution would charge for insuring the same risk. The Budget proposes to give the PBGC Board the authority to adjust premiums and directs PBGC to take into account the risks that different sponsors pose to their retirees and to PBGC. This reform will both encourage companies to fully fund their pension benefits and ensure the continued

financial soundness of PBGC. The PBGC Board would use this authority to increase premiums in the multiemployer program by adding a variable rate premium based on plan underfunding as well as an exit premium, which would be assessed to employers that leave the system. This proposal is estimated to save \$15 billion over the next decade.

Foreign Labor Certification fees. The Budget proposes legislation to allow DOL to charge fees for new applications filed under the Permanent and H-2B foreign labor certification programs, to improve the speed and quality of certification processing. The Budget also proposes legislation to allow DOL to retain fees for certified applications filed under the H-2A temporary labor certification program and modify the fee to cover full program costs. The fees would partially offset Federal costs for administering these programs and, once fully implemented, would eliminate the need for appropriations for this purpose.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Confidential business information (CBI) management fee. EPA receives filings under the Toxic Substances Control Act that may contain information claimed as CBI. The Budget proposes to expand EPA's existing authority to collect fees to recover approximately 40 percent annually of the costs of reviewing and maintaining the CBI. These costs relate to the management and maintenance of headquarters and regional CBI repositories, a stand-alone secure CBI database and communications system, physical security, and CBI reviews and sanitizations.

2. Offsetting receipts

Department of Agriculture

Food Safety and Inspection Service: Performance and other charges. This fee would be charged to those meat processing plants that have sample failures that result in retesting, have recalls, or are linked to an outbreak. This arrangement will offset the Federal Government's costs for resampling and retesting, while encouraging better food safety practice for processing plants. This fee is expected to generate \$4 million in 2017.

Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration: Standardization and licensing activities. These fees would recover the full cost for the development, review, and maintenance of official U.S. grain standards and also for licensing fees to livestock market agencies, dealers, stockyards, packers, and swine contractors. The fees are expected to generate \$30 million in 2017.

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service: Inspection and licensing charges. The Administration proposes to establish charges for: 1) animal welfare inspections for animal research facilities, carriers, and in-transit handlers of animals, 2) licenses for individuals or companies who seek to market a veterinary biologic, and 3) reviews and inspections related to authorized activities to ensure that the regulated entities provide sufficient safeguards for regulated products of biotechnology.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Conservation user fee: The BBA of 2013 provided NRCS with the authority to establish a modest fee to partially

offset the agency's cost to develop conservation plans. While this authority included provisions that would exempt beginning, limited resource, and socially disadvantaged farmers, it did not provide NRCS with the authority to retain and spend any fees collected. To more closely associate the fee with the service being provided, the Budget includes language that would allow NRCS to retain and spend any fees collected for the development of conservation plans.

Department of Health and Human Services

CMS: Income-related premium increase under Medicare Parts B and D. The Budget contains a proposal to increase income-related premiums under Medicare Parts B and D. Beginning in 2020, this proposal would increase premiums for certain high-income beneficiaries and maintains the income thresholds associated with these income-related premiums until 25 percent of beneficiaries under Parts B and D are subject to these premiums. This will help improve the financial stability of the Medicare program by reducing the Federal subsidy of Medicare costs for those who need the subsidy the least.

CMS: Medicare Provider Enrollment Application Fee. The Budget proposes an enrollment application fee for all individuals and groups enrolling as Medicare providers, to be adjusted by inflation annually. Providers may request hardship exemptions where applicable. Amounts collected would cover the costs of conducting required provider screening and related program integrity efforts.

CMS: Medicare Billing Agent Enrollment Application Fee. The Budget proposes to establish an enrollment and registration process for clearinghouses and billing agents who act on behalf of Medicare providers and suppliers, introducing an application fee to be consistent with program integrity safeguards in place for institutional and individual providers.

CMS: Medicare Provider Fee for Ordering Services or Supplies without Proper Documentation. Improperly documented items and services account for the majority of Medicare fee-for-service improper payments. The Budget proposes a fee for physicians and practitioners when items or services ordered are not supported by sufficient documentation. Amounts collected would cover the costs of conducting medical claim reviews.

