



## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

February 17, 2009

### **S. 160**

#### **District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009**

*As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Homeland Security  
and Governmental Affairs on February 11, 2009*

#### **SUMMARY**

S. 160 would expand the number of Members in the House of Representatives from 435 to 437 beginning with the 112th Congress (or the 113th Congress if the legislation is enacted late in the legislative session of the 111th Congress). The legislation would provide that one of the new Members represent the District of Columbia. The second new Member would initially be assigned to the state of Utah and then could be reallocated based on the next Congressional apportionment following the 2010 census (which will occur prior to the start of the 113th Congress).

CBO estimates that enacting the bill in 2009 would increase direct spending by about \$140,000 in 2011 and by about \$2 million over the 2011-2019 period. In addition, implementing the bill would increase discretionary costs by about \$1 million in 2011 and about \$7 million over the 2011-2014 period, assuming the availability of appropriated funds.

S. 160 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no significant costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

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

The estimated budgetary impact of S. 160 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 800 (general government).

By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars													
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2010- 2014	2010- 2019
<b>CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING</b>													
New Representative's Salary and Expenses													
Estimated Budget Authority	0	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	2
Estimated Outlays	0	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	2
<b>CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION</b>													
New Representative's Office and Administrative Expenses													
Estimated Authorization Level	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	7	17
Estimated Outlays	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	7	17

## BASIS OF THE ESTIMATE

For this estimate, CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted during 2009 and that spending will follow historical patterns for spending by Congressional offices, beginning in 2011.

The legislation would permanently expand the number of Members in the House of Representatives by two, to 437 Members. The new representatives would take office on the same day at the start of the 112th Congress. (If S. 160 were enacted after it was possible to elect the new representatives in the November 2010 general election, the new Members would be seated on the first day of the 113th Congress.) One member would represent the District of Columbia, and the other would be a Representative for the state of Utah until the next Congressional apportionment based on the 2010 census (that appointment will be transmitted to the President in December 2010 and would be effective for the 113th Congress). The District of Columbia currently has a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives with the same salary and administrative support as other Representatives. Consequently, enacting S. 160 would increase costs for only one of the new Members.

## Direct Spending

CBO estimates that the increase in direct spending for the salary and benefits of one new Representative would be about \$2 million over the 2011-2019 period. We assume that the current Congressional salary of \$174,000 would be adjusted for inflation.

## **Spending Subject to Appropriation**

Based on the current allowances for administration and expenses available for Members and other typical costs for a Congressional office, CBO estimates that adding a new Member would increase such costs by about \$1 million in fiscal year 2011 and about \$7 million over the 2011-2014 period, subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

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

S. 160 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA and would impose no significant costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

### **ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:**

Federal Costs: Matthew Pickford

Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Elizabeth Cove Delisle

Impact on the Private Sector: Paige Piper/Bach

### **ESTIMATE APPROVED BY**

Theresa Gullo

Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis