

## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

February 27, 2009

# H.R. 157 District of Columbia House Voting Rights Act of 2009

As ordered reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary on February 25, 2009

#### **SUMMARY**

H.R. 157 would expand the number of Members in the House of Representatives from 435 to 437 beginning with the 112th Congress. The legislation would provide the District of Columbia with one Representative and add one new at-large Member. Under H.R. 157, the new at-large seat would likely be assigned to a state based on information from the 2000 census and then be reallocated based on the next Congressional apportionment following the 2010 census (which would occur prior to the start of the 113th Congress).

The legislation's effects on direct spending over the 2009-2013 and 2009-2018 periods are relevant for enforcing pay-as-you-go rules under the current budget resolution. CBO estimates that enacting this legislation would increase direct spending by about \$1 million over the five-year period from 2009 through 2013 and by about \$4 million over the 2009-2018 period. Implementing the bill would increase discretionary costs by about \$2 million in 2011 and about \$12 million over the 2011-2014 period, assuming the availability of appropriated funds.

H.R. 157 contains an intergovernmental mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA), but CBO estimates that the costs would not be significant and would not exceed the threshold established in UMRA (\$69 million in 2009, adjusted annually for inflation). The bill contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

#### ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 157 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												
										2010-	2010-	
2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2014	2019
	CH	IANGE	S IN D	IRECT	SPEND	ING						
0	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	1	1	2	
0	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	1	1	2	:
HANG	ES IN	SPEND	ING SU	J <b>BJEC</b> T	TO A	PPROP	RIATI	ON				
0	0	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	12	32
0	0	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	12	32
]	0 <b>HANG</b> 0	0 0 0 0 HANGES IN S	CHANGE  0 0 * 0 0 * HANGES IN SPEND  0 0 2	CHANGES IN DI	2009 2010 2011 2012 2013  CHANGES IN DIRECT  0 0 * * * * 0 0 * * *  HANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT	2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014  CHANGES IN DIRECT SPEND  0 0 * * * * * 0 0 * * * * *  HANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO A	2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015  CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING  0 0 * * * * * * * 0 0 * * * * * *  HANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROP	2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016  CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING  0 0 * * * * * * * * * 0 0 * * * * * *	2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017  CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING  0 0 * * * * * * * * * 1 0 0 * * * * * * * * 1  HANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION	2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018  CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING  0 0 * * * * * * * * 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019  CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING  0 0 * * * * * * * * * 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2010- 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2014  CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING  0 0 * * * * * * * * * 1 1 1 1 2 2 0 0 0 * * * * * * * * * 1 1 1 1 2 2  HANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION

#### **BASIS OF ESTIMATE**

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

The legislation would permanently expand the number of Members in the House of Representatives by two to 437. One new Member would represent the District of Columbia and the other would likely be a Representative at-large for the state of Utah until the next apportionment based on the 2010 census. The District currently has a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives (which would be retained under this legislation). Consequently, enacting H.R. 157 would increase costs for two new Members.

## **Direct Spending**

CBO estimates that the salaries and benefits of the two new representatives would increase direct spending by about \$5 million over the 2011-2019 period. We assume that the current Congressional salary of \$174,000 would be adjusted in future years for anticipated 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 two new members would increase costs by about \$3 million annually (\$1.5 million per office, adjusted annually for inflation) and about \$12 million over the 2011-2014 period, subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

## ESTIMATED IMPACT ON STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS

H.R. 157 contains an intergovernmental mandate as defined in UMRA. Assuming that the additional Representative provided for in the bill is assigned to Utah, the bill would temporarily preempt laws in that state governing the election of Members of the House of Representatives. The bill would require Utah to elect an additional Member of the House using a statewide election. CBO estimates that the state would incur marginal costs to elect the additional Member in the 2010 election cycle, but those costs would not be significant and would not exceed the threshold established in UMRA (\$69 million in 2009, adjusted annually for inflation.)

#### ESTIMATED IMPACT ON THE PRIVATE-SECTOR

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

#### PREVIOUS CBO ESTIMATE

On February 17, 2009, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for S. 160, the 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. The two bills are similar in that they would permanently increase the number of Members of the House of Representatives, with those new Members coming from the District of Columbia and Utah. However, the House bill would not repeal the provisions of current law related to the delegate for the District of Columbia. The estimated costs of each bill reflect that difference.

## **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