CMS: Refundable Filing Fee for Medicare Parts A & B Appeals. The Budget proposes a refundable filing fee on providers, suppliers, and State Medicaid Agencies to pay a per-claim filing fee beginning at the first level of appeals. The fee will be assessed at each level of appeal and is estimated to reflect 30 percent of the applicable administrative costs associated with adjudicating claims. If an appellant's appeal receives a favorable determination, the fee will be refunded. The fee will not apply to beneficiary appeals and will be phased in over a three-year period.

Department of Homeland Security

Customs and Border Protection (CBP): COBRA and Express Consignment Courier Facilities fees. The Budget proposes to increase COBRA fees (statutorily set under the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of

1985) and the Express Consignment Courier Facilities (ECCF) fee created under the Trade Act of 2002. COBRA created a series of user fees for air and sea passengers, commercial trucks, railroad cars, private aircraft and vessels, commercial vessels, dutiable mail packages, broker permits, barges and bulk carriers from Canada and Mexico, cruise vessel passengers, and ferry vessel passengers. This proposal would increase the customs inspection fee by \$2 and increase other COBRA fees by a proportional amount.

The ECCF fee was created to reimburse CBP for inspection costs related to express consignment and the proposal would increase the fee by \$0.36. The additional revenue raised from increasing the COBRA and ECCF user fees will allow CBP to recover more costs associated with customs related inspections, and reduce waiting times by helping to support the hiring of 840 new CBP officers.

CBP: Increase immigration inspection user fee (IUF) and lift IUF fee limitation. The Budget proposes to increase the immigration inspection user fee by \$2. The current fees are \$7 for air and commercial vessel passengers and \$3 for partially exempted commercial vessel passengers whose trips originate in Canada, Mexico, U.S. territories, and adjacent islands. This fee is paid by passengers and is used to recover some of the costs related to determining the admissibility of passengers entering the U.S. Specifically, the fees collected support immigration inspections, personnel, the maintenance and updating of systems to track criminal and illegal aliens in areas with high apprehensions, asylum hearings, and the repair and maintenance of equipment. CBP has also identified several automation and technology development initiatives to improve its business processes related to cruise ship processing, should this fee increase be realized, including mobile devices for passenger processing; automated passport control and Global Entry Kiosks; and Entry/Exit Biometric technology development, all for the cruise environment.

The Budget also proposes to lift the exemption for passengers traveling from those partially-exempt regions so that the same fee will be applied to all sea passengers. As noted, each sea passenger arriving in the United States is currently charged a \$7 fee if his or her journey originated from a place outside of the United States except for certain regions. Lifting this fee limitation will bring collections more in line with the cost of conducting sea passenger inspections as well as help modernize and create more efficient and effective business processes and systems in the cruise environment. Together, the additional receipts collected from these increases would fund 1,230 new CBP officers, which will reduce wait times at air and sea ports of entry, especially as cruise volumes continue to grow as projected in future years.

TSA: Aviation passenger security fee increase. As discussed above in the section on discretionary user charge proposals, the Budget includes a proposal to increase the aviation passenger security fee incrementally over 2017-2020. The fee would be \$7.50 per one-way trip beginning in 2020 and would generate \$5.4 billion in mandatory re-

ceipts over the 10-year budget window, which would be deposited in the general fund for deficit reduction.

Department of the Interior

Federal oil and gas management reforms. The Budget includes a package of legislative reforms to bolster and backstop administrative actions being taken to reform the management of DOI's onshore and offshore oil and gas programs, with a key focus on improving the return to taxpayers from the sale of these Federal resources. Proposed statutory and administrative changes fall into three general categories: 1) advancing royalty reforms, 2) encouraging diligent development of oil and gas leases, and 3) improving revenue collection processes. Royalty reforms include: establishing minimum royalty rates for oil, gas, and similar products; increasing the standard onshore oil and gas royalty rate; piloting a price-based sliding scale royalty rate; and repealing legislatively-mandated royalty relief for "deep gas" wells. Diligent development requirements include shorter primary lease terms, stricter enforcement of lease terms, and monetary incentives to move leases into production (e.g., a new statutory per-acre fee on nonproducing leases). Revenue collection improvements include simplification of the royalty valuation process and permanent repeal of DOI's authority to accept in-kind royalty payments. Collectively, these reforms will generate roughly \$1.7 billion in net receipts to the Treasury over 10 years, of which about \$1.2 billion would result from statutory changes. Many States will also benefit from higher Federal revenue sharing payments.

BLM: Reform of hardrock mineral production on Federal lands. The Administration proposes to institute a leasing process under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 for certain minerals (gold, silver, lead, zinc, copper, uranium, and molybdenum) currently covered by the General Mining Law of 1872. After enactment, mining for these metals on Federal lands would be governed by the new leasing process and subject to annual rental payments and a royalty of not less than 5 percent of gross proceeds. Half of the receipts would be distributed to the States in which the leases are located and the remaining half would be retained by the Treasury. Existing mining claims would be exempt from the change to the leasing system, but would be subject to increases in the annual maintenance fees under the General Mining Law of 1872.

BLM: Reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (FLTFA). The Budget proposes to reauthorize the FLTFA, which expired in July 2011, and allow lands identified as suitable for disposal in recent land use plans to be sold using the FLTFA authority. The FLTFA sales revenues would continue to be used to fund the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands and to cover BLM's administrative costs associated with conducting sales.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Pre-manufacture notice fee. EPA currently collects fees from chemical manufacturers seeking to market new chemicals. These fees are authorized by the Toxic Substances Control Act and are subject to a statutory cap.

The Budget proposes to lift the cap so that EPA can recover a greater portion of the program cost.

Federal Communications Commission (FCC)

Spectrum license fee authority. To promote efficient use of the electromagnetic spectrum, the Administration proposes to provide the FCC with new authority to use other economic mechanisms, such as fees, as a spectrum management tool. The FCC would be authorized to set charges for unauctioned spectrum licenses based on spectrum-management principles. Fees would be phased in over time as part of an ongoing rulemaking process to determine the appropriate application and level for fees.

Auction domestic satellite service spectrum licenses. The FCC would be allowed to assign licenses for certain satellite services that are predominantly domestic through competitive bidding, as had been done before a 2005 court decision called the practice into question on technical grounds. The proposal is expected to raise \$50 million from 2017–2026. These receipts would be deposited in the general fund for deficit reduction.

Auction or assign via fee 1675-1680 megahertz. The Budget proposes that the FCC either auction or use fee authority to assign spectrum frequencies between 1675-1680 megahertz for flexible use by 2020, subject to sharing arrangements with Federal weather satellites. Currently, the spectrum is being used for radiosondes (weather balloons), weather satellite downlinks, and data broadcasts, and the band will also support future weather satellite operations. NOAA began transitioning radiosondes operations out of the band in 2016 as part of the Advanced Wireless Services 3 (AWS-3) relocation process. If this proposal is enacted, NOAA would establish limited protection zones for the remaining weather satellite downlinks and develop alternative data broadcast systems for users of its data products. Without this proposal, these frequencies are unlikely to be auctioned and repurposed to commercial use. The proposal is expected to raise \$300 million in receipts over 10 years.

C. User Charge Proposals that are Governmental Receipts

Department of Energy

Reauthorize special assessment on domestic nuclear facilities. The Administration proposes to authorize the use of balances in the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund for the same purpose as the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, in order to fund higher-than-expected cleanup costs. Established in 1992, the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund pays, subject to appropriation, the decontamination and decommissioning costs of the Department of Energy's gaseous diffusion plants in Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky. To offset the PAYGO cost of the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund proposal, the

Budget proposes to reauthorize the special assessment on domestic nuclear utilities.

Department of Homeland Security

CBP: Establish user fee for Electronic Visa Update System. The Budget proposes to establish a user fee for the Electronic Visa Update System (EVUS), a new CBP program to collect biographic and travel-related information from certain non-immigrant visa holders prior to traveling to the United States. This process will complement existing visa application process and enhance CBP's ability to make pre-travel admissibility and risk determinations. CBP proposes to establish a user fee to fund the costs of establishing, providing, and administering the system.

