



REP. TOM PRICE, M.D. (R-GA), CHAIRMAN
PAUL TELLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
 424 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
 WASHINGTON, DC 20515

rsc.price.house.gov ph (202) 226-9717 / fax (202) 226-1633

Legislative Bulletin.....June 29, 2010

Contents:

- H.R. 4505** - To enable State homes to furnish nursing home care to parents any of whose children died while serving in the Armed Forces
- H.Res. 1446** - Recognizing the residents of the City of Tracy, California
- H.Res. 1228** - Honoring the veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three and their families
- H.R. 4307** - The "Alejandro Renteria Ruiz Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic" Designation Act
- S.J.Res. 33** - A joint resolution to provide for the reconsideration and revision of the proposed constitution of the United States Virgin Islands
- H.R. 1554** - Fountainhead Property Land Transfer Act
- H.R. 4445** - Indian Pueblo Cultural Center Clarification Act
- H.R. 2340** - Salmon Lake Land Selection Resolution Act
- H.Res. 1460** - Recognizing the important role of pollinators
- H.R. 5611** - Extending the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and extending the authorizations for the airport improvement program
- H.R. 5552** - Firearms Excise Tax Improvement Act
- H.R. __** - Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010
- H.R. __** - Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act
- H.Res. 1153** - Recognizing the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local responders for their work rescuing 17 individuals from a downed military helicopter on a rugged, snow-covered mountain on the Pocahontas-Randolph county line

H.R. 4505 – To Enable State Homes to Furnish Nursing Home Care to Parents Any of Whose Children Died While Serving in the Armed Forces (Thornberry, R-TX)

Order of Business: H.R. 4505 is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.R. 4505 would require the Department of Veterans Affairs to amend Title 38, Code of Federal Regulations to allow state nursing homes to admit and provide services to a non-veteran parent who has had *any* of their children die while serving in the Armed Forces.

Under current law, in order for state homes built using VA grants to receive VA per diem payments, they must maintain 75% veteran residency rates. VA nursing home care is already available to non-veterans as long as they are spouses of veterans or a parent in which all of their children died while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

According to the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Report to Congress on State Home Care, “current authority does not allow the VA per diem payments for services provided in a State Veterans Home to Gold Star parents or any other non-Veteran residents.” Furthermore, the report recommends that a feasibility study is not needed as there would be no additional cost to VA (despite a potential financial impact on states) by opening up State Home Care facilities to non-veterans who have had one child die while serving.

Committee Action: H.R. 4505 was introduced on May 27, 2010, and referred to the Health Subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, which held hearings.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: No CBO score was available at press time.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: Yes, the bill expands services to an additional class of persons.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there is no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing the constitutional authority for Congress to enact this bill is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Emily Henehan Murry; Emily.Murry@mail.house.gov; 202-225-9286

**H.Res. 1446 - Recognizing the residents of the City of Tracy,
California, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the city's
incorporation, for their century of dedicated service to the United
States (McNerney, D-CA)**

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 1446 resolves that Congress:

- “Expresses its gratitude to the veterans of the City of Tracy, California, who have committed their lives to serving the United States; and

- “Expresses its gratitude to all of the residents of the City of Tracy, California, for their century-long commitment to serving the United States.

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “The City of Tracy is located in San Joaquin County, which is home to more than 42,000 veterans;
- “The Tracy area is home to the Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin, which serves as a vital distribution center for materials and supplies for the United States Armed Forces;
- “The City of Tracy maintains a cherished memorial containing the names of the heroes from Tracy who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to the United States from World War I to the present;
- “Members of the United States Armed Forces from the City of Tracy have served with honor in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; and
- “The Tracy Press reported on November 11, 2008, that the City of Tracy has endured one of the Nation's highest per capita casualty rates in the war in Iraq.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 1446 was introduced on June 16, 2010, and referred to the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee, which took no public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.Res. 1228 - Honoring the veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three and their families (Boozman, R-AR)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 1228 would resolve that the House of Representatives:

- “Honors the service, courage, and sacrifice of the veterans of HAL-3;
- “Honors the families of HAL-3 veterans for their support;
- “Expresses its condolences to the families and comrades of those killed in action; and
- “Recognizes HAL-3 as a unique squadron in the history of naval aviation.”

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as `HAL-3') began its history as detachments of Navy Helicopter Combat Support Squadron One (HC-1) which began helicopter gunship operations in support of Navy `Brown Water', Special Operations, and Army units in the Mekong Delta of South Vietnam on September 19, 1966;
- “HAL-3 was officially established on April 1, 1967, in Vung Tau, South Vietnam, and was the only active duty Navy helicopter gunship squadron in the history of Naval Aviation;
- “The valor of the veterans of HAL-3 earned 5 Navy Crosses, 31 Silver Stars, 2 Legion of Merit Medals, 5 Navy and Marine Corps Medals, 219 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 156 Purple Hearts, 101 Bronze Stars, 142 Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Crosses, over 16,000 Air Medals, 439 Navy Commendation Medals, and 228 Navy Achievement Medals, making it possibly the most decorated Navy squadron during the Vietnam War; and
- “HAL-3 was disestablished in March 1972 at Binh Thuy, South Vietnam, as part of the Vietnamization program leaving behind it a combat and humanitarian record recognized as bringing great credit upon the United States Navy and its role in the Vietnam War.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 1228 was introduced on March 25, 2010, and referred to the House Veterans' Affairs and House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel, which took no public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution does not authorize additional expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's

no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226 8576.

**H.R. 4307 - To name the Department of Veterans Affairs
community-based outpatient clinic in Artesia, New Mexico, as the
“Alejandro Renteria Ruiz Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic”
(Teague, D-NM)**

Order of Business: The legislation is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 4307 would designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic at Artesia, New Mexico, as the “Alejandro Renteria Ruiz Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.”

Additional Information: Alejandro Renteria Ruiz served in the U.S. Army during WWII in the Pacific theater. He received the Medal of Honor for heroism shown in Okinawa on April 28, 1945. He remained in the Army after the war and again saw action in Korea. He retired as a sergeant in 1964. He passed away on November 20, 2009. Additional information can be found [here](#).

Committee Action: H.R. 4307 was introduced on December 14, 2009, and referred to the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee, which took no public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: No CBO score is available, but the only costs associated with a U.S. post office renaming are those for sign and map changes, none of which significantly affect the federal budget.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: Although no committee report citing constitutional authority is available, Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to establish Post Offices and post roads.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226 8576.

S.J.Res. 33 - A joint resolution to provide for the reconsideration and revision of the proposed constitution of the United States Virgin Islands to correct provisions inconsistent with the Constitution and Federal law (*Sen. Bingaman, D-NM*)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: S.J.Res.33 would amend P.L. 94-584 to allow Congress to urge the Fifth Constitutional Convention of the United States Virgin Islands to reconvene to reconsider and revise its proposed constitution. Specifically, the resolution expresses that Congress shares the concerns expressed by the executive branch of the Federal Government on certain features of the proposed constitution of the United States Virgin Islands and provides a sense of Congress that:

- “Recognizes the commitment and efforts of the Fifth Constitutional Convention of the United States Virgin Islands to develop a proposed constitution; and
- “Urges the Fifth Constitutional Convention of the United States Virgin Islands to reconvene for the purpose of reconsidering and revising the proposed constitution in response to the views of the executive branch of the Federal Government.”

The resolution amends Section 5 of Public Law 94-584 to permit or urge the constitutional convention to reconvene after the 60 day Presidential and Congressional review period expires.

Additional Background: Acquired from Denmark in 1917, the U.S. Virgin Islands is an unincorporated territory of the United States and one of only two U.S. territories that does not have a locally-adopted constitution to provide for basic governmental organization and operations. In 1974, Congress passed legislation (P.L. 94-584) that would permit citizens of the Virgin Islands to convene a constitutional convention and draft a constitution. The law provides for two consecutive 60-day periods for Presidential and Congressional review. On December 31, 2009, the Governor of the Virgin Islands submitted a proposed constitution to President Obama, and it was transmitted to Congress with administration comments. The end of the 60 legislative day Congressional review period is June 30. This is the fifth proposed constitutional convention for the U.S. Virgin Islands.

In February, the Justice Department noted that at least nine features of the proposed constitution warranted comment by the department and revision. S.J.Res.33 expresses Congress agrees with some of those concerns and the resolution to allow Congress to urge the constitutional convention to reconvene to revise the proposed constitution in response to the concerns outlined by the executive branch and Congress.

Committee Action: On June 17, 2010, the bill was introduced in the Senate and passed without amendment and with a preamble by unanimous consent. On June 22, 2010, the bill was received in the House and held at the desk.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO cost estimate of H.R. S.J.Res.33 is unavailable.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for S.J.Res.33.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 1554—Fountainhead Property Land Transfer Act (*Boren, D-OK*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: The bill requires the Secretary to transfer land currently under control under the Army Corps of Engineers to the Secretary of Interior to be held in trust for the Muscogee (Creek) Nation tribe of Oklahoma. After the Muscogee tribe conducts a survey to determine the approximate acreage of the transfer (reportedly 18 acres), H.R. 1554 requires the tribe to pay the Secretary of the Interior fair market value for the property in addition to the administrative expenses associated with the transfer such as the survey. The bill prohibits gaming from taking place on the transferred property.

Additional Background: According to the bill's sponsor, "the entire Fountainhead property, which the tribe purchased through a foreclosure auction in 2005, consists of 48

acres of fee land, 18 of which is the land owned by the Corps, a 188 room hotel, a recreational building, and some duplex cabins.

After the tribe purchased the property in 2005, a subsequent survey determined that the 18 acres owned by the Corps included the recreational building. Even though the acreage falls within the jurisdiction of the Creek Nation already, the Corps of Engineers has no authority to sell land outright and Congressional action is necessary for the transfer.”

Committee Action: On March 17, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On June 10, 2010, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by favorably by a voice vote.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO cost estimate of H.R. 1554 is unavailable.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 1554.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 4445—Indian Pueblo Cultural Center Clarification Act *(Heinrich, D-NM)*

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 4445 strikes language under current law (Public Law 95-232) that precludes land held in trust by the federal government for the benefit of 19 Indian pueblos in New Mexico from being defined as “Indian country” under United States Code.

Additional Background: In 1978, Congress placed the [Indian Pueblo Council Center](#) in Albuquerque, New Mexico, into trust for the 19 Pueblos of New Mexico. The law did not consider the center Indian Country “for criminal and civil jurisdiction purposes.”

According to the State of New Mexico, the intent of H.R. 4445 is to clarify the “existing practice of non-taxation of the business operations occurring on the lands upon the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center property.” H.R. 4445 will resolve inconsistencies in Public Law 95-232, reflect the current taxation practices on this trust property, and provide clarification in federal law regarding the State and tribal jurisdiction over the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center trust land.

Committee Action: On December 9, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On March 11, 2010, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by favorably by a voice vote.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: CBO estimates that any costs associated with additional law enforcement activities would be insignificant and subject to the availability of appropriated funds. Enacting H.R. 4445 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? Yes, the bill would impose an intergovernmental mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) by prohibiting gaming on some land held in trust for the Pueblos in New Mexico. Because the Pueblos are not currently operating gaming activities on this land nor do they have plans to do so in the future, CBO estimates the cost, if any, would be small and well below the annual threshold established in UMRA (\$70 million in 2010, adjusted annually for inflation).

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 4445.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 2340—Salmon Lake Land Selection Resolution Act (Young, R-AK)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 2340 would ratify the Salmon Lake Area Land Ownership Consolidation Agreement entered into by the United States, the State of Alaska, and the Bering Straits Native Corporation. The federal government would convey about 18,000 acres of land to satisfy claims made by those parties under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and the Alaska Statehood Act.

Additional Background: According to the Senate Natural Resources Committee, Salmon Lake is located 40 miles northeast of Nome and one of the largest bodies of fresh water on the Seward Peninsula and is managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). “The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) created Regional Native Corporations with the right to select certain Federal land as part of a settlement of aboriginal land claims in Alaska. The Bering Straits Native Corporation (BSNC) exercised its rights under ANCSA by selecting land around Salmon Lake. The State of Alaska also selected some of the same land under the Alaska Statehood Act, which granted the State the opportunity to select certain Federal land in Alaska for the benefit of the State.”

According to the BLM, “the BSNC and the State of Alaska each sought to gain title to the Salmon Lake area through selection applications filed under respective provisions of ANCSA and the Alaska Statehood Act. However, the land addressed by the two applications overlapped. The BSNC and the State negotiated a resolution to this issue whereby each entity would receive title to distinct lands.”

The three parties signed the Salmon Lake Area Land Ownership Consolidation Agreement on July 18, 2007. However, legislation is required to ratify the Agreement between the, BLM the BSNC, and the State of Alaska. The Agreement would have expired on January 1, 2009, but its term was extended to January 1, 2011 in anticipation of ratifying legislation.

Committee Action: On May 7, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On June 16, 2010, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, “the federal government currently collects about \$1,500 per year from a lease on the affected land. Thus, CBO estimates that conveying that land would reduce offsetting receipts (a credit against direct spending) by less than \$20,000 over the 2010-2020 period. In addition, upon enactment of the bill, BLM would transfer 90 percent of all receipts collected over the life of the lease (about \$15,000 to date) to the state of Alaska and would deposit the remaining 10 percent of those funds in the U.S. Treasury. In total, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would increase direct spending by about \$30,000 over the 2010-2020 period.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: No explanation of constitutional authority is provided for H.R. 2340.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.Res. 1460 - Recognizing the important role pollinators play in supporting the ecosystem and supporting the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week (*Hastings, D-FL*)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 1460 would resolve that the House of Representatives:

- “Recognizes the importance of pollinators in agriculture and in maintaining our diverse ecosystem; and
- “Supports the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week.”

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “Bees, birds, butterflies, and other pollinators are vital to sustaining a healthy ecosystem;
- “Pollinators are responsible for an estimated 1 out of every 3 bites of food that we eat;
- “A decline in pollinators would adversely impact animal species that eat pollinating plants;
- “Colony collapse disorder has caused an alarming decline in the population of honey bees, one of the most important pollinators; and
- “The majority of States have recognized June 21-27, 2010, as National Pollinator Week.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 1460 was introduced on June 22, 2010, and referred to the House Agriculture Committee, which took no public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report stating constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.R. 5611 - Extending the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and extending the authorizations for the airport improvement program (*Levin, D-MI*)

Order of Business: The legislation is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 5611 would extend the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) authority to collect taxes and administer FAA programs through August 1, 2010 (under current law this authority lapses on July 3, 2010).

Specifically, the legislation would:

- Extend Funding for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund through August 1, 2010;
- Extend the Airport and Airway Trust Fund Expenditure Authority through August 2, 2010; and
- Extend the Airport Improvement Program through August 1, 2010.
 - Authorize appropriations of \$3,515,000,000 (an increase of \$490,342,466 from the previous extension) for FY 2010.

Sets Authorized Spending Levels: This legislation authorizes the following FAA Programs between October 1, 2009, and August 1, 2010, and sets authorized funding levels (subject to appropriation) as follows:

FAA Operations, \$7.813 billion

Air Navigation Facilities and Equipment, \$2.453 billion

Research, Engineering, and Development, \$159 million

Additional Background: The previous extension (H.R. 5147) passed the House on April 28, 2010, by voice vote.

Committee Action: H.R. 5611 was introduced on June 28, 2010 and referred to the House Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, which took no public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A score from CBO is unavailable.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report stating constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.R. 5552 - Firearms Excise Tax Improvement Act of 2010 *(Kind, D-WI)*

Order of Business: The legislation is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 5552 would require that the manufacturers' excise tax on recreation equipment be paid quarterly. Under current law they are paid every two weeks.

The bill would also require the Treasury Secretary to assess and collect the amount of restitution for failure to pay any tax imposed under this title in the same manner as if such amount were such tax. An assessment of the amount of restitution would not be made before all appeals have concluded and the right to make all appeals has expired.

Committee Action: H.R. 5552 was introduced on June 17, 2010, and referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, which took no public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A report from CBO is not available.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report stating constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.R. __ - Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010 (*Dahlkemper, D-PA*)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.R.__ would extend the deadline to close on pending home contacts to October 1, 2010.

Additional Information: Under current law the deadline to close on pending contacts and be eligible for the first-time homebuyer tax credit is July 1, 2010. Homes that are under construction must be complete in order to certify occupancy and then close on the sale, and therefore be eligible for the tax credit. This legislation extends the date of which homebuyers would be able to close and still receive the credit.

The last legislation which contained language that modified the first-time homebuyer tax credit was H.R. 3548, which passed the House on September 22, 2009, by a [roll call vote](#) of 331-83.

Committee Action: H.R.__ has yet to be introduced.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO score is unavailable.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report stating constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.R. 5618 - Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act (*McDermott, D-WA*)

Order of Business: The legislation is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 5618 extends the temporary program of “emergency” unemployment programs that were first created by Federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) Act of 2008 and then expanded by the “stimulus.” This program provides up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits. The bill extends the EUC program entirely through federal funding for the EB program through November 30, 2010. The bill does not include the Federal Additional Compensation payments of an extra \$25 dollars a month in UC provided under the “stimulus.”

H.R. 5618 also establishes procedures by which the states may decide eligibility for unemployment compensation for certain individuals.

The bill designates all spending authorized as “emergency.”

Possible Conservative Concern: Some conservatives may be concerned that the legislation increases the deficit by \$34 billion, according the Ways and Means Committee. In addition, some conservatives have expressed concern that this program being extended grants up to 99 weeks of unemployment. In addition, many economists argue that extending unemployment benefits creates incentives to delay returning to work, which has a negative effect on the economy. As Martin Feldstein states in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in January 2009:

"[w]hile raising unemployment benefits or extending the duration of benefits beyond 26 weeks would help some individuals ... it would also create undesirable incentives for individuals to delay returning to work. That would lower earnings and total spending."

Committee Action: H.R. 5618 has yet to be introduced.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO score is unavailable.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: Yes. This legislation requires states not to reduce their regular unemployment compensation in order to be eligible for unemployment funds that were made under the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2008 (H.R. 2642 in the 110th Congress).

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report stating constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

**H.Res. 1153 - Recognizing the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local responders for their work rescuing 17 individuals from a downed military helicopter on a rugged, snow-covered mountain on the Pocahontas-Randolph county line
(Rahall, D-WV)**

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.Res. 1153 would resolve that the House of Representatives:

- “Honors the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local first responders; and
- “Recognizes the countless volunteers, families, and neighbors who assisted in rescuing the 17 individuals; and
- “Recognizes the courage, ability, incredible determination, and willingness of West Virginians to lend a neighborly hand.”

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “The West Virginia National Guard and local responders safely and successfully rescued 17 individuals from a downed military helicopter on a rugged, snow-covered mountain on the Pocahontas-Randolph county line;
- “On February 18, 2010, the West Virginia Army National Guard HH-60 Blackhawk helicopter, gallantly piloted by Bluefield, West Virginia, native Major

Kevin Hazuka, located the downed aircraft in extremely adverse weather conditions;

- “Two West Virginia Army National Guard Flight Medics, SSG Nicole Hopkins and SPC Casey Dunfee, were lowered to the landing site to assess the situation and to provide assistance to the injured through the night while emergency response and rescue teams worked their way to the survivors;
- “Local West Virginia civilians generously donated the use of their snowmobiles that enabled first responders to reach the site;
- “A Shavers Fork Volunteer Fire and Rescue Unit went as far as they could with special equipment and snowmobiles along a railroad grade to where it was still about a 45-minute trek in 5 feet of snow, straight up the side of a mountain with an approximate 50-degree pitch; and
- “The Bartow-Frank-Durbin Volunteer Fire and Rescue attempted an approach to the crash sight from the North side with support from State of West Virginia Departments of Natural Resources and Highways, neighboring Randolph and Tucker County Sheriff Departments and EMS units, Elkins, Harmon, and Huttonsville/Mill Creek Volunteer Fire Departments, and the American Red Cross.”

Committee Action: H.Res. 1153 was introduced on March 9, 2010, and referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel, which took no public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report stating constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.