Corps of Engineers—Civil Works

Reform inland waterways funding. The Administration proposes legislation to reform the laws governing the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, including establishing an annual per vessel fee to increase the amount paid by commercial navigation users of the inland waterways. In 1986, the Congress provided that commercial traffic on the inland waterways would be responsible for 50 percent of the capital costs of the locks and dams, and other features that make barge transportation possible on the inland waterways. The additional revenue would help finance future capital investments in these waterways, as well as 25 percent of the operation and maintenance costs, to support economic growth. The current excise tax on diesel fuel used in inland waterways commerce, which was recently increased to 29 cents per gallon, will not produce the revenue needed to cover these costs.

Table 13–4. USER CHARGE PROPOSALS IN THE FY 2017 BUDGET—Continued
(Estimated collections in millions of dollars)

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2017-2021	2017-2026
Rural Housing Service: Guaranteed Underwriting System fee				4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	12	32
Department of Labor													
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation: Premium increases		1,220	1,265	1,310	1,401	1,446	1,536	1,581	1,672	2,991	578	6,642	15,000
Foreign Labor Certification fees		38	78	81	85	88	92	96	100	104	109	370	871
Environmental Protection Agency													
Confidential Business Information management fee			2	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	26	66
<i>Offsetting receipts</i>													
Department of Agriculture													
Food Safety and Inspection Service: Performance and other charges		4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	22	47
Grain, Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration: Standardization and licensing activities		30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	150	300
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service: Inspection and licensing charges		20	27	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	131	291
Natural Resource Conservation Service: Conservation user fee			4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	16	36
Department of Health and Human Services													
CMS: Income-related premium increase under Medicare Parts B and D					1,870	3,370	4,620	6,170	7,950	7,740	9,080	5,240	40,800
CMS: Allow collection of application fees from individual providers		9	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	11	47	98
CMS: Establish registration process for clearinghouses and billing agents		15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	85	195
CMS: Medicare provider fee for ordering services or supplies without proper documentation													
CMS: Medicare appeals refundable filing fee		9	86	131	131	131	136	141	146	146	151	488	1,208
Department of Homeland Security													
Customs and Border Protection (CBP): COBRA fee		264	276	292	308	328	344	361	380	400		1,468	2,953
CBP: Express Consignment Courier Facilities fee		12	12	14	14	16	16	18	18	18		68	138
CBP: Increase immigration inspection user fee (IUF) and lift IUF limitation		270	279	316	327	396	408	484	500	550	602	1,588	4,132
TSA: Aviation passenger security fee increase			410	490	550	410	400	390	380	370	2,000	1,860	5,400
Department of the Interior													
Federal oil and gas management reforms		20	70	90	110	120	140	150	170	180	190	410	1,240
BLM: Reform of hardrock mineral production on Federal lands			2	4	5	5	6	6	11	17	24	16	80
BLM: Reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act		5	10	20	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	95	245
Environmental Protection Agency													
Pre-manufacture notice fee		4	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	36	76
Federal Communications Commission													
Spectrum license fee authority		200	300	425	550	550	550	550	550	550	550	2,025	4,775
Auction domestic satellite service spectrum licenses		25	25									50	50
Auction or assign via fee 1675–1680 megahertz				150	150							300	300
Subtotal, mandatory user charge proposals		2,146	2,914	3,435	5,647	7,028	8,438	10,169	12,121	13,322	13,553	21,169	78,772
Subtotal, user charge proposals that are offsetting collections and offsetting receipts		3,976	4,817	5,467	7,815	9,375	10,845	12,633	14,642	15,900	14,549	31,449	100,018
GOVERNMENTAL RECEIPTS													
Department of Energy													
Reauthorize special assessment on domestic nuclear facilities		208	212	217	222	227	232	237	243	248	254	1,086	2,300
Department of Homeland Security													
CBP: Establish user fee for Electronic Visa Update System		31	25	27	31	27	31	29	34	24	28	141	287
Corps of Engineers - Civil Works													
Reform inland waterways funding		3	78	118	156	156	156	156	156	155	155	511	1,289
Subtotal, governmental receipts user charge proposals		242	315	362	409	410	419	422	433	427	437	1,738	3,876
Total, user charge proposals		4,218	5,132	5,829	8,224	9,785	11,264	13,055	15,075	16,327	14,986	33,187	103,894

* \$500,000 or less